

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

Technical Subcommittee - Meeting #1

Tuesday, July 18, 2006

3:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

Upper Fort Mason HQ Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Golden Gate Room, San Francisco, CA

---

Subcommittee Members: Karin Hu, Steven Krefting, Cindy Machado, Keith McAllister, Bob Planthold, Brent Plater, Christine Powell (Designated Federal Officer), Holly Prohaska, David Robinson, Levon Sagatelyan, Martha Walters, Jane Woodman.

National Park Service Staff: Mai-Liis Bartling, Sarah Bransom, Sandra Hamilton, Daphne Hatch, Paula Lee, Howard Levitt, Bill Merkle, Yvette Ruan, Shirwin Smith.

Facilitation Team: Greg Bourne, Catherine McCracken.

---

Documents distributed at the meeting are listed in Attachment A. Two members of the public attended the meeting. The discussion followed the issues and general timing described in the meeting agenda.

Introductions, Agenda and Meeting Objectives

In addition to the Committee members on the Subcommittee additional members provided self-introductions representing Marin County: Levon Sagatelyan and Jane Woodman. Chris Powell reviewed the guidelines for the Subcommittee operations. As a Subcommittee of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee, the group does not take formal actions on its own but develops reports and/or recommendations that go back to full Committee meetings for action. Subcommittee meetings are open to members of the public but there is not a required public comment agenda item on Subcommittee meeting agendas.

In addition to inviting participation on the Subcommittee by Marin County, Chris Powell also reported that GGNRA has talked with several other agencies suggested by Committee members for Technical Subcommittee participation. The San Francisco Recreation and Park Department recently designated Bob Pulaski as their point of contact on dog issues and he may participate on the Subcommittee in the future. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is open to responding to the Subcommittee's needs or questions, but has limited ability to send a representative to attend meetings. The Presidio Trust declined participation on the Subcommittee. The Regional Manager of the East Bay Regional Parks District is interested in providing information to the Subcommittee on their dog policies. At the suggestion of a Subcommittee member, Chris Powell agreed to contact East Bay Municipal Utility District.

Overview of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Data Collection to Date  
 Sandra Hamilton (Environmental Protection Specialist, National Park Service (NPS) Environmental Quality Division) provided an overview of NPS use of data in NEPA and how NPS conducts NEPA analysis. NPS follows procedures and requirements found in NEPA, regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality, NPS Director's Order 12 and accompanying guidance documents, and the National Parks Operations Management Act (NPOMA). Heidi West (Principal, Total Quality NEPA, a contractor to NPS) provided an overview of materials distributed to Subcommittee members and the organization of an NEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) document. The draft Affected Environment (AE) section of the EIS is in internal NPS review at this time. The preliminary draft GGNRA Data Attributes Tables and summary table summarize information available on soils, hydrology and water quality, vegetation, wildlife, species of special concern (SSC), visitor use and visitor experience, park operations, socioeconomics, human health and safety, and adjacent land use for Muir Beach, Trails at Oakwood Valley, Rodeo Beach, Upper Ft. Mason, Crissy Field, Baker Beach, Lands End Trail, Ocean Beach (not plover area), Fort Funston, Cattle Hill, and Pedro Point Headlands. If a listing is followed by AE, that information is included in the draft Affected Environment section of the EIS. Information collected during public scoping will expand the draft AE section.

Subcommittee members requested clarification/additional information and/or definitions for: high quality information, high use area, distinctions of listed species/habitat as compared to rare or unique species/habitat, lists used to evaluate whether or not a particular location has listed/rare/unique species/habitat, definitions of recover plans and recovery areas, information base for compliance issues (data available on violations/complaints v. tickets issued, definition of conflict), information base for health/safety concerns. Other questions/comments from Subcommittee members:

- Will the EIS address dog safety issues? (i.e. dogs falling off cliffs, hit by cars, dog-dog fights, dog-horse interactions/attacks, etc.);
- Guide Dogs for the Blind (San Rafael) may be a useful resource, particularly for additional information regarding health and safety issues and service dog issues;
- Crissy Field Dog Owners Group has/is collecting data (Martha Walters is contact);
- How can Subcommittee members access documents on reference list?  
*NPS answer: Shirwin Smith is the conduit for library resources; some documents are available online; NPS will explore use of ftp (file transfer protocol) site to make other documents available.*
- Request that a glossary of terms and definitions be developed.
- How do we define need for off-leash access and what types of off-leash activity would be considered? Is a demand analysis available?
- Has there been a determination that there may be places in the GGNRA where off-leash activity could be acceptable?
- What information is available on other places in the Bay area where off-leash is available as a recreational use and how should that context/information be considered in this process?

Review and Discuss Draft List of Information Needs to Support Rulemaking  
 Subcommittee members reviewed and discussed the draft list of Information Needs for Rulemaking, Summary by Category of Issues from the draft May 15, 2006 Meeting Summary. The discussion is summarized in the table below. 2A and 2B areas refer to list of locations in areas open for discussion of dog walking (see National Park Service, Parameters and Scope of Negotiated Rulemaking Discussion document).

<b>LIST OF INFORMATION NEEDS TO SUPPORT RULEMAKING</b>	
<b>Summary by Category of Issues</b>	
<b>ISSUES</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
<b>Information Related to Habitat or Species</b>	
How does GGNRA determine areas to restore?	No specific discussion – see different protection needs below
Criteria for critical habitat – not just FWS  Clarification: The term “critical habitat” has a specific legal meaning under the Endangered Species Act; critical habitat is designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, FWS, or the National Marine Fisheries Service, NMFS.	No critical habitat defined within GGNRA; critical habitat defined for Chinook salmon; need site-specific information for 2A and 2B areas
Different protection needs (species)	Plants included; seasonal variations; native species; restoration projects. Some information in AE and Section 7 consultation. Differentiate between potential v. identified impacts; need site-specific information for 2A and 2B areas
USFWS info. re: sensitive species (species sightings v. habitat) – correlation  Clarification: Information database is maintained by GGNRA and provided to FWS.	Need site-specific information for 2A and 2B areas (to extent allowed under policies limiting public availability of information on locations of threatened and endangered species)
<b>Information Related to Use of GGNRA Lands</b>	
Impact of adjacent land uses  Comments/clarifications: Identifying areas where there are inconsistent rules for adjacent lands, particularly on trails, is important. This is the case in part of Marin and possibly other areas. What is availability of other off-leash areas in the Bay area (particularly city parks) and does that impact need for GGNRA off-leash areas? Is data available on acreages for this recreational use in other urban environments?	NEPA Team mapping land uses adjacent to GGNRA, and other off-leash areas in Bay area. Potential closure of existing GGNRA areas looked at under NEPA under cumulative/indirect effects section. Review 2002 federal panel report and recommendations.

Criteria for closure	Covered under critical habitat in first section
Compare dog impacts quantitatively with other uses  Comments: Can dog activity be compared to other uses? How does GGNRA evaluate if an impact is significant? Need to see what comes out of NEPA team analysis.	Not in purpose of NEPA document to compare dog impacts with other uses; unacceptable impacts to be defined in NEPA analysis.
Analyze level of conflicts v. frequency of use/correlate usage with conflicts  Comment: What is definition of conflict?	If conflicts are reported, there is documentation available. Need to come back to this issue.
Age demographics/children in user data  Comment: GGNRA-specific data on users (numbers and demographics) is a challenge/limited availability from some visitor surveys.	Some limited visitor demographics information is available; include Census data and Northern Arizona University (NAU) survey data.
Visitor satisfaction – why? (focus group or survey)	Data from NAU and park surveys
Deterred visit – why? (focus group or survey)	Data from NAU and park surveys
More data re: “visitor conflicts” in context of all uses	Covered under conflicts section above.
Recreational uses information	Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy creating map of designated trail uses; compile information on allowable uses v. available users data
Impacts on disabled visitors  Comment: Is information available for GGNRA? Potential impacts to service dogs from off-leash dogs; possible deterrence of visitors with service dogs to off-leash dog areas; recent state legislation on interference of service dogs.  Also discussed: definition of voice control; availability of data on percentage of dogs who meet voice control definition (return on call) and degree of dog control.	Contact Guide Dogs for the Blind; Guide Dog Users Inc. survey (~2004) submitted to NPS during NEPA public scoping; deterred visits survey; information from Cindy Machado on individual municipal regulations/licensing of service dogs and on control definition used in Marin County. Some data in plover studies per Daphne Hatch.
<b>Information Related to Reporting</b>	
Define “conflict”  Comment: Terminology needs to be defined and explained so consistent use and framework for discussion are in place. Additional discussion/information on how areas were identified as high conflict areas.	Presentation on defining incidents, criteria used, kinds of conflicts/incidents, and reporting system. Investigate info. from CA Research Bureau ocean beaches study, city of Santa Cruz (Lighthouse Beach), and EBRPD Shoreline/Pt. Isabel areas/soft barriers.

Validity of extrapolating recorded data	Guidelines on this per NEPA Team
Analyze all records re: incident reports	See notes under first section in Reporting above
What about all incidents not just dogs?	See notes under first section in Reporting above
<b>Information Related to Staffing and Enforcement</b>	
Staffing level changes and enforcement	See notes under first section in Reporting above.
Who takes reports (of incidents or conflict)?	
Citation guidelines-what are they? Clear definition of an “incident”	
<b>Information Related to Sociological Impacts</b>	
Impacts on dogs or owners	ANPR results; NAU survey data; information provided to NPS during NEPA public scoping; literature; behaviorists at humane societies; Committee members could compile template and identify attributes (covering different GGNRA units).
Social impact to dogs: aggression or injury	
Data re: what makes a location attractive for dog walking	
Identify negative and positive off-leash impacts	
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	
Go beyond site-specific data	See Marin County Open Space guidelines and regulations (Cindy Machado).
Service dog issues	Covered above in use of GGNRA lands section.
Significant incidents of dogs let out of car in parking lot?	Some information may be in reporting system but pursuing additional data not high priority.
Comment: What are the number and severity of incidents involving dogs in parking lots in GGNRA?	

### Next Steps

Subcommittee members requested that the meeting summary be provided to the Committee members for their review prior to the July 31 Committee meeting. Instead of a report from the Subcommittee, members decided to provide the meeting summary and be prepared to answer questions or provide clarification as needed at the July 31 meeting.

The next Technical Subcommittee meeting will be scheduled in between the July 31 and September 21 Committee meetings. The facilitation team will coordinate with GGNRA to identify potential dates and a Meeting Wizard request will be sent to Technical Subcommittee members.

## Attachment A

### Materials distributed to Subcommittee members:

- Copy of slides used in PowerPoint presentation: DATA and its Importance (National Park Service, Environmental Quality Division)
- GGNRA Data Attributes Tables (Preliminary Drafts, dated July 14, 2006):
  - Muir Beach
  - Trails at Oakwood Valley
  - Rodeo Beach
  - Upper Ft. Mason
  - Crissy Field
  - Baker Beach
  - Lands End Trail
  - Ocean Beach (not plover area)
  - Fort Funston
  - Cattle Hill
  - Pedro Point Headlands
- Summary Table: “The following table summarizes attributes for sites where voice control remains an option that are likely to be key in developing management strategies. The table was compiled using information in the bibliography for Affected Environment.”
- GGNRA Dog Management Plan/EIS No Action-Current Conditions Table (Revised Draft, dated June 1, 2006)
- Reference List from first draft of Dogs AE (dated June 28, 2006)
- Information Needs for Rulemaking, Summary by Category of Issues (from draft May 15, 2006 Meeting Summary – Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for Dog Management at Golden Gate National Recreation Area)