

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, September 7, 2020 7:47 PM  
**To:** Donna Legge  
**Cc:** heritage-oaks-dog-park@googlegroups.com; Casey Richardson; 'Chaya Shahar'  
**Subject:** Please Reconsider your Decision Regarding Off Leash Program Location

Donna,

I am opposed to the dog off leash plan at Heritage Oak park because the park is not suitable for such program and I request PARC to **re-consider** its position regarding Heritage Oak. Based on discussions with my neighbors at McKenzie Ave, they all share this view. In fact, it was also the dog committee view that at Heritage Oak “the parking is insufficient and the residences are too close” (see dog committee report from 05/09/2018). No study or analysis was done since then by the dog committee to justify a change in its position to explain why Heritage Oak was selected for this program rather than another park in south Los Altos such as McKenzie or Grant.

Trying to understand the dog committee choice of Heritage Oaks Park, I visited all parks in Los Altos. It was evident that compared to the other Los Altos parks, Heritage Oak is the worst suited for this plan in terms of the impact on the nearby residents including:

1. Not sufficient buffer zone between the park and the residents
2. Non sufficient parking combined with a relatively narrow street will create traffic jam in McKenzie Ave
3. Noise and littering

The insufficient buffer zone poses a safety risk to the residents from aggressive dogs. In addition, unlike in some of the other parks, there is no parking lot. Parking is along the narrow McKenzie Ave creating traffic jam.

Focusing on South Los Altos alone, based on the dog committee own reports, McKenzie park is far better suited than Heritage Oak on all criteria considered and the same is true for Grant park. Once the dog subcommittee decided not to pursue a fenced dog park in McKenzie, it should have considered McKenzie park as a candidate for the dog off-leash program. Similarly, Grant park for an unknown reason was not even proposed. The Dog Park Sub-committee Report and Recommendations from May 20, 2020 states that “staff recommended two sites for off-leash hours ..... These two sites are : The Hillview Baseball Field and Heritage Oaks Park”. There is no discussion if Heritage Oaks meets the criteria established by the committee itself in previous recommendations and no comparison of Heritage Oaks to the other parks in south Los Altos.

The Dog Park Sub-committee Report and Recommendations from May 20, 2020 states that the “recommendations are based to a large extent on the dog park workshops”. **These workshops failed to inform most of McKenzie Ave residents of the dog unleash plans.** . Moreover, the information itself was misleading and tailored towards dog-owners. The vast majority of “dog-less residents” simply ignored the event called “dog park workshops”. Same way as people who has no guns at home would ignore events called “gun safety workshop”. The majority of people who had no dogs did not even bother looking at this. As such, the results of the workshops are not valid. The lack of awareness of the Heritage Oak park community to the dog unleash plan is not the community fault, and the community should not suffer the consequences for its lack of awareness. Once the community became aware of these plans it started to voice its opposition to the

plan. In spite of Covid 19, we collected so far 150 signature petition and we expect to get many more. Note that these 150 signatures were collected in a short time under Covid 19 restrictions without the resources available to PARC. Nevertheless, PARC workshops turnout was only 289 residents out of which only 51.3 % were supportive. Out of the 289 people, only 112 people attended the south Los Altos workshop at Grant Park. It is reasonable to conclude that the number of south Los Altos residents (which are likely to use a south Los Altos park) who attended the workshop at Grant and support the off-leash program at Heritage Oaks is in the order of 60 only. This is a very small number with no significance at all.

Once we became aware of the plan, we did everything in our power to make our views known to PARC and to the committee members. **This was however too late because some of the commissioners were already locked in their position.** This is evident from the May 20, 2020 recommendations which were the basis for the commission decision. Moreover, even today when PARC and the committee are aware of their failure to notify the McKenzie Ave residents and after we submitted the petition with 150 signatures, the workshops are still being used to justify the decision in the Pilot Off-Leash implementation plan recommendation from 09/09/2020. In order to better understand the views of the four commissioners who supported the program at Heritage Oaks and the three who objected, I met all commissioners except commissioner Yeh who did not want to meet me. My objective was to see if the commissioners maintain an open mind and will consider the community inputs. While one of the commissioners who supported the plan, commissioner Spielman, seemed to be open minded, commissioner Weinberg was locked in his position. In order to justify his position, commissioner Weinberg came up with a baseless argument that the status quo at Heritage Oaks park is bad and not sustainable and that the off leash program will be an improvement for the community. While it is true the status quo is not perfect, the community so far accepted it and did not previously complain about occasional unleashed dogs incidents, which proves the argument is false. A second argument used by commissioner Weinberg to justify his position was that a similar program is successful in Mountain View. When I pointed out that Heritage Oaks is very different from the Mountain View parks such as Questa which is much bigger than Heritage Oaks, with no nearby residents and a large parking lot, commissioner Weinberg suggested that a good reference park in Mountain View is Cooper. I went to see Cooper and it is again much bigger than Heritage Oak, it is isolated from the residents and has much better parking.

While I appreciate the effort done by Teresa and Scott to make things less painful, no adjustment can undo the mistake of selecting the wrong park for this plan. Moreover, any recommendations even if accepted, depend on strong and consistent enforcement which based on our experience is unlikely. Please see in this regard the many complaints we sent to the LAPD regarding unlawful dog unleash incidents. I therefore ask the PARC department and the dog park subcommittee **to re-consider** its decision regarding the dog unleash at Heritage Oak.

Please forward this email to all PARC personnel and dog subcommittee members who are going to attend the PARC meeting on September 9.

Regards,

Menashe Shahar  
[REDACTED] McKenzie Ave

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Marta Tkalcevic [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 4, 2020 9:21 AM  
**To:** Donna Legge  
**Subject:** Off-Leash Hours at Hillview Youth Baseball Field

Dear Donna,

We are writing to you in regard to the lack of a dog park in the City of Los Altos. Recently there has been a complaint leading to animal control coming out to enforce the off leash municipal code **5.08.010**. At this point a large number of dog owners are asking why the City enforces an off leash municipal code when there are no options for pet owners to exercise their dogs off leash. We are focusing primarily on Hillview Youth Baseball field, where over the last sixth months there has been little to no use of this facility other than the dog group in the morning and afternoon hours.

We find this action to be unsettling, frustrating and unnerving, forcing Los Altos residents to drive outside of the city to neighboring communities and cities in order to use a dog park facility. As a potential solution we are asking to enact the proposed off leash pilot program at Hillview Youth Baseball field. We are also asking for the off leash hours to be adjusted from 6 A.M. to 9 A.M. to a more realistic use time of 9 A.M. to 12 P.M. and evening hours from 5 P.M. to 7 P.M.

The Hillview Youth field is an ideal location for dog owners due to comfortable distance from any large road, mostly enclosed space, and several waste locations for dog owners to dispose their pets waste bags and keep the field clean. With the lack of sports teams utilizing the field due to the pandemic, launching an off leash pilot at this time seems like the quickest and easiest solution to the issue that the city of Los Altos has still not provided a dog park for its residents and their pets.

We are asking for this issue to be resolved as quickly as possible as currently we, the residents of Los Altos, don't have any legal option that allows our pets to socialize and exercise.

With respect,

Marta Tkalcevic

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Carol Stanek [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 10:11 AM  
**To:** Casey Richardson  
**Cc:** Donna Legge  
**Subject:** Off leash dog Pilot programs

Please forward to the Parks and Recreation Commissioners.

Dear Commissioners,

With the upcoming Off leash dog pilot item again on your agenda, I wanted to give you an update on the Dog Off Leash Area (DOLA) pilot currently underway in Cupertino.

The Cupertino pilot started last October and was scheduled to run through July of this year. The trial was interrupted from March 24 to June 5th due to County Covid-19 Shelter In Place requirements. As noted in the September issue of the Cupertino Scene (the monthly publication of the City of Cupertino), "The City has received continuous feedback affirming how much users have enjoyed the DOLA during this trial period", per Joanne Magrini, Cupertino Parks and Recreation Department Director.

At their July 2020 meeting, the Cupertino Parks and Recreation Commission voted unanimously to extend the trial through July 2021 to allow for the full period of the initial trial to run. During the initial 6 months of the trial program no issues were reported.

I commend your commission and your Community Services department for the outreach that you conducted. The workshops provided significant feedback where residents responded to the specific proposals presented. I also commend your subcommittee for the work that has been done to try to address specific neighbor concerns and to design the trial to mitigate potential issues. The experience thus far in Cupertino (and at the numerous off leash areas in Mountain View and elsewhere) has shown that off leash areas can succeed and allow multiple users to enjoy the parks together and also accommodate those who would prefer to have separate times.

Through outreach you have identified support for the off leash trials in Los Altos. Valid concerns by neighbors can and should be addressed during a trial period. The experiences of neighboring cities has demonstrated that these areas can be successfully implemented.

Sincerely,  
Carol Stanek

Sent from my iPad

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Heather Larkin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 12:10 PM  
**To:** Donna Legge  
**Subject:** No to Special Interest groups! Protect our parks. 9-9-2020 meeting

Dear Park and Recreation Commissioners,

Both the off leash dogs and bocce ball proposals should be defeated. Not only are both proposals detrimental to park usage, PARC should not allow special interest groups (especially those with a bribe) to drive PARC decisions.

I am not an immediate neighbor to either Grant Park or Heritage Oaks, but I am alarmed when a special interest proposal causes numerous negative effects (displaces park users, decreases public safety, destroys green space ... ) and PARC even considers such a proposal.

Do Los Altos residents have to monitor PARC to see if a special interest group threatens a park? Currently, that unsettling premise is the unfortunate norm.

Sincerely,  
Heather Larkin  
Oakhurst Avenue

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:27 PM  
**To:** Donna Legge  
**Subject:** FW: Los Altos Parks  
**Attachments:** Los Altos Parks Comparison Table.xlsx

Hi Donna,

Please forward this email to the committee.

Regards,

Menashe

---

**From:** menasheshahar@yahoo.com <menasheshahar@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:24 PM  
**To:** 'dlegge@losaltosca.gov' <dlegge@losaltosca.gov>  
**Cc:** 'heritage-oaks-dog-park@googlegroups.com' <heritage-oaks-dog-park@googlegroups.com>; 'Chaya Shahar' <chaya@chayahomes.com>  
**Subject:** Los Altos Parks

Hi Donna,

I went to see all the parks in Los Altos to try understand why Heritage Oaks was selected for the dog off-leash program. I checked suitability of the parks to an off leash program under the following criteria:

1. Is the park big enough for this program
2. Is there sufficient buffer zone to the nearby residents
3. Is the parking space sufficient
4. Is there small children playground in the park
5. Is there a busy street bordering the park
6. Is there a creek bordering the park.

My answers are summarized in the attached excel sheet. Only Hillview is good in all criteria while all other parks have issues. It is clear however from the table that Heritage is one of the least suitable parks in the list. If the city of Los Altos insists on having a dog Off-Leash program in south Los Altos, it is clear McKenzie park is much better suited with far less impact on the residences, much better buffer zone and much better parking. Also, McKenzie park does not have a busy street bordering the park like Portland bordering Heritage Oaks. It seems once the committee gave up on a fenced dog park, rather than consider McKenzie park to be a candidate to an off leash program, it was removed from the list.

Regards,

Menashe

Park	Address	Size	Buffer Zone from Nearby Resident Homes	Parking	Proximity to Small Children Playground	Busy street bordering the park	Creek Bordering the Park
Grant	1575 Holt Ave	Large	Good	Good	Yes	No	No
Heritage Oak		Large	Poor. Residents will be severely effected.	Poor	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lincoln		Very large	Good	Good	No palyground	Yes	No
Marymeade	1285 Fremont Ave	Small	Good	Poor	No palyground	Yes	No
Mckenzie	707 Fremont Ave	Large	Good	Good	Yes	No	No
Montclair	1160 St. Joseph Ave	Too Small					
Shoup	401 University Ave	Large	Good. No Nearby residents	Good	Yes	No	Yes
Village	W. Edith Ave	Too Small					
Hillview	97 Hillview Ave	Large	Good. Protected with a fence. Few homes in one side of the park	Good. A laot of parking and easy access from the city of Los Altos municipality building complex.	No palyground	No	No

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Chaya Shaha [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 1:35 PM  
**To:** Donna Legge  
**Cc:** heritage-oaks-dog-park@googlegroups.com  
**Subject:** Please Reconsider your Decision Regarding Off Leash Program Location

Hi Donna,

I am opposed to the dog off leash plan at Heritage Oak park!

Given the fact that we now have **150 opposed signatures** of the residents that are living in the neighborhood and given that all the neighbors in McKenzie Ave are **100%** against the off leash dog park I ask the committee to reconsider their decision regarding the off leash dog park location!!!!  
Note that these 150 signatures were collected in a short time under Covid 19 restrictions!

**Heritage oak is not suitable to serve as an off leash dog park in all the aspects!**

I can repeat my reasoning for why heritage Park is not a good option for an off leash dog park including it's small size, the close proximity to residential houses, the minimal parking space, the busy streets on either side and many more. Safety is a major consideration. Kids need to run freely in the park and not to be surrounded by fences. This is why parks are establish! However, **having reached 150 signatures in support of my position alone, should be sufficient to prompt the reconsideration of the decision.**

Unfortunately, we did not have an opportunity to express our opposition to the committee recommendations before the decision to do the off leash dog Park! So I really hope that our voices will be heard this time.

**No accommodations or adjustments would be sufficient. We disagree to take part in this Pilot.**  
As citizen of Los Altos I have the right to live in peace and without fear of dog attack as I or my grandkids steps out the door or I may accidentally drive over a running dog as I get out of my garage.  
we are too close to the park !!!

I want to emphasize, it will be the city responsibility if an accident will happen because you allowed it!!! A dog owner will not have the time to avoid these situation!!!

We ask the committee **to reconsider again the off leash dog park location!**

Please forward this email to the committee.

Chaya Shaha  
[REDACTED] Mckenzie Ave.  
Los Altos

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Yoav Agmon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 5:07 PM  
**To:** Donna Legge; Casey Richardson; [REDACTED]; City Council  
**Subject:** Heritage Oaks Park Unleash Dogs conundrum..

Hello,

Ever since that decision by the committee to recommend this pilot project of unleashing dogs at our neighborhood park, I have been trying to understand why it feels so wrong and unfair. As on the surface it appears as a reasonable and democratic process being conducted. And not to repeat the many facts of why objectively the park is just not suited for this purpose.

My conclusion which I will also try to raise at the next meeting tomorrow is distilled to this:

- Heritage Oak is a neighborhood park and its purpose is to serve us, all those who live close by ( It is we who also share it with many others who come over and crowd our street and parking on many occasions from all around ) thus, when overwhelming majority of residents are against this project, under what kind of governance is it OK to go forward with it ?
- The whole premise of this recommendation has resulted from a flawed process, this workshop that provided its basis, was wrongly named and promoted thus resulted in many folks who don't own dogs to ignore it and not participate. And the fact that a mistake was made and continuing to use the data from that workshop just adds insults to injury. IN a matter of a very short time, with the restrictive Covid19 environment we have collected 150 signatures to support the petition against this project, if only a small portion of these people participated in the workshop the data would have been strongly tilted against it.
- Finally, gathering the emotions and resolve of my neighbors I'm certain that if this recommendation moves forward and gets to the city council, even if it gets approved there, we'll continue to fight it all the way including legal actions at the courts, so why initiate such a proceeding that will generate so much ill-will, conflict and waste resources, time and money to all involved ?

There is no blame or belief that the intentions were anything but good, but now that you have the deeper recognition and better understanding of the issues, please just drop it, and let's take on some more appropriate projects that can benefit the whole public and not just a few that are inconvenienced by the current status.

Respectfully,

Yoav Agmon  
[REDACTED] McKenzie Ave  
Los Altos

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Donna Legge](#)  
**Cc:** [Casey Richardson](#)  
**Subject:** Please Rescind your Off Leash Program Proposal  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 8, 2020 11:59:29 AM

---

From: Vladimir Rubashevsky  
[REDACTED] McKenzie Ave  
Los Altos CA 94024  
To: Los Altos PARC  
Re: Dog Park Proposal

**Dear Commissioners.**

**This email is to express my opposition to the current Dog Park proposal. Here are the reasons for it:**

**1. The current proposal was built on the following incorrect premises:**

**1.1. Incorrect assumption that 43% of Los Altos households have dogs.**

The Commission did not take into consideration the amount of dogs per "dog household" and uses the total amount of dogs in Los Altos instead. *"there are over 3,800 licensed dogs in the city of Los Altos. Given that there are 10,700 residences in the city, between 35 and 40% of the homes in the city have dogs"*.

I don't think anybody would reasonably support the presence of "unlicensed dogs" in justification to establish the dog park. So let's try to properly calculate the amount of Households with dogs based on the number provided by the Commission (3800).

Per <https://www.avma.org/> the average amount of dogs per US Household is 1.6

This will give us the total amount of Households with dogs (HHD) as  $3800/1.6=2375$ . The total number of Households in Los Altos (HH) is 10,700. This means that the number of Households with dogs (HHD) is **2,375** and the share of the HHD is  **$2,375/10,700 = 22\%$**  of total Households in Los Altos (HH).

**1.2. Incorrect Assumption that the unleashed dog hours are good for dogs**

Please see articles below.

1.2.1. <https://docplayer.net/>

1.2.2. <https://www.nytimes.com/>

These articles are talking about dog parks from the dog owner's point of view. And according to them the Dog Parks, especially incorrectly designed, can be bad for dogs.

**1.3. Incorrect Assumption that all dog owners are supporting the unleashed**

## **dog hours.**

188 dog owners attended the Dog Park Workshop. Altogether only 152 attendees supported the unleashed dog hours. **Even if we assume** that all 152 'Yes' votes belonged to the dog owners and all "dogless" people voted 'No', then at least 36 dog owners were against the proposal. So the unleashed hours support ratio among dog-owners is only  $152/188=81\%$

This means that among 2,375 HHDs (see #1) there are only  $2,375*81\%=1,923$  HHDs who support the "Off-Leash hours at a non-fenced-in park". So the dog park support share among Los Altos households would be:  **$1923/10700=18\%$**

### **1.4. Incorrect counting of support by households instead of by people.**

The recommendation ignores the fact that households with children (usually larger households) are less likely have dogs than the households with fewer people (with no children). <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/housing-survey-reveals-five-trends-about-american-pet-owners> This means that calculating "by household" favors dogs over people.

### **1.5. Data from a single-sided "Dog Park workshop" named in the way which discourages people with no dogs from attendance.**

The workshop was named "**Dog Park workshop**". Would you attend "Elephant Handling workshop"? Probably not if you do not have an elephant. So, the people who did not have dogs did not attend.

The numbers are confirming this fact: 188 dog owners; 96 non-dog owners out of 296 attendees.

So basically 64% of the workshop attendees were dog owners while the dog owners' share is by Subcommittee assumptions ~43% and in reality ~22% (see calculation in #1.1)

Since we were assuming earlier that all "dogless" attendees voted against the Proposal (1.3) we can easily estimate the numbers which would be gotten by the survey if it was properly advertised.

Here is the calculation:

There were 188 dog owners participating in the workshop. They were supposed to be 43% per Subcommittee math or 22% by the above calculation. So there should have been  $188/0.43=437$  or  $188/0.22=854$  participants respectively. Only 146 supported Unleashed Dog hours. This is respectively  $146/437=33\%$  and  $146/854=17\%$  respectively.

So the "corrected survey" would show only 17% of support of the proposal.

### **1.6. Baseless assumption that all dog-owners who will take advantage of the proposed program will suddenly start obeying the proposed rules and schedule.**

There are plenty of conscious dog owners who will obey the rules. However there are many of them who don't do it now and there is no reason to believe that they would not do it in the future. The Subcommittee used a number of unlicensed dogs in Los Altos and estimated it at 400. So according to the Subcommittee's own calculations

there are at least 400 dog owners who violate simple registration and licensing rules. Since these people violate the basic dog ownership rules we can not expect them to follow scheduling and other rules stated in the proposal.

## **2. Heritage Oaks Park is unfit for the proposed program.**

According to the School of Veterinary Medicine (UC Davis) one of the most important rules in establishing a dog park is:

"Do not establish a dog park immediately adjacent to residential property lines.  
<http://thestantonfoundation.org/assets/canine/Dog-Park-Resources/UC-Davis-Study-Dog-Park-Maintenance.pdf> "

## **3. Prioritizing questionable additional benefits of a few dogs over real benefits of humans is wrong**

At this point the parents with children as well as dog owners with leashed dogs are main users of the Heritage Oaks Park. During my conversation with Commissioner Weinberg I asked him the specific question: who would have priority using the Park during unleashed dog hours? He basically explained to me that **unleashed dogs would** and if I or my kids are afraid of dogs we should not use the Park during these times.

### **Conclusion:**

The PARC proposal of unleashed dog hours in Heritage Park should be dropped because

- a ) its justification is based on untrue premises,
- b) it does not reflect opinion of a majority of Los Altos Residents
- c) it violates the Dog Park standards accepted across the country
- d) it puts dogs above human residents (children and adults).

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Colleen Blake [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 12:24 AM  
**To:** Los Altos Parks & Recreation Commission  
**Subject:** Save the Heart of Our Neighborhood - Save Grant Park's Green Space

To the Los Altos City Council and Parks & Recreation,

I'm a resident in the Grant Park neighborhood of Los Altos and am asking you to please save the green space of our local park. Grant Park is a small community space that is the heart of our neighborhood and has a familial culture among its residents. When I heard bocce ball courts were going to be installed, I was flabbergasted and so, I want to share my concerns.

Given the current state of our world, it seems selfish and even unethical for a small "elite" group to buy public land for their own interest. Who would cover additional costs for construction, the overhead shade structure (which would also be an eyesore) and ongoing maintenance? Why not spend fewer dollars on maintaining and upgrading Grant Park's senior citizen kitchen, play structures and walking paths instead? These are areas that are used by all ages and would benefit every visitor of the park.

What happened to local input? The fact that Grant Park residents' feedback were not included in the decision, goes against the community spirit that makes our neighborhood special. In a recent survey of 300+ Grant Park residents, over 80% of respondents DO NOT WANT the bocce ball court. Our children, senior citizens and pets use the walking path and green space daily for open play and exercise. Every day kids and adults are playing pickup tag, frisbee, soccer, football, baseball, cricket or just free play. Families use the space for picnics or just sitting and enjoying the grass, trees and open space. Why would the city want to take these away?

Lastly, Grant Park is not a community center, but a quiet neighborhood park. It's where young children, families and neighbors visit with each other because we can walk there anytime. Bocce ball courts would likely attract people of a select age group from outside our neighborhood, overwhelming the tiny parking lot and streets with cars and the park with litter and noise. I hear there could be bocce ball tournaments at Grant Park involving dozens of people at a time and hundreds over extended time. Grant Park is too small and the neighborhood too fragile to handle any more than today's occasional soccer games and summer concerts.

Please SAVE OUR GREEN SPACE and do not let this elite group take over and destroy the heart of what makes South Los Altos a special place for Grant Park residents. With everything we're already struggling with - the pandemic, systemic racism, distance learning, & wildfires - is a bocce ball court really what we need?

Thanks in advance for considering my perspective.

Respectfully,

Colleen  
[REDACTED] Holt Avenue  
Grant Park Resident

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Nina Srinath [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 10:23 AM  
**To:** Casey Richardson  
**Cc:** Nina Srinath  
**Subject:** Dog off leash hours discussion

Hello,

My family and I have lived in Los Altos for the last 11 years and have been taking our dog to the Hillview field for some leash free run and ball fetching. It seems odd to me that recently there has been so much discussion on the topic of dogs being off leash in the Los Altos parks and I would like to understand why.

In spite of trying to be as engaged as possible in this topic and attending the opinion poll last fall, it is unclear to me what the real issue even is. Could you please make it a point to address this in today's meeting?

It seems to me that if the field is being unused and empty it is okay to have friendly dogs running there. I can only think of a few concerns

- 1) Dog poop - well this is a non issue. People have been picking up poo very well and both leashed as well as unleashed dogs can poo
- 2) Kids wanting to use the field - another non issue. The dog owners use the park only when it is empty and leave whenever players want to use the field
- 3) People afraid of dogs - well this is probably the only issue and can be solved by having off leash hours. The people who are afraid of dogs can stay away during this period

I look forward to your explanations and answers in this evening's webinar

Sincerely  
Nina Srinath

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** City of Los Altos Official Website via City of Los Altos California <info@losaltosca.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 10:36 AM  
**To:** Recreation (FAX)  
**Subject:** austin taylor

Submitted on Wednesday, September 9, 2020 - 10:35am Submitted by anonymous user: 98.248.49.41 Submitted values are:

Department: Recreation & Community Services

Name: austin taylor

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Comments / Requests: dog park in los altos, we are concerned with a lot of kids and the fact that they are not fenced in

[REDACTED]

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 10:49 AM  
**To:** Casey Richardson  
**Cc:** Donna Legge; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Hi Casey - my written testimony re: agenda item #2 Pilot Off Leash Implementation Plan

Good am Casey,

Per the direction given, I am submitting my written testimony as it pertains to agenda item #2 - Pilot Off Leash Implementation Plan for the meeting to be held later tonight.

This is in addition to the verbal comments that I will make (thank you again for confirming my text message to you yesterday regarding this) during the time allotted for public comments.

Written Testimony is below...thank you again, Martin Saso, Home Owner on McKenzie Ave, [REDACTED] cell

-----

**Please allow me to be respectful yet direct as possible with my comments below...**

**My name is Martin Saso and I am the owner for the past 30 years of a home on McKenzie Ave...**

- One of the homes directly across from Heritage Oak Park and one of the homes that would be DIRECTLY impacted by, what I and others would label to be an unsafe idea to allow dogs to be (at any time) off a leash / un-leashed in this day and age of litigious activity and where the safety of children and adults are paramount and, in my view, should be top priority.
- As I stated back at the May 20th PARC meeting **... when I was 4 years old, I was attacked by an un-leashed dog in an area that had an "assigned area" for un-leashed dogs, yet the owner of said dog (similarly to what we have regularly witnessed over these recent months and reported to the Capitola Police, Donna Legge and others as we saw them take place) had his dog un-leashed in an area that was not permitted...and I have the scars on my right hand to show when I was attacked by the un-leashed dog.**

- In this day and age, one can only imagine the liability issues that will result from such an event taking place and all parties directly and indirectly involved.
- My friend who is a Personal Liability Attorney has plenty of cases that he represents and prosecutes on behalf of those attacked and harmed by un-leashed dogs...he was so very surprised to hear that the City of Los Altos was considering such an idea at Heritage Oaks Park.

### **Additional thoughts include:**

- I could not find any data within the "previous study" back in May of the impact of the un-leash hours at Heritage Oak Park would have on the Community and on McKenzie Ave residents in particular and the **overall impact on human SAFETY.**
- Un-leashed dogs running in the park will not only deny park usage for children but also make our street unsafe and dangerous as there is not a sufficient buffer zone between the park and the residents.
- The insufficient buffer zone poses a safety risk to the residents from aggressive dogs. In addition, unlike in some of the other parks, there is no parking lot. An unleashed and aggressive dog entering the property of a Resident on McKenzie Ave. would be a danger to said Residents and children of same playing or being in their front yard area.
- I also recall that back around 2007, an idea for a dog park in the Heritage Oak Park was presented and logic prevailed and the idea was fortunately scrapped.
- Respectfully...**In my view, the safety of children and to all humans are far more important than a dog owner exercising their pet dog off-leash at the ongoing risk to humans when a sub-set of the pet owners disobey the law / continue to disobey the law which they have been doing and, logically (without any known consequences to date), they will continue to do.**
  - As an example of this overall inappropriate and illegal behavior, the Subcommittee used a number of unlicensed dogs in Los Altos and estimated it at 400. So according to the Subcommittee's own calculations there are at least 400 dog owners who violate simple registration and licensing rules. Since these people violate the basic dog ownership rules we can not logically expect them to follow scheduling and other rules stated in the proposal.

### **In Conclusion:**

- **Respectfully, with this and the other data being presented in opposition to this un-leashed pet dog idea, I trust that the City of Los Altos will now**

**seriously consider these concerns and not pursue this ill advised pilot program.**

Please note that I have attempted in this communication to summarize accurately every fact known that is relevant to making sound opinions contained in the preceding paragraphs.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Martin Saso  
McKenzie Ave, Los Altos, CA

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Daniel Brunton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 11:25 AM  
**To:** Casey Richardson  
**Subject:** Fwd: Regarding dogs off leash policy for HillView

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Daniel Brunton [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Wed, Sep 9, 2020 at 11:09 AM  
**Subject:** Regarding dogs off leash policy for HillView  
**To:** <[dlegge@losaltosca.gov](mailto:dlegge@losaltosca.gov)>

Hi,

I understand this long running issue is coming up again for discussion, and hopefully this time a resolution that benefits everyone can be decided.

As I see it, there are three potential issues of conflict regarding this. I've been taking my dog to HillView for 10 years and here is what I see.

**1. Dogs pooping in the field and people not picking up afterwards.**

- Most regular people there are very diligent about this and often pick up any poop they find there. They don't want to walk in it either. Regardless, this is not really anything to do with off leash or not.

**2. Conflict with other field uses, primarily baseball.**

- Whenever there is a baseball game going, I see most of the dog people will wait until the game is over to use the field. Sometimes during a practice, they'll agree to share the field.

**3. People who are scared of dogs and uncomfortable with off leash dogs.**

- To me, this is probably the biggest issue. I've seen people walk by and an off leash dog will come up to them to say hello, they will freak out and the dog owner will quickly retrieve the dog, but I imagine they are already upset by this point. One way to manage this is to set morning and evening hours for off leash usage, so these people can avoid that route at those times. The other is to put up a sign informing people that if requested by a passerby, they should please put their dogs on leash during the passing. Overall, this situation is rare and I actually see most passers enjoying meeting the dogs.

Well, as far as I can see, these are the main issues that need to be dealt with. Please let me know if I've missed any other issues.

On a personal note, my dog lives for going to HillView. She won't leave me alone in the morning until I take her out there. She lives to chase balls.

In addition, the HillView dog group is a great way to get to know your neighbors and build community closeness. Most of the people I know in Los Altos are from this group.

Well, if you've made it this far, thanks for taking the time to consider my opinion on this issue and I hope for a speedy resolution that benefits all.

Thanks,

Dan Brunton

■ Navajo Lane

Los Altos

## Casey Richardson

---

**From:** Daniel Brunton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 9, 2020 11:09 AM  
**To:** Donna Legge  
**Subject:** Regarding dogs off leash policy for HillView

Hi Donna,

I understand this long running issue is coming up again for discussion, and hopefully this time a resolution that benefits everyone can be decided.

As I see it, there are three potential issues of conflict regarding this. I've been taking my dog to HillView for 10 years and here is what I see.

**1. Dogs pooping in the field and people not picking up afterwards.**

- Most regular people there are very diligent about this and often pick up any poop they find there. They don't want to walk in it either. Regardless, this is not really anything to do with off leash or not.

**2. Conflict with other field uses, primarily baseball.**

- Whenever there is a baseball game going, I see most of the dog people will wait until the game is over to use the field. Sometimes during a practice, they'll agree to share the field.

**3. People who are scared of dogs and uncomfortable with off leash dogs.**

- To me, this is probably the biggest issue. I've seen people walk by and an off leash dog will come up to them to say hello, they will freak out and the dog owner will quickly retrieve the dog, but I imagine they are already upset by this point. One way to manage this is to set morning and evening hours for off leash usage, so these people can avoid that route at those times. The other is to put up a sign informing people that if requested by a passerby, they should please put their dogs on leash during the passing. Overall, this situation is rare and I actually see most passers enjoying meeting the dogs.

Well, as far as I can see, these are the main issues that need to be dealt with. Please let me know if I've missed any other issues.

On a personal note, my dog lives for going to HillView. She won't leave me alone in the morning until I take her out there. She lives to chase balls.

In addition, the HillView dog group is a great way to get to know your neighbors and build community closeness. Most of the people I know in Los Altos are from this group.

Well, if you've made it this far, thanks for taking the time to consider my opinion on this issue and I hope for a speedy resolution that benefits all.

Thanks,  
Dan Brunton  
[REDACTED] Navajo Lane  
Los Altos