
Memorandum

To: GGNRA Dog Management Work Group

From: Facilitation Team

Subject: Draft Progress Report from Work Group Meetings

Date: October 25, 2007

Based on discussions during three Work Group meetings, a series of agreements have been reached which are important to document in preparation for the full Committee meeting on October 27, 2007. These include:

1. Characterization of products/outcomes from the Work Group
2. Dog Management Guidelines
3. Site Specific Dog management proposals for NEPA analyses
4. Commercial dog walking concepts.

Each of these are described in more detail below. With the inclusion of appropriate revisions, this will constitute the report from the Work Group to the Committee for their action.

1. Characterization of Products/Outcomes from the Work Group

It is important to properly characterize the products from Work Group deliberations. To ensure that everyone has a common understanding, please review the following:

- 1) Consensus agreements adopted by the Committee represent an attempt to identify management guidelines and site-by-site dog management alternatives that address the myriad demands on the park and varying interests which must be accommodated in a balanced fashion; such agreements establish proposals that will be fully considered in the NEPA analysis of alternatives.
- 2) At this point, no Committee member will be asked to finally endorse any agreement, pending results from the NEPA impact analysis process; nevertheless, there is value in reaching preliminary agreements as discussed below.
- 3) Consensus agreements reached (by the full Committee) will “be integrated into one or more alternatives in the EIS” and could “serve as the basis for the proposed regulation” pending the results of the NEPA analysis (from NEPA public scoping brochure and Committee Charter).
- 4) Preliminary agreements (on dog management proposals) that receive support across the spectrum of Committee members will ensure those potential solutions are fully analyzed in the NEPA process; in the absence of such agreements,

- GGNRA will design options that it believes best meet its mandates in light of the information collected and input provided during the course of the deliberations.
- 5) Monitoring and adaptive management will be part of any agreements reached, as will public education and outreach.
 - 6) Enforcement will be a critical consideration in the NEPA evaluation process.
 - 7) GGNRA leadership believes by virtue of GGNRA's unique nature, historical use and past litigation that a GGNRA-specific rule addressing dog management will have limited impact on setting precedent for other National Parks. The Federal Panel concurred with this view.
 - 8) Agreements reached by the Committee should fit National Park Service considerations for proposed rules: further compliance with the NPS mission, promote visitor safety and resource protection, and be clearly understandable and enforceable. The NPS recognizes that full compliance with rules regulating visitor conduct cannot be ensured, but that the vast majority of visitors obey park rules.

These are the key issues to be incorporated into the characterization of the results from the work group discussions, as well as in any agreements ultimately reached by the GGNRA Dog Management Negotiated Rulemaking Committee.

2. Dog Management Guidelines

The GGNRA Reg Neg Committee adopted nine Guiding Principles for dog management at its April 5, 2007 meeting (see Appendix A). From Committee and Technical Subcommittee discussions, a set of Dog Management Guidelines was then compiled to assist in identifying how these Principles could be "operationalized." Those Guidelines were discussed by the Technical Subcommittee and subsequently the Work Group discussing proposals for dog management at specific GGNRA sites.

Based on those discussions, the revised list of Guidelines is proposed for consideration by the entire Committee. The guidelines below represent a consensus recommendation from the October 19, 2007 Work Group participants. The intent is for this to contribute to a comprehensive proposal containing preliminary agreements on both Dog Management Guidelines and site-specific proposals for adoption by the full Committee. *Please note: Revisions were made to Guidelines 3, 4, 10, and 14; agreement on Guideline #9 was deferred until others could be included in the discussion.*

| | Proposed Dog Management Guidelines | Guiding Principles |
|----|--|---------------------------|
| 1. | All GGNRA visitors should have clear notice about the potential for interactions with a dog at all GGNRA locations where dogs are permitted. | 1, 5, 8 |
| 2. | Dog management policies should support the reasonable expectation of personal safety for all GGNRA visitors. | 1, 5, 8 |
| 3. | Dog guardians have a responsibility to prevent unwelcome (non-consensual) interactions between their dog(s) and people, other | 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 |

| | | |
|-----|---|------------------|
| | dogs, horses and wildlife at all areas within GGNRA. (Refer to Guideline #14 for definition of “control.”) | |
| 4. | Dog guardians have a responsibility to ensure their dog(s) does not create negative impacts (such as digging, harassing wildlife or entering sensitive habitat) on GGNRA resources (such as plants, soils, wildlife and water bodies). | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
| 5. | All GGNRA dog use areas shall have well-maintained signage that clearly describes conditions of use by dogs and guardians, located to maximize visitor education and awareness. | 1, 5, 8 |
| 6. | GGNRA dog rules and regulations shall be followed by dog guardians; dog guardians should be made aware that otherwise they shall be subject to enforcement actions. | 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 |
| 7. | An area designated for off-leash dog activity within GGNRA will be called a Regulated Off-Leash Area (ROLA). | 1, 4, 5, 8 |
| 8. | ROLAs are the only areas within GGNRA where off-leash dogs are allowed, and dog guardians are responsible for ensuring that their off-leash dogs remain within ROLA boundaries. | 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 |
| 9. | <i>ROLA boundaries shall be clearly and effectively delineated to achieve visitor safety, provide notice regarding appropriate uses, protect natural resources, and provide a range of visitor experiences. A variety of delineation measures shall be considered, including fencing, vegetation, other natural or man-made barriers (e.g., bluffs, sea walls), buffers or some combination of the above.</i> | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8 |
| 10. | Dog guardians must have a current dog license to visit GGNRA dog use areas, and each dog must wear a collar exhibiting their registration/vaccination tag. | 1 |
| 11. | Dog guardians must have a leash for each dog in their care, complying with NPS regulations that currently stipulate a maximum length of six feet. | 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 |
| 12. | Dogs must be leashed at all times in parking lots and designated picnic areas. | 1, 5, 8 |
| 13. | Dog guardians must at all times be in possession of bags to clean up dog waste and ensure that their dog’s waste is picked-up and disposed of at designated locations. | 1, 4, 5 |
| 14. | Dogs in a ROLA are to be kept under control at all times. Dogs are considered under control when they are within direct eyesight of the owner/handler and when they immediately respond to their owner/handler. | 1, 5, 8 |
| | | |

| | | |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 15. | Visitors must have reasonable notice of the boundaries of a ROLA and what they should expect within those boundaries. Notice shall include signs at ROLA access points, in transition zones, and in conjunction with fencing or other physical barriers. | 1, 5, 8 |
| 16. | Dog guardians wishing to utilize ROLAs must participate in a Tag Program confirming their understanding of the locations and conditions under which dogs may be allowed off-leash, the natural resources of GGNRA and other relevant information. | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 |
| 17. | In the event of a live stranded marine mammal's presence in a ROLA, e.g., on a beach, all dogs must be immediately leashed (if not already on leash) within 100 yards of the marine mammal. This will stay in effect until the marine mammal is no longer present on the beach. (The presence of a dead marine mammal on a ROLA does not require that dogs be leashed.) Additional signage to educate the public should be utilized. | 1, 2, 3 |

It should be noted that a fundamental concept contained in these Guidelines is the creation of a Tag Program. “Off-leash” representatives on the Work Group highlighted their purpose for promoting this --- to ensure that those who have off-leash dogs in GGNRA recognize it as a privilege, are well aware of the conditions for having a dog in GGNRA and are committed to abiding by those conditions.

3. Site Specific Dog Management Proposals for NEPA Analyses

To reiterate from Section 1, agreement on site specific proposals in essence means that those proposals will be specifically evaluated in the NEPA process. Agreements at this point are not intended to be a final endorsement of any proposal. Based on the results of the NEPA evaluation process, those proposals may then comprise at least part of the solution for identifying where, and under what conditions, off-leash activity might occur.

To date, the following site-specific agreements on proposals have been articulated by the Work Group:

- 1) Pedro Point: analyze the proposed trail (to the site of the future parking lot) for both on-leash and off-leash in conjunction with local jurisdictions which operate adjoining trails.
- 2) Oakwood Valley: on Oakwood trail, no dogs until the juncture with Oakwood Valley Fire Road; on the Road, off-leash with fencing to protect identified sensitive habitats; on-leash past the point where the trail and road intersect.
- 3) Upper Fort Mason: Laguna Green and the main segment of the Great Meadow, off-leash; no dogs in the three parcels between the Great Meadow and the NPS headquarters building; on-leash on the paths; on-leash on the street side of the walkways around Laguna Green.

Partial agreements were identified at three other sites:

- 1) Lands End, W. Ft. Miley and East Ft. Miley: the decision was made to consider these sites together; agreement was reached on the following – off-leash on the eastern boundary of E. Ft. Miley, along the fence which separates it from the golf course; no dogs at the Sutro Baths area and on the Ocean View trail; off-leash on the east-west portion of El Camino.

The proposal to have the Coastal Trail be on-leash its entire length was countered by the suggestion of having at least the northern portion allocated for no dogs; there was not agreement on the idea of evaluating the Coastal Trail for both no dogs and on-leash; W. Ft. Miley was not included in any proposal because there appeared to be no common ground, with the possible exception of no dogs in the picnic area. There are competing interests in allowing off-leash use and protection of potentially valuable bird habitat and viewing.

- 2) Cattle Hill/Sweeny Ridge: the decision was made to consider these two sites together; Sweeny Ridge, however, is not on the list of potential off-leash sites but on the list of potential locations for on-leash or no dogs. The primary issue for the work group is whether off-leash activity might be possible to the west of the trail junction leading up from the parking area due to concerns about the habitat in this area; work group members discussed whether post-and-cable could be used to delineate the areas where dogs must stay on the trail (to protect sensitive coastal sage habitat), but this was left unresolved so other sites could be explored.

This summary addresses six of the 12 sites where off-leash, on-leash and/or no dog options can be considered. Time did not allow discussion of the remaining six sites, which include all the beaches under consideration. These will remain under discussion up to October 27th in an effort to make some progress prior to the Committee meeting.

4. Commercial Dog Walking Concepts

The Work Group considered a set of guidelines for commercial dog walking offered by ProDog through its representative Joe Hague. The Golden Gate Audubon Society has taken a principled position opposing commercial dog walking in GGNRA. One other member of the Work Group also expressed concern about the principle of commercial dog walking in GGNRA. If, however, the decision is made to allow commercial dog walking in GGNRA, the following guidelines were proposed based on the ProDog proposal.:

- 1) Professional Dog walkers must carry a leash for each dog in their care.
- 2) Professional Dog walkers must pickup dog waste for all dogs in their care.
- 3) Professional Dog walkers will be limited to six dogs.
- 4) Professional Dog walkers will carry a liability insurance policy for \$1 million. Proof of policy must be shown to acquire permit.

- 5) Professional Dog walkers will pay a permit fee to use the GGNRA lands, (recommend \$100 per dog walker, as they also must pay county permit fees).
- 6) Professional Dog walkers will transport dogs in a safe well ventilated vehicle.
- 7) Professional Dog walkers must have their dogs under control (see Dog Management Guideline #14 define “control”).
- 8) Professional Dog walkers must abide by all rules regarding off leash dogs on GGNRA lands.
- 9) Having more then the allowed number of dogs will result in a fine for every dog over the limit. Second offense will result in a doubling of the fine, per dog. Third offense will result in suspension of dog walkers’ permit for up to three months.

The original proposal from ProDog included proposed times which would govern when commercial dog walking would be allowed. There was insufficient time for the Work Group to thoroughly discuss and resolve that issue.

Four areas were identified where commercial dog walking might be suitable: Crissy Field, Ft. Funston, Ocean Beach and Upper Ft. Mason. No agreement could be reached on other sites. Again, this outcome is subject to principled opposition to commercial dog walking in GGNRA.

The question was also raised about whether a limit should be placed on how many of the allowable six dogs could be off leash at any one time. The Work Group identified this as an issue to be resolved.

APPENDIX A

Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management
at Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA)

Guiding Principles for Design and Evaluation of Options *Final version as adopted at April 5, 2007 Committee Meeting*

Preamble: The following principles are intended to assist the Committee in evaluating “starting points” and related proposals for dog management within GGNRA, consistent with National Park Service statutes and policies, including the Organic Act, GGNRA enabling legislation, and current management plans.

Guiding Principle 1: Minimize conflicts with other visitors and park staff.

Guiding Principle 2: Protect sensitive species and their habitat. Sensitive species means federal-listed, state-listed, unique or rare species.

Guiding Principle 3: Protect native wildlife and their habitat.

Guiding Principle 4: Minimize soil/water resources degradation.

Guiding Principle 5: Ensure consistency with National Park Service visitor experience definition.

Guiding Principle 6: Continue recreational use including special events.

Guiding Principle 7: Avoid obstructions/barriers to wildlife, except where the purpose of barriers would be protective of wildlife.

Guiding Principle 8: Ensure public safety/visitor protection.

Guiding Principle 9: Consider historic and social use values.