Dog Park Public Meeting

Held Thursday, March 5, 2015 at City Hall

Purpose: to discuss criteria for dog park placement and process establishment of dog parks

- Introductions
    - Equal access to city services
    - Saline water dog park - real like; interested in parks in general
    - Special place where dog parks should be, not around churches and thinks of that nature
    - Where we could put a dog park, concerned about the cleaning up of dogs
    - Walk in regular parks - don't think Ann Arbor is going to make a dog park because we have too many spaces where people keep their dogs off leash
    - Dog clean-up is an issue and would like to have input on where dog parks could be and where they shouldn't be
    - Concerned about proximity of parks and who is going to maintain that park. Concerned about dog residue, small, and don't want dogs around little people and elders because they could bite them…corned about location around church. Wants to know about methods
- Purpose of Meeting
    - There is a long history of advocacy to establish dog parks
    - Realize that people have strongly held vies about dog parks
    - Worked to come up with a consistent and coherent process for locating dog parks
    - Make sure that the prices sis as objective as possible
    - Make sure we are on the right track before we consider specific sites
    - This meeting is not about talking about individuals sites - it's about process
- Goals for development of document
    - Amy shared the four goals
- Background
- Research - what we learned
- Choosing dog park locations
    - Extra points for water bodies for swimming
    - Change the residential buffer to include institutional buffers as well, which includes churches, hospitals, etc.
        - Buffer from residents isn't always a good thing (maybe being close is better for walkability)
    - Shade criteria is confusing - no trees to too many trees
    - Use conflict avoidance - not just what is in the park but what is around it
    - Geography - simplify so that it's about more equitable distribution
    - Didn't understand about water quality and drainage, wasn't clear

    - The shade category is really hard for people to understand, our criteria doesn't seem readily understandable to people
    - Water source was confusing, is it just where dogs can get something to drink or somewhere they can swim, play in, etc. Could bring in water tank
    - I'm not sure that separating kids from dog parks is a desirable thing --- having the kids at the park and then a place for the dogs in the same vicinity can be desirable as well. And the dog parks are really far away as s user
    - We could weighting the scoring - like water access isn't the same as size
        - Parking
        - Size
        - Shade
        - Conflict use avoidance
    - Geographic - serving an area of the city that isn't well served by existing dog parks
- Decision making process
    - Is there wiggle room in the selection criteria in the times of use, etc. It's not like there is a formula, it's site by site