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## Off-Leash Dog Park Feasibility Study
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## Executive Summary

There are an estimated 13,224 dogs in Olympia and its Urban Growth Area, "Walking with a Pet" is identified as the \#1 outdoor recreation activity by Washington residents, and as Olympia is becoming more developed there is becoming less open space for off-leash dog activity. There is a need for one or more off-leash dog areas in Olympia.

There is a strong public preference for several smaller off-leash dog areas is several areas of Olympia rather than one large, centrally located one. Ideally Olympia's foray into off-leash dog areas would begin a modestly sized off-leash dog area. The ideal site would be about an acre in size, would be located in a community park or special use area, would not be in an environmentally sensitive area, would be at least 150 feet away from the nearest residences (or would have sound-proof fencing installed), would not require road frontage improvements, and would have adequate parking.

An off-leash dog park would likely draw well over 20 vehicle trips per day. Road frontage improvements would therefore be required on currently undeveloped sites on roads that do not yet have full road frontage improvements. This would add approximately $\$ 300,000-\$ 400,000$ in costs. If a parking lot is not currently available, this would cost an additional $\$ 150,000$. The cost for a modest 1 -acre dog park itself (fencing, water fountain, benches, etc.) would be approximately $\$ 80,000$. Due to the disproportionate cost of road frontage improvements and parking costs to the facility itself and the fact that no funds are currently budgeted for this project, it is recommended that the site that is selected for near-term development already has road frontage, parking, and restroom facilities in place.

The recommended site for near-term development is Yauger Park (a portion of the gravel parking lot). This site would not require road frontage improvements and already has existing restrooms, parking, and water sources. For approximately $\$ 80,000$, a modest off-leash dog area could be installed as a pilot project. The pilot project should be evaluated after a year and the site made permanent or discontinued depending on the evaluation.

Community Parks are best suited for off-leash dog parks. With the growing demand for offleash dog parks, this need should be recognized in Community Park planning along with traditional ballfields and other facilities. Off-leash dog areas should therefore be considered for the proposed Yelm Highway Community Park and Lindell Road Community Park. These sites are scheduled to be purchased in late 2006 and 2009 respectively.

## Introduction

During the past several years, Olympia Parks, Arts, and Recreation (OPARD) staff and members of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC) have received numerous requests to create an off-leash dog park in Olympia. There appears to be growing interest in these types of facilities, with off-leash dog parks springing up in cities throughout the Northwest. With the City of Olympia developing rapidly, and an estimated 13,000 dogs in Olympia, there are fewer and fewer areas for these animals to exercise freely. Many people currently ignore the existing leash laws and allow their dogs to run off leash in Olympia's parks and trails.

With these issues in mind, one of PRAC's 2006 work plan items was the completion of an offleash dog park feasibility study to be presented to City Council. OPARD staff and PRAC have worked together to create this Off-Leash Dog Park Feasibility Study. While there is currently not money budgeted for implementation, it was felt that this would be a good way to begin a dialog with the community on this issue. It should be noted that this is not a development plan that is cast in stone. Rather it is a snapshot of what could potentially be done given Olympia's current park system and budget constraints. It is expected that this will be an evolving document that will change as new opportunities may present themselves.

## Research Sources

Much was learned from the public meeting on March 23, 2006 as well as the 226 surveys that were completed. Public feedback from these sources was compiled in document that is attached as Appendix I

Several jurisdictions were contacted by telephone in order to complete this study. These include Tumwater, Lacey, Thurston County, Seattle, Bellingham, Portland, San Francisco, Santa Barbara County, and Whidbey Island. Susanne Beauregard, Director of Thurston County Joint Animal Services was contacted by telephone as well.

Finally, the internet also proved an invaluable resource. Particularly valuable websites included: http://www.mrsc.org/Subjects/Parks/OffLeash.aspx - Municipal Research Service Center dog park resources http://home.earthlink.net/~ejlmp/dpd.html - Great resource on dog park design http://www.dogplay.com/Activities/dogparkl.html\#start - Many valuable dog park links http://www.explorerdog.com/offleash/index.htm - List of Washington off-leash dog areas

## Public Process



## Facilities Review

## Olympia Area

There are currently no official off-leash dog parks in Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater or Thurston County. The nearest official off-leash dog park is approximately 20 miles away at Ft .
Steilacoom Park Off-Leash Area in Lakewood.

Currently, dogs are allowed on-leash in all City of Olympia Parks with the exception of Grass Lake Refuge which does not allow dogs due to the sensitive wetland, nesting and denning habitats. Currently there is no active enforcement of the leash policy, although park staff sometimes ask people to put their dogs on leashed when dogs are seen running free.

There are several unofficial areas that people are currently allowing their dogs to run off-leash. Some of the more popular ones in the Olympia area include Priest Point Park, Garfield Elementary and other schools, Christ the Rock Church property at the corner of Fir St. NE and Yew Ave NE and Pioneer Park in Tumwater.

## Existing Off-Leash Dog Parks in the Western Washington

There are at least 34 off-leash dog parks in Western Washington including 11 in Seattle, nine in Bellingham, five on Whidbey Island, and three in Everett. See Appendix for a complete listing of Western Washington dog parks.

## Types of Off-Leash Dog Parks

There are at least three types off off-leash dog areas common to the northwest: Fenced, dedicated facilities; off-leash trails; and portions of multi-use parks that are designated as offleash during certain times of day.

Fenced, Dedicated Facilities: These areas vary greatly in size. Seattle, for example, has off-leash parks ranging from one-fifth of an acre (Plymouth Pillars) to nine acres (Magnuson Park). A typical size seems to be about 1-2 acres. Surfacing can be turf, crushed rock/gravel, or wood chips. There is often a double gate system so that the dogs cannot escape when one gate is open. Typical amenities include dog waste bags, a kiosk for notices/regulations, doggie drinking fountains, and sheltered or unsheltered seating areas.

Off-leash Trails: Bellingham has some trails that are designated as off-leash. Only trails that get little use are designated as off-leash.

Shared Parks: Portland has 33 off-leash dog parks, 27 of which are "SHARED" sites (Seasonal Hours at Reserved Sites). These are portions of existing parks, usually not fenced, that allow off-leash dogs during certain times of the day depending on the season. For example, Woodstock Park allows off-leash use in the summer $5 \mathrm{am}-10 \mathrm{am}$ and 7 pm

- midnight, in the spring and fall 5am - 8am, 9:30am-11:30am, and 6pm-midnight, and in winter 5am - 8am, 9:30am-11:30am, and 4pm-midnight.


## Role of an Advocacy Group

Many jurisdictions have an advocacy group associated with their off-leash dog parks. Seattle, for example, has Citizens for Off-Leash Dog Areas (COLA). COLA is responsible for the maintenance and stewardship of Seattle's off-leash areas. King County's Marymoor Park has been "adopted" by Save Our Dog Area (SODA). This group has resurfaced trails, built bridges, and provides 500,000 pet waste bags annually for the park. Protect Our Pets (POP) is an advocacy group formed in support of the off-leash area at Ft. Steilacoom Park in Lakewood. Among other things, this organization sells t-shirts and personalized fence posts to raise funds for the dog park.

## Needs Summary

## Over 13,000 Dogs in Olympia

According to Susanne Beauregard, Thurston County Animal Services Director, 36.5\% of U.S. households own at least one dog and the average is 1.52 per household. ${ }^{1}$ According to figures from Thurston Regional Planning Council, the population of Olympia's and its urban growth area in 2006 is approximately $56,017 .^{2}$ With an average household size of 2.35 persons, Olympia has approximately 23,837 households. Assuming the national average of $36.5 \%$, an estimated 8,700 of those households would have dogs. With an average of 1.52 dogs for each of those households, Olympia would have approximately 13,224 dogs.

## Walking with a Pet Top Outdoor Activity in Washington

The Washington State Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation does comprehensive surveys of participation rates in outdoor recreation activities. While respondents are not asked specifically about off-leash dog activities, the most popular outdoor activity in terms of average events per year was "walking with a pet." ${ }^{3}$ This activity appears to be more popular than tennis, baseball, or basketball, all activities for which we provide park recreational facilities.

As noted earlier, there are currently no off-leash dog parks in Olympia, Lacey, Tumwater or Thurston County. In conversations with the directors of parks and recreation departments of Tumwater, Lacey and Thurston County, there are currently no plans to develop off-leash facilities in any of those jurisdictions. ${ }^{4}$ Olympia's population is growing rapidly. As Olympia fills in with residential developments with very small yards and multi-family and high rise housing, the demand for off-leash dog areas will likely increase.

## Public Support for Off-Leash Dog Park

On March 23, 2006, OPARD staff hosted a public meeting to get feedback on the topic of an off-leash dog park. 85 people attended the meeting, with everyone in attendance in support of the creation of an off-leash dog park. In addition to the meeting, surveys were distributed on the City of Olympia website, at the Olympia Center, and in various other locations throughout the community. 226 surveys were filled out, with $94 \%$ of respondents responding that they would use an off leash dog park in Olympia with $62 \%$

2006 Olympia Public Survey
 responding that they would use it several times per week and $28 \%$ responding that they would use it about once a week.

[^0]
## Liability Issues

The City of Olympia is self-insured through the Washington Cities Insurance Authority (WCIA). Margaret Langworthy, a Risk Management Representative for WCIA, was asked about off-leash dog parks. She offered the following risk-management recommendations:

## Park Layout

- Locate the off-leash dog park away from children's playgrounds, beaches, picnic areas, sport fields, and horse and horse or bicycle/motorcycle tracks (unless on a time-sharing basis).
- Clearly define where on the grounds the dogs must be leashed and where they may be unleashed. This is particularly important in a multi-use park, and can be accomplished with a combination of landscaping, fencing and appropriate signage at each entry point to the park.
- Consideration should be given to the adequate land spacing between different parts of the park to minimize any spillover effects of one area on another.


## Signage

- Signage designating where dogs must be leashed and where they may be unleashed should be specific, clear and consistent throughout the park.
- Rules particular to the off-leash area should be posted.
- Reference to RCW 16.08.040 may be appropriate.


## Waste Removal

- Rules should specify that dog owners are responsible to clean up after their pets. However, it should be recognized that additional costs for maintenance staff, time and equipment may be needed to repair fencing, fill holes dug by the dogs, and to clean up dog waste left by irresponsible dog owners. Documentation should be kept and maintained as for any other park maintenance activity.


## Type of Facility Needed

As noted earlier, there are three basic types of facilities used for off-leash dog areas: Off-leash trails, shared facilities and fenced, dedicated sites. Olympia's Off-Leash Dog Park Survey asked what type of facility people would prefer. The number one preference was "Several smaller facilities (one in each quadrant of the City for instance)"


Off-leash Trails: As noted earlier, Bellingham has some trails that are designated as offleash. Staff in Bellingham are finding, however, that as use is increasing, so are conflicts and complaints. They are realizing that they need better signage warning people that they are entering an off-leash trail area, and that only low-use trails should be designated as off-leash.

Pros: Little infrastructure needed other than signage. Cons: Potential conflicts with non dog-owners, wildlife disruption, only appropriate for low-use areas.

Shared Parks: As noted earlier, Portland has 27 shared off-leash dog parks - portions of existing parks, usually not fenced, that allow off-leash dogs during certain times of the day depending on the season. Seattle tried one in the Capitol Hill area and discontinued it because people did not follow the schedule.

Pros: Little infrastructure needed other than signage. Allows other uses of off-leash area at certain times of the day.
Cons: Facility only available certain times of the day. Schedule can become overly complex in an effort to accommodate various uses (Portland's, shared sites, for example, have different hours varying by season and weekday vs. weekend). May be problems with people not following the schedule (as in Seattle's experience). Least preferred alternative by Olympia survey respondents.


Fenced, Dedicated Facilities: Based on survey responses and feedback provided at the March 23, 2006 public meeting, there seems to be a strong preference for fenced, dedicated facilities.

Pros: Less conflict with other park users than a shared site or off-leash trail. Less wildlife disruption than an off-leash trail. Available during all hours that park is open. Favored alternative by survey respondents.
Cons: Space cannot be utilized for other uses. More expensive than un-fenced trail or shared site.

Conclusion: Based on public preference and weighing the pros and cons, it is recommended that if one or more off-leashed dog parks are constructed in Olympia that they are fenced, dedicated facilities.

## Site Design/Amenities

Surfacing: After talking with several jurisdictions with off-leash dog areas, it appears that it is very difficult to maintain turf in an off-leash dog area. Seattle reports that when they tried turf in their off-leash areas it only lasted a month or so. They have now switched to crushed rock or cedar chips. The dog owners apparently prefer wood chips as it's easier on the dogs' paws ${ }^{5}$. San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department also favors alternatives to turf such as sand, gravel, decomposed granite, synthetic turf and other surface materials ${ }^{6}$ It is recommended that wood chips be utilized for the pilot program (unless Yauger Park is utilized as a site in which case crushed rock would be preferable - wood chips would float away when the area floods in the winter).

Fencing: In order to minimize conflicts with other park users, it is recommended that off-leash dog areas are fully fenced. After drinking water, the second most requested feature by survey and meeting participants was fencing. Vinyl-coated chain link or wood fencing with wire are both approximately the same cost, so either could be used. If necessary, sound proof fencing should be used. A 6 foot tall fence with sound-proof panels sandwiched between the wood layers would cost approximately $\$ 45$ per linear foot.

Double-Gated Entrance: In order to prevent other dogs from escaping when entering or exiting, a double-gated entrance should be installed.

Water Source: This was the feature most requested by survey and meeting participants. A dual water fountain for both humans and dogs should be provided.

Dog waste: A standard "Bowser" pet waste bag station should be provided. If hauling away pet waste becomes a maintenance problem, Sanicans for pet waste should be considered. Most of

[^1]Seattle's dog parks now have topless Sanicans (which they refer to as "Sanicans on the halfshell") A trash can is placed beside the Sanican for disposal of the plastic bags and the Sanican company empties the Sanican.

Regulation sign: A regulation sign should be provided.
Small shelter: Four of the six small groups at the public meeting listed having a covered area (for people) as a desired amenity. While this is not absolutely required, for approximately $\$ 5000$, a small pre-fabricated mini-shelter could be installed.

ADA Accessible Parking/Travel Route: The site will need to have an ADA accessible parking space and travel route to the facility.

## Siting Criteria

Size: Current off-leash dog parks in Western Washington vary greatly in size from 40 acres at Redmond's Marymoor Park to one-fifth of an acre at Seattle's Plymouth Pillars park.

Some jurisdictions have set minimum sizes for their off-leash dog areas: Portland's 1999 Citizen Task Force on Off-Leash Dogs recommended 5000 square feet (. 11 acre) as a minimum size. ${ }^{7}$ San Francisco has set the minimum size for their off-leash dog areas to 10,000 square feet (. 23 acres, or 1.5 times the size of a tennis court) although they try to find sites $3 / 4$ of an acre in size ${ }^{8}$. The City of Boulder, Colorado has established 1-acre as the minimum size for its off-leash dog parks. ${ }^{9}$

It would seem reasonable to adopt San Francisco's standards for size - about $1 / 4$ of an acre as an absolute minimum, but if at all possible the site would be about an acre in size. To give perspective on how large an acre is, that is the size of the grassy area at Percival Landing. While this is perhaps smaller than some dog advocates would hope for, it seems a reasonable size to start with for a pilot program.

Environmental: Off-leash dog park managers contacted for this study report that their dog parks generally have less dog waste than the rest of their parks. People seem to police themselves fairly well in these facilities. Dogs will of course produce waste whether they are in an off-leash dog area or another part of the park. The fact that people apparently are more conscious of picking up their pet's waste in an off-leash area indicates that the net amount of waste entering the environment may actually be less in a park with an off-leash dog area. That being said, off leash dog parks should be sited in a way to minimize impact to environmentally sensitive areas such as streams, steep slopes, wetlands or areas with high wildlife habitat value.

[^2]Fencing within the off-leash area may be needed to protect existing trees - the off-leash facility at Seattle's Volunteer Park was shut down in 2000 due to tree damage by urine and root compaction. Seattle now fences around the drip lines of trees within dog parks.

Noise: Cities with dog park experience recommend that off-leash dog parks be located at least 150 feet from the nearest residence or other land use where dog noise could create conflicts. When siting dog parks, site conditions should be considered as hills, berms, vegetation, and other features help to buffer sound. If an otherwise suitable site is less than 150 feet from residences, and does not contain adequate natural sound barriers, sound-proof fencing should be installed.

Road Frontage: If a currently undeveloped site is converted into an off-leash dog park facility, road frontage improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and street lights) will likely be required. With no funds currently budgeted for an off-leash dog area, sites that would not require extensive frontage improvements would be preferable.

ADA Accessibility: Sites with existing ADA accessible parking and pedestrian routes would be preferable.

Spill-Over: In talking with jurisdictions with off-leash dog parks, some report issues with people allowing their dogs off-leash in nearby parking areas or other parts of the park not designated as off-leash. A common problem, for example, seems to be people not leashing their dogs for the walk from the car to the off-leash area. With this in mind, an ideal site would be located in an area in which there are not potential conflicts if this happens (not adjacent to a playground or environmentally sensitive area for instance).

Parking: Sites that currently have adequate parking available would be preferable.

## One Regional Facility vs. Several Smaller Facilities:

When asked what type of facility they would prefer, nearly twice as many survey respondents chose "several smaller facilities" over "one regional facility."

Several Smaller Facilities:
Pros: No one would have to drive across town to go to an off-leash dog park. There would be less use at any one facility so there would be less parking needs. Survey respondents preferred this alternative.
Cons: More expensive (Several seating areas, drinking fountains, sign kiosks, etc. to purchase)

One Regional Facility:
Pros: Less expensive. Easier to implement one facility as a pilot program than several facilities.
Cons: For many people would require driving across town. More parking needs. Not survey respondents preferred alternative.

Park Classification: Olympia's parks are classified in four categories: Neighborhood Park, Community Park, Special Use Park, and Open Space Area. Neighborhood Parks are designed to
serve the immediate neighborhood, while the other three categories of parks are designed to serve the entire community. Since it is reasonable to assume that people would be willing to travel beyond their neighborhood to utilize an off-leash dog park, a neighborhood park would not be an ideal site. Similarly, Open Space Areas are defined as "Undeveloped land that is set aside to protect the special natural character of Olympia's landscape." They are designed for passive recreation such as hiking and nature observation. Since an off-leash dog park would be a fairly "active" rather than "passive" use and would be disruptive to wildlife and their habitat, Open Space Areas would not be appropriate for an off-leash dog park.

Conclusion: Ideally there would be a pilot program with a modestly sized off-leash dog area. The ideal site would be about an acre in size, would not be in an environmentally sensitive area, would be at least 150 feet away from the nearest residences (or would have sound-proof fencing installed), would not require road frontage improvements, would be in an area free of "spillover" conflicts, and would have adequate parking.

## Possible Locations

The following potential sites meet the majority of the above siting criteria. They all have at least $1 / 4$ acre of underutilized open space that could be converted into an off-leash dog area.

## West Olympia:

Yauger Park (Near Field \#1)
Yauger Park (In gravel parking lot)
Black Lake Meadows

## East Olympia:

Greene Parcel
Chambers Lake Parcel*
Steven's Field
Mission Creek*
Priest Point Park
Friendly Grove*
*Note that Mission Creek and Chambers Lake are both Open Space Areas. While it was noted above that Open Space Areas are generally not appropriate for off-leash areas, there are portions of both of these sites that are highly disturbed with limited habitat value. Funds for Community Parks or Special Use Areas could be utilized to purchase portions of these sites so that those portions could be classified as a Special Use Area or Community Park. Similarly, while Friendly Grove is classified as a Neighborhood Park, it is over 14 acres in size, far larger than the 2-4 acres of a typical neighborhood park in Olympia. A small portion of this park could be classified as Community Park or Special Use Area.

## Yauger Park - Behind Field 1

Description: Yauger Park is a 40 -acre community park located at 3100 Capital Mall Drive on Olympia's West Side. There are four athletic fields at the park as well as a skate court, horseshoe pits, picnic areas and a playground. One area of Yauger Park that could be utilized for an off-leash dog park is the area behind the outfield fence of Field 1.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 56 acres
Road Frontage/Parking: Since Yauger Park is already a fully developed park, road frontage improvements would not be necessary and parking is already available.

Noise Issues: None - this site is quite far from any residential areas and surrounded by forested areas on two sides and a ballfield on the other side.

Fencing: Assuming the outfield fence was utilized as one of the sides, approximately 510 feet of fencing would be required.

Total Estimated Cost: (Fencing, double-gates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall, and wood chips) $\$ 80,000$

Pros: Already developed park, so frontage improvements would not be necessary. Restrooms, parking, small shelters, and water supply already in place. Development costs would be low. Area is currently underutilized.

Cons: Since Yauger Park is utilized as a stormwater facility, this area is typically under water and therefore not usable November - March. (Stormwater runoff contains contaminates that make it unsuitable for a dog swimming area). Potential conflict between dogs and nearby baseball players. Yauger Park was acquired with an Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) grant, so a conversion of use would have to be approved by IAC Director


## Yauger Park - Gravel Parking Lot

Description: Yauger Park is a 40 -acre community park located at 3100 Capital Mall Drive on Olympia's West Side. There are six athletic fields at the park as well as a skate court, horseshoe pits, picnic areas and a playground. One area of Yauger Park that could be utilized for an offleash dog park is the gravel parking lot in the southern portion of the park.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 75 acres
Road Frontage/Parking: Since Yauger Park is already a fully developed park, road frontage improvements would not be necessary and parking is already available.

Noise Issues: None - this site is 230 feet from the nearest resident and in an already noisy environment.

Fencing: 750 feet of fencing would be required to fence the entire perimeter of this site.
Total Estimated Cost: (Fencing, double-gates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) $\$ 80,000$

Pros: Already developed park, so frontage improvements would not be necessary. Restrooms, parking, small shelters, and water supply already in place. Development costs would be low.

Cons: Since Yauger Park is utilized as a stormwater facility, this area is under water and therefore not usable during heavy rains which typically occur frequently November - March. (Stormwater runoff contains contaminates that make it unsuitable for a dog swimming area). Approximately $40 \%$ of the auxiliary gravel parking area would be displaced.


## Yauger Park <br> 3100 Capital Mall Dr. SW



## Black Lake Meadows

Description: Black Lake Meadows is a 44-acre City-owned stormwater facility encompassing the Black Lake Ditch in Southwest Olympia. Much of the site is composed of wetlands and provides excellent bird habitat. There is, however, a small portion of disturbed upland area in the Northwest corner of the property that might be suitable for an off-leash dog area.

Road Frontage/Parking: It is likely that road frontage improvements would be likely along approximately 570 feet of Black Lake Boulevard. This would cost an estimated $\$ 370,000$. A 10 -stall parking lot would cost approximately $\$ 150,000$.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 76 acres
Noise Issues: None anticipated - this site is over 150 feet away from the nearest residence, and is separated by Black Lake Boulevard and vegetation.

Fencing: 760 feet of fencing would be needed to fence the perimeter of this site.
Total Estimated Cost: (road frontage improvements, 10 -stall parking lot, fencing, doublegates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) $\$ 600,000$

Pros: Currently underutilized site.

Cons: Road frontage improvements would likely be necessary. Parking, restroom and water necessary.



## Greene Parcel

Description: The Greene Parcel is a 3.5 acre undeveloped community park parcel located at 3535 Yelm Hwy SE in the Southeast Urban Growth Area of Olympia. It is currently being utilized as a staging area for construction of the Country Club Villas development adjacent to the east. Upon final construction of this development, the Greene Parcel's existing house will be removed, the site will be cleared and seeded with grass, and Wiggins Road Extension will be constructed along the eastern side of the site.

Road Frontage/Parking: Road frontage improvements would likely be needed along 650 of Wiggins Road Extension. This would cost approximately $\$ 420,000$. A ten-stall parking lot would cost approximately $\$ 150,000$.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: 1-acre
Noise Issues: None anticipated - The northwestern section of Greene Parcel could be utilized such that the site would be at least 150 feet away from the nearest resident.

Fencing: Approximately 890 feet of fencing would be required to fully enclose this site.
Total Estimated Cost: (road frontage improvements, 10 -stall parking lot, fencing, doublegates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) $\$ 650,000$.

Pros: Park parcel classified as "Community Park." Currently undeveloped site. Could utilize a full acre or more for an off-leash area.

Cons: Not in Olympia City Limits. Road frontage improvements would likely be necessary.


Greene Parcel


## Chambers Lake Open Space

Description: Chambers Lake Open Space is a 46-acre undeveloped open space area located at 4808 Herman Rd SE in southeast Olympia. The northern portion of the site is densely vegetated, much of it wetlands. The southern portion of the site is comprised mostly of open fields with a few small wetlands. The portion that would be suitable for an off-leash dog area is a one-acre upland area in the southeast portion of the site.

Road Frontage/Parking: Road frontage improvements would likely be required for the 635 feet of road frontage on $37^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Herman Rd. At approximately $\$ 650$ a linear foot, this would cost approximately $\$ 400,000$. A ten-stall parking lot would cost approximately $\$ 150,000$.

## Off-Leash Dog Park Size: 1 acre

Noise Issues: The site would be at least 150 feet away from the nearest resident. There could, however, be an issue in that there is a public expectation that open space areas are quiet for bird watching and other relaxing activities.

Fencing: Approximately 900 feet of fencing would be required to fully enclose this site.
Total Estimated Cost: (road frontage improvements, 10 -stall parking lot, fencing, doublegates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) $\$ 630,000$.

Pros: Park parcel classified as "Open Space" Currently unutilized site. Could utilize a full acre or more for an off-leash area.

Cons: Road frontage improvements would likely be necessary. Would require "purchase" of portion of site with community park funds. May conflict with natural area values and other related uses.


## Chambers Lake Open Space



## Steven's Field

NOTE: Steven's Field is leased from the Olympia School District. The creation of an offleash dog area there would need approval from the District in order to implement.

Description: Steven's Field is a 13-acre community/neighborhood park that the City of Olympia leases from the Olympia School District. With two softball fields and an area used for youth soccer, Steven's Field is utilized primarily for athletics. There is an area in the northeast corner of the park that could be suitable for an off-leash dog park. This area just east of the tennis courts is currently an open grassy area with two very small picnic shelters.

Road Frontage/Parking: Since Steven's Field is already a fully developed park, road frontage improvements would not be necessary. Parking is available, although limited during hours that Lincoln Elementary School is in session.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 51 acres

Noise Issues: The proposed off-leash dog area is approximately 75 feet from the nearest residences to the north. The northern edge of this site is 150 feet long, and sound-proof fencing would likely be necessary along this edge.

Fencing: As it is near a jogging path, this entire site would need to be fenced. This would require 550 feet of fencing (in addition to the 150 feet of sound-proof fencing described above).

Total Estimated Cost: (chain link fencing, sound-proof fencing, double-gates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) $\$ 82,000$

Pros: Already developed park, so no frontage improvements would be necessary. Restrooms, parking, small shelters, and water supply already in place. Development costs would be low.

Cons: Close to residences on northern side. Fairly small space. Would displace current picnic area. Could create parking conflicts especially during school hours.
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## Mission Creek Park/Open Space

Description: Mission Creek Neighborhood Park and Mission Creek Open Space are adjacent undeveloped parcels at 1500 Fir St. NE in Northeast Olympia. Mission Creek Neighborhood Park is 7.6-acres and Mission Creek Open Space is 29 acres. (Note: As both parcels are adjacent to each other and undeveloped, a 4-acre portion of the "Open Space" parcel may be utilized for a neighborhood park with the "Neighborhood Park" parcel being converted to "Open Space.")

Road Frontage/Parking: There is no road frontage on this site. A ten-stall parking lot would cost an estimated $\$ 150,000$.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 75 acres
Noise Issues: The existing .75-acre open meadow southeast of the Fir St. entrance is more than 200 feet from the nearest residence and is surrounded by dense vegetation, so there would likely not be issues with disturbing neighbors. There could, however, be an issue in that there is a public expectation that open space areas are quiet for bird watching and other relaxing activities.

Fencing: Approximately 730 feet of fencing would be required to fully enclose this site.
Total Estimated Cost: (10-stall parking lot, fencing, double-gates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path and wood chips) $\$ 230,000$.

Pros: Large, undeveloped site. Currently underutilized. No frontage improvements would be necessary. Parking lot could be utilized for the future open space and neighborhood park amenities.

Cons: Currently no parking, restroom or water on site. Would require "purchase" of portion of site with community park funds. May conflict with natural area values and other related uses.


## Mission Creek Open Space/Neighborhood Park



## Priest Point Park

Description: Priest Point Park is a 313-acre Open Space/Community Park/Neighborhood Park at 2600 East Bay Drive in Northeast Olympia. There is a trail system, picnic shelters, a playground, a play meadow, and restroom facilities. The site that could be utilized as an offleash dog area is a .35 -acre lawn area south of the Restroom \#3 where the former wading pool used to be.

Road Frontage/Parking: Since Priest Point Park is already a fully developed park, road frontage improvements would not be necessary. There is existing parking at the park, although parking can be limited during peak use times.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 35 acres
Noise Issues: None anticipated - The proposed off-leash dog area is approximately 575 feet from the nearest residences and separated by dense woods.

Fencing: Approximately 450 feet of fencing would be required to fully enclose this site.
Total Estimated Cost: (Fencing, double-gates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) $\$ 80,000$

Pros: Already developed park, so no frontage improvements would be necessary. Restrooms, parking, and water supply already in place. Development costs would therefore be low.

Cons: Small site. Adjacent parking is full on peak use days so parking conflicts may be created. Parking lot would be shared with people visiting playground so could be some user conflicts between off-leash dogs and young children if dogs are loose in parking area. Barking dog sound could potentially carry through wooded area creating conflicts with users seeking quiet experience in nature. Slope could cause challenges for surfacing and/or environmental issues stemming from $\mathrm{mud} /$ pet waste runoff into woods.


## Priest Point Park - Developed Facilities



## Friendly Grove Park

Description: Friendly Grove Park is a 14 -acre Neighborhood Park located at 2316 Friendly Grove Road in Olympia's Northeast Urban Growth Area. It has a playground, picnic shelter, tennis court, skate court, basketball court, and play meadow. The portion that could be utilized as an off-leash dog area is a half-acre grassy area south of the tennis court.

Off-Leash Dog Park Size: . 5 acres

## Water Source:

Road Frontage/Parking: Since Friendly Grove Park is already a fully developed park, road frontage improvements would not be necessary. There is existing parking at the park and overflow parking provided by the adjoining church.

Noise Issues: This site is approximately 100 feet from Huber's Gasthaus, a house that is rented out for private events. Adding sound-proof fencing to the portions of the site that face the house would require approximately 200 feet of sound-proof fencing.

Fencing: Approximately 450 feet of fencing (in addition to the 200 feet of sound-proof fencing mentioned above) would be necessary to fully enclose this site.

Total Estimated Cost: (chain link fencing, sound-proof fencing, double-gates, doggie fountain, Bowser station, regulation sign, three benches, mini-shelter, ADA path/parking stall and wood chips) \$89,000

Pros: Already developed park, so no frontage improvements would be necessary. Restrooms and parking already in place, so development costs would be low.

Cons: Close to resident/small business. Fairly small area. Parking already at capacity during peak use times.



## Off-Leash Dog Park Site Suitability Assessment

|  |  | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ |  |  |  | suo!ఛеләр!suoう ן!!oәds | $$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West Olympia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yauger Park - Gravel Parking Lot | Community/ Neighborhood | . 75 ac . | n/a | Existing | Yes | Seasonal Site | \$80,000 | \$80,000 |
| Yauger Park - Behind Field 1 | Community/ Neighborhood | . 56 ac . | n/a | Existing | Yes | Seasonal Site | \$80,000 | \$80,000 |
| Black Lake Meadows | Not Park Prop. | . 76 ac . | \$370,000 | \$150,000 | no | Not Park Property | \$80,000 | \$600,000 |
| East Olympia |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greene Parcel | Community | 1 ac | \$420,000 | \$150,000 | no |  | \$80,000 | \$650,000 |
| Chambers Lake | Open Space | 1 ac | \$400,000 | \$150,000 | no |  | \$80,000 | \$630,000 |
| Steven's Field | Community/ Neighborhood | . 51 ac . | n/a | Existing | Yes |  | \$82,000 | \$82,000 |
| Mission Creek | Neighborhood Open Space | . 76 ac . | n/a | \$150,000 | no |  | \$80,000 | \$230,000 |
| Priest Point Park (old wading pool) | Com/Neig/ Open Space | . 35 ac . | n/a | Existing | Yes |  | \$80,000 | \$80,000 |
| Friendly Grove | Neighborhood | . 50 ac . | n/a | Existing | yes |  | \$84,000 | \$84,000 |

## Site Location Conclusions:

Since there do not appear to be any existing sites that are ideal in all respects, it is recommended that if one or more sites are developed that they are developed as a pilot project. The park should be operated for a year and monitored by OPARD staff and advocacy group members. After a year in operation, the pilot project should be evaluated. Depending on the evaluation, the sites may be made permanent, enlarged (if space permits), modified or discontinued depending on the evaluation.

Road frontage improvements and/or parking improvements are considerably more expensive than all of the other improvements necessary for an off-leash dog park combined. (Sites in parks that are currently developed and thus do not require road frontage or parking improvements can accommodate an off-leash dog park for approximately $\$ 80,000$ while those that would need road frontage improvements would cost $\$ 575,000-625,000$.) Since there is currently no money budgeted for this project, it is recommended that a site that would not require road frontage or parking improvements is chosen. Potential sites would thus include either Yauger Park site for West Olympia and either Stevens Field, Priest Point Park, or Friendly Grove for East Olympia.

## West Olympia:

One of the Yauger Park sites (the area in the southeast corner of the park that is currently utilized as overflow parking) is recommended to be used for the pilot project. $3 / 4$ of an acre could be utilized in this area while still leaving the majority of that space available for parking. This would result in an area a bit larger than the half-acre available near field 1 . There is also space for benches and a small shelter on an existing berm above this area, while there is not in the other site. As noted above, both sites at Yauger Park would not be available approximately November - March since this park doubles as a stormwater detention facility. (Due to concerns about potential water quality issues in stormwater runoff, the City of Olympia Water Resources program will conduct water quality tests to ensure the dog park is not causing excessive water contamination.) So while this is not an ideal site, it could be developed at a reasonable cost. Yauger Park was the second most desirable City of Olympia park selected by survey respondents as a good location for an off-leash dog area.

## East Olympia:

Priest Point Park appears to be the best available East Olympia site. Unlike Stevens Field and Friendly Grove, the site at Priest Point Park does not have any nearby neighbors, so noise issues should not be a concern. Also, both Stevens Field and Friendly Grove's parking areas were designed for neighborhood park use, not a community-wide amenity such as an off-leash dog area. Finally, Priest Point Park was the number-one choice selected by survey respondents as a good location for an off-leash dog area.

There are, however, some concerns about Priest Point Park. Barking noise could potentially create conflicts with users seeking a quiet nature experience. The site's slope also may create $\mathrm{mud} /$ pet waste runoff issues that could affect nearby Mission Creek. For these reasons, it is recommended that Yauger Park be tried as a pilot project first and depending on the experience there, as well as further research into environmental issues, Priest Point Park may be tried next.

# Olympia Off-Leash Dog Park Cost Estimates 

(1-acre/43,560 s.f.)

| QTY | UNIT |  | COST/UNIT | EXTENSION |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 750 | If | Fencing | $\$ 16$ | $\$ 12,000$ |
| 1 | ea | Double Gate | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 1,000$ |
| 1 | ea | Doggie Fountain | $\$ 2,500$ | $\$ 2,500$ |
| 300 | If | Water Supply, Trench, Backfill | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 300 | If | Sewer Line, Trench, Backfill | $\$ 25$ | $\$ 7,500$ |
| 1 | ea | Bowser Station | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 1 | ea | Regulation Sign | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 500$ |
| 20 | load | Cedar Chips | $\$ 250$ | $\$ 5,000$ |
| 3 | ea | Park Benches/Pad | $\$ 1,500$ | $\$ 4,500$ |
| 1 | ea | Mini-shelter | $\$ 5,000$ | $\$ 5,000$ |
| 1 | ea | ADA path/parking stall |  | $\$ 5,000$ |

## Conclusions \& Recommendations

- There appears to be a need for one or more off-leash dog facilities in the City of Olympia.
- There is a public preference for several smaller facilities rather than one larger one.
- Due to the cost of road frontage improvements and parking lot construction, it is far more cost-effective to utilize an existing developed park than an undeveloped park or open space for an off leash dog area. Construction of an off-leash dog area in an existing park would cost an estimated $\$ 80,000$.
- Currently there are no funds budgeted for an off-leash dog area. Funds for one or two pilot off-leash dog areas should be considered for inclusion in Olympia Capital Facility Plan in the next several years.
- If supporters of off-leash dog areas would like this amenity sooner or larger in scale, they are welcome to raise the funds themselves. Off-leash dog park advocates could work with the Parks, Arts and Recreation Organization, veterinarians, pet-related businesses, and other organizations to raise funds.
- Once funds are available, a pilot off-leash dog park could be constructed in Yauger Park. Depending on the experience there and further research into environmental issues, a small site at Priest Point Park could be utilized as a second pilot project.
- An advocacy group can play a large role in monitoring and maintaining the off-leash dog park. Many jurisdictions report that advocacy groups play an important role in selfpolicing their facilities.
- After a year, the pilot project should be evaluated. Depending on the evaluation, the sites may be made permanent, enlarged (if space permits), modified or discontinued depending on the evaluation.
- A portion of the proposed Yelm Highway Community Park and/or Lindell Road Community Park sites should be considered for an off-leash dog area when those parks are developed. These sites are scheduled to be purchased late 2006 and 2009 respectively. Funds are not currently budgeted for development of these sites. Community parks are best suited for off-leash dog parks. Off-leash dog parks can be best fitted into parks when planned for in advance as part of the acquisition and master planning process. With the growing demand for off-leash dog parks, this need should be recognized in park planning along with the traditional ballfields and other facilities.


## Appendix I - Survey and Community Meeting Results

Prepared by Jennifer Swidler, May 2006

The city of Olympia Parks, Arts and Recreation Department (OPARD) and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee are conducting a feasibility study to learn the level of citizen interest and support for creating one or more off-leash dog parks in Olympia. There are currently no off-leash dog parks in Olympia. OPARD administered surveys and held a public meeting to learn the following themes: Is there community support for creating off-leash dog parks? Where should they be located? How often would they be used? What features they should have? Are there existing parks that could accommodate an offleash dog park? What concerns to citizens have about off-leash dog parks? There is no budget for creating or maintaining off-leash dog parks in Olympia, but OPARD hopes this feasibility study will provide insight into whether citizens support funding such parks in the future.

To help answer these questions, OPARD created and administered surveys and held a public meeting on March 23, 2006. Survey distribution was not random or scientific; they were distributed through word-ofmouth and e-mail. The survey responses and information from the public meeting generated the data in this paper, and were collected as follows:

- 190 surveys were submitted before the public meeting;
- 36 surveys were completed and submitted at the public meeting;
- 85 people attended the public meeting.

There are two versions of the survey that have nine of the same questions and vary by three questions. One of the surveys was distributed prior to the public meeting and the other was distributed at the public meeting.

- The three questions that varied were Question nine - "How would you suggest that problem dogs be handled" which appeared on the survey at the public meeting but not the one distributed prior to the meeting;
- Question 11 - "Do you see a role for an advocacy group?" which also appeared on the survey at the public meeting but not the other; and
- Question 10 that asked for desired dog park features, is not on the survey that was distributed at the public meeting but is on the one distributed prior to the meeting.
- Three of the questions from the surveys distributed prior to the public meeting were verbally asked at the public meeting:
- Question 6, regarding model dog parks;
- Question 10 asking for dog park features; and
- Question 11 requesting other recommendations, concerns or comments.

For analysis and presentation purposes, the surveys and questions from the public meeting were combined resulting in one survey with 12 questions.

## Results

## Question 1: Do you have dogs?

- 226 people responded to this question on the survey.
- Yes - $93 \%$
- No-7\%

Question 2: Would you use an off-leash dog park in Olympia?

- 226 people responded to this question on the survey.
- Yes - $94 \%$
- No-6\%
- Don't know - 1\%


## Question 3: If yes, how often?

- 209 people responded to this question on the survey.
- Graph A shows how many times survey respondents would visit an off-leash dog park per month.


Question 4: Please use numbers to rank your preference for what type of off-leash park you would prefer:

The information is presented in the order it was ranked by the survey respondents.

1. Several smaller facilities (one in each quadrant of the city)
2. One large "regional" facility
3. An off-leash forested trail
4. Existing neighborhood parks being designated as off-leash during certain hours

Question 4 continued: Two-hundred and seventeen people ranked this information. Several smaller facilities ranked the highest, with 55 percent marking it as their first choice for the type of park they would like best. Graph B shows how frequently each facility ranked number one.

* Several of the surveys were marked with an X instead of ranked by numbers.


Question 5: Are there any areas in Olympia that are frequently used as off-leash areas now?

- 170 people responded to this question.
- 136 responded with one or more parks or areas currently used as off-leash facilities.
- 34 indicated they do not know of any parks or areas currently used as off-leash facilities.
- Olympia city parks are bolded.

| Park or areas currently <br> used as off-leash parks | \# of Responses | \% of Responses |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Priest Point Park | 33 | $19 \%$ |
| Garfield Elementary <br> School | 20 | $12 \%$ |
| Schools in general | 20 | $12 \%$ |
| Christ the Rock Church on <br> corner of Yew \& Fir | 19 | $11 \%$ |
| Pioneer Park (Tumwater) | 18 | $11 \%$ |
| LBA Park | 11 | $6 \%$ |
| Watershed Park | 10 | $6 \%$ |
| Yauger Park | 10 | $6 \%$ |
| Dept. of Ecology | 10 | $6 \%$ |
| Lacey Community Center | 9 | $5 \%$ |
| McLane Creek Nature Trail | 7 | $4 \%$ |
| The Evergreen State <br> College | 5 | $3 \%$ |

Question 6: Are there any off-leash dog parks that would be a good model for Olympia?

- 145 people responded with one or more models.
- 11 of the responses were either "I don't know," or "I've never been to a dog park."
- 25 ideas were generated from the public meeting.
- Responses are split into two categories: A. model cities and, B. model parks.
A. Most mentioned model cities:

| Cities with good model <br> parks | \# of Responses | \% of Responses |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Seattle | 44 | $30 \%$ |
| Portland | 12 | $8 \%$ |
| Bellingham | 5 | $3 \%$ |
| Bend | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| Eugene | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| San Diego, CA | 3 | $2 \%$ |

Other model cities mentioned more than once were Ashland, Bellevue, Lacey, Los Angeles, San Diego, Tacoma, Vancouver, Victoria and Whidbey Island.
B. Most mentioned model parks:

| Parks that are good <br> models | \# of Responses | \% of Responses |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Marymoor Park, Redmond | 26 | $18 \%$ |
| Magnuson Park, Seattle | 11 | $8 \%$ |
| Ft. Steilacoom Park | 9 | $5 \%$ |
| Grandview, Seatac | 4 | $3 \%$ |
| Golden Gardens, Seattle | 3 | $2 \%$ |
| Thousand Acres | 2 | $1 \%$ |

Question 7: Are there any other areas in Olympia that you think would be good locations?

- 135 people responded to this question with one or more locations.
- Olympia city parks are bolded.

| Good Dog Park <br> Locations | \# of Responses | \% of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Priest Point Park: beach, <br> old wading pool, behind <br> rose garden | 28 | $21 \%$ |
| Pioneer Park (Tumwater) | 22 | $16 \%$ |
| Yauger Park | 14 | $10 \%$ |
| Capitol Lake Park (WA <br> State) | 12 | $9 \%$ |
| LBA Park: area already <br> fenced, Field \#3 | 11 | $8 \%$ |
| West Bay Park | 8 | $6 \%$ |
| Grass Lake Park | 6 | $4 \%$ |
| 46th \& Cooper Pt. Rd. <br> (Thurston County) | 4 | $3 \%$ |
| Burfoot Park (Thurston <br> County) | 4 | $3 \%$ |
| Friendly Grove Park | 4 | $3 \%$ |

Other areas mentioned: Lacey Community Center, Marathon Park, Watershed Park, behind the Department of Ecology, undeveloped areas, Rainier Vista Park, Mission Creek, Sunrise Park, Sylvester Park, Homan Park, former landfills

Question 8: Are there any areas in parks where dogs should not be allowed?

- 148 people responded to this question with one or more areas where dogs should not be allowed.

| No Dogs Allowed Areas | \# of Responses | \% of <br> Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Children's playgrounds | 36 | $24 \%$ |
| Sports fields | 13 | $9 \%$ |
| Picnic areas | 10 | $7 \%$ |
| Watershed Park, <br> specifically during salmon <br> spawning season | 8 | $5 \%$ |
| Dogs should be allowed in <br> all areas | 8 | $5 \%$ |
| Flowerbeds, gardens, <br> nature areas | 4 | $3 \%$ |
| Away from schools | 2 | $1 \%$ |
| Near streets | 2 | $1 \%$ |
| Heritage Park Fountain | 2 | $1 \%$ |
| Non-fenced areas | 1 | $1 \%$ |
| Small parks | 1 | $1 \%$ |

## Question 9: How would you suggest that problem dogs be handled?

- This question was on the survey distributed at the public meeting but not on the survey distributed before the meeting.
- 27 people responded to this question out of the 36 that filled out the survey at the public meeting.

| Problem Dogs | \# of Responses | \% of Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Owners responsible/ self <br> monitor | 14 | $52 \%$ |
| Removed from park | 6 | $22 \%$ |
| Banned from park | 6 | $22 \%$ |
| Post rules | 4 | $15 \%$ |
| Owners fined | 2 | $7 \%$ |

## Question 10: What features would you like to see in a dog park?

- This question was on the survey distributed before the public meeting, and it was verbally asked at the public meeting. It was not on the survey distributed at the public meeting.
- Pre-meeting surveys and public meeting verbal responses were combined, generating 253 responses.
- Note: Many people responded with "water" as a desired feature. Unless it was made clear that they meant water for swimming or washing, it was assumed they meant drinking water.

| Requested Dog Park <br> Features | \# of Responses | \% of Respondents |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Drinking water | 81 | $32 \%$ |
| Fence | 76 | $30 \%$ |
| Bowser bags with <br> multiple stations | 74 | $29 \%$ |
| Open spaces | 64 | $25 \%$ |
| Trash cans | 58 | $23 \%$ |
| Enforcement of rules | 51 | $20 \%$ |
| Trails | 46 | $18 \%$ |
| Stream/pond | 41 | $16 \%$ |
| Separate area for <br> larger/small dogs | 28 | $11 \%$ |
| Seating | 27 | $11 \%$ |
|  <br> regulations | 26 | $10 \%$ |
| Trees | 25 | $10 \%$ |
| Beach areas | 15 | $6 \%$ |
| Covered area w/table | 15 | $6 \%$ |
| Agility course | 12 | $5 \%$ |
| Separate dog area in <br> existing parks | 12 | $5 \%$ |
| Varying terrain | 12 | $5 \%$ |


| Bushes | 9 | $4 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Toys/play structure | 9 | $4 \%$ |
| Bathroom | 8 | $3 \%$ |
| Double gate system | 8 | $3 \%$ |

Question 11: Do you see a role for an advocacy group?

- This question was asked on the survey distributed at the public meeting, generating 36 surveys.
- 30 people responded "yes," that they see a role for an advocacy group.
- Nobody responded that they did not see a role for an advocacy group.

Specific ideas on what role an advocacy group could play:

- Park maintenance and monitoring.
-5 responses
- Dog park associations are always good to help self police parks \& raise funds for upkeep. -2 responses
- Advocacy groups could serve as a liaison between park users and others around park.
- 1 response
- Perhaps part-time city dog park coordinator.
- 1 response
- Not so much advocacy but advisory, to help troubleshoot problems or volunteer. - 1 response
- Could be used for information gathering about alternative designs and locations. - 1 response
- We must use our conglomerate voting power to establish a nice, well kept dog park. -1 response


## Question 12: Do you have other recommendations, concerns or comments?

- This question was asked on both surveys and at the public meeting.
- Refer to Attachment A for separate lists of recommendations, concerns and comments

| Most Common Thoughts | \# of Responses |
| :--- | ---: |
| Dealing w/ problem aggressive dogs | 38 |
| Park would be good for dog owners, dogs and <br> community at large | 20 |
| Willing to pay fee / donate for using park | 13 |
| Waste removal | 9 |
| Safety of park users and dogs | 6 |
| Owners should be held responsible for dog behavior | 6 |
| Rules / maintenance monitored by dog association | 3 |

## Recommendations:




Signs posted about non-aggressive only. Get funding from PetSmart to fence, they can advertise dog obedience classes, the animal shelter
Small dogs need their own space. All areas need fencing. Community wk parties to maintain. Rules posted, bowser bags everywhere
Social activities for people
Somehow communicating to dog owners their dogs should be in control or not off-leash
Spray bottles, lights
Start by making all the parks \& trails "shared use", later make a fenced park or two
Start with shared, then dedicated
Suggestion box
Suggestion: Volunteer groups to maintain and monitor
Tack-on fee for licenses (example: \$5 per dog tag)
Thank you for all your time \& effort to make this happen. It is much needed. Dogs should be non-aggressive to be allowed in park.
Training classes on good handling skills.
Trash cans and bags for waste
Trial periods and places (1 year)
Volunteer maintenance
Willing to pay use fee for off-leash area for people to socialize
Work with other public agencies and other local governments

## Concerns:

| Aggressive dogs |
| :--- |
| Aggressive dogs |
| Agility safety with novice dogs |
| As an owner of a retired greyhound - I feel that I would get no use out of a dog part that was not <br> fully fenced, because of worry that she could run off. Please make sure to fully fence the park <br> you create. |
| Bacteria in standing water |
| Concern - Less tolerance for off-leash walking in other areas if off-leash parks established |
| Concern = Dog in heat |
| Demonstrations |
| Dog fights |
| Dog waste. Fencing, lighting needs to be installed. Educate dog people to be good citizens too |
| Dogs that are not socialized \& poop pick-up |
| Economic impact of dog owners on community |
| Enforcement of "scoop" rules |
| Enough parking. Close enough for people to walk to the park |
| Feces disposal, Dog areas are good community builders. I want hard line against nuisance <br> dogs, mandatory licensing |
| How to handle aggressive dogs and owners |
| How to have animal control officers patrol the pks for aggressive dogs, non neutered. Sign to <br> guide for behavior. |
| I am always concerned when owners of aggressive dogs are clueless to their animals behavior. <br> Need to educate owners re proper dog behavior |
| I am very opposed to an off leash dog park. Bad experience dogs/owners trespassing |


| I have a small dog who is very social with other dogs, but who has been frightened by aggressive <br> dogs. Need a way to screen or separate |
| :--- |
| I use a guide dog. Supportive of off-leash dog park as long as it is separated from sidewalk way |
| I would be concerned about dogs off leash in trails or areas where wildlife exists. |
| Liability for dog bites |
| Mud |
| My concern is that I would expect the duty of picking up waste be the responsibility of the dog <br> owners |
| My dog deaf \& need fenced area to be safe to run |
| Please be sensitive to environmental impact i.e watershed area. How to handle dog fights, <br> unruly dogs, people. |
| Too many people with aggressive dogs use dog parks |
| Who is liable for dog bites? How sanitary will grounds be? |
| Will we be asked to finance horse parks too? Bird parks? Snake parks? Pet ownership is <br> voluntary \& they should finance all costs of pet ownership |

## Comments:

| Bravo! For initiating a dialogue/proposal. Let me know if I can help get it off the ground |
| :--- |
| Depends on problem dog, expect dog training, have problem dog designated areas. Clean-up <br> your dog's waste. |
| Dog owners are a constituency not having their needs met - we are tax payers |
| Dog owners pay taxes |
| Dog park, encourage responsible dog ownership |
| Dog parks are great for community. A great way to know neighbors |
| Dog parks are needed in this area as it promotes positive dog socialization as well as <br> introduction with other dog owners |
| Dog parks create good neighbors. Dog that get the change to behave as dogs and socialize with <br> others dogs are better suited for life in city. Good city acknowledges need for dog parks |
| Dogs are social animals - dog lovers are also. |
| Dogs often behave better off leash than on a leash w/other dogs |
| Everyone needs to clean up after their dog |
| Healthy pets - healthy owners |
| Hope you do it! |
| How soon? |
| I am in full support of a dog park |
| I believe well trained dogs with responsible owners should not present a problem off leash. |
| I don't understand why leashes are required at all! I think the owners should be responsible for <br> the actions of their pets. This is a police matter. Fine/who have unruly dogs. Licenses fees for <br> enforcement |
| I find unofficial off-leash gatherings monitor themselves \& dogs quite well. |
| I have a runner; I would not take her off-leash anywhere. I still think this is a wonderful idea. |
| I have a small dog \& having an off-leash pk would make the other pks safer for my dog, because <br> big dog owners would use the off-leash areas |
| I live in an apartment \& leashes are required everywhere \& I do understand why, but my dog <br> does need time to run \& play that is not out in the country |
| I really hope we get a dog park. When I lived in Bellingham it was such a joy to go to the dog <br> park and interact w/dogs/owners |

I see no need for an "Off-leash" park when all city parks currently appear to be leash-free areas. There is NO enforcement of leash laws or poop pick-up. Why bother spending my tax money on add'l areas
I would like to see a dog park in Tumwater. Site on Lloyd's St could be converted quickly. Much closer than Lakewood
I would love to see a dog park. There is such a high dog ownership in Oly I am sure it would be used regularly
I'm not an Olympia resident but run my dogs w/Olympia residents who are dog/human friendly Interested in full fenced park
It would be nice to have a place where you can relax and let your dogs loose to have fun.
Locations for dog events
Long overdue in this area!
Many public benefits; greater sense/community,exercise,well behaved dogs
My dog loves to play w/other dogs \& I would just like a fenced, safe area in walking distance
Off-leash dog parks would be a great benefit to our community. Providing an off-leash park would reflect just how wonderful \& community minded Olympia is!
Off-leash dogs are better socialized, quieter and healthier
Olympia becomes "pet friendly" and market it (economic development
Olympia has great pks \& area w/dog run, a dog pk will allow more people to enjoy our parks
Olympia is in need of a dog park, it doesn't need to be expensive or fancy - just a place for them
to run \& owners to meet \& socialize
Please move as quickly as you can!
Reasons this will benefit "non-dog people": it will keep us \& our dogs off their trails, and a wellexercised dog is not barking \& running crazy in his neighborhood.
Sooner the better.
Thank you for the effort! This is an important issue that needs to be addressed as use grows in this area
This has been long overdue. Citizens need a place to run their dogs \& dog parks build sense of community
This is a great idea!
This is a great idea. I would even be willing to pay a user fee for an off-leash park. Thank for the opportunity to comment.
This is a wonderful idea and so needed!
This park will really be used. Seattle found that they couldn't keep it grassed
Want something now!
We are new to Olympia \& yard is small. We would not unleash dogs without fencing. Many small dog owners a dog park's a must
We desperately need this facility in Olympia. A place that is easily accessible for frequent use, and large enough not to become overly crowded \& fenced for safety
We do need a park for dogs
We feel that there is a great need for a dog park. This community has so may dogs. Finally a cause that we wouldn't mind being taxed for.
We need a safe place to take our for kids to play, socialize \& exercise. Need to support dog owners in Olympia
We need this
We support dog parks
We would be happy to help out if you need volunteers

## Appendix II - Public Meeting Feedback 3/23/06

| Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| What model of dog park is best? Why? <br> Marymoor Pk, Redmond <br> Ft. Steilacoom www. Parkdogs.com <br> Start off with mixed/used park, fenced <br> Old land fill - Cascade Pole site <br> Yew Street site (Why is it not fenced?) <br> Can it be a County issue? Tumwater? | What model of dog park is best? Why? | What model of dog park is best? Why? <br> Fenced <br> Segregated for small vs. large dogs <br> Open field with forest borders <br> Water feature = "Doggy pool: for wading, splashing <br> Several smaller parks - No overcrowding <br> Regional - Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, Thurston Cty, so one jurisdiction isn't over burdened <br> Behind Lacey Community Ctr. - <br> Planned park - Look into. |
| What features would you like in a dog park? <br> Water for swimming or drinking (people and dogs) <br> Fenced <br> Separate areas for large \& small dogs <br> Baggies <br> Garbage cans <br> Open Space <br> Grass <br> Rules and Regulations <br> Porta-Potties <br> Bathrooms <br> Bulletin Board <br> Group of Volunteers <br> Benches | What features would you like in a dog park? <br> Separated area = small/timid and large/active dogs <br> Designated areas with water areas and benches <br> Overhead awnings in case of rain Pebble trails to limit mud Double gates with springs Pick-up bags and pooper scoopers <br> Message/Event boards <br> Fenced area of a current park Signs of rules/policies | What features would you like in a dog park? <br> Donated bags from grocery stores <br> Double gates <br> Tap water <br> Bathrooms (for people) <br> Garbage cans <br> Wet weather shelter <br> Seats for people - Big logs, picnic tables <br> Bulletin board (notices, lost/found animals, etc.) |


| Other comments, |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| suggestions, concerns. | Other comments, <br> suggestions, concerns. <br> Double gate by busy streets | Other comments, <br> suggestions, concerns. <br> Fee for dog park association |
| Donation park <br> Public relations campaign to those who rules <br> don't want park | No exclusions of breeds | Pass out information at veterinarian <br> office, pet store, etc. <br> Minimize conflict with neighborhoods, <br> other park users <br> A way of dealing with repeat offenders <br> (uncontrollable dogs, aggressive dogs) <br> Suggestion: Volunteer groups to <br> maintain and monitor <br> Tack-on fee for licenses (example: $\$ 5$ <br> per dog tag) <br> Suggestion box heat <br> Trial periods and places (1 year) |


| Group 4 | Group 5 | Group 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| What model of dog park is best? Why? <br> Off-leash forest trail <br> Combination of open/trail area <br> Large regional area/one in each side of town <br> Water areas <br> Small dog area separate from big dog area <br> Neighborhood oriented area <br> Fenced area | What model of dog park is best? Why? <br> Fenced <br> Multiple sites <br> Shared use OK <br> Three acre minimum | What model of dog park is best? Why? <br> Dedicated full time <br> Plus additional shared - various locations <br> People exercise too - trails PetSmart sponsors some parks <br> Marymoor is a good size - need size to give dogs space |
| What features would you like in a dog park? <br> Fenced and gated <br> Water for drinking/hose/wading <br> Bag \& disposal <br> Small dogs <br> Handicap accessible <br> Walking path for humans <br> Benches <br> Covered area <br> Porta-Potties | What features would you like in a dog park? <br> Water (drinking and playing) <br> Shelter <br> Cleaning/staging area (double gated) <br> Trails <br> Beach access <br> Parking <br> Agility course <br> Poop bags <br> Restrooms | What features would you like in a dog park? <br> Parking access <br> Garbage - dog waste <br> Water - swimming <br> Trails <br> Variety of land features <br> Separated from cars <br> Fencing <br> Double-gate <br> Signage rules <br> Handicap accessible <br> Seating benches <br> Fresh drinking water |


| Other comments, suggestions, concerns. <br> How to handle aggressive dogs and owners <br> Signage of rules <br> Not in area of sensitive wildlife <br> Olympia becomes "pet friendly" and market it (economic development <br> Want something now! <br> Off-leash dogs are better socialized, quieter and healthier <br> Seek corporate sponsors <br> Healthy pets - healthy owners <br> Dog owners are a constituency not having their needs met - we are tax payers <br> Work with other public agencies and other local governments <br> Ballot issue | Other comments, suggestions, concerns. <br> How soon? <br> Start with shared, then dedicated <br> Volunteer maintenance <br> Concern - Less tolerance for offleash walking in other areas if offleash parks established <br> Bacteria in standing water Lighting for night/winter months ( to better see dog poop) | Other comments, suggestions, concerns. <br> Location - proximity <br> Aggressive dogs <br> Rules posted, clear contact/reporting enforcement <br> Maintenance - city volunteers <br> Consider voluntary fee/contribution donations, advertising/sponsorships <br> Mud <br> Agility safety with novice dogs <br> Dog owners pay taxes <br> Economic impact of dog owners on community <br> We support dog parks <br> Locations for dog events <br> Fun matches <br> Demonstrations <br> Dog owners can share knowledge referrals <br> Social activities for people <br> Dog park, encourage responsible dog ownership |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Appendix III - Western Wash. Off-Leash Dog Parks

## Seattle

Blue Dog Pond Park
Genesee
Golden Gardens
Dr. Jose Rizal Park
Magnuson Park
Northacres Park
Regrade Park
Volunteer Park
Westcrest Park
Woodland Park
I-5 Colonnade
Plymouth Pillars
South King County
Grandview Park
Mercer Island
Luther Burbank Park
Redmond
Marymoor Park
Edmonds
Edmonds Marina

## Everett

Kasch Park
Howarth Park
Lowell Park
Gold Bar
Gold Bar Off-Leash Area
Bellingham
Arroyo Park
Bloedel Donovan Park
Lake Padden Park
Marine Park
Post Point Treatment Area
2.0

Sehome Hill Arboretum
Sunset Pond \& Bug Lake
Whatcom Falls Park
Whidbey Island
Double Bluff Beach
Marguerite Brons
13.0

Patmore Pit
Tehcnical Park
Clover

## Camano Island

English Boom Waterfront
Lakewood - Ft. Steilacoom
9.0
37.0
40.0

Acres
3.2 gravel/sand/turf
0.3 sand, hog fuel
1.0 wood chips
1.2 crushed rock
0.2 crushed rock

Off-leash trails
Swim Beach
2.0 turf
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