Appendix 7: Scoring Sheet for Placement Criteria

| Criteria Description | Score 1 | Score 3 | Score 5 | Comments | SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Size: variable and dependent upon proposed park location. Minimum $1 / 4$ acre; $1 / 2$ acre preference | Less than 1/4 acre | 1/2 acre to 1 acre | > 2 acres |  |  |
| Buffer from Residential: ideally limit neighborhood disturbance to be consistent with typical park uses. Desired: increased distance; vegetative buffer | 50' or less from adjacent residents, and little opportunity for buffer | $>100$ ' from residents and moderate <br> opportunities for buffer | $>200$ from residents and good opportunity for buffer |  |  |
| Non-residential adjacent Land Use: Depending on the type of business or institution, may be considered either a benefit or an undesirable amenity | Surrounding <br> Institution(s)/Business <br> does not consider dog <br> parks compatable with <br> its mission/constituency | A dog park would be neutral for the surrounding institution or business | An adjacent dog park would be a positive addition to the surrounding institution or business |  |  |
| Drinking fountain: highly desirable within or adjacent to dog park area | No drinking water available on site, would be expensive/ difficult to provide water | Drinking fountain and/or water service available on site, but outside of dog park | Drinking fountain available within proposed dog park area |  |  |
| Parking: sufficient and convenient; provided without undue burden on neighbors. | On-site parking not currently existing, and site too small to accommodate parking lot | On-site parking not currently existing. Site can accommodate parking lot | Existing parking lot on site can accommodate dog park |  |  |
| Land suitability: relatively flat topography, permeable soils, design to minimize erosion potential, protection for water bodies, good visibility through site | Excessive slopes, impermeable soils, and high erosion potential | Moderately flat, moderate visability, moderately permeable soils | Primarily flat, good drainage, permeable soils, good visibility |  |  |
| Shade: highly desirable, site provides good mix of shade/ mature trees and open space/ turf grass | No trees on site, full sun | Some trees on site, smaller trees don't provide much shade | Mature trees, good mix of shade and open space |  |  |
| Use Conflict Avoidance: avoid placing dog park in area that would conflict with or displace desired active and passive activities | Dog park would conflict with existing park uses | Existing park use would not be impacted by proposed dog park | Dog park would complement existing park uses |  |  |


| Appendix 7: Scoring Sheet for Placement Criteria |  | $5=$ ideal conditions $4=$ exceeds basic criteria, $3=$ meets criteria, $2=$ minimally meets criteria, not optimal, $1=$ does not meet criteria |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Criteria Description | Score 1 | Score 3 | Score 5 | Comments | SCORE |
| Protect Natural Areas: should not be located in close proximity to high quality natural areas to limit disturbance of nesting birds, small mammals, native plants | Site within 50' of high quality natural area | Natural area > 100' from proposed dog park area | No natural areas at site |  |  |
| Geographic Distribution: located such that there is equitable distribution to dog parks in the City | Within 1 /4 mile of an existing dog park; well served by dog park | Within a 1 mile of an existing dog park; moderately well served | Equal distance from other dog parks in unserved area of City |  |  |
| Highest score attainable - 45 pts, Minimal score for consideration - 20 pts, Eliminate as possibility <20 pts |  |  |  | Total Score |  |
| Summary Comments: |  |  |  |  |  |

