

Dogs in Park Work Group  
October 25, 2006  
Milwaukie Center  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.  
[Notes taken by Eric Shawn]

Twelve people attended the meeting, including Sally Shook, Jim Schuld, Tony Clark and Eric Shawn from the Stewardship Committee for North Clackamas Park.

The task of the Work Group is to gather information, identify issues, describe options and recommend a public process and timeline for discussing dogs in the park.

In preparation for Stewardship Committee discussions about north side planning, the work group discussed the location of the Dog Park in North Clackamas Park.

### **Dog Park Locations**

#### **Trade Locations**

Lisa Gibson suggested looking into trading locations of the Dog Park and the Horse Arena. One reason in support was that with sports events scheduled from April through August, the Horse Arena would not be available for use during the Spring and Summer of the year. Another reason in support was that parking is not sufficient.

Tony Clark presented the idea of putting the Dog Park at the location of the Horse Arena and within the boundaries of the new asphalt trails and roadway.

Citizens who were present discussed the idea of looking into the possibilities of moving the Horse Arena to the north side of the park and placing the dog park in the approximate location of the current horse arena. After discussion the consensus of the group was measured using the consensus measuring process and results are shown below:

- 1 – Full support. No more discussion needed. [10]
- 2 – Tend to support. [2]
- 3 – Can live with the proposal. Have reservations and want to discuss them. [0]
- 4 – Have significant discomfort and need more discussion. [0]
- 5 – Oppose the proposal as presented and need more discussion. [0]

Consensus: The Work Group recommends that the Stewardship Committee look into moving the Horse Arena to the north side of the park and placing the Dog Park in the approximate location of the current Horse Arena.

### **Picnic Area B**

Jim Schuld suggested that the Dog Park be moved to the area of the park now used for Picnic Area B. Citizens who were present discussed this idea and several factors were mentioned in opposition. One factor was the oak/ash forest remnant and the difficulty throwing balls for dogs. Another factor was the close proximity to houses. After discussion the consensus of the group was measured using the consensus measuring process and results are shown below:

- 1 – Full support. No more discussion needed. [1]
- 2 – Tend to support. [1]
- 3 – Can live with the proposal. Have reservations and want to discuss them. [1]
- 4 – Have significant discomfort and need more discussion. [1]
- 5 – Oppose the proposal as presented and need more discussion. [8]

Consensus: The Work Group demonstrated significant discomfort and opposition to the proposal. Consensus was weighted [three to one] against moving the Dog Park to Picnic Area B. The Work Group does not recommend moving the Dog Park to Picnic Area B.

### **Multiple Dog Parks**

The idea of locating multiple dog parks throughout the park district was discussed at previous Work Group meetings [9/13, 9/27 and 10/11]. One factor mentioned is that multiple dog parks would relieve the dog use pressure from North Clackamas Park. After further discussion the consensus of the group was measured using the consensus measuring process and results are shown below:

- 1 – Full support. No more discussion needed. [12]
- 2 – Tend to support. [0]
- 3 – Can live with the proposal. Have reservations and want to discuss them. [0]
- 4 – Have significant discomfort and need more discussion. [0]
- 5 – Oppose the proposal as presented and need more discussion. [0]

Consensus: The Work Group recommends that the Stewardship Committee discuss creation of multiple dog parks throughout the park district.

### **Leave Dog Park As Is**

The Work Group discussed the option of leaving the Dog Park at its' current location. After discussion the consensus of the group was measured using the consensus measuring process and results are shown below:

- 1 – Full support. No more discussion needed. [2]
- 2 – Tend to support. [5]
- 3 – Can live with the proposal. Have reservations and want to discuss them. [4]
- 4 – Have significant discomfort and need more discussion. [1]
- 5 – Oppose the proposal as presented and need more discussion. [0]

No Consensus: The Work Group did not reach consensus. Seven citizens supported or tended to support leaving the dog park where it is. Five citizens had reservations or significant discomfort with leaving the dog park where it is.

### **Public Process & Timeline**

One task of the Work Group is to recommend a public process and timeline for discussing dogs in the park. Citizens present discussed the idea of including discussions about the dog park in the meeting sequence for north side planning. After discussion the consensus of the group was measured using the consensus measuring process and results are shown below:

- 1 – Full support. No more discussion needed. [9]
- 2 – Tend to support. [2]
- 3 – Can live with the proposal. Have reservations and want to discuss them. [0]
- 4 – Have significant discomfort and need more discussion. [0]
- 5 – Oppose the proposal as presented and need more discussion. [0]

Consensus: The Work Group recommends to the Stewardship Committee that discussions about the Dog Park be inserted into the meeting sequence for north side planning.