BOISE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2020
4:00 P.M.

Location:
Video Conference Call
Parks and Recreation Administration Office
1104 Royal Blvd
Boise, ID 83706

Members of the public are encouraged to attend the meeting virtually.
Join at: Microsoft Teams Meeting

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ATTENDANCE
   A. Roll Call
   B. Welcome – Commissioner Liz Urban

III. CONSENT
   *A. CFH20-00082 – Boise River System Permit – 5021 W Alamosa St.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
   *A. Minutes – August 20, 2020
   *B. Dog Off-Leash Area Expansion Request – Cypress Park – Public Hearing
      Written testimony is encouraged and can be submitted in advance to BPR@cityofboise.org. To testify via teleconference, join the Microsoft Teams Meeting.
   *C. Executive Session – Pursuant to Idaho Code §74-206(1)(c) to acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency, and Idaho Code §74-206(1)(f) to communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Idaho Code Section 74-204(4), all items on the Agenda marked with an asterisk * are action items that require a vote. Identifying an item as an action item on the Agenda does not require that a vote be taken. All Consent Agenda items will be enacted by one motion, unless a Commissioner or citizen requests the item be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in the normal sequence of business.
TO: President Angela Johnson and Boise Parks and Recreation Commissioners
FROM: Doug Holloway, Director
DATE: 9/11/2020
RE: September 17, 2020 Boise Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Please find enclosed the descriptive information supporting your agenda items for this meeting. The meeting is anticipated to last one-hour and will take place as a hybrid-video conference call. Join at: Microsoft Teams Meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. CFH20-00082 – BOISE RIVER SYSTEM PERMIT – 5021 W ALAMOSA ST. – Requested by Trevor Kesner, Park Planner (Item III. A. on the agenda)

The property owners of 5021 W Alamosa St. intend to develop a 0.65-acre parcel to include four residential units, in addition to the existing residential home situated on the lot. A portion of the property is located within the Boise River Management Plan Boundary at the southwest corner of the parcel. This area of the parcel currently has Class A lands that provide natural resource value to the Boise River riparian corridor. As such, the developer is required to obtain a Boise River System permit approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission in order to proceed with the proposed development.

The Boise River System permitting process requires the Boise Parks and Recreation Commission to review any proposed development that is adjacent to, or includes, Greenbelt setback lands and waters. Three of the four new residential buildings proposed by the applicant will directly abut and slightly encroach within the Greenbelt setbacks. Additionally, the applicant proposes to place a four-foot retaining wall to support elevated patios for the new homes within these setbacks.

The applicant’s submitted development plans are attached as an addendum to this memo (Exhibit A). The applicant’s proposed private drive aisle placement parallel to the existing pathway access to the Greenbelt on the east side of the parcel is in conformance with the code. According to the applicant’s planting plan, the existing trees and ‘wetland’ vegetation is to be retained and protected. However, department staff believe the amount of ground disturbance necessary to construct portions of the residential units and their attached patios within the Greenbelt setback lands would adversely affect the existing vegetation and natural resource values.

RECOMMENDATION: The department requests that the Boise Parks and Recreation Commission recommend approval to the Boise Planning and Zoning Commission, with the following amendments: the applicant modifies the development plans to remove the portions of the
buildings from the Greenbelt setback area and redesign the patio projections to discourage future residents’ access and activity (landscaping, pathways, fencing, etc.) within the setback.

NEW BUSINESS AGENDA

A. MINUTES – AUGUST 20, 2020 – Requested by Doug Holloway, Boise Parks and Recreation Director (Item IV. A. on the agenda)

RECOMMENDATION: The department requests that the Boise Parks and Recreation Commission recommend approval of the August 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes (Exhibit B), to Boise City Council.

B. DOG OFF-LEASH AREA EXPANSION REQUEST – CYPRESS PARK – PUBLIC HEARING
– Requested by Jennifer Tomlinson, Parks Superintendent (Item IV. B. on the agenda)

A 7.3-acre park in Southeast Boise, Cypress Park is one of nine parks where the city offers hourly/seasonal off-leash use, and is one of six parks that were originally adopted into the program in response to a call for more off-leash space in the 2011 Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan.

The Parks and Recreation Commission approved Cypress Park for regular off-leash use in 2012, with the off-leash area consisting of 1.4 acres bordered by the tennis courts, shelter, and playground to the west and the sidewalk to the north, east and south. Users may use the area to run their dogs from sunrise to 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. to sunset.

Prior to launching the off-leash program in Cypress Park, the department sought feedback from park neighbors to gauge support. This was accomplished via a public meeting and surveys. A survey was taken prior to piloting the program in 2011, asking if neighbors supported the use and times being proposed. A follow up survey was taken at the conclusion of the yearlong pilot to determine how the program was received. Survey results are as follows:

2011 Pre-Pilot Period Survey

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (308):
- Support Off-Leash Use: 70.8% (216)
- Oppose Off-Leash Use: 29.2% (89)
- Support Morning Hours (Sunrise to 10 a.m.): 78.9% (168)
- Support Evening Hours (4 p.m. to Sunset): 87.8% (187)

Park Survey Results from neighbors within a ½ mile radius of the Cypress Park (303):
- Support Off-Leash Use: 70.9% (215)
- Oppose Off-Leash Use: 28.7% (87)
2012 End of Pilot Period Survey

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (154):

- Support Off-Leash Use: 82.7% (124)
- Oppose Off-Leash Use: 17.3% (26)
- Support Morning Hours (Sunrise to 10 a.m.): 89.7% (113)
- Support Evening Hours (4 p.m. to Sunset): 92.9% (117)

Park Survey Results from neighbors within a ½ mile radius of the Cypress Park (154):

- Support Off-Leash Use: 82.7% (124)
- Oppose Off-Leash Use: 17.3% (26)

Although there has been strong support for the use, there has also been consistent concerns raised by park users. This includes conflicts with other uses, dog waste, and compliance and enforcement.

The department is now being petitioned to expand Cypress Park’s off-leash space to include the sidewalk circling the main body of the park. The goal being to allow dog owners to walk the circuit of the sidewalk with their dogs off-leash.

The off-leash expansion proposal and petition is included in the agenda packet (Exhibit C).

The agenda packet has been updated to include written public testimony received (Exhibit D).

**RECOMMENDATION:** The department recommends that the Boise Parks and Recreation Commission approve the dog off-leash area expansion request at Cypress Park; and furthermore make the entire park off-leash during the allocated hours, with restricted areas at the playground and tennis courts and an on-leash requirement for the parking lot and entrance road.
This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable. THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION.
This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable. THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION.
8/18/2020

Boise Planning and Development Services
150 North Capitol Blvd.
Boise, ID 83702

RE: Boise River System / Floodplain review

Dear Reviewer,

This detailed letter is for the Floodplain Review application for the proposed Freer Townhomes Subdivision located at 5021 W. Alamosa St. A Boise River System permit application will also be submitted for this project. The project is on a 0.65-acre lot in Boise, Idaho Parcel # R0306000322. There are four new proposed residential structures. One new single-family house and three new townhomes. One existing residential house will be retained. A second existing house will be removed. There will be 5 residential lots and 2 common lots for a total of 7 lots.

The portion of the parcel located within the floodplain and floodway have been delineated as class A and Class C lands. No impact is anticipated for the floodway and existing trees will not be removed within the floodplain. The proposed development also does not impact the 6500 CFS Boise River flowline and the structures are located outside the 6500 CFS greenbelt setback. A small portion of the buildings and back patios are located within the floodplain. There is a retaining wall less than 4’ high along the rear of the townhomes to reduce the fill within the floodplain. To evaluate the effect of the proposed fill on the water surface elevations, a copy of the current FEMA flood map and HEC-RAS model were obtained. The location of the fill within the floodplain is located outside of the FEMA model effective flow limits. Therefore, the fill has no effect on the conveyance of flood flows or on the water surface elevations.

The maximum base flood elevation on this property is 2640.40’. All new buildings will be slab on grade with a minimum finish floor elevation of 2642.45’ and 2 feet above the base flood elevation in accordance with Boise City Code section 11-08-03.2.D.2.

See the attached FIS profile, FEMA map, and HEC-RAS cross section exhibits.

Thank you for your attention to this application. If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (208) 323-2288.

Sincerely,
T-O Engineers

David Sterling, P.E.
PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR
FREER TOWNHOMES SUBDIVISION

A PORTION OF THE AREA OF THE NW 1/4 OF SECTION 32
TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 2 EAST, EROMS MERIDIAN,
ADA COUNTY, IDAHO

2020

NOTES:
1. COMMON LOTS 3C, AND 7C BLOCK 1 ARE TO BE OWNED AND MAINTAINED BY OWNER.
2. ALL ON SITE STORM WATER FROM THE SHARED DRIVEWAY AND SITE WILL BE RETAINED ONSITE WITHIN STORM WATER SWALES IN ACCORDANCE WITH CITY OF BOISE STORM WATER POLICY.
3. COMMON LOT 3 SHALL HAVE A BLANKET SHARED ACCESS EASEMENT, PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT, AND DRAINAGE EASEMENT.
4. THIS DEVELOPMENT RECOGNIZES SECTION 22-4503 OF IDAHO CODE, RIGHT TO FARM ACT, WHICH STATES: "NO AGRICULTURAL OPERATION, AGRICULTURAL FACILITY OR EXPANSION THEREOF SHALL BE OR BECOME A NUISANCE, PRIVATE OR PUBLIC, BY ANY CHANGED CONDITIONS IN OR ABOUT THE SURROUNDING NON-AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AFTER IT HAS BEEN IN OPERATION FOR MORE THAN ONE (1) YEAR, WHEN THE OPERATION, FACILITY OR EXPANSION WAS NOT A NUISANCE AT THE TIME IT BEGAN OR WAS CONSTRUCTED. THE PROVISIONS OF THIS SECTION SHALL NOT APPLY WHEN A NUISANCE RESULTS FROM THE IMPROPER OR NEGLIGENT OPERATION OF AN AGRICULTURAL OPERATION, AGRICULTURAL FACILITY OR EXPANSION THEREOF."

LEGEND
SUBDIVISION BOUNDARY
R/W
PROPOSED ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY
ROAD CENTER LINE
PROPOSED LOT NUMBER
PROPOSED BLOCK NUMBER
PROPOSED LOT LINE
PROPOSED COMMON LOT
BUILDING SETBACKS
SECTION LINE
ACREAGE SUMMARY
TOTAL = 0.655 ACRES
BUILDABLE LOTS = 0.304 ACRES
COMMON LOTS = 0.338 ACRES
STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY = 0.013 ACRES

LOT SUMMARY
RESIDENTIAL BUILDABLE LOTS = 5
COMMON LOTS = 2
CURRENT ZONING
R-1C
ROADWAY JURISDICTION
ADA COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT
SEWER PROVIDER
CITY OF BOISE SEWER
WATER PROVIDER
SUEZ WATER
FIRE DISTRICT
BOISE CITY FIRE DISTRICT

DEVELOPER / OWNER
MICHAEL FREER
SIRP LLC
703 N 14TH E.
MOUNTAIN, HOME ID 83647

ENGINEER
T-O ENGINEERS, INC.
DAVID STERLING, P.E.
2471 S. TITANIUM PLACE
MERIDIAN, IDAHO 83642

SURVEYOR
T-O ENGINEERS, INC.
STEVE FRISBIE, P.L.S.
2471 S. TITANIUM PLACE
MERIDIAN, IDAHO 83642

PARCEL ADDRESS
5021 W. ALAMOSA ST.
BOISE, ID 83703

ACREAGE SUMMARY
LOT
BUILDABLE LOTS = 0.304 ACRES
COMMON LOTS = 0.338 ACRES
STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY = 0.013 ACRES

LOT SUMMARY
BUILDABLE LOTS = 5
COMMON LOTS = 2

CURRENT ZONING
R-1C
ROADWAY JURISDICTION
ADA COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT
SEWER PROVIDER
CITY OF BOISE SEWER
WATER PROVIDER
SUEZ WATER
FIRE DISTRICT
BOISE CITY FIRE DISTRICT

PAVEMENT SECTION SHALL BE 4% SUNKEN MCH, PG 63-2 BASE LINES THICK,
MINIMUM LINES OF 4-INCH LINES CUSHED AGGREGATE BASE AND LINES OF 4-INCH MCH PCC SLAB.
28 August 2020

Planning and Development Services
Boise City Hall, 2nd Floor
150 N. Capitol Boulevard
Boise, Idaho 83701-0500

Attention: PDSTransmittals@cityofboise.org

Subject: VPNA Comments on Proposed Freer Subdivision
PUD20-00034 and SUB20-00039
5021 Alamosa Street
Boise, Idaho

Planning and Zoning Commission:

This comment letter is in regard to the project at 5021 Alamosa Street, PUD20-00034 and SUB20-00039. Our Veterans Park Neighborhood Association (VPNA) board has reviewed the plan to demolish one of the two residential units on this property and to construct four new units, for a total of five residential units. While we generally accept the project as designed, residents of the Veterans Park Neighborhood Association (VPNA) have some concerns that we want to see this project addressed, and we are hoping to work with Planning and Zoning and the developer to address these issues. Some of our Board Members attended the neighborhood meeting held on March 12, 2020, and we are happy to note that some concerns residents raised in that meeting appear to be addressed in the submittal documents we reviewed.

This letter presents our concerns with the proposed development in the following categories, addressed individually in more detail below: turning traffic, stormwater drainage, floodplain infill, wildlife concerns, building height, and public notification.

**Turning Traffic**
The access road/driveway for the proposed subdivision parallels the public Greenbelt access multi-use pathway (MUP) connecting Alamosa Street to the Greenbelt. The proposed driveway is 20 feet wide, and is separated from the existing 8 foot wide MUP by an approximately 8 foot wide vegetated buffer strip. This MUP is a high-use corridor for bicyclists and pedestrians entering the neighborhood from the Greenbelt, and it is frequently used by children to access the nearby neighborhood park, Willow Park. During the neighborhood meeting, residents expressed concern with potential conflicts between subdivision traffic and vulnerable road users at the subdivision exit. We see and appreciate that the developer has incorporated a vision triangle with reduced vegetation height in their landscaping plan to help drivers exiting the subdivision be aware of users on the MUP. However, VPNA also requests that additional pro-active traffic calming measures be installed at the subdivision exit to help prevent potential collisions. Currently, the proposed design for a 20-foot wide roadway with additional width...
provided in driveway radii to exit onto Alamosa street encourages high-speed travel. We assume that the roadway width is dictated by code for emergency vehicle access, but we request that the driveway radius distances be reduced or removed to encourage cars to come to a complete stop prior to turning onto Alamosa. Additional design measures to reduce traffic speed at this location such as installation of speed bumps may also be appropriate.

**Stormwater Drainage**

From our review of the plans submitted, it does not appear that the developer has incorporated any on-site stormwater retention capacity associated with this subdivision. During the neighborhood meeting, the developer’s representative indicated that stormwater would most likely flow to the storm drain located at the head of the MUP adjacent to the site. However, this storm drain consistently floods during storm events under current conditions, as was brought to the developer’s representative’s attention. The development plans submitted call for a high percentage of hardscape – from a cursory visual inspection of the landscape plan we estimate that asphalt, concrete, and building footprint approach 80% of the newly developed portion of the property with no apparent mechanism provided to account for the accompanying increase in stormwater drainage. The VPNA is concerned that this could exacerbate flooding at the nearby storm drain, and potentially impede traffic travelling on Alamosa Street as well as access to the Greenbelt access MUP.

**Floodplain Infill**

The site plans identify an “Effective Floodplain” boundary, and show that the proposed development will include infill of up to 13 feet into the “Effective Floodplain,” at which point a retaining wall will be built to end floodplain infill. However, these buildings project up to approximately 32 feet past the topographical high point, which acts as an informal levee, and beyond which the relatively flat land slopes quickly down to the lower lying floodplain. In recent years, we have had flooding beyond this levee within the Heron Hollow neighborhood of the VPNA, and the 100-year flood plane goes well beyond this levee, incorporating Alamosa street, as well as portions of Wymosa Street and Wylie Lane. All fill associated with this project is within the 100-year flood plain, and we are concerned that significant infill of more than 30 feet of flood plain from the topographical high point will increase the flood potential at nearby residences and properties.

**Wildlife Concerns**

Neighborhood residents have raised concerns on two points associated with wildlife. 1) The unmaintained portion of the property within the lower elevation floodplain serves as a wildlife corridor in which deer, fox, rabbits, turkeys, ducks, and numerous other bird and wildlife species have been observed. Residents noted that any development should not include fencing that could impede wildlife travelling through this area from east to west. From our review of the currently proposed plans, it does not appear that this development will include such fencing. 2) There is a Nesting Reserve running from the Greenbelt to the Boise River immediately southwest of this property. Residents would like to ensure that planning and zoning review any restrictions that may be associated with development in the vicinity of this reserve to confirm that this development does not impact wildlife use of the reserve.

**Building Height**

VPNA was not able to access an electronic copy of special use restrictions associated with the Greenbelt River System Overlay District. However, we request that planning and zoning review these restrictions and confirm that the development is in accordance with them. The Greenbelt MUP bordering the site to
the east is a micropath accessing the Greenbelt. As previously stated, the path is approximately 8 feet from the proposed townhome wall. The proposed townhome height is 27.5 feet immediately adjacent to the path, with a maximum height of 31.5 feet.

**Public Notification**
Residents who attended the neighborhood meeting and provided their contact information for future notifications were not notified of the document submittal, the comment submission deadline, or the date of the planning and zoning meeting.

Thank you for your consideration. As mentioned, while we are generally supportive of the project, we do have some concerns we would like to see addressed.

Please do not hesitate to contact the VPNA board to discuss the contents of this comment letter.

Sincerely yours,
VETERANS PARK NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

[Signature]

Katy Decker
Vice President, VPNA
5001 W Wymosa Street
Boise, ID 83703
katymariedecker@gmail.com

C:\Users\kdecker\Desktop\2020_08-28_VPNA_5021 Alamosa Comment Letter.docx
The Boise Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) held its regular monthly meeting on August 20, 2020 via hybrid-conference call. Boise City Staff present: Doug Holloway and Jennifer Tomlinson (Parks and Recreation Department), James Smith (Legal Department), and Chloe Sallabanks (Clerk).

I. CALL TO ORDER:

Commission President Jon Ruzicka called the meeting to order at 10:31 a.m.

II. ATTENDANCE:

A. Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Jon Ruzicka, Scott Raeber, Kate Lovan, Preston Carter, Angela Johnson and Susan McIlroy. Councilmembers Jimmy Hallyburton and Lisa Sánchez were present.

Commissioners Absent: Erik Stidham

Director Holloway acknowledged that Commissioners Carter and Lovan had been reappointed by Mayor and City Council for another three-year term.

III. ELECTIONS

A. Commission President

MOTION: Boise Parks and Recreation Commission elected Angela Johnson to serve as Commission President.

RESULT: APPROVED
MOVER: S. McIlroy
SECONDER: S. Raeber
AYES: Unanimous
ABSENT: E. Stidham

B. Commission Vice President

MOTION: Boise Parks and Recreation Commission elected Susan McIlroy to serve as Commission Vice President.

RESULT: APPROVED
MOVER: P. Carter
SECONDER: S. Raeber
AYES: Unanimous
ABSENT: E. Stidham
IV. IN THE MATTER OF NEW BUSINESS:

A. Minutes – June 18, 2020

MOTION: Boise Parks and Recreation Commission moved to recommend the approval of the June 18, 2020 Boise Parks and Recreation Commission Meeting Minutes to Boise City Council.

RESULT: APPROVED

MOVER: A. Johnson

SECONDER: S. Raeber

AYES: Unanimous

ABSENT: E. Stidham

B. Molenaar Park Master Plan Update – Public Hearing

Summary: Superintendent Tomlinson presented the Molenaar Park Master Plan Update. The existing master plan was approved in 2014; since that time, the preliminary greenup phase had been completed. This phase included turf, irrigation, trees, pathways, parking and a restroom.

Updating the master plan was necessary due to Ada County Highway District (ACHD)’s plans to widen Maple Grove Rd, leading to the need to create a larger catch-basin for water runoff. The dog off-leash area was planned for a portion of the park which would be repurposed due to the ACHD project.

Option 1 of the master plan update showed aligning the amenities on the west side of the park, with volleyball and two tennis courts in the lower portion of the park. Option 2 of the master plan update showed the volleyball and four tennis courts in the center of the park. Both options would have pickleball lines painted on the tennis courts.

Members of the public were invited to vote on an option for the master plan update, and each site received 31 votes. Due to tennis court installation costs, the department recommended Option 1 be the adopted master plan.

Commissioner Raeber asked if there was potential to move the volleyball court to allow for additional tennis courts to be added in the future, to which Superintendent Tomlinson answered that relocating the volleyball court would be doable should funding come available for additional tennis courts.

President Ruzicka opened the public hearing at 10:45 a.m.

Resident Matt Wilhelm at 2834 S Ozark

M. Wilhelm was interested in the possibility of more tennis courts being added. They stated that Option 2 showed the skate park near the splash pad and voiced concern about potential conflicts between user age groups.

President Ruzicka closed the public hearing at 10:49 a.m.
Commissioner Raeber complimented the general design of the park. Councilmember Hallyburton complimented the department on its work to design and complete the park. The commissioners shared consensus that the park would serve families and community members for years to come.

**MOTION:** Boise Parks and Recreation Commission approved Option 1 as the adopted master plan update at Molenaar Park.

**RESULT:** APPROVED

**MOVER:** P. Carter

**SECONDER:** S. McIlroy

**AYES:** Unanimous

**ABSENT:** E. Stidham

C. **Boise Parks and Recreation COVID-19 Update**

Summary: Director Holloway provided an overview of the department’s response to COVID-19. The Fall Activity Guide was published with registration to start Aug. 16 and 18. Programming safety protocols included smaller class sizes, mask requirements, and outdoor activities. The Dick Eardley Senior Center would remain closed for the foreseeable future out of an abundance of caution. Idaho IceWorld would not be offering hockey or public skate programs either. The department also implemented a no-spectator policy for programming due to the county’s social gathering limitation.

Commissioner Lovan questioned what safety precautions were in place for employees who were working in the field and interacting with the public. Director Holloway commended the city’s risk and safety team and the steps taken to protect staff members.

The commissioners and councilmembers complimented Director Holloway and the department on the programming offered, as well as the open spaces and pathways made available to the community during the pandemic.

There was no motion, as this was an informational item only.

V. **IN THE MATTER OF ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business to come before the commission at the time, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

**RESULT:** APPROVED

**MOVER:** S. Raeber

**SECONDER:** A. Johnson

**AYES:** Unanimous

**ABSENT:** E. Stidham

_________________________________________________________

Angela Johnson, President
Dog Off-Leash Area Expansion Request - Cypress Park

Exhibit C
Jerry Pugh

From: Ryan McFarland <ryan@mcfarlandritter.com>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 11:07 AM
To: Jerry Pugh
Cc: BPR; linda.murphy241@gmail.com
Subject: RE: [External] Cypress Park, Dog off Leash area
Attachments: Park petition.pdf; Cypress Park.pdf

Jerry,

We have begun gathering signatures for the change. See attached.

To reiterate: the park already has a beautiful concrete walking path that goes in a nice circle. The off-leash area is adjacent to about 2/3 of that circle. The attached map shows the existing off-leash area in red, and the proposed expanded off-leash area in blue. We’re asking for a minor change – for the circle to be completed, the whole circular walking path to be “off-leash,” so dog owners can walk the circle with our dogs off leash.

Thanks for your consideration. Please tell me what else we should do to have this request considered and granted.

Ryan McFarland
Legal Counsel
P.O. Box 1335
Meridian, ID 83642
p. 208.895.1291
c. 208.789.1643
f. 208.895.1270
mcfarlandritter.com

McFARLAND•RITTER

This e-mail message is intended only for named recipients. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, are not a named recipient, or are not the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to a named recipient, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify me immediately if you have received this message in error, and delete the message.

From: Jerry Pugh [mailto:JPugh@cityofboise.org]
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2020 7:06 AM
To: Ryan McFarland <ryan@mcfarlandritter.com>
Cc: BPR <BPR@cityofboise.org>
Subject: RE: [External] Cypress Park, Dog off Leash area

Ryan,
Cypress Park

Write a description for your map.

Exhibit C - Dog Off-Leash Area Expansion Request - Cypress Park

Legend

Google Earth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence Zip Code</th>
<th>Breckenridge Resident?</th>
<th>How many days per week do you use Cypress Park?</th>
<th>Dogs off Leash?</th>
<th>Exhibit C - Dog Off-Leash Area Expansion Request - Cypress Park Support Expanded Off Leash Areas?</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ryan McFarland</td>
<td>23716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208 789 1643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. McLenon</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208 841 1946</td>
<td>John McLenon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Murphy</td>
<td>25716</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208 713 8443</td>
<td>Linda Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Residence Zip Code</td>
<td>Breckenridge Resident?</td>
<td>How many days per week do you use Cypress Park?</td>
<td>Dogs off Leash?</td>
<td>Support Expanded Off Leash Areas?</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeley Wilson</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-616-5281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Martin</td>
<td>83720</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-371-6704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swann</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>719-415-3447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Cooper</td>
<td>83712</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>408-151-5555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Bean</td>
<td>83706</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-783-6419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>703-786-5040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-473-2331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Silverwood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>417-261-2058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koren Keela</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-820-1784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cali Dixon</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-740-4781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Hecker</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>400-1000-2818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Jenkins</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>703-454-6027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavo Navarre</td>
<td>83716</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208-967-6700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linda Murphy 241@gmail.com
Cypress Park Dog Off-Leash Area Expansion - Public Testimony

Exhibit D

Written public testimony received as of 9/17/2020 8:30 a.m.
Chloe Sallabanks

From: Ryan McFarland <ryan@mcfarlandritter.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 12, 2020 4:40 PM
To: BPR
Cc: linda.murphy241@gmail.com; ‘Grandma Ellie Mckinnon’
Subject: [External] Written Testimony re Cypress Park, 4382 S. Tableridge Way
Attachments: Cypress Park.pdf; PilotProgramYearEndReport.pdf

To Whom it May Concern,

I am in receipt of the letter from Boise Parks and Recreation regarding the proposed expansion of the off-leash area of the park. A requested, here is my written testimony. I request that it be entered into the record of the September 17, 2020 meeting concerning this topic.

I live at 1675 E. Picabo Ct. in Boise. My house is immediately adjacent to Cypress Park. I have two dogs, and I walk them at the park twice a day, every day. I am the person who submitted the written request for expansion of the off leash area – I did so after obtaining numerous signatures on a petition for expansion of the off leash area.

I want to first correct one point in the letter: we are NOT asking that the entire park be off-leash. We are asking that the area of the park with a circular sidewalk path be off leash. The Park has a long dog leg (pun intended) that extends from the main area of the park to the South east. That area is not off-leash, and we are not requesting a change there. Also: we are not requesting any adjustment to the off-leash hours.

The main area of the park includes the current off-leash area, tennis courts, playground, bathrooms, and covered eating area. That main area is ringed by a paved sidewalk. There are signs indicating the distance of that sidewalk area – 0.3 miles. However, only about ½ of that sidewalk ring is adjacent to the off-leash area, which means that dog walkers cannot enjoy the entire loop. We are asking that the off leash area be extended to the entire sidewalk ring area so that dogs and people can walk the loop. That is all we are asking for.

I have attached here the google map I created to show the proposed expansion. The red-shaded area is the current off-lease area; the blue-shaded area is the proposed/requested expansion of the off-leash area.

It is worth pointing out that many dog owners walk this path with their dogs off leash anyway. This expansion will only bring the rules in line with how the park is actually being used. It will, accordingly, reduce the need for and cost of enforcement.

As mentioned above, I am a very-frequent user of the park. I have not witnessed a single instance of human-dog aggression or violence. I have literally never seen a negative interaction between dogs and non-dog-owner humans. I have very rarely seen dog-dog violence, and in each of those very few cases, dog owners were immediately responsive to separate the animals. The dog owners I have witnessed at the park are diligent about cleaning up pet waste, and I do not observer pet waste problems in the park. The expansion proposed here would not increase dog-human violence or aggression, nor would it increase the presence of dog waste.

I have seen statistics regarding citations and public support of the off-leash area (provided by Jerry Pugh). That information is also attached here. It’s nice to see that support for the park went up from 2011 to 2012, and citations went down over that same period. I do not have a report of attitudes or citations in recent years, but based on my personal observation, I have no reason to believe that citations have gone up, or that public opinion has gone down.

Thank you for allowing the park to be off-leash. It is a wonderful benefit to me and the many other dog owners I interact with at the park. Thank you for considering this requested off-leash area expansion. I really think that opening the entire sidewalk circuit would be a benefit to all park users and would have no downside.

Ryan McFarland
Legal Counsel
This e-mail message is intended only for named recipients. It contains information that may be confidential, privileged, attorney work product, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this message in error, are not a named recipient, or are not the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to a named recipient, be advised that any review, disclosure, use, dissemination, distribution, or reproduction of this message or its contents is strictly prohibited. Please notify me immediately if you have received this message in error, and delete the message.
Cypress Park

Write a description for your map.
The 2010 – 11 Boise Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plan update recommended that the Parks & Recreation Commission designate two to four pilot sites for off-leash use during designated off-leash hours, considering the following suggested criteria:

- Dog off-leash use should not conflict with existing uses, including reservation sites and scheduled activities such as soccer, lacrosse, football, etc.
- Site access.
- Available parking.
- Site layout, including opportunities for division of use based on natural barriers such as berms, trees and fencing. As well as, placement to minimize impacts (e.g., noise and smells) to adjacent neighbors.
- Maintenance requirements.
- Geographic diversity.
- Financial impact.
- Limited impact to wildlife/natural areas.

Based on the recommendation, Parks & Recreation staff presented eight (8) locations to the Boise Parks & Recreation Commission in November of 2010, who recommended that staff further explore the eight sites for potential off-leash use.

Public input was then sought for each site through a series of surveys and public meetings to determine the level of support or opposition for off-leash use. Post cards were mailed to 12,749 households that were within a ½ mile radius of each site, a public meeting was conducted for each location, and an online survey was made available for citizens to voice their support or opposition.

The comments received statistical analysis and public meeting minutes were distributed to the Parks & Recreation Commission, who used the provided data to approve moving forward with seven (7) of the eight (8) proposed locations in March of 2011. The year long Pilot Program was launched shortly thereafter on April 11, 2011, at the seven locations with the following designated hours:
- Castle Hills Park - Sunrise to 10 a.m. & 4 p.m. to sunset
- Cypress Park - Sunrise to 10 a.m. & 4 p.m. to sunset
- Hillside Park - 4 p.m. to sunset
- Manitou Park - Sunrise to 10 a.m. & 4 p.m. to sunset
- Redwood Park - Sunrise to 10 a.m. & 4 p.m. to sunset
- Sunset Park - Sunrise to 10 a.m.
- Winstead Park - Sunrise to 8 a.m. year round; evening hours are 3 p.m. to sunset Nov 1-Feb 1.

The Pilot Program was to last for one year, during which each location has been closely monitored for compliance and the impacts dog off-leash use has had on facilities and other uses. Animal Control Officers and to a smaller extent park staff were asked to keep daily logs of what they’ve observed in the parks. Public feedback has also continually collected through the duration of the program via an online survey, e-mails, and phone calls.

In October 2011, the Commission approved the end of year evaluation process which included a summation of all the collected data and a roll out of a follow-up survey to the neighbors of the seven (7) locations. The survey went out on February 1, 2012, to residents within a ½ mile radius of each location (10,133 households) to gather feedback on how the program has been received.

All the data collected from Animal Control, park staff, and surveys has been compiled and will be presented to the Parks & Recreation Commission in April 2012. At which time, the Commission will make a decision on the future of the program.

**OVERALL**

Throughout the program, there has been steady public support for hourly dog off-leash use at the pilot locations. Of the 3,417 respondents to the initial survey (2011), 69.1% (1,574 respondents) were in support of the program. Although overall input was low for the on-line survey through the duration of the pilot program (97 respondents), this support continued to be reflected with 73.2% of respondents being in favor of the pilot program. This support has continued to increase through the end of year follow-up survey. The overall results for all three surveys are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS IN SUPPORT</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS OPPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 – Initial Survey</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>69.1 % (1,574)</td>
<td>30.9% (705)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate On-line Survey</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>73.2% (71)</td>
<td>26.8% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 – Final Survey</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>83.2% (1,132)</td>
<td>16.8% (228)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although most respondents are supportive of the program, there have been consistent concerns raised regarding dogs off-leash in the parks from both those in support of and opposed to the program. These concerns include:
1. **Dog Waste**

Dog owners and non-dog owners identified the lack of clean-up of dog waste as a major issue. Comments have ranged from the dog waste situation getting better to it being much worse since the program was implemented. As not picking up after your dog is an infraction, Animal Enforcement issues citations for not doing so. However, education and pressure from fellow dog owners will be a far more effective deterrent. Dog owners are urged to educate one another about picking up after their dog (including health messages) and to pick up for others when possible.

Boise Parks & Recreation continues to work on a media campaign for all dog off-leash areas to educate people on the importance of picking up after their dogs, including health concerns and amount of waste produced.

2. **Barriers**

None of the pilot locations have barriers (fencing) separating off-leash areas from other areas of the parks. As a result, park users are experiencing dogs straying out of the identified areas and encroaching into other areas such as picnic sites and playgrounds. Survey respondents have consistently expressed concerns about the lack of separation between the off-leash areas and other areas of the parks, which have resulted in some user conflicts and may continue to do so in the future.

Staff understands these concerns, and feels that in certain circumstances fencing may want to be considered to provide separation. However, if the pilot program is to continue dog owners will need to use their best judgment and be responsible and respectful of all park patrons. If a dog cannot be controlled by voice command, then owners should consider taking their dogs to one of the three fenced DOLAs within the city.

3. **Controlled Off-Leash Use**

Citizens have expressed concern that not all dog owners have control over their animals or have them under voice command. Staff acknowledged this and realizes that not all people will be responsible; but that providing an area for controlled off-leash use is the goal of this pilot. Fenced off-leash areas provide a location for people who don’t have full control over their dogs and we would ask that they take advantage of these areas.

4. **Compliance and Enforcement**

For the most part, the public seems to understand that not all dog owners are responsible and do not follow the laws pertaining to dogs in the parks. As a result, many have asked for additional enforcement to encourage compliance with leash laws and dog waste.

Unfortunately, there are only two enforcement officers dedicated to patrolling the parks and foothills. Although Animal Control cites dog owners when they witness a violation,
they are more often than not in a position to catch someone in the act. If dogs off-leash are going to work in parks, we must rely on dog owners to take personal responsibility for their pets as well as the dog community to police itself.

5. Increased Traffic

In the initial survey and public meetings, neighbors at each park had concerns about how the use of their neighborhood parks would increase with the pilot off-leash program resulting in increased in traffic. In the follow up survey, we only had a one respondent express that concern.

With numerous DOLA sites across the city, dog off-leash use has most likely been spread out. Therefore, we haven’t seen the neighborhoods being overwhelmed with new users.

6. Allotted Times

Those respondents that are in favor of the dog off-leash program heavily support the hours when dogs are allowed off leash and in many cases favor them being expanded. However, there are those that feel strongly that the allotted hours infringe on other uses in the parks, especially in the evening. Most people seem to visit the park in the evening hours when school is out and people get off work, which is when the off-leash dogs are allowed in the parks.

There have been a number of complaints from youth sport groups that have typically used the parks for unscheduled practice, that dogs off-leash now are infringing on there ability to conduct practice. The Commission approved that Sunset Park be restricted in the evenings due to this potential conflict, so if the same conflict exists in other parks we may want to consider restricting use to the mornings in those locations.

7. Preferred Use

The implementation of the pilot dog off-leash program has brought the question of whether dog owners have preferred use over other users, during the allotted off-leash times. If the program continues, we will need to clarify that all locations are drop in use and available on a first come first serve basis.
CASTLE HILLS PARK

Castle Hills Park is a 7.2 acre neighborhood park located in northwest Boise. Of the 7.2 acres, 2.2 acres were approved for hourly dog off-leash use. The approved area is defined by the property lines on the east, south, and west of the park, and the sidewalk, playground, and tennis courts to the north.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours in both the mornings, sunrise to 10:00 a.m., and evenings, 4:00 p.m. to Sunset.

Survey results specific to Castle Hills Park break down as follows:

2011 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (440):

Support 73.2% (314)
Oppose 26.8% (115)

Mornings 80.9% (250)
Evenings 89.0% (275)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Castle Hills Park (421):

Support 72.4% (305)
Oppose 25.7% (108)

2012 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (197):

Support 81% (158)
Oppose 19% (37)

Mornings 84% (136)
Evenings 93.2% (151)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Castle Hills Park (190):
Support 80% (152)
Oppose 19.5% (37)

Castle Hills Park Animal Control Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warnings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Citations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CYPRESS PARK**

Cypress Park is a 7.3 acre neighborhood park located in southeast Boise. Of the 7.3 acres, 1.4 acres were approved for hourly dog off-leash use. The approved area is in the southwest portion of the park to the east of the tennis courts, shelter, and playground, on the inside of the sidewalk.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours in both the mornings, sunrise to 10:00 a.m., and evenings, 4:00 p.m. to Sunset.

Survey results specific to Cypress Park break down as follows:

**2011 Survey***

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (308):

Support 70.8% (216)
Oppose 29.2% (89)
Mornings 78.9% (168)  
Evenings 87.8% (187) 

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Cypress Park (303):  
Support 70.9% (215)  
Oppose 28.7% (87)  

2012 Survey*  
Park Survey Results from All Respondents (154):  
Support 82.7% (124)  
Oppose 17.3% (26)  
Mornings 89.7% (113)  
Evenings 92.9% (117)  
Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Cypress Park (154):  
Support 82.7% (124)  
Oppose 17.3% (26)  

Cypress Park Animal Control Statistics:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warnings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Citations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HILLSIDE PARK

Hillside Park a 10 acre neighborhood park located in northwest Boise. Of the 10 acres, .50 acres were approved for hourly dog off-leash use. The approved area is limited to the interior of the horse area in the northeast part of the park.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours in the evenings, 4:00 p.m. to Sunset, so the area may be shared with horse use. The horse arena is the only equestrian use area in Boise parks, except on designated foothills trails.

Survey results specific to Hillside Park break down as follows:

**2011 Survey***

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (266):

| Support | 84.8% (224) |
| Oppose  | 15.2% (40)  |

Mornings 80.0% (176)
Evenings 89.5% (197)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Hillside Park (217):

| Support | 84.3% (183) |
| Oppose  | 16.1% (35)  |

**2012 Survey***

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (115):

| Support | 92.1% (105) |
| Oppose  | 7.9% (9)    |

Mornings 71.4% (75)
Evenings 96.2% (101)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Hillside Park (109):
Support 90.8% (99)
Oppose 8.0% (9)

Hillside Park Animal Control Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANITOU PARK**

Manitou Park is an 11.9 acre neighborhood park located in southeast Boise. Of the 11.9 acres, 5.1 acres were approved for hourly dog off-leash use. The approved area is the open field on the north end of the park defined by the berm on the south side and the property lines on the east, north and west ends of the park.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours in both the mornings, sunrise to 10:00 a.m., and evenings, 4:00 p.m. to Sunset.

Survey results specific to Manitou Park break down as follows:

**2011 Survey**

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (468):

- Support 76.6% (351)
- Oppose 23.4% (107)
- Mornings 83.4% (292)
- Evenings 92.0% (322)
Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Manitou Park (421):

Support 75.0% (303)
Oppose 24.3% (98)

**2012 Survey***

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (228):

Support 85.3% (191)
Oppose 14.7% (33)

Mornings 85.1% (160)
Evenings 95.7% (180)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Manitou Park (215):

Support 83.7% (180)
Oppose 15.3% (33)

Manitou Park Animal Control Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warnings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REDWOOD PARK

Redwood Park is a 6.8 acre neighborhood park located in west Boise. Of the 6.8 acres, all areas with the exception of the playground were approved for hourly dog off-leash use.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours in both the mornings, sunrise to 10:00 a.m., and evenings, 4:00 p.m. to Sunset.

Survey results specific to Redwood Park break down as follows:

2011 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (337):

Support 60.3% (202)
Oppose 39.7% (133)

Mornings 82.5% (165)
Evenings 82.5% (165)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Redwood Park (317):

Support 59.3% (188)
Oppose 40.7% (129)

2012 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (183):

Support 72.8% (131)
Oppose 27.2% (49)

Mornings 85.7% (114)
Evenings 88.7% (118)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Redwood Park (169):

Support 69.8% (118)
Oppose 28.4% (48)
Redwood Park Animal Control Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Citations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUNSET PARK**

Sunset Park is a 10 acre neighborhood park located in north Boise. Of the 10 acres, 4.33 acres were approved for hourly dog off-leash use. The approved area is the open field on the west end of the park defined by the tennis courts and sidewalk to the west, the sidewalk on the south, and the property lines on the west and north end of the park.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours in the mornings, Sunrise to 10:00 a.m., due to youth sport use in the evenings.

Survey results specific to Sunset Park break down as follows:

**2011 Survey***

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (529):

- Support: 80.2% (420)
- Oppose: 19.8% (104)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Sunset Park (483):
Support 79.0% (382)
Oppose 20.0% (97)

2012 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (267):

Support 87.7% (229)
Oppose 12.3% (32)

Mornings 87.8% (202)
Evenings 83.5% (192)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Sunset Park (259):

Support 86.1% (223)
Oppose 12.0% (31)

Sunset Park Animal Control Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Warnings</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Citations</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WINSTEAD PARK

Winstead Park is an 11.2 acre neighborhood park located in on the Boise Bench. Of the 11.2 acres, all areas with the exception of the tennis courts, playground, and shelter were approved for hourly dog off-leash use.

For the pilot program, the Commission approved dog off-leash hours from Sunrise to 8:00 a.m. all year round, and 3:00 p.m. to Sunset November 1 – February 1. In November, 2011, the Commission directed staff to survey the park in the mornings to evaluate use and traffic. Based on staff’s findings, the Commission voted to expand off leash use from September 1 through May 31, to Sunrise to 10:00 a.m. Morning off-leash use would revert back to Sunrise to 8:00 a.m. the remainder of the year.

Survey results specific to Winstead Park break down as follows:

2011 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (574):

Support 67.9% (337)
Oppose 32.1% (178)

Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Winstead Park (520):

Support 65.9% (343)
Oppose 31.5% (164)

2012 Survey*

Park Survey Results from All Respondents (228):

Support 82.2% (194)
Oppose 17.8% (42)

Mornings: Sunrise to 8:00 a.m., June 1 – August 31 84.4% (157)
Mornings: Sunrise to 10:00 a.m., Sept. 1 – May 31 89.2% (166)
Evenings: 3:00 p.m. to Sunset, Nov. 1 – Feb. 1 89.2% (166)
Park Survey Results from Neighbors residents within a ½ mile radius of the Winstead Park (231):

Support 80.0% (185)
Oppose 17.8% (41)

Winstead Park Animal Control Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Warnings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Citations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Survey numbers may not add up, due to irregularities in the responses. Some respondents had incomplete responses, causing what appears to be a discrepancy in the data. In cases where duplicate addresses (more than 2 per household) were found; only the comments were captured for those beyond the 2 per household allowance. Responses that provided no additional comments or were left blank were removed. If duplicated responses were in opposition to each other (supported vs. opposed), no more than two were kept per household. However, most duplicated responses were consistently in favor of or opposed to (i.e. one person commented 5 times and opposed each time).
The Form 'Request to Present Testimony' was submitted

MAKING BOISE THE MOST LIVABLE CITY IN THE COUNTRY

Form Results

Topic
September 17 meeting regarding Cypress Park

Additional Background
I am a mother of two young children and we have lived directly on Cypress Park for seven years. We received notice that there is a request to expand the off leash area. Along with many other families with children, we use the park facilities regularly, almost every day, weather permitting. The off leash area is already quite large and limits the ability for other people to use the park for anything other than playing fetch with a dog. I would like to present our many concerns regarding expanding this already large and generous area.

Supporting Documents (if applicable)
Name
Amanda Cairns

Street Address
4468 South Tableridge Way, Boise Idaho 83716

Email
CairnsLPC@yahoo.com

Phone Number
9045664762
Hello –

I would like to provide comment for the proposal to expand the off-leash area at Cypress Park. I have lived in the Breckenridge Neighborhood since 2013 and regularly walk my dog in the park.

The current identified off-leash area is difficult for a dog owner to keep within the defined off-leash area. The north, east, and south ends of the off leash area are bordered by the sidewalk. If the dogs are playing with each other they can unintentionally cross the sidewalk. Owners can call them back, but they have still left the off-leash area. The current off-leash area is difficult for dog owners to stay in compliance.

I support the proposal to expand the off-leash area at Cypress Park. I would recommend that Boise Parks and Rec give consideration to keeping the play ground area and tennis courts as off-leash. The tennis court has the benefit of the fence, but the play ground area does not. Parents and children using the play ground should feel comfortable that there area is separate and not part of the off-leash area. If dogs are within this area they are on-leash with their owners. It would be a good investment of public resources to eventually put a low fence around the play ground area to have a clear separation from the different user groups.

The current off-leash hours are working and give the other users complete access to the entire park regardless of the time of day. I have seen pee wee soccer teams practicing, folks playing football, frisbee and other sports, all during the off lease hours with no apparent conflicts. Over the years I have seen an increase in use during the dog park hours, but I have always seen empty parking spaces available for other users.

There are some residents within the Breckenridge Subdivision who are completely against having dogs in the park off-leash. There has been problems with dog owners not picking up the “poop” but there are many other dog owner’s who will pick up whatever they find (myself). There are some dog owner’s who do not pay attention to their pets and other dog owner’s have asked them to pick up their dogs “poop”. A little bit more enforcement in picking up “poop” would be helpful.

Unfortunately dog owner’s think everyone loves dogs, but that is not the case, and I know you will hear many comments from citizens who want them completely removed. I would hope that the Boise Parks and Rec would give a balanced review of the proposal when making their decision.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lynn Oliver

4252 S. Rimview Way
Boise, Idaho 83716
760-937-6192
lynnkoliver@hotmail.com
Chloe Sallabanks

From: noreply@cityofboise.org
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 11:10 AM
To: BPR
Subject: Contact Form Submitted to Parks and Rec

CITY of BOISE

MAKING BOISE THE MOST LIVABLE CITY IN THE COUNTRY

CONTACT FORM SUBMITTED TO PARKS AND REC

From Brad Norman bnormany22@hotmail.com

"This is in regards to the upcoming petition to make Cypress Park totally off leash. You people must be kidding. You don’t enforce the park regulations that you have now. Dog owners let their dogs run off leash and in all parts of this park 24/7 day and night without any consequences. I know this because my home backs right up to the park. I have been awoke at night plenty of times by this annoyance. Calling law enforcement is a waste of time. They never show up. So I compare this analogy to drivers that always go 55mph in a 45mph speed zone. If you are not enforcing the laws and codes the people are already breaking, than you might as well make it legal for them to break. I doubt that you will have any interest in responding to this letter. Brad"

Contact Form Submitted On: https://www.cityofboise.org/departments/parks-and-recreation/parks-and-recreation-commission/
Hello,

Thank you for accepting written testimony concerning the expanding of the off-leash area in Cypress Park. My name is Lindsey Whitney, and I am a mother living in the nearby Silverwood subdivision. I have two boys (ages 1 and 3), and we regularly visit this park.

I am interested in how many people are requesting this change, and why walking their dogs around the park on their leashes is an issue. I can attest that my boys have had both positive and negative interactions with dogs at the park, but the worst situations have all been when dogs were in the play area where they shouldn’t have been.

Both of my kids have been knocked over (on separate occasions) by large dogs that were running through the play area. My oldest is very scared of dogs because of an incident at Cypress Park where a large labrador came barreling across the park and jumped on him in the middle of the playground. He was 2 at the time, and as you can imagine the dog was much larger than he was. I had to pull the dog off myself because the owner was too far away to do anything about it.

I have also seen owners allow their dogs to defecate in the mulch of the play areas, and not bother to clean it up. I, or another mom on the premises, has had to clean it up ourselves on more than one occasion.

I already don't allow my kids to play on the grassy area (the "dog" area) because there is almost always a dog and owner playing fetch out there and I don't feel it is safe with them being as little as they are. It seems to me the dogs already "own" most of the park and they don't need to have free reign over the whole thing.

The safety of our kids should come first.

Thank you for listening,
Lindsey Whitney
"Expanding the dog off leash area at cypress park is a horrible idea. Mostly because you (the city) have no way to enforce the rules for the park. The off leash area is currently too big already. There is so much poo everywhere and the dogs pee on the playground equipment. This is currently a park within a large subdivision. There are tons of families with children living here who would love a place to play without worrying about aggressive off leash animals or stepping in poops. Build a dog park somewhere else since you can’t seem to regulate this one. What good is a park that’s only open to people from 10am-4pm? Just makes no sense. Build a dog park nearby that is only for dogs. Like other major cities do."

Contact Form Submitted On: https://www.cityofboise.org/departments/parks-and-recreation/
Form Results

Topic
Cypress Park Off-leash dog regulations

Additional Background
I live in the neighborhood and would like to speak to the negative impact the change in regulation would have, especially as someone who has kids who frequently use the park.

Supporting Documents (if applicable)
Name
Eric Martin

Street Address
4491 S Tableridge Way

Email
emmartin11@gmail.com

Phone Number
9703716493

Questions?
Dear Boise Parks and Rec team,

In regards to the request to expand the off-leash area at Cypress Park, located at 4382 S. Tableridge Way, I strongly object to this expansion proposal.

As a longtime resident of Breckenridge neighborhood and a parent of a 4 year old, I would like to be able to use the park and its facilities without constantly getting bothered by dogs running around the park. Even without the off leash expansion, I frequently encounter dog owners who allow their dogs to run around in the non-off-leash areas and torment kids and other users. I can recall countless instances where my toddler got knocked over by a dog while playing on the playset, my toddler’s snack pack getting snatched by a dog, a dog urinating/defecating on a slide and so on and so forth. I strongly believe that expanding the off-leash area would result in the irresponsible dog owners to further abuse the facilities and make the park unusable for non-dog owners.

Many of us use the sidewalk circuit to jog around the park. Allowing the opportunity for users to walk their dogs off-leash around the circuit of the sidewalk would result in dogs chasing after runners/joggers like myself and likely jeopardize the safety and harmony of users like me.

By no means all dog owners are irresponsible. But on the same token, the responsible dog owners are making perfect use of the off-leash area and hours currently at hand. A counter proposal would be to fence off the existing off-leash area so as to provide a better experience to the dog owners. The dog owners can walk/run their dogs in the fenced area and simulate the sidewalk circuit environment.

Thank you and please reach out to me if you have any further questions/clarifications.

Rajesh Kariya (raj_kariya@yahoo.com; 208-841-6162)

Proud resident of Breckenridge neighborhood
Hello Parks and Rec Board Members,

I'm Daniele Evans and I represent Breckenridge East Owners Association and we are opposed to the Dog Off Leash Expansion in Cypress park. After becoming aware of the letter that was sent to only a few of our residents who live on Cypress park, I started out early Monday morning to get BEOA residents’ opinions and people at the parks opinions during off leash hours. I first put the letter from the Parks and Rec on the BEOA facebook page and asked their opinions there. I got many responses, many of them DM me so not to show the others. I then sent the letter to the BEOA Board members 9 in total to get their opinions. I then personally went to the park during off leash hours, I was there from 5-6pm 9/14/2020. I collected data from everyone I saw in the park, with and without dogs, in that hour. I had a copy of the Park and Rec’s letter with me and I asked if they lived in the subdivision and then asked if they liked the idea or were opposed to the idea, or indifferent about the idea. Then Tuesday night September 15 BEOA had an HOA meeting and the board members decided to allow me to be the voice of our Neighborhood. The data I collected is as follows:

- Oppose: Please leave it the way it is.
  - 3 who don’t live in BEOA but had dogs in the park, their top concern were children.

- For the Expansion:
  - 9 Who had dogs in the park and did not live in BEOA
  - 2 who live in BEOA
  - 11 Total

- Indifferent, Doesn’t really matter to them
  - 3 Live in BEOA

Online the BEOA Facebook page and Board members emails as follows:

- 2 for the Expansion
- 19 Oppose

**Totals I have come up with so far is:**

- 12 For Expansion
- 22 Oppose
- 3 are indifferent

Below I have included some of the reasons people are opposed and the few that are for this Dog Off Leash Expansion in Cypress Park.

**Oppose OFF Leash Dog Expansion**

Hi Daniele, First I'd like to say thank you for taking the time to reach out to everyone and provide your platform. I'll try to be concise and organize my thoughts into bullet points. However, this is LONG.

1. Safety. As you might be aware, the off leash dog area gets overrun with dogs in the afternoon hours. Especially when the weather is nice. What ends up happening is that dog owners get distracted and lose track of their animals. Or they let the dogs out of the car off leash, to run freely through the play ground. They urinate and defecate in the play area. I've seen it for myself and cleaned it up myself, on numerous occasions. One time I asked an owner to rinse their dogs urine off of the children's stairs and I was met with outright hostility. To make it worse? The other dog owners defended them. As they said "once one dog does it, they all want to. And it's impossible to stop them". So clearly admitting that all of their dogs pee there. (Never mind my one year old daughter playing there). Once they can allow their dogs to
surround the play area, this issue will become even worse. Not to mention, outright dangerous. My children have been knocked down, and even charged by growling barking off leash dogs. One dog knocked over a baby stroller. Plain and simple: This is a liability. And it's only a matter of time until a child is bit or worse.

2. Other park uses. off leash area is already very generous. So when the kids get out of school there is no place for team sports. Other areas of the park are too small or too hilly. So once the off leash dogs take over the entire park, the small area children ARE free to run in, will be even less.

3. Parking. Parking in the afternoon is already an issue, especially when the weather is nice. Some dog owners end up parking illegally or along Tableridge. If we attract even more people, where will they park?

4. Necessity. Ann Morrison dog island and military reserve dog park is ten minutes away. The new Bowler park on Surprise Way will offer an off leash dog park. If dog owners feel that the park is too over crowded for them, they have other options. They don't need to take over our already small park.

5. Neighborhood value. What's the value of having a park in our neighborhood, if it only caters to dogs? As it is, we are forced to leave the park around 5pm because the dogs take over and it just doesn't feel safe. If we turn this into a full off leash dog park, I'm afraid that cypress park will develop a reputation for being a "dog only" park. This will turn away young families and buyers who don't have dogs.

As a dog owner, I love seeing the dogs run freely and neighbors socializing while they play. However, as a parent my primary concern is the safety of our kids and the freedom for our kids to run and play in wide open spaces. And as home owners we all need to be realistic about the long term impact this could have on the attractiveness of our neighborhood. Again, I'm sorry this is so long. And thanks again Amanda cairns

We constantly have bad owners allowing them to urinate on equipment, and taking food out of toddlers hands. The first reason that Dhansika is so scared of dogs is bc her first experience is the big ones knock her down inside the play area unprovoked. But to risk the entire park to bad pet owners that don't even live in this area has got to be the worst idea. I have pics of pee'd on equipment if you'd need them. Tonya Kariya

***Parks and Rec should have received an email from Tonya's husband Rajesh Kariya on 9/15/2020

Hi Daniele - I saw your post in Breckenridge. We live across the street from the park (so not technically on the park) but we utilize it daily with our two young kids. We STRONGLY oppose the change. I am planning on speaking at the meeting (or at least sending a letter) but can provide that to you if you would like. Let me know what you need and I can help in any way possible to make sure this does not go through. Thanks! Erik Martin

Hi Daniele, Thank you for asking for input and being willing to bring forth the voices of neighborhood residents. I live in Breckenridge and my roommate and I walk almost every single evening through the park. We value this time and enjoy that the walkways are clear of dogs. There are several times I have used the park specifically during the time frame when dogs are not supposed to be off leash. I am a roller skates and was previously attacked by an off leash dog and am hesitant to skate around unleashed dogs. I would be sincerely disappointed of dogs were able to be off leash anywhere at anytime in the park. Thank you. Brytney Scheer

Hi Daniele,

After reading your email regarding the dog park letter, here is our response (we did not receive the letter, but have some feedback thoughts).

The reason we vote NO for the unleashed park for dogs is:
We very seldom use the park due to what we have encountered many times.
1. Dogs running towards people (us). 2. Dog feces in the play area and chasing playing kids.
3. There is much dog poop on the walkway, sidewalks, grass. The park is like a “free for all” pooping area, which can result in ringworm on your feet (if wearing sandals/flip flops), and children’s health being affected by touching it. We have seen dogs also urinating on the playground equipment!

We very rarely venture over to the park, my wife is deathly afraid of dogs (she has been bitten 3 times in her life).

Families with children at the playground deserve a SAFE and CLEAN place for their children to play. Older neighbors with walkers/canes don’t deserve to be startled by loose dogs running up to them!

People that are afraid of dogs ONLY go over there when there are NO LOOSE dogs - if dog owners are obeying off-leash-times.

If this turns into a dog park, where does the rest of the neighborhood go to enjoy the day?
Where is the closest dog park to our neighborhood for people to take their dogs?

Again, we vote NO.

Thanks for letting the neighborhood voice their opinions. Dave and Leda Christian BEOA ACC Board Members

For Off Leash Dog Expansion

Daniele - I live in the neighborhood and visit the park daily with my kids and dog. I absolutely am in favor of expanding the dog park and have signed the list going around to expand it. My reasons are that if my children are playing on the swings or the bigger kid park, I have to be over there too. If I’m over there too, that means my dog is over there. I have had multiple people yell at me and it’s emotionally taxing. I have to watch my children and they are young so I am usually assisting or playing with them, especially in swings. Our dog is very well behaved but I don’t think it’s appropriate to leave my dog unattended on the other side by herself and our dog naturally follows us where we go anyways. The verbal abuse I have received from neighbors is insane. I can’t believe some of the things people have yelled even with children present! It’s appalling! Expanding the dog park allows me to meet the needs of my children and my dog without breaking the rules and enduring the verbal abuse from neighbors. Cali Dixon *** I recommend Cali to write an email to Parks and Rec for the meeting on Thursday and to attend BEOA HOA meeting Tues night at 7pm.

I live here, and have children and got to Cypress park almost daily at all hours. I have no pets. My home does not border the park.

I'm in favor of the expansion. I think it makes a lot of sense. Currently you can't even walk a full loop with your dog if you go walking with your pet. Parents with children and dogs should be able to be with their children on the playground with their pets nearby. This is a well known dog park, kids who are afraid of dogs don't come here anyway. This is a city park, not an HOA park, people who don't live here are more than welcome to bring their pets. There is no fence dictating where animals are not allowed, so they go everywhere anyway. Either make the whole thing a dog park or none of it.

Maria Powell

I did get everyone’s authorization to use their names and comments for this specific matter.
Thank you for your time and consideration on this very important matter in Breckenridge East Owners Association area,
Daniele Evans
BEOA Secretary
daniele4888@gmail.com
208.867.4888
Hello,

Please present, or otherwise read into the record, the following information to the Boise Parks and Recreation Commission for their meeting on 17 Sept. 2020. This comment is related to the topic of expansion of the off-leash area at Cypress Park.

##### START COMMENT #####

Hello,

After reading through the available material related to the proposed changes to the off-leash area at Cypress Park, I noticed that none of the material takes into consideration one specific demographic of citizens. If the off-leash area is expanded as proposed the Boise Parks Commission is taking a stand to deny park access to citizens who, for whatever reason, do not feel safe around dogs. Whether they were attacked by a dog as a child (as one respondent to this topic suggests--her children have been assaulted by dogs while at Cypress Park), are allergic to dogs, or have other reasons to distrust dogs, these citizens should not be denied access to Cypress Park. The off-leash area is not intended to allow dog owners to complete the full circuit of the path. Rather, the current off-leash area was, according to documents related to the initial phase, created to give dog owners a place to exercise their dogs and NOT for the owners to get more exercise. It is my feeling that the dog area at Cypress Park is currently of adequate size for dogs to exercise and the off-leash area should not be expanded.

Name: Walter R. Davies  
Address: 4398 S. Rimview Way, Boise, Idaho, 83716  
Stance: AGAINST the expansion of the off-leash area at Cypress Park

Thank you for consideration.

Sincerely,
Walter R. Davies

##### END COMMENT #####

Thanks.  
Walt
To Whom it May Concern:

I have been made aware of the letter from Boise Parks and Recreation about the proposed expansion of the off-leash area. I wanted to provide my written testimony for the meeting on September 17, 2020. Please ensure my comments are read at the meeting and officially entered into the record.

I live in Breckenridge Subdivision which surrounds Cypress Park. I have a dog and two young children, ages 3 1/2 and 1 1/2. We love having a park and dog park so close to our home. It is a wonderful way for me to meet all the needs of my family: exercise for the dog and playtime for my children. We utilize the park and dog park at least once a day.

I am absolutely in favor of expanding the dog park to include the entire sidewalk ring for two main reasons.

The first reason is because if my children are playing on the swings or the section of the park adjacent to the proposed expansion area, I have to be over there too. If I am over there, that means my dog is over there. I have had multiple neighbors yell at me for having my dog off leash in the proposed area, and it is emotionally taxing. This occurs despite the dog being near me (but in the grassy area), and not harassing any people or other dogs. I have to watch my children, and they are young enough that I am usually playing with or assisting them, especially on the swings. Our dog is very well behaved, but I don’t think it’s appropriate to leave my dog unattended on the other side of the park in the current off-lease boundary. The dog naturally follows us where we go. Expanding the dog park allows me to meet the needs of my children and my dog without breaking the rules and enduring unnecessary verbal abuse from neighbors.

The second reason for the expansion is to complete the walking loop. We love to go for walks around the beautiful park with our dog off-lease. This allows her to run and get her energy out. Currently, how the off-lease dog park is divided, there is no way to make a full circle loop without breaking the rules or putting your dog back on and off leash throughout this short loop. Expanding the dog park would allow people walking dogs to enjoy the park at the fullest and walk the entire loop.

We are so grateful for this park and especially that it has the off-lease hours. I would like to reiterate that no expansion to off-lease hours is being requested, so the majority of the day would still be available for those who wish to recreate in the park without off-lease dogs. Secondly, there would still be significant portions of the park that remain off-lease, even during "off-lease hours." Thank you for your time and for considering this expansion of the dog park.

Cali Dixon
We vote NO for any expansion of dog park boundaries....(and we even own a dog!) Our home backs the part that is most used as the dog park area, so we see almost all of what goes on. It is ridiculous how many people do not pay attention to their dogs and pick up after them! Rather, they get sidetracked talking with people or have their head down in their phone while their dog does its duty. Even if it’s on a leash, I have witnessed MANY people look around to see if anyone’s watching and walk on without picking up. I see it happen often. It gets even worse in the winter because the mowers don’t mow it up. (Poor mowers that hit multiple mines each mow!) Are people that daft that they think it will just disappear on its own?!

When our children were little, (starting during the trial dog park period), we had to quit playing ball on the grass for fear of stepping in a mine. There used to be multiple soccer teams that would use the park for practice, but they all quit coming because of the same problem. Parks are for children, not animals.

As for expanding it so people can walk around, that only exacerbates the problem, because as they walk, they RARELY check where their dog is. There’s no way they can catch it in the act of pooping when they aren’t even paying any attention. I have witnessed this MANY times, and had I known this issue was going to come up, I would’ve taken multiple videos to prove this. People ALREADY let their dogs loose day AND night without watching them. “Legally” expanding the boundary will only make it worse.

There ARE people who are responsible owners, and even quite a few who will pick up even if not being watched. We are grateful for them and go out of our way to thank them when they do pick up after their animal. But expanding the area will only invite more people....which will increase the number of negligent disrespectful people.

Thank you for letting us voice our opinion. I know we are not the only ones that feel this way.

~Hannah and Marshall Tolman