

To: ParksandRecreation@smcgov.org

Attention Dog Working Group, San Mateo County Parks Department

Cc: Peggy Jensen <pjensen@smcgov.org>

cgroom@smcgov.org

dpine@smcgov.org

dhorsley@smcgov.org

wslocum@smcgov.org

dcanepa@smcgov.org

From [REDACTED], Menlo Park, 94025

Dear Members,

I cannot make your Dog Working Group meeting Monday 2pm on 6th April as I am a working person and the time is very inconvenient. I did make an effort to attend some previous meetings and was very disappointed with the allowance for public input. I was particularly concerned after the first meeting I attended when a member of the Dog Working Group complained that the Parks Dept had ruled out 90% of the SMC parks area to dog access from the get-go and left only minor parks to be considered by the Dog Working Group. Any public input made no difference, as the stage was already set by the Parks Dept.

I was particularly concerned when I saw the presentation on Youtube of the Board of Supervisors meeting. Peggy Jensen on 23 April 2019 said that the Dog Working Group was driving the agenda for dog access. That is patently untrue and is misleading the Supervisors. The Dog Working Group is rubber stamping what the Parks Dept has already decided. Fining working class people in areas with preexisting off-leash uses is a serious problem and is not something the working group ever recommended.

As the public has had no real input to date in the selection phase for the pilot program, ***I am asking that the Dog Working Group consider public input on how well (or not) the pilot programs are working.*** The criteria for success proposed in the last meeting are mostly negative and are a set-up for failure. The criteria should simply be the opinion of the Park users (voters and taxpayers) at the end of the day. I do not think that the Parks Department should discriminate against mailed or emailed responses versus surveys by rangers or parks officials. Many of us cannot make the 2pm Monday times when the decisions are made. All of us taxpayers deserve some inputs in the process.

Best Regards,

[REDACTED]

On May 8, 2019, at 4:09 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Park Members and County Parks Department,

Re: Requesting approval of a dog park on the
POST Property Side of the Quarry Park parking lot.

This is my response to your Dog Park Meeting which I attended and spoke at last month.

First, a bit of history:

As I stated, I was one of the original founders of Quarry Park, and with the blessings of the County Supervisors of that time, Ted Lempert and Ruben Barrales, we formed a Community Non-profit Organization, called Midcoast Park Lands (MPL) to purchase, manage and maintain QP. We had to form a JPA with the County and School District and we were off and running.

The County insisted that MPL alone had to dismantle and clean up the old horse stables which the County had leased to the manager for about 30 years, until his death at age 101. By that time, it was really dilapidated. After many long weeks of hard work, we did dismantle and clean up the area and designed and built the projects in the park, including the View Site at the top of QP. The Tot Lot was included in our Plan and since the equipment had to be ADA approved, the County had to install the equipment after taking a Community Survey to decide which playground equipment they preferred. MPL continued to manage and maintain QP for about 15 years.

We held regular work days and annual family play days, "Concerts in the Park" on the Quarry floor and the County insisted we had to raise \$5,000 per year to cover our own Insurance for the park. (We never understood why it couldn't be covered under the County Insurance?) We worked hard all those years to develop the park into the lovely green family playground it is today. It is the entrance to the park and the only scenic, green area which everyone can view and enjoy while walking or driving by and which needs to be protected as we protect the ocean scenic view.

We were also working with the Granada Sanitary District (GSD) to reorganize it into a Community Services District with park powers, so they could take over Quarry Park, but as always, there were stumbling blocks, which took longer than the majority of our MPL Bd could continue, so after 15 years, the MPL Bd was growing weary of working to raise all that money every year and managing the park. Since the County wanted to take over QP along with Mirada Surf and eventually the POST Property, QP was turned over to the County.

After all those years of hard work that MPL put into QP as I like to say, "our blood, sweat and tears and money," I think we more than paid off our debt to the County during those years, but we were never given credit for all that work. It was supposed to be a Community Park as required by the State or National Commission based on the population of each City or Community but the County has now turned it into a Regional Park and taken away our right to have one area that belongs just to the Coastside Community, so we are back to square one, again.

I think it was the following year, that GSD finally was put on the Nov. Ballot. The Community voted to reorganize the GSD into a Community Services District with park powers, now known as Granada Community

Services District (GCSD.). I was the Co-Chair of the Campaign to get the reorganization of the GSD into a CSD on the ballot and I am also a committee member of the GCSD Park Advisory Committee (PAC.)

All this is to say, why I have come to the conclusion that the whole lower area of QP, about 3 or 4 acres, including the Tot Lot and the lovely green family play area adjoining it be off limits to dogs. This year, dog owners have decided it is their dog park and frequent it daily to play catch or go fetch with their dogs, off leash and illegally.

Our request:

I am in support of a dog park on the other side of the QP parking lot which is the old POST Property side but the park rangers have to mow it and keep it mowed so the dogs can run around on it as they are now doing illegally, on the Tot Lot side, including letting them play, dig and run around in the Tot Lot where it clearly says, no dogs in this area. Because of the rains, other commitments and I think a different, stronger mower needed to be brought over to mow that side, it is still not mowed to this day.

So, to conclude, I am hoping that you will all vote to approve the request to keep the Tot Lot side for family play which is currently used by families and groups when dogs are not running around on it. Families, kids and groups picnic there, play baseball, frisbee, soccer, valley ball, fly kites, etc. It is a pleasure to see them all enjoying it as we originally intended. We will also need signs posted to inform everyone that the dog park is on the other side and no dogs allowed on the Tot Lot side. For families that bring their dogs with them when they bring their children to play in the Tot Lot, maybe the adjoining fence could be posted as a hitching post to tie the dogs to and to inform parents of this.

I have spoken with the dog owners and even they have agreed they would be happy to use the POST Prop side if it were mowed.

The MPL Bd, the neighbors, a GCSD BD member and another Park Committee member have agreed with this conclusion. (I just haven't put it before the whole Bd or PAC group but I'm sure they would all agree, also.) Everyone thought the QP Master Plan would have been completed and all this would have been decided, by now. Since it won't be completed anytime soon, there is no reason this can't be approved ASAP, since the dog owners have made this an urgent matter. Other decisions can be made when the Master Plan is completed.

We sincerely hope you will vote to approve our request immediately,

Thank you for your consideration,

██████████, El Granada
Co-Founder of QP, MPL
Past President of GSD and current Park Committee Member

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 01, 2019 2:58 PM
To: PARKS_ParksAndRecreation <ParksAndRecreation@smcgov.org>
Cc: Tom Cramer <tcramer@stanford.edu>
Subject: Off Leash dog request

Please let dogs and their owners be a part of the Crissy Field and San Mateo County. There are so few places that dogs and their owners can roam together.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]

Dog Owner in Menlo Park and frequent visitor to San Mateo and San Francisco beaches

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, June 01, 2019 4:56 PM
To: PARKS_ParksAndRecreation <ParksAndRecreation@smcgov.org>
Subject: Please support dog walking recreation in San Mateo County parks

To whom it may concern,

It's ridiculous that folks with their on-leash dogs are so limited with their access to recreational parks, with so much area that we and the fact that so many people are dog owners in SMC.

Why do other user groups, such as equestrians have about 90% trails access, while dog owners have only 5%?

My family and I urge you to reduce and remove fines for utilizing these spaces with our canine companions.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]