



Cincinnati Board of Park Commissioners

Board Meeting Agenda

April 15, 2021

9:00 AM

950 Eden Park Drive

Cincinnati, OH 45202

Order of Business

I. Call to Order

A. Acknowledgement of Public Comments

B. Approval of March 18, 2021 Meeting Minutes*

II. Election of Park Board Officers*

III. Quarterly Police Report

IV. New Business

A. Dunore Park Survey Results Discussion*

Rocky Merz, Division Manager

B. Division of Planning & Design Items

1) MEMI Revised Management Agreement*

Steven Schuckman, Division Manager

2) Lot 28 Design Services*

Steven Schuckman, Division Manager

3) Smale River's Edge*

Cindy France, Principal Architect

C. Contracts and Agreements for Approval*

Mary Unterreiner, Executive Assistant

D. In-Kind Contributions*

Craig Sherman, CFO

E. Presentations:

1) Volunteer Program

Christyl Johnson-Roberts, Vol. Coordinator

2) Krohn Conservatory

Mark House, Krohn Manager

V. Old Business

A. Director Goals*

Kara Kish, Director

VI. Staff Comments

VII. Commissioner Comments

VIII. Next Regular Meeting Date: May 20, 2021

IX. Adjournment

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS
March 18, 2021

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Cincinnati Board of Park Commissioners was held on this day remotely by video conference. Commissioners present: President Brad Lindner, Vice President Jim Goetz, Commissioner Susan Castellini, Commissioner Linda Lee Thomas, and Commissioner Molly North. President Lindner called the meeting to order at 9:02 A.M. Attendance was confirmed by roll call.

Acknowledgement of Public Comments

President Lindner announced there were no public comments submitted for this meeting.

Approval of Meeting Minutes: February 18, 2021; February 22, 2021 (Special); March 4, 2021 (Special)

Commissioner Castellini motioned to approve the meeting minutes from February 18th, February 22nd, and March 4th. Commissioner Thomas seconded. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Update from Cincinnati Police Department

Captain Dennis Swingley provided an update on recent police activity in French Park and Mt. Airy Forest. Captain Swingley explained on March 3rd, gunshots were reported in French Park and an individual reported witnessing someone carrying a rifle in the park. An extensive search was conducted and officers stopped patrons from entering the park. He explained it was determined to be a misperception; the individual was carrying a large stick and the noise was from nearby construction. He explained CPD has been patrolling the park daily in the weeks since the incident to ensure safety. Captain Swingley presented an update for Mt. Airy Forest, reporting Year-to-Date (YTD) calls for service as 104, mostly for small theft.

Commissioner Thomas asked how the YTD calls have increased from the previous year. Captain Swingley explained calls to the parks in general are increasing now that the weather is improving and COVID-19 vaccinations are increasing.

Commissioner Castellini asked for an update on Twin Lakes in Eden Park. Jenny Mobley provided an overview of communications with CPD Assistant Chief Lisa Davis to address noise complaints in the area. Ms. Mobley explained CPD plans to patrol the area in vehicles and possible need for police detail has been discussed. She indicated new speed bumps and increased seasonal staff will hopefully improve speeding and noise levels. There was discussion regarding CPD's awareness of complaints and noise in the area and Parks' preparedness for the Spring season.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

President Lindner announced the plan to move into Executive Session. He explained the public livestream would be discontinued for the session and would continue when the public meeting reconvenes for the purposes of continuing the regular meeting agenda.

President Lindner motioned to enter into Executive Session pursuant to ORC Section 121.22(G) to consider the employment and discipline of a public employee. Commissioner Castellini seconded. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

The Board entered Executive Session at 9:15 A.M.

The Board entered back into public meeting at 9:55 A.M.

Vice President Goetz motioned to place Y. Laketa Cole on unpaid leave status and authorize Director Kish to initiate disciplinary action related to Ms. Cole. Commissioner Castellini seconded. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

OLD BUSINESS

FY 2022 City Funds Recommended Budget

Director Kish thanked the Board for the budget feedback provided at the previous meeting. She pointed out major modifications made to the budget since the first reading. She explained the budget is reflective of City Funds only and is directly in line with the targets provided by the City. Ms. Kish presented the budget of \$20,919,946 and explained \$9,582,000 is from the General Fund 050. She explained the 8% reduction exercise has been modified to reflect a reduction in Position Vacancy Allowances.

Commissioner North acknowledged the All Positions Summary report provided and noted modifications could help formulate more of an understanding staffing opportunities. President Lindner agreed the summary was helpful and acknowledged there are opportunities for refinement.

Vice President Goetz commented on the elimination of 28 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) positions since FY19, and that there are only 3 PVAs to “cushion” the budget this fiscal year. This point and implications for future budget reductions was discussed.

Vice President Goetz motioned to accept the budget recommendation as presented. Commissioner North seconded. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Parks Foundation Grant: Smale Riverfront Park Design

Director Kish presented an opportunity to complete the design of Smale Riverfront Park. She noted the Cincinnati Parks Foundation has been raising funds since 2019 for the completion of the park. She presented the staff recommendation to approve application and acceptance of a Foundation grant for up to \$500k to procure design services to produce construction documents.

Commissioner Castellini asked if the request was specifically for Lot 23 and if it included Lot 28. Director Kish answered the completion of Smale Riverfront Park includes Lot 28 and the funding could potentially include design services for it.

Vice President Goetz commented on the great opportunity being offered by the Foundation to cover up front design costs for Lot 23 and Lot 28 if funds remain available and the Park Board is still supportive of completing Smale Riverfront Park.

Commissioner Thomas expressed her support and appreciation for the funding opportunity. She reiterated her understanding the grant would be for design work for Lot 23 and Lot 28, assuming there will be sufficient funds for both and further funding may be needed for Lot 28. President Lindner commented Director Kish should get more clarification, Lot 23 design work would be priority and remaining funds could be used toward Lot 28.

Vice President Goetz motioned for the Park Board to show its appreciation to the Cincinnati Parks Foundation for their continued work in fundraising for the completion of Smale, and that the Park Board request funding for up to \$500k for design work to prepare for the completion of the park when funds are available. Commissioner Castellini seconded. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Contracts over \$50k: Stump Grinding Contract

Crystal Courtney explained the three-year stump grinding contract needs to be renewed so tree stumps can be ground after removal to allow for new plantings. She presented the staff recommendation to approve the presented contract and expense of annual forestry funds from Fund 792 to cover the cost of right-of-way stump grinding, city-wide.

Commissioner Thomas asked if the 924 trees removed per year was high and if trees are replanted. Ms. Courtney answered the annual total is based on a 5-year average and trees are replanted.

Commissioner Castellini motioned to approve the staff recommendation. Commissioner Thomas seconded. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Burnet Woods Invasives Management Update

Crystal Courtney presented updates on the invasive species management project with Mad Scientist in Burnet Woods. She thanked new Conservation Technician, Drew Goebel for oversight of this contract and initiative. Ms. Courtney presented an overview of the program and insight into the invasives management plan over next four years. She described priority areas, invasive species removal work to date, timeline of work, and the budget.

Commissioner Castellini asked about mudslide concerns in hilly areas that have been cleared of invasives. Ms. Courtney explained since the areas are not very steep, slippage is not a concern and the area will be reseeded when the weather is warmer to prevent future movement. She expressed the importance of ongoing maintenance of these sites, continued replanting, and reseeding.

Replanting and ongoing management of the newly cleared areas was discussed as well as treatment of lesser celandine. Volunteer assistance from Preserve Burnet Woods (PBW) was discussed as well as future goals of training volunteers in land management.

Commissioner North asked how parks are prioritized for invasive species management and what the overall vision is for invasives management. Ms. Courtney explained prioritization is based on existing partnerships with volunteers because Parks does not have the staff to target invasives management system-wide. She explained land management plans have been created for areas with strong existing volunteer groups as a model for the rest of the Parks system.

Vice President Goetz commented on the transformation of Burnet Woods and commended PBW and staff on the creation of this partnership model.

The role of the Parks Foundation in invasives management was discussed. Ms. Courtney described the commitment of the Foundation to conservation, including a \$25k grant for invasive species management in Mt. Airy through a partnership with Groundwork Ohio River Valley. She also explained a partnership with the Foundation and PBW, will provide 250 volunteers to be trained, certified, and insured for pesticide invasive species management application.

President Lindner commended Ms. Courtney and staff on the thorough plan and management of invasive species removal. Commissioner Castellini also commended Ms. Courtney.

Volunteer recognition was discussed. Commissioner Thomas suggested recognizing volunteers at a future meeting for this work. President Lindner suggested continuing the bi-monthly volunteer recognition at Park Board meetings.

Urban Tree Canopy Analysis Update

Matt DiBona presented an update on the urban tree canopy analysis used for analytics in Urban Forestry and throughout the Parks system as well as an overview of tree inventory. He described the current status of the UTC analysis, explaining imagery is being reviewed but quantitative analysis is not yet available. Further, the deliverable from Applied Geographics should be available in the fall. Mr. DiBona explained the contract includes the entire county and is being maximized by funding from MSD.

Mr. DiBona showed comparisons between free online data and the accuracy and detail of the UTC data. He provided an overview of LiDAR technology. He presented the iTree analysis for Parks' tree inventory, which generates the benefits for trees within any setting.

Commissioner North commented on the impact of development to tree canopy and asked if the data can be used to determine the cost of development on the tree canopy so Parks can position itself for resources. Mr. DiBona described the ways Parks is analyzing tree canopy trends related to development and zoning. There was further discussion regarding measuring and recuperating value of trees impacted by development as well as considerations for species selection for replanting.

Commissioner Thomas expressed excitement for the public availability of the data and iTree dashboard. She asked if there was an incentive for developers to replace tree canopy. Mr. DiBona answered there are deterrents. Ms. Courtney explained MSD is working on an impervious surface fee which could include tree canopy as mitigation for impervious surfaces. There was discussion regarding opportunities to include tree regulations in zoning codes and educating developers and City Council on the benefits of tree canopy, as well as the ability to update data moving forward.

Vice President Goetz commended staff on this work and asked for future updates so the Park Board can advocate on behalf of Parks staff. Commissioner North commented on the opportunity to also prohibit the planting of invasives such as bamboo in the city. President Lindner expressed support and the positive impact on quality of life this work accomplishes. Mr. DiBona commented on the ability for Parks to complete this in-house. There was further discussion regarding the need to protect and identify mature trees because they cannot be replanted at maximum value.

Director Kish commented positively on the Park Board's investment in this software and the passion and talent of the Natural Resources team.

Mt. Airy Forest Plan Community Engagement

Steve Schuckman presented an overview of the community engagement process staff have participated in with the Mt. Airy community. He explained Mt. Airy wanted to incorporate ideas and improvement recommendations for Mt. Airy Forest in their new neighborhood plan preparation, and a survey was developed and established a working group to represent park and community interests and stakeholders. He described representation on the community group, content and outcomes of two community engagement sessions, and survey results.

Director Kish expressed excitement for Parks' participation in this plan with the community and City Planning Department to explore how parks can be improved and commented on the Planning Department's future plans to create plans for other neighborhoods. Mr. Schuckman emphasized Parks is working with Planning to be at the table for development of the 10 neighborhood plans.

Commissioner Thomas commented on the mutual benefit of Parks and the community to engage in this process to focus community needs and utilize them to improve the parks through these neighborhood plans in partnership with the neighborhoods and Planning.

The Mt. Airy Forest survey was discussed. Mr. Schuckman commented 99% of respondents expressed interest in volunteering at Mt. Airy Forest. Commissioner Thomas commented the demographics of respondents was not representative of the park users and future plans should focus more on gathering diverse feedback. Mr. Schuckman agreed and suggested methods for achieving this. Vice President Goetz echoed the need to consider the source of the data and not focus solely on the survey feedback when determining recommendations for the park.

Commissioner North commented Parks should not wait for a new master plan to address long sought-after improvements, including trails. She suggested trails may be an opportunity for federal stimulus funding. Mr. Schuckman agreed trail improvements could happen sooner and emphasized the asset Mt. Airy to walkers and hikers.

Director Kish introduced Daniel Traicoff, Director of Mt. Airy Community Urban Redevelopment Enterprise (CURE). Mr. Traicoff provided background on the neighborhood plan in development, emphasizing many Mt. Airy residents do not regularly visit Mt. Airy Forest despite the prevalence of its footprint. He commented on safety perception of the park, neighborhood property value, and Parks staff's assistance in the planning process. He acknowledged the need to improve accuracy of survey demographics and commented on desired improvements including electricity and improving connection to Hawaiiin Terrace apartments. He thanked the Park Board and staff for their involvement.

The involvement of the Mt. Airy Forest Advisory Council was discussed. Vice President Goetz commented on the great resource community groups involved in this discussion provide. President Lindner thanked Mr. Traicoff.

Approval & Advice Requirements Discussion

Director Kish recommended tabling this discussion item, as it is not time sensitive. President Lindner tabled the item until the next regular Park Board meeting.

STAFF COMMENTS

Kelly Piller, Communications and Visual Designer, presented staff updates on Explore Nature! summer camps, flood response, and April events. Ms. Piller announced Explore Nature! summer camp registration went live on February 27th and nearly sold out within the first 48 hours. She expressed gratitude to the Parks Foundation for the Stevenson Sisters Scholarship, which provided free registration for 40 campers. She commented 55 spots remain for the camps for kids 3.5-14 years old which take place June 14th to August 6th at \$75-125 per camper. Director Kish explained this year's camps are designed to be COVID safe again and discussions are occurring for enhancing camps next year. Ms. Piller emphasized safety requirements are being met and overall, registrants did not show hesitancy regarding safety of camps. Commissioner Thomas asked if reduced capacity of summer camps would continue this year and Ms. Piller confirmed.

Regarding the recent flooding of the Ohio River, Ms. Piller expressed appreciation for the Riverfront and East District teams for their extensive preparation of the area and thorough cleaning response after the waters receded.

Ms. Piller announced April is the official start of the season and the majority of park restrooms start opening April 1st through 15th. She explained staff are planning volunteer events and tree plantings in conjunction with Earth Day on April 22nd Arbor Day on April 30th, including a partnered volunteer event with the Parks Foundation and LifeCenter to plant 40 trees in Mt. Echo to honor Parks' 40th year as a Tree City USA community. Ms. Piller described plans to honor volunteers for volunteer appreciation month in April and acknowledged the Park Board's interest in reestablishing volunteer recognition at Board meetings. She explained volunteer events can be found at CincinnatiParks.com.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

There was discussion regarding the possibility for Parks to benefit from federal stimulus funding received by the City through the American Rescue Plan Act. Director Kish asked for direction on communicating with the Mayor's Office to speak to the value of an investment in Parks as the City is deliberating on best utilization of funds. She asked for Board feedback on engaging with the Mayor's office regarding available funding projects to be considered, and demonstrating support for projects that have an impact on park property.

President Lindner was supportive of contributing ideas for utilization of stimulus funding and informing the Mayor's Office of potential projects. He suggested prioritizing capital needs and new transformational projects.

Commissioner Castellini asked if the City knows the amount it will be receiving. Commissioner North answered, \$291 million. Ms. North referenced the possibility a portion must be committed in the first 12 months after receipt. The implications for project timelines as a result of these guidelines were discussed. Director Kish expressed the guidance is still unclear but Parks has been asked to provide ideas for projects that are not necessarily shovel ready, implying there could be an extended timeline, but presuming expense of funds in a timely manner. She cited the Infrastructure Study which could be used as a tool to determine potential projects for investment.

Commissioner North provided feedback to Director Kish on a one-page draft document highlighting ideas for a \$30 million investment in Parks. She suggested proposing priorities within the \$20 million suggested for capital needs, as well as clarifying the difference between funding priorities and additional ideas, and stating projects rather than problems. Director Kish noted this feedback. The "Spark the Parks" vision was discussed.

Vice President Goetz commented on the best approach for communicating funding priorities to the Mayor's Office. He recommended collaboration through meeting instead of just a formal letter.

Commissioner Thomas provided feedback on the one-page draft document, suggesting simplification and presenting the priorities within broader areas of focus, such as "rehabilitation" and "enhancement."

Director Kish discussed methods of initiating the conversation with the Mayor's office. President Lindner suggested sending a letter stating general areas of focus and stating Parks' ability to utilize the Infrastructure Study to identify specific funding opportunities, and express interest in a collaborative meeting as a next step.

Commissioner Castellini asked if a portion of the federal funding would be committed to the City's deficit. Commissioner North explained her understanding is about a \$20 million portion would. She expressed investing stimulus dollars in parks would be valuable to the community, but funding will still be competitive.

Vice President Goetz emphasized the need to move quickly and submit a full proposal for stimulating the parks as opposed to a “piecemeal” approach. Director Kish suggested sending an email correspondence to the Mayor’s Office with high level priorities, with reference to the Infrastructure Study, and a request to meet. President Lindner and Commissioner Thomas expressed the strength of having data to support the requests. Ms. Thomas reiterated the need to communicate the value of investing in Parks and to collaborate in a meeting with the Mayor’s Office, not just in writing. The community benefits of Parks receiving federal stimulus funding were discussed.

Vice President Goetz commented MEMI is interested in constructing a permanent stage on Lot 23 and requested drawings for those plans. Steve Schuckman confirmed he could provide those to the Board. Mr. Goetz explained a property in Mt. Adams adjacent to Tom Jones Commons is for sale and a group of citizens is interested in purchasing the space and donating to Parks. He explained staff have been in communication with the citizen group.

Mr. Goetz asked about the reopening plan for Krohn. Jenny Mobley explained Krohn will reopen with reservations for an extended Butterfly Show, May 8th through Labor Day. She explained staff are considering extended hours to maximize daily attendance while reducing capacity. Mr. Goetz asked the purpose of delaying the opening until May 8th and Ms. Mobley explained further preparation is needed for the Butterfly show installation and a Spring show is not currently installed in the exhibit space.

Commissioner Castellini commented on the positive and informative meeting. Director Kish expressed plans to continue to include informative staff presentations on the agenda.

Commissioner North suggested discussing the status of projects at an upcoming meeting, as well as having an overview of upcoming projects for consideration.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Castellini motioned to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 12:40 P.M.

ATTEST:

PRESIDENT

DIRECTOR



BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Kara S. Kish
Director

Jenny Mobley
Deputy Director

Crystal Courtney
Division Manager

Rocky Merz
Division Manager

Steven L. Schuckman
Division Manager

Craig Sherman
Division Manager

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Rocky Merz, Division Manager *KSK*

Subject: Dunore Dog Park Engagement Feedback & Next Steps

Background

At the January 21, 2021 regular Park Board meeting, as a follow-up to a community led presentation at the February 28, 2020 meeting, the Board asked staff to further engage with the community regarding installation of a dog park at Dunore Park. The engagement effort generated a significant amount of interest and feedback within the surrounding community. Throughout, staff sought to keep the process as transparent and inclusive as possible.

Engagement Efforts

Given the pandemic environment, an electronic survey was the primary, though not the only, means of collecting feedback. The survey was shared widely and open from February 12 through March 31. Specifically, it was distributed twice to an e-mail list of community stakeholders in the Clifton area including the surrounding community councils, anyone who had previously contacted Cincinnati Parks about the proposal and other civic groups such as BPAC and Preserve Burnet Woods. Physical signs were placed at the park with instructions on how to complete the survey. It was also shared on Nextdoor Clifton and the Cincinnati Parks website. These individuals and organizations were encouraged to share with their respective contact lists.

As always, individuals were invited to send feedback via e-mail to the cincy.parks@cincinnati-oh.gov account. All of these responses and survey results were compiled and sent to the Park Board, the various individuals and stakeholders and posted on the website and Nextdoor Clifton. Staff also met onsite with area residents, at their request, to hear feedback and answer questions.

950 Eden Park Drive
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone (513) 352-2604
Fax (513) 352-4096
www.cincinnatiiparks.com
#cincyparks

Results

These efforts produced a substantial amount of feedback and interest. Overall, 850 survey responses were received over the 6-week period from more than 25 zip codes, the vast majority of which were from the 45220 Clifton area. This generated 1,384 individual comments (Usage-523, Interest-449, Benefit-178, Concern-234). A total of 21 e-mails were also received during the survey period (Attachment B). We are not aware of any complaints from anyone wishing to express their feedback who was unable to do so.

For comparison, last year a very similar approach was used to collect feedback over several months about the closure of Burnet Woods Drive including a survey, stakeholder notification and signage at the park. This effort generated a total of 235 responses.

The results pointed to strong feelings both for and against constructing a dog park at Dunore Park. This split was demonstrated in the written comments as well as the response data with an overall 55% “for” / 45% “against” split. Further, those living close to the park were mostly opposed, while those living further away were most often supportive.

Additionally, on April 5 the Clifton Town Meeting (CTM) met and adopted a resolution acknowledging the survey results, opposing construction of a dog park at Dunore, expressing interest in a dog park serving Clifton and requesting Cincinnati Parks explore alternate dog park locations (not taking away existing greenspace) and work with CTM to gather feedback on potential sites (Attachment C).

Through these engagement efforts, we have also received correspondence from the Burnet Woods Advisory Council (opposing a dog park in Burnet) as well as the Mt. Storm/Dunore/Bowdle Park Advisory Council (sympathizing with those opposed to a Dunore dog park). (See Attached)

Next Steps

The feedback, comments and engagement to date have provided value in terms of better understanding where the surrounding community stands. Collectively, the data supports additional engagement to identify and further vet potential sites.

Staff would like to work with the community councils and park advisory councils serving this area to finalize a list of potential sites located within an existing park or at other viable locations. Parks would vet sites identified for technical viability (size, topography etc.). These organizations include:

- Clifton Town Meeting
- Corryville Community Council
- CUF Community Council (Clifton Heights, University Heights and Fairview)
- Burnet Woods Advisory Council (BPAC)
- Mt. Storm/Dunore/Bowdle Park Advisory Council

After an agreeable list of viable sites is determined, staff would conduct another round of engagement with the surrounding community to receive feedback on these locations. The goal would be to identify a site(s) suitable for a dog park in the surrounding Clifton area, both from a

technical as well as a community standpoint. After this round of community feedback, Staff will bring the results and findings to the Park Board for consideration.

Recommendations

Staff respectfully requests the Board allow Parks Staff to work with Clifton area community Councils and Park Advisory Councils to identify and gather additional community feedback about installing a dog park to serve the community. Once complete, staff will report the findings to the Park Board.

Attachment A—Dunore Dog Park Engagement Survey Results

Attachment B—Dunore Dog Park E-mail Feedback

Attachment C—Clifton Town Meeting April 5, 2021 Dog Park Resolution


Attachment D—Burnet Woods Advisory Council Resolution

Attachment E—Mt. Storm/Dunore/Bowdle Park Advisory Council E-mail

Dunore Park Feedback

Q1 Where do you live in relation to Dunore Park?

Answered: 850 Skipped: 1



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Within one block	26.59%	226
Less than a 10 minute walk	43.29%	368
More than a 10 minute walk	30.12%	256
TOTAL		850

Dunore Park Feedback

Q2 What is the zip code of your residence?

Answered: 839 Skipped: 12

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	45202	4/1/2021 8:04 AM
2	45220	3/31/2021 11:47 PM
3	45220	3/31/2021 11:30 PM
4	45220	3/31/2021 10:47 PM
5	45220	3/31/2021 10:30 PM
6	45220	3/31/2021 10:05 PM
7	45220	3/31/2021 9:37 PM
8	45232	3/31/2021 9:24 PM
9	45229	3/31/2021 9:17 PM
10	45220	3/31/2021 9:15 PM
11	45220	3/31/2021 8:27 PM
12	45220	3/31/2021 8:01 PM
13	45229	3/31/2021 4:23 PM
14	45220	3/31/2021 4:21 PM
15	45220	3/31/2021 4:10 PM
16	45220	3/31/2021 4:01 PM
17	45220	3/31/2021 3:24 PM
18	45220	3/31/2021 2:12 PM
19	45220	3/31/2021 1:43 PM
20	45223	3/31/2021 1:41 PM
21	45220	3/31/2021 12:08 PM
22	45219	3/31/2021 11:19 AM
23	45219	3/31/2021 10:16 AM
24	45220	3/31/2021 9:47 AM
25	45220	3/31/2021 9:31 AM
26	45241	3/31/2021 7:08 AM
27	45220	3/30/2021 7:29 PM
28	45220	3/30/2021 7:26 PM
29	45227	3/30/2021 7:25 PM
30	45220	3/30/2021 7:10 PM
31	45220	3/30/2021 5:25 PM
32	45220	3/30/2021 5:15 PM
33	45220	3/30/2021 4:17 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

34	45232	3/30/2021 3:20 PM
35	45220	3/30/2021 2:35 PM
36	45220	3/30/2021 1:52 PM
37	45220	3/30/2021 12:00 PM
38	45220	3/30/2021 11:33 AM
39	45220	3/30/2021 11:19 AM
40	45220	3/30/2021 11:16 AM
41	45317	3/30/2021 11:09 AM
42	45220	3/30/2021 10:37 AM
43	45220	3/30/2021 10:13 AM
44	45223	3/30/2021 9:58 AM
45	45220	3/30/2021 9:58 AM
46	45220	3/30/2021 9:55 AM
47	45220	3/30/2021 9:16 AM
48	45223	3/30/2021 7:48 AM
49	45223	3/30/2021 7:46 AM
50	45220	3/29/2021 9:37 PM
51	45220	3/29/2021 6:24 PM
52	45220	3/29/2021 4:47 PM
53	45220	3/29/2021 4:32 PM
54	45220	3/29/2021 4:30 PM
55	45220	3/29/2021 3:42 PM
56	45220	3/29/2021 3:41 PM
57	45220	3/29/2021 3:37 PM
58	45223	3/29/2021 2:32 PM
59	45223	3/29/2021 1:35 PM
60	45220	3/29/2021 1:32 PM
61	45220	3/29/2021 12:09 AM
62	45220	3/28/2021 11:52 PM
63	45220	3/28/2021 8:43 PM
64	45223	3/28/2021 8:09 PM
65	45223	3/28/2021 7:03 PM
66	45220	3/28/2021 5:44 PM
67	4522"	3/28/2021 3:22 PM
68	45220	3/28/2021 3:11 PM
69	45220	3/28/2021 12:43 PM
70	45220	3/28/2021 12:10 PM
71	45220	3/28/2021 11:46 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

72	45220	3/28/2021 10:45 AM
73	45220	3/28/2021 8:43 AM
74	45220	3/28/2021 7:25 AM
75	45220	3/27/2021 10:53 PM
76	45220	3/27/2021 10:49 PM
77	45220	3/27/2021 8:46 PM
78	45220	3/27/2021 8:12 PM
79	45223	3/27/2021 7:48 PM
80	45220	3/27/2021 7:43 PM
81	45220	3/27/2021 6:34 PM
82	45229	3/27/2021 4:05 PM
83	45219	3/27/2021 1:50 PM
84	45220	3/27/2021 1:39 PM
85	45220	3/27/2021 1:35 PM
86	45220	3/27/2021 1:15 PM
87	45220	3/27/2021 1:00 PM
88	45220	3/27/2021 12:45 PM
89	45220	3/27/2021 11:30 AM
90	45220	3/27/2021 9:52 AM
91	45219	3/27/2021 9:43 AM
92	45202	3/27/2021 9:29 AM
93	45219	3/27/2021 9:25 AM
94	45229	3/27/2021 9:25 AM
95	45220	3/27/2021 9:21 AM
96	45229	3/27/2021 7:16 AM
97	45220	3/26/2021 10:47 PM
98	45220	3/26/2021 10:33 PM
99	45220	3/26/2021 10:29 PM
100	45219	3/26/2021 10:20 PM
101	45238	3/26/2021 10:11 PM
102	45220	3/26/2021 10:02 PM
103	45220	3/26/2021 9:57 PM
104	45220	3/26/2021 9:57 PM
105	45213	3/26/2021 9:56 PM
106	45236	3/26/2021 9:54 PM
107	45202	3/26/2021 9:54 PM
108	45236	3/26/2021 9:53 PM
109	45219	3/26/2021 7:59 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

110	45220	3/26/2021 1:25 PM
111	45220	3/26/2021 11:34 AM
112	45220	3/26/2021 11:25 AM
113	45220	3/26/2021 9:20 AM
114	45220	3/26/2021 7:43 AM
115	45220	3/25/2021 8:22 PM
116	45220	3/25/2021 7:10 PM
117	45220	3/25/2021 6:46 PM
118	45220	3/25/2021 6:17 PM
119	45220	3/25/2021 5:46 PM
120	45220	3/25/2021 5:38 PM
121	45220	3/25/2021 5:04 PM
122	45220	3/25/2021 4:42 PM
123	45220	3/25/2021 2:43 PM
124	45220	3/25/2021 1:53 PM
125	45220	3/25/2021 1:13 PM
126	45220	3/25/2021 12:46 PM
127	45220	3/25/2021 12:27 PM
128	45238	3/25/2021 11:56 AM
129	45220	3/25/2021 11:53 AM
130	45220	3/25/2021 11:13 AM
131	45220	3/25/2021 11:13 AM
132	45220	3/25/2021 9:28 AM
133	45220	3/25/2021 8:07 AM
134	45220	3/25/2021 8:04 AM
135	45220	3/25/2021 7:58 AM
136	45229	3/25/2021 7:06 AM
137	45220	3/24/2021 10:47 PM
138	45220	3/24/2021 7:40 PM
139	45220	3/24/2021 7:36 PM
140	45220	3/24/2021 7:36 PM
141	45220	3/24/2021 1:59 PM
142	45223	3/23/2021 12:47 PM
143	45220	3/22/2021 5:00 PM
144	45220	3/22/2021 4:54 PM
145	45220	3/22/2021 12:48 PM
146	45220	3/22/2021 9:08 AM
147	45220	3/21/2021 12:36 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

148	45220	3/20/2021 5:25 PM
149	45220	3/20/2021 3:47 PM
150	45220	3/17/2021 6:14 PM
151	T45220	3/17/2021 12:51 PM
152	45220	3/17/2021 12:41 PM
153	45220	3/17/2021 9:02 AM
154	45220	3/16/2021 5:34 PM
155	45220	3/16/2021 10:48 AM
156	45225	3/16/2021 9:47 AM
157	41011	3/15/2021 5:50 PM
158	45213	3/15/2021 5:23 PM
159	45212	3/15/2021 4:48 PM
160	45220	3/15/2021 4:45 PM
161	45232	3/15/2021 4:34 PM
162	45219	3/15/2021 4:30 PM
163	45202	3/15/2021 4:24 PM
164	45202	3/15/2021 4:19 PM
165	45220	3/15/2021 4:15 PM
166	45220	3/15/2021 4:12 PM
167	45205	3/15/2021 3:56 PM
168	45223	3/15/2021 3:54 PM
169	45223	3/15/2021 3:53 PM
170	45220	3/15/2021 3:17 PM
171	45220	3/15/2021 1:58 PM
172	45220	3/15/2021 10:44 AM
173	45220	3/15/2021 9:43 AM
174	45220	3/15/2021 9:12 AM
175	45220-1430	3/14/2021 11:19 PM
176	45220	3/14/2021 7:48 AM
177	45220	3/14/2021 7:48 AM
178	45223	3/14/2021 12:49 AM
179	45220	3/14/2021 12:00 AM
180	45220	3/13/2021 6:50 PM
181	45220	3/13/2021 6:45 PM
182	45220	3/13/2021 6:09 PM
183	45220	3/13/2021 6:08 PM
184	45220	3/13/2021 5:24 PM
185	45220	3/13/2021 11:11 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

186	45220	3/13/2021 8:21 AM
187	45220	3/13/2021 12:37 AM
188	45220	3/12/2021 10:38 AM
189	45220	3/11/2021 2:29 PM
190	45220	3/10/2021 8:05 PM
191	45220	3/10/2021 6:40 PM
192	45220	3/10/2021 5:31 PM
193	45230	3/10/2021 2:10 PM
194	45220	3/10/2021 2:04 PM
195	45220	3/10/2021 1:41 PM
196	45224	3/10/2021 1:12 PM
197	45220	3/10/2021 12:52 PM
198	45220	3/10/2021 9:08 AM
199	45220	3/10/2021 8:53 AM
200	45220	3/9/2021 4:56 PM
201	45223	3/9/2021 4:15 PM
202	45220	3/9/2021 2:50 PM
203	45220	3/9/2021 1:28 PM
204	45220	3/9/2021 11:26 AM
205	45220	3/9/2021 6:41 AM
206	45220	3/8/2021 9:33 PM
207	45220	3/8/2021 6:46 PM
208	45220	3/8/2021 6:10 PM
209	45220	3/8/2021 5:15 PM
210	45220	3/8/2021 4:09 PM
211	45220	3/8/2021 4:02 PM
212	45220	3/8/2021 1:19 PM
213	45211	3/8/2021 12:58 PM
214	45220	3/8/2021 12:27 PM
215	45220	3/8/2021 11:55 AM
216	45220	3/8/2021 7:30 AM
217	45220	3/8/2021 3:11 AM
218	45220	3/7/2021 10:05 PM
219	45220	3/7/2021 9:15 PM
220	45220	3/7/2021 9:10 PM
221	45220	3/7/2021 8:42 PM
222	45220	3/7/2021 7:19 PM
223	45220	3/7/2021 7:08 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

224	45220	3/7/2021 6:47 PM
225	45220	3/7/2021 6:46 PM
226	45220	3/7/2021 6:41 PM
227	45220	3/7/2021 6:33 PM
228	45220	3/7/2021 5:32 PM
229	45220	3/7/2021 4:58 PM
230	45220	3/7/2021 4:50 PM
231	45220	3/7/2021 4:45 PM
232	45220	3/7/2021 3:20 PM
233	45220	3/7/2021 3:00 PM
234	45220	3/7/2021 2:51 PM
235	45220	3/7/2021 12:35 PM
236	45220	3/7/2021 12:33 PM
237	45229	3/7/2021 12:05 PM
238	45220	3/7/2021 11:51 AM
239	45220	3/7/2021 10:33 AM
240	45220	3/7/2021 8:20 AM
241	45220	3/7/2021 8:14 AM
242	45220	3/6/2021 8:22 PM
243	45220	3/6/2021 7:58 PM
244	45220	3/6/2021 7:17 PM
245	45220	3/6/2021 6:21 PM
246	45220	3/6/2021 5:49 PM
247	45220	3/6/2021 5:36 PM
248	45220	3/6/2021 5:30 PM
249	45220	3/6/2021 4:29 PM
250	45220	3/6/2021 4:27 PM
251	45220	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
252	45220	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
253	45220	3/6/2021 2:55 PM
254	45220	3/6/2021 2:53 PM
255	46220	3/6/2021 2:49 PM
256	45220	3/6/2021 2:30 PM
257	45220	3/6/2021 2:28 PM
258	45220	3/6/2021 2:23 PM
259	45220	3/6/2021 2:21 PM
260	45220	3/6/2021 2:17 PM
261	45220	3/6/2021 2:16 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

262	45220	3/6/2021 1:39 PM
263	45220	3/6/2021 1:31 PM
264	45220	3/6/2021 1:17 PM
265	45220	3/6/2021 12:32 PM
266	45220	3/6/2021 10:16 AM
267	45220	3/6/2021 10:13 AM
268	45220	3/6/2021 10:09 AM
269	55230	3/6/2021 9:56 AM
270	45220	3/5/2021 10:13 PM
271	45220	3/5/2021 6:36 PM
272	45220	3/5/2021 6:09 PM
273	45220	3/5/2021 5:35 PM
274	45220	3/5/2021 5:18 PM
275	45220	3/5/2021 4:57 PM
276	45220-1434	3/5/2021 2:10 PM
277	45220	3/5/2021 11:16 AM
278	45030	3/4/2021 11:16 PM
279	45220	3/4/2021 3:08 PM
280	45220	3/4/2021 2:54 PM
281	45220	3/4/2021 2:33 PM
282	45220	3/3/2021 6:30 PM
283	45220	3/3/2021 4:40 PM
284	45220	3/3/2021 8:53 AM
285	45220	3/3/2021 8:13 AM
286	45220	3/3/2021 7:52 AM
287	45220	3/2/2021 11:07 PM
288	45220	3/2/2021 8:09 PM
289	45220	3/2/2021 7:06 PM
290	45220	3/2/2021 5:59 PM
291	45220	3/2/2021 1:48 PM
292	45219	3/2/2021 1:34 PM
293	45220	3/2/2021 1:00 PM
294	45220	3/2/2021 12:05 PM
295	45232	3/2/2021 11:54 AM
296	45219	3/2/2021 11:43 AM
297	45223	3/2/2021 11:27 AM
298	45220	3/2/2021 11:21 AM
299	45220	3/2/2021 11:17 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

300	45219	3/2/2021 11:10 AM
301	45220	3/2/2021 11:08 AM
302	45220-1616	3/2/2021 11:02 AM
303	45220	3/2/2021 11:00 AM
304	45220	3/2/2021 10:55 AM
305	45220	3/2/2021 10:49 AM
306	45220	3/1/2021 9:46 PM
307	45220	3/1/2021 8:36 PM
308	45220	3/1/2021 4:32 PM
309	45251	3/1/2021 4:28 PM
310	45220	3/1/2021 4:26 PM
311	45227	3/1/2021 4:09 PM
312	45220	3/1/2021 2:39 PM
313	45220	2/28/2021 6:29 PM
314	45220	2/28/2021 2:30 PM
315	45220	2/28/2021 2:22 PM
316	45220	2/27/2021 9:30 PM
317	45220	2/27/2021 3:35 PM
318	45220	2/27/2021 2:58 PM
319	45220	2/25/2021 8:41 PM
320	45220	2/25/2021 8:37 PM
321	45220	2/25/2021 10:44 AM
322	45220	2/25/2021 9:32 AM
323	45220	2/24/2021 11:15 PM
324	45220	2/24/2021 6:06 PM
325	45220	2/24/2021 5:16 PM
326	45220	2/24/2021 5:02 PM
327	45220	2/24/2021 2:38 PM
328	45220	2/24/2021 2:26 PM
329	45212	2/24/2021 11:07 AM
330	45220	2/24/2021 11:02 AM
331	45220	2/24/2021 10:54 AM
332	45223	2/24/2021 10:09 AM
333	45213	2/24/2021 9:58 AM
334	45212	2/24/2021 9:08 AM
335	45220	2/24/2021 9:02 AM
336	45220	2/24/2021 8:49 AM
337	45220	2/24/2021 8:41 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

338	45220	2/24/2021 8:23 AM
339	45220	2/24/2021 8:03 AM
340	45220	2/24/2021 7:44 AM
341	45220	2/24/2021 7:42 AM
342	45208	2/23/2021 8:18 AM
343	45220	2/22/2021 12:48 PM
344	45219	2/22/2021 12:07 PM
345	45220	2/22/2021 8:25 AM
346	45220	2/21/2021 6:19 PM
347	45220	2/21/2021 5:33 PM
348	45220	2/21/2021 4:36 PM
349	45220	2/21/2021 3:21 PM
350	45220	2/21/2021 1:27 PM
351	45220	2/21/2021 12:51 PM
352	45218	2/21/2021 10:04 AM
353	45220	2/21/2021 9:23 AM
354	45219	2/20/2021 9:21 PM
355	45220	2/20/2021 7:14 PM
356	45220	2/20/2021 4:55 AM
357	45220	2/19/2021 8:41 PM
358	45220	2/19/2021 8:16 PM
359	45220	2/19/2021 7:55 PM
360	45220	2/19/2021 4:02 PM
361	45220	2/19/2021 3:35 PM
362	45220	2/19/2021 2:01 PM
363	45206	2/19/2021 1:16 PM
364	45202	2/19/2021 7:17 AM
365	45202	2/19/2021 7:15 AM
366	45223	2/18/2021 9:27 PM
367	45220	2/18/2021 7:02 PM
368	45220	2/18/2021 1:33 PM
369	45220	2/18/2021 7:37 AM
370	45220	2/18/2021 7:34 AM
371	45220	2/18/2021 12:45 AM
372	45220	2/18/2021 12:06 AM
373	45111	2/17/2021 8:57 PM
374	45220	2/17/2021 8:18 PM
375	45220	2/17/2021 6:08 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

376	45220	2/17/2021 6:06 PM
377	45220	2/17/2021 5:40 PM
378	45220	2/17/2021 4:53 PM
379	45220	2/17/2021 4:30 PM
380	45220	2/17/2021 3:40 PM
381	45220	2/17/2021 11:24 AM
382	45220	2/17/2021 11:09 AM
383	45220	2/17/2021 10:59 AM
384	45220	2/17/2021 9:33 AM
385	45220	2/17/2021 9:03 AM
386	45220	2/17/2021 8:15 AM
387	45220	2/17/2021 7:21 AM
388	45220	2/17/2021 7:15 AM
389	45220	2/17/2021 6:03 AM
390	45220	2/17/2021 4:09 AM
391	45211	2/17/2021 12:28 AM
392	45220	2/16/2021 11:54 PM
393	45220	2/16/2021 9:41 PM
394	45220	2/16/2021 9:36 PM
395	45220	2/16/2021 9:32 PM
396	45229	2/16/2021 9:22 PM
397	45220	2/16/2021 9:18 PM
398	45220	2/16/2021 7:42 PM
399	45220	2/16/2021 6:09 PM
400	45220	2/16/2021 5:55 PM
401	45220	2/16/2021 5:37 PM
402	45220	2/16/2021 5:36 PM
403	45219	2/16/2021 5:29 PM
404	45220	2/16/2021 4:47 PM
405	45220	2/16/2021 4:46 PM
406	45220	2/16/2021 4:12 PM
407	45220	2/16/2021 3:56 PM
408	45220	2/16/2021 3:49 PM
409	45220	2/16/2021 3:19 PM
410	425220	2/16/2021 3:17 PM
411	45220	2/16/2021 3:13 PM
412	45220	2/16/2021 3:01 PM
413	45204	2/16/2021 2:57 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

414	452:0	2/16/2021 2:50 PM
415	45220	2/16/2021 2:03 PM
416	45225	2/16/2021 1:59 PM
417	45220	2/16/2021 1:22 PM
418	45220	2/16/2021 12:51 PM
419	45220	2/16/2021 12:48 PM
420	45220	2/16/2021 12:08 PM
421	45220	2/16/2021 12:06 PM
422	45202	2/16/2021 11:04 AM
423	45220	2/16/2021 11:00 AM
424	45220	2/16/2021 10:58 AM
425	45220	2/16/2021 10:53 AM
426	45223	2/16/2021 10:35 AM
427	45220	2/16/2021 10:34 AM
428	45220	2/16/2021 10:33 AM
429	45220	2/16/2021 10:07 AM
430	45220	2/16/2021 10:01 AM
431	45220	2/16/2021 9:51 AM
432	45220	2/16/2021 9:51 AM
433	45220	2/16/2021 9:40 AM
434	45220	2/16/2021 9:35 AM
435	45217	2/16/2021 9:26 AM
436	45220	2/16/2021 9:09 AM
437	45220	2/16/2021 9:04 AM
438	45220	2/16/2021 8:54 AM
439	45220	2/16/2021 8:51 AM
440	45220	2/16/2021 8:47 AM
441	45220	2/16/2021 8:10 AM
442	45220	2/16/2021 8:07 AM
443	45205	2/16/2021 7:43 AM
444	45220	2/16/2021 5:45 AM
445	45220-1430	2/16/2021 4:52 AM
446	45231	2/16/2021 12:17 AM
447	45220	2/15/2021 11:32 PM
448	45220	2/15/2021 11:10 PM
449	45220	2/15/2021 11:05 PM
450	45220	2/15/2021 10:55 PM
451	45220	2/15/2021 10:46 PM

12 / 23

Dunore Park Feedback

452	45220	2/15/2021 10:44 PM
453	45220	2/15/2021 10:43 PM
454	45220	2/15/2021 10:37 PM
455	45220	2/15/2021 10:18 PM
456	45223	2/15/2021 10:08 PM
457	45220	2/15/2021 9:49 PM
458	45220	2/15/2021 9:45 PM
459	45220	2/15/2021 9:41 PM
460	45220	2/15/2021 9:25 PM
461	45220	2/15/2021 9:21 PM
462	45220	2/15/2021 9:18 PM
463	45220	2/15/2021 8:57 PM
464	45220	2/15/2021 8:42 PM
465	45220	2/15/2021 8:32 PM
466	45223	2/15/2021 8:24 PM
467	45220	2/15/2021 8:08 PM
468	45220	2/15/2021 7:59 PM
469	45223	2/15/2021 7:58 PM
470	45220	2/15/2021 7:51 PM
471	45220	2/15/2021 7:50 PM
472	45214	2/15/2021 7:49 PM
473	45220	2/15/2021 7:46 PM
474	45220	2/15/2021 7:41 PM
475	45220	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
476	45220	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
477	45220	2/15/2021 7:36 PM
478	45220	2/15/2021 7:29 PM
479	45220	2/15/2021 7:27 PM
480	45247	2/15/2021 7:24 PM
481	45220	2/15/2021 7:13 PM
482	45220	2/15/2021 7:06 PM
483	45220	2/15/2021 7:04 PM
484	45220	2/15/2021 7:03 PM
485	45219	2/15/2021 7:01 PM
486	45220	2/15/2021 7:01 PM
487	45220	2/15/2021 6:57 PM
488	45220	2/15/2021 6:55 PM
489	45220	2/15/2021 6:47 PM

13 / 23

Dunore Park Feedback

490	45220	2/15/2021 6:44 PM
491	45229	2/15/2021 6:34 PM
492	45220	2/15/2021 6:34 PM
493	45220	2/15/2021 6:34 PM
494	45220	2/15/2021 6:29 PM
495	45220	2/15/2021 6:29 PM
496	45220	2/15/2021 6:18 PM
497	45220	2/15/2021 6:17 PM
498	45220	2/15/2021 6:08 PM
499	45220	2/15/2021 6:05 PM
500	45220	2/15/2021 6:03 PM
501	45220	2/15/2021 6:01 PM
502	45220	2/15/2021 5:57 PM
503	45220	2/15/2021 5:50 PM
504	45220	2/15/2021 5:45 PM
505	45220	2/15/2021 5:45 PM
506	45220	2/15/2021 5:42 PM
507	45220	2/15/2021 5:42 PM
508	45220	2/15/2021 5:41 PM
509	45223	2/15/2021 5:39 PM
510	45220	2/15/2021 5:33 PM
511	45220	2/15/2021 5:32 PM
512	45220	2/15/2021 5:32 PM
513	45220	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
514	45220	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
515	45220	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
516	45220	2/15/2021 5:24 PM
517	45220	2/15/2021 5:22 PM
518	45220	2/15/2021 5:21 PM
519	45220	2/15/2021 5:21 PM
520	45220-1534	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
521	45220	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
522	45220	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
523	45220	2/15/2021 5:18 PM
524	45220	2/15/2021 5:15 PM
525	45220	2/15/2021 5:10 PM
526	45239	2/15/2021 4:57 PM
527	45238	2/15/2021 4:20 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

528	45220	2/15/2021 4:06 PM
529	45220	2/15/2021 2:43 PM
530	45215	2/15/2021 2:31 PM
531	45220	2/15/2021 2:31 PM
532	45220	2/15/2021 2:28 PM
533	45220	2/15/2021 2:27 PM
534	45202	2/15/2021 1:27 PM
535	45220	2/15/2021 12:54 PM
536	45223	2/15/2021 12:27 PM
537	45223	2/15/2021 12:11 PM
538	45214	2/15/2021 12:10 PM
539	45229	2/15/2021 12:00 PM
540	45220	2/15/2021 11:58 AM
541	45220	2/15/2021 11:55 AM
542	45220	2/15/2021 11:28 AM
543	45220	2/15/2021 11:04 AM
544	45223	2/15/2021 10:43 AM
545	45229	2/15/2021 10:30 AM
546	45220	2/15/2021 10:25 AM
547	45223	2/15/2021 10:18 AM
548	45223	2/15/2021 10:14 AM
549	45220	2/15/2021 10:08 AM
550	45220	2/15/2021 10:05 AM
551	45220	2/15/2021 9:34 AM
552	45223	2/15/2021 9:30 AM
553	45220-1616	2/15/2021 9:28 AM
554	45220	2/15/2021 9:21 AM
555	45220	2/15/2021 9:01 AM
556	45220	2/15/2021 8:57 AM
557	45223	2/15/2021 8:57 AM
558	45220	2/15/2021 8:31 AM
559	45223	2/15/2021 8:29 AM
560	45223	2/15/2021 8:28 AM
561	45223	2/15/2021 8:08 AM
562	45223	2/15/2021 7:41 AM
563	45220	2/15/2021 7:37 AM
564	45223	2/15/2021 7:12 AM
565	45223	2/15/2021 7:06 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

566	45223	2/15/2021 5:37 AM
567	45223	2/15/2021 5:11 AM
568	45220	2/15/2021 1:29 AM
569	45220	2/15/2021 12:53 AM
570	45220	2/15/2021 12:03 AM
571	45220	2/15/2021 12:01 AM
572	45220	2/14/2021 11:38 PM
573	45223	2/14/2021 11:38 PM
574	45220	2/14/2021 11:33 PM
575	45220	2/14/2021 11:24 PM
576	45223	2/14/2021 11:19 PM
577	45220	2/14/2021 11:08 PM
578	45223	2/14/2021 11:05 PM
579	45220	2/14/2021 11:03 PM
580	45220	2/14/2021 10:22 PM
581	45220	2/14/2021 9:40 PM
582	45223	2/14/2021 9:33 PM
583	45223	2/14/2021 9:30 PM
584	45223	2/14/2021 9:17 PM
585	45223	2/14/2021 8:59 PM
586	45223	2/14/2021 8:38 PM
587	45202	2/14/2021 8:00 PM
588	45220	2/14/2021 7:43 PM
589	45220	2/14/2021 7:27 PM
590	45220	2/14/2021 7:13 PM
591	45220	2/14/2021 6:42 PM
592	45223	2/14/2021 6:21 PM
593	45223	2/14/2021 6:17 PM
594	45220	2/14/2021 5:51 PM
595	45220	2/14/2021 5:47 PM
596	45220	2/14/2021 5:38 PM
597	45202	2/14/2021 5:01 PM
598	45220	2/14/2021 4:58 PM
599	45220	2/14/2021 4:55 PM
600	45220	2/14/2021 4:49 PM
601	45220-1526	2/14/2021 4:26 PM
602	45219	2/14/2021 4:01 PM
603	45220	2/14/2021 3:23 PM

16 / 23

Dunore Park Feedback

604	90048	2/14/2021 3:21 PM
605	45220	2/14/2021 2:42 PM
606	45220	2/14/2021 2:40 PM
607	46220	2/14/2021 2:37 PM
608	45223	2/14/2021 2:18 PM
609	45229	2/14/2021 2:01 PM
610	45220	2/14/2021 1:43 PM
611	45220	2/14/2021 1:42 PM
612	45220	2/14/2021 1:35 PM
613	45220	2/14/2021 1:08 PM
614	45223	2/14/2021 12:55 PM
615	45220	2/14/2021 12:55 PM
616	45220	2/14/2021 12:45 PM
617	45220	2/14/2021 12:35 PM
618	45223	2/14/2021 12:34 PM
619	45223	2/14/2021 12:29 PM
620	45223	2/14/2021 12:27 PM
621	45220	2/14/2021 12:27 PM
622	45220	2/14/2021 12:13 PM
623	45220	2/14/2021 12:03 PM
624	45220	2/14/2021 11:59 AM
625	45220	2/14/2021 11:57 AM
626	45220	2/14/2021 11:54 AM
627	45220	2/14/2021 11:52 AM
628	45220	2/14/2021 11:27 AM
629	45220	2/14/2021 11:25 AM
630	45220	2/14/2021 11:20 AM
631	45220	2/14/2021 11:05 AM
632	45220	2/14/2021 11:03 AM
633	45220	2/14/2021 10:50 AM
634	45220	2/14/2021 10:49 AM
635	45220	2/14/2021 10:45 AM
636	45223	2/14/2021 10:38 AM
637	45220	2/14/2021 10:30 AM
638	45220	2/14/2021 10:29 AM
639	45212	2/14/2021 10:18 AM
640	45223	2/14/2021 10:15 AM
641	45223	2/14/2021 10:13 AM

17 / 23

Dunore Park Feedback

642	45220	2/14/2021 9:50 AM
643	45220	2/14/2021 9:40 AM
644	45220	2/14/2021 9:04 AM
645	45220	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
646	45229	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
647	45220	2/14/2021 8:51 AM
648	45220	2/14/2021 8:47 AM
649	45220	2/14/2021 8:44 AM
650	45220	2/14/2021 8:33 AM
651	45220	2/14/2021 8:18 AM
652	45223	2/14/2021 8:05 AM
653	45223	2/14/2021 7:59 AM
654	45223	2/14/2021 7:58 AM
655	45220	2/14/2021 7:57 AM
656	45223	2/14/2021 7:55 AM
657	45220	2/14/2021 7:49 AM
658	45202	2/14/2021 7:35 AM
659	45220	2/14/2021 7:32 AM
660	45220	2/14/2021 7:18 AM
661	45220	2/14/2021 7:16 AM
662	45220	2/14/2021 7:12 AM
663	45220	2/14/2021 6:15 AM
664	45220	2/14/2021 6:06 AM
665	45220	2/14/2021 5:40 AM
666	45223	2/14/2021 5:13 AM
667	45220	2/14/2021 5:06 AM
668	45220	2/14/2021 5:04 AM
669	45220	2/14/2021 3:44 AM
670	45220	2/14/2021 3:33 AM
671	45220	2/14/2021 3:06 AM
672	45223	2/14/2021 3:05 AM
673	45220	2/14/2021 2:59 AM
674	45220	2/14/2021 2:36 AM
675	45220	2/14/2021 1:56 AM
676	45219	2/14/2021 1:50 AM
677	45220	2/14/2021 12:46 AM
678	45220	2/14/2021 12:35 AM
679	45220	2/14/2021 12:22 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

680	45220	2/13/2021 11:50 PM
681	45220	2/13/2021 11:44 PM
682	45220	2/13/2021 11:39 PM
683	45220	2/13/2021 11:12 PM
684	45220	2/13/2021 11:08 PM
685	45223	2/13/2021 11:05 PM
686	45223	2/13/2021 11:02 PM
687	45223	2/13/2021 11:00 PM
688	45220	2/13/2021 10:51 PM
689	45220	2/13/2021 10:45 PM
690	45220	2/13/2021 10:43 PM
691	45220	2/13/2021 10:30 PM
692	45220	2/13/2021 10:26 PM
693	45220	2/13/2021 10:24 PM
694	45220	2/13/2021 10:17 PM
695	45220	2/13/2021 10:17 PM
696	45220	2/13/2021 10:13 PM
697	45220	2/13/2021 10:10 PM
698	45220	2/13/2021 10:09 PM
699	45220	2/13/2021 10:04 PM
700	45220	2/13/2021 10:03 PM
701	45220	2/13/2021 10:03 PM
702	45220	2/13/2021 9:58 PM
703	45220	2/13/2021 9:57 PM
704	45220	2/13/2021 9:57 PM
705	45216	2/13/2021 9:56 PM
706	45220	2/13/2021 9:54 PM
707	45223	2/13/2021 9:52 PM
708	45220	2/13/2021 9:51 PM
709	45223	2/13/2021 9:28 PM
710	45220	2/13/2021 9:24 PM
711	45220	2/13/2021 9:14 PM
712	45220	2/13/2021 9:14 PM
713	45223	2/13/2021 9:09 PM
714	45220	2/13/2021 9:08 PM
715	45220	2/13/2021 9:05 PM
716	45220	2/13/2021 8:58 PM
717	45220	2/13/2021 8:57 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

718	45220	2/13/2021 8:53 PM
719	45220	2/13/2021 8:51 PM
720	45220	2/13/2021 8:44 PM
721	45220	2/13/2021 8:42 PM
722	45220	2/13/2021 8:42 PM
723	45220	2/13/2021 8:41 PM
724	45220	2/13/2021 8:40 PM
725	45220	2/13/2021 8:38 PM
726	45220	2/13/2021 8:36 PM
727	45238	2/13/2021 8:32 PM
728	45220	2/13/2021 8:31 PM
729	45220	2/13/2021 8:28 PM
730	45220	2/13/2021 8:20 PM
731	45220	2/13/2021 8:20 PM
732	45220	2/13/2021 8:19 PM
733	45220	2/13/2021 8:18 PM
734	45220	2/13/2021 8:18 PM
735	45220	2/13/2021 8:15 PM
736	45220	2/13/2021 8:14 PM
737	45220	2/13/2021 8:10 PM
738	45220	2/13/2021 8:10 PM
739	45220	2/13/2021 8:09 PM
740	45220	2/13/2021 8:08 PM
741	45220	2/13/2021 8:06 PM
742	45220	2/13/2021 8:04 PM
743	45220	2/13/2021 7:56 PM
744	45206	2/13/2021 7:54 PM
745	45220	2/13/2021 7:37 PM
746	45220	2/13/2021 7:35 PM
747	45220	2/13/2021 7:33 PM
748	45220	2/13/2021 6:50 PM
749	45220	2/13/2021 6:24 PM
750	45229	2/13/2021 6:12 PM
751	45220	2/13/2021 6:12 PM
752	45220	2/13/2021 5:55 PM
753	45220	2/13/2021 5:45 PM
754	45220	2/13/2021 5:44 PM
755	45219	2/13/2021 4:58 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

756	4522	2/13/2021 4:57 PM
757	45220	2/13/2021 4:07 PM
758	45220	2/13/2021 3:46 PM
759	45220	2/13/2021 3:45 PM
760	45220	2/13/2021 3:44 PM
761	45220	2/13/2021 3:43 PM
762	45220	2/13/2021 3:37 PM
763	45220	2/13/2021 3:37 PM
764	45219	2/13/2021 2:59 PM
765	45220	2/13/2021 2:54 PM
766	45220	2/13/2021 2:30 PM
767	45220	2/13/2021 2:29 PM
768	45220	2/13/2021 2:28 PM
769	45220	2/13/2021 2:11 PM
770	45225	2/13/2021 2:10 PM
771	45220	2/13/2021 1:55 PM
772	45220	2/13/2021 1:48 PM
773	45220	2/13/2021 1:35 PM
774	45220	2/13/2021 1:31 PM
775	45220	2/13/2021 1:24 PM
776	45220	2/13/2021 1:17 PM
777	45220	2/13/2021 1:11 PM
778	45206	2/13/2021 1:06 PM
779	45220	2/13/2021 12:58 PM
780	45220	2/13/2021 12:53 PM
781	45219	2/13/2021 12:45 PM
782	45220	2/13/2021 12:41 PM
783	45220	2/13/2021 12:28 PM
784	45220	2/13/2021 12:26 PM
785	45220	2/13/2021 12:11 PM
786	45220	2/13/2021 12:09 PM
787	45220	2/13/2021 12:02 PM
788	45220	2/13/2021 11:57 AM
789	45220	2/13/2021 11:56 AM
790	45220	2/13/2021 11:40 AM
791	45220	2/13/2021 11:18 AM
792	45220	2/13/2021 10:18 AM
793	45220	2/13/2021 9:48 AM

Dunore Park Feedback


794	45220	2/13/2021 9:30 AM
795	45220	2/13/2021 9:12 AM
796	45220	2/13/2021 8:52 AM
797	45220	2/13/2021 8:23 AM
798	45220	2/13/2021 8:20 AM
799	45220	2/13/2021 8:10 AM
800	45220	2/13/2021 7:35 AM
801	45220	2/13/2021 7:17 AM
802	45220	2/13/2021 5:38 AM
803	45220	2/13/2021 12:13 AM
804	45220	2/13/2021 12:12 AM
805	45220	2/12/2021 11:51 PM
806	45220	2/12/2021 10:56 PM
807	45220	2/12/2021 10:05 PM
808	45220	2/12/2021 10:01 PM
809	45220	2/12/2021 10:00 PM
810	45220	2/12/2021 9:50 PM
811	45220	2/12/2021 9:24 PM
812	45220	2/12/2021 9:22 PM
813	45220	2/12/2021 9:17 PM
814	45220	2/12/2021 9:11 PM
815	45220	2/12/2021 9:02 PM
816	45219	2/12/2021 8:45 PM
817	45220	2/12/2021 8:41 PM
818	45220	2/12/2021 8:22 PM
819	45220	2/12/2021 8:18 PM
820	45220	2/12/2021 7:54 PM
821	45232	2/12/2021 7:48 PM
822	45220	2/12/2021 7:03 PM
823	45220	2/12/2021 6:47 PM
824	45220	2/12/2021 6:44 PM
825	45220	2/12/2021 6:41 PM
826	45220	2/12/2021 6:39 PM
827	45220	2/12/2021 6:39 PM
828	45220	2/12/2021 6:37 PM
829	45220	2/12/2021 6:35 PM
830	45220	2/12/2021 6:25 PM
831	45220-1616	2/12/2021 6:20 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

832	45220	2/12/2021 6:04 PM
833	45220	2/12/2021 5:43 PM
834	45220	2/12/2021 5:23 PM
835	45220	2/12/2021 5:22 PM
836	41015	2/12/2021 5:20 PM
837	45220	2/12/2021 5:10 PM
838	45220	2/12/2021 5:02 PM
839	45231	2/1/2021 4:40 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

Q3 Would you use a dog park in Dunore Park?



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	46.45%	393
No	53.55%	453
TOTAL		846

#	LEAVE REASONING WHY HERE IF YOU SO CHOOSE.	DATE
1	There are no nearby dog parks and this park is very, very under-utilized	3/31/2021 11:30 PM
2	My dogs are walked frequently through the park on leash and I deem that good enough.	3/31/2021 10:47 PM
3	It is dangerous- dogs accidentally get let out, not on a leash and it is a heavy traffic area- not safe. Also there would prove to be lots more noise because of all the neighborhood dogs.	3/31/2021 10:30 PM
4	Prefer dog parks with adequate space for dogs to run. Dunore park is not sized properly for adequate off leash run.	3/31/2021 10:05 PM
5	It will be the closest one to me	3/31/2021 9:24 PM
6	Is great to have a place to let the dog off leash and run in a safe way.	3/31/2021 9:17 PM
7	I don't want my dogs around potentially aggressive dogs. I prefer the park as it is.	3/31/2021 9:15 PM
8	no dog	3/31/2021 4:23 PM
9	there are no dog parks nearby.	3/31/2021 1:41 PM
10	My dogs dit do well with other dogs	3/31/2021 11:19 AM
11	We're in the gas light district several days a week, and it would be very convenient.	3/31/2021 10:16 AM
12	Too busy a street	3/31/2021 9:47 AM
13	do not have a dog	3/31/2021 9:31 AM
14	NO! WE LIVE YARDS AWAY FROM THE PARK AND WE DO NOT WANT TO HEAR BARKING DOGS ALL DAY!! ABSOLUTELY NOT!	3/30/2021 7:26 PM
15	Spend a lot of time in that area and I feel it would disrupt the community	3/30/2021 7:25 PM
16	Dog lover who has always wished for a dog park in my neighborhood!	3/30/2021 7:10 PM
17	The next closest dog park is a long way away.	3/30/2021 5:25 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

18	If there were a dog park in Dunore Park, I would probably use it at least 4 times a week.	3/30/2021 5:15 PM
19	It's right down the street from me. My dog is not a fan of traffic. Great opportunity to meet neighbors.	3/30/2021 4:17 PM
20	We want to have an off-leash area for our dog to socialize, and for us to hang out with other dog owners.	3/30/2021 3:20 PM
21	I have a dog, but this is a TERRIBLE location because it will displace the uses that families and kids have now. Plus, is there a budget to keep it maintained?	3/30/2021 2:35 PM
22	The residents and citizens deserve a clean and enjoyable place. A dog park will not allow for this	3/30/2021 1:52 PM
23	Would love to have a dog park closer to home for my dog to go play at	3/30/2021 11:19 AM
24	Proximity to home	3/30/2021 11:16 AM
25	It would be great to have a safe space for dogs to get exercise close to home	3/30/2021 10:37 AM
26	I live in an apt and so don't have a fenced backyard. Having a place for my dog to run and play would be nice.	3/30/2021 10:13 AM
27	Within walking distance	3/30/2021 9:58 AM
28	Accessible, close, underutilized, perfect spot for a dog park!	3/30/2021 9:55 AM
29	I have a dog, and have always hoped there would be a dog park in Clifton, but do not feel that Dunore Park is the place for a dog park...Have Burnet Woods or Mt. Storm Park been considered for a dog park? There is much more area in both those parks for a separate area for a dog park. The Otto Amleger dog park has two areas for use that are rotated to maintain the grass etc. Dunore Park is not big enough for that, Dog behavior can be unpredictable, and the more space the better.	3/30/2021 9:16 AM
30	Because we desperately need a dog park in Clifton and northside	3/30/2021 7:46 AM
31	It would allow dogs to run free and socialize with other dogs.	3/29/2021 9:37 PM
32	There are no fenced off areas near me to let my pup roam free. I would also love to be able to socialize her with other neighborhood dogs	3/29/2021 4:30 PM
33	A walkable dog park would be amazing.	3/29/2021 3:41 PM
34	There are no walkable places to socialize our dogs, and having a designated dog-park is much safer than any other alternative to dog-socialization.	3/29/2021 3:37 PM
35	Dog parks are the only safe area to introduce dogs off leash as most trainers and animal behaviorist suggest	3/29/2021 2:32 PM
36	Uh, no dogs. But am a CAT lover. 🐱	3/29/2021 1:35 PM
37	WE DONT HAVE A DOG. For those who have a dog, you should use your own yard. If you don't have a yard, you shouldn't have a dog!	3/28/2021 11:52 PM
38	Closest dog park and favorite places to hang out in Gaslight district.	3/28/2021 8:09 PM
39	Close to northside !	3/28/2021 7:03 PM
40	I don't have a dog	3/28/2021 5:44 PM
41	It would be the closest one to my house	3/28/2021 3:22 PM
42	The park hosts families, discussion groups, meditators. It's an active park not well situated to be a dog park.	3/28/2021 3:11 PM
43	Not good for dogs really	3/28/2021 12:43 PM
44	For my dog to exercise and play offleash	3/28/2021 12:10 PM
45	I have a dog and have wanted a dog park near where I live for him to play and run around. My back yard is not very large and this dog park would give him more space to run.	3/28/2021 8:43 AM
46	The dog parks I've visited with my dog always seem to attract large dogs and it's unknown	3/28/2021 7:25 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

	whether dogs there have been properly vaccinated. With as many college students as there are in Clifton with little regard for the care of their dog (much less picking up after it), I can see this one as I've seen others, become a haven for dirty, smelly dogs. The beautiful park would become a fenced in mud pit and eye sore.	
47	It's going to be mayhem	3/27/2021 10:53 PM
48	Disease, dog fights, uncleanliness of both dogs and people it brings in. The park isn't kept clean to begin with.	3/27/2021 10:49 PM
49	If it were there, I would take my dog to the dog park.	3/27/2021 8:46 PM
50	My dog does not like fences.	3/27/2021 8:12 PM
51	I'm a dog trainer by profession. I know too much. Not a fan of them.	3/27/2021 7:48 PM
52	I have been going to Dunore park since I was a baby. Dunore is a wonderful place to climb trees and for kids to play on the playground or just walk around and peacefully enjoy. Adding a Dog park would be a hassle and it would go unused. I suggest finding a better place since Dunore already is being used for better things.	3/27/2021 7:43 PM
53	I never seem to get the time to drive to another area that has a dog park and it would be really great to have one in the neighborhoods that I can walk my dogs to.	3/27/2021 6:34 PM
54	No dog	3/27/2021 1:39 PM
55	There are no other convenient locations for taking my pets to a dog park. It would be much better than the people who already go and dont have their dogs on a leash; having a dog park here would provide a safe designated area for neighborhood dogs. Additionally, it is hard to find dog parks that have designated spaces for small dogs. If you would like a model, consider Louisville's dog run association. Being able to have a safe space for my dogs in my neighborhood would also offer a place to socialize with my neighbors and would result in significant satisfaction and ownership of our spaces.	3/27/2021 1:15 PM
56	Don't take my dog to dog parks	3/27/2021 12:45 PM
57	I would go with my friends who have dogs and hang out.	3/27/2021 11:30 AM
58	It works as a great family park and I'm we have a dog but do not want a dog park we want a family park	3/27/2021 9:52 AM
59	Friends and family that live near by with their dogs.	3/27/2021 9:29 AM
60	Don't have a dog.	3/27/2021 9:25 AM
61	We currently drive to Washington Park to take our dog to the dog park. I would love having one in our neighborhood.	3/26/2021 10:47 PM
62	I live close by.	3/26/2021 10:29 PM
63	Convenience for a place to let my dog run and socialize.	3/26/2021 10:20 PM
64	Before purchasing or house in Covedale we lived in the Ludlow area, and continue to visit often with our dog.	3/26/2021 10:11 PM
65	We have a dog	3/26/2021 9:57 PM
66	Meet friends with dogs etc	3/26/2021 9:57 PM
67	Great location	3/26/2021 9:56 PM
68	Friends in the area and beautiful place to go for walks with the dogs!	3/26/2021 9:54 PM
69	I live at Stetson Square and there are no fenced open spaces for my dog to run or play. Dunore would be the closest dog park and we would frequent it often; nearly daily without having to drive 10+ minutes each day. We could even walk to this dog park and my dog can run instead of staying in lease like he does at Burnett Woods. We go to the other local dog parks and like some of them, but it's such an inconvenience we can't go every day. Dunore would change my dogs quality of life and health significantly.	3/26/2021 7:59 PM
70	Dog	3/26/2021 11:34 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

71	I don't own a dog.	3/26/2021 11:25 AM
72	I think there are problems with putting a dog park so close to Ludlow. Even with a double gate, dogs can get out and they would be so close to a busy road which is not safe for them. I've also seen many dog parks turn into mud pits which isnt really helpful for anyone.	3/26/2021 9:20 AM
73	I have two dogs and have struggled to find one in the area.	3/26/2021 7:43 AM
74	The city needs more places where dogs can be off leash	3/25/2021 8:22 PM
75	I eat lunch and picnic there with family and pets ON LEASH.	3/25/2021 5:46 PM
76	I have a small dog, I walk him.	3/25/2021 5:04 PM
77	I probably would if it were built but I am not convinced that is the best location for a dog park in Clifton as I believe it will become a dusty, muddy, littered blight in what is a charming small island pocket park.	3/25/2021 4:42 PM
78	Residents nearby don't want it!	3/25/2021 2:43 PM
79	Close and convenient, love the area - plus, it would be a great opportunity for pets to play with their neighborhood friends.	3/25/2021 1:53 PM
80	My dog is terrified of big dogs	3/25/2021 12:46 PM
81	It would be the only dog park within walking distance of our house. This would be an awesome, close location to socialize with other dogs and meet new neighbors.	3/25/2021 12:27 PM
82	I wish I could - I would love to have a dog park located close to me.	3/25/2021 11:56 AM
83	I don't have a dog	3/25/2021 11:13 AM
84	No dog	3/25/2021 9:28 AM
85	I prefer to have a designated area for dog socialization rather than leashed walks in parks.	3/25/2021 8:07 AM
86	Dog parks provide the best environment for dog socialization and exercise.	3/25/2021 8:04 AM
87	It would be the closest dog park to my home	3/25/2021 7:06 AM
88	This should be left as a green space for everyone.	3/24/2021 10:47 PM
89	Yes, I have a dog and would love a close outlet for him to play safely.	3/24/2021 7:40 PM
90	We would love a place to let our dog run free so close to home.	3/24/2021 7:36 PM
91	I do no know the people and/or the dogs who would be using the park, their actions are unpredictable. I include my dogs in this as well. Therefore I would be uncomfortable allowing my dog to run off leash with other dogs.	3/24/2021 1:59 PM
92	The closest dog park to me is Washington Park and it is always busy. I would visit Dunore as a Northside resident because it is much closer.	3/23/2021 12:47 PM
93	Very close to my home.	3/22/2021 5:00 PM
94	I live very close and would walk my dog there.	3/22/2021 4:54 PM
95	Its near my place. I love this neighborhood, my neighbors and their dogs.	3/22/2021 12:48 PM
96	As sympathetic as I am to the desires of dog owners (and am one myself), I would find it inconsiderate as a public nuisance to those who live nearby. My neighbors living near Dunore Park, who use it for recreation (exercise, child play, quiet reading or meditation, etc.) would certainly be annoyed by incessant barking and litter. Experience in other City dog parks would lead one to expect deterioration of the ground, and the attendant public expense of cleaning, repairing and maintaining a facility which serves only dog owners.	3/22/2021 9:08 AM
97	Use the park daily. Every time we are at the park there are dogs and people. It would be great for the community. Not slot of houses close so perfect location. Traffic speeds down Ludlow. It's very dangerous walking dogs on sidewalks here.	3/21/2021 12:36 PM
98	We walk here to play with our kids and if there was a dog park, we would bring the dogs.	3/20/2021 5:25 PM
99	Not safe for small, gentle dogs	3/17/2021 12:51 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

100	Unsafe for gentle, small dog	3/17/2021 12:41 PM
101	It is an underutilized space and would be more vibrant and valuable to the community as a dog park.	3/17/2021 9:02 AM
102	There are no other dog parks in the area and there isn't much going on there anyway.	3/16/2021 9:47 AM
103	Friends who live nearby with dogs	3/15/2021 5:50 PM
104	I have many friends in the Clifton area who would join me	3/15/2021 4:48 PM
105	dont have a dog	3/15/2021 4:45 PM
106	My dog doesn't get along well with other dogs.	3/15/2021 4:34 PM
107	Close to my home, we enjoy going to different dog parks around the city.	3/15/2021 4:24 PM
108	It is a beautiful small park enjoyed by everyone on Clifton. The fencing nessessary to make a dog park would, in my opinion, ruin the natural beauty of the park.	3/15/2021 4:12 PM
109	There is easy access to the park, parking available and there is a large open space already available, my dog loves to run.	3/15/2021 3:56 PM
110	Wonderful way to have dogs socialize!	3/15/2021 1:58 PM
111	As a long time dog trainer walks are better for all involved. Dog parks are an excuse for owners to get out of walking. Too often they impose human sentiments believing the dogs "want" to run free. Dogs want to be with their families. A dog park is no replacement for a good long walk	3/15/2021 9:43 AM
112	Concerned about irresponsible people with dogs not suitable for socializing - health and temperament. Anticipate park will be a muddy, dirty mess.	3/15/2021 9:12 AM
113	Don't currently own a dog	3/14/2021 11:19 PM
114	We currently travel to Armletter or White Water Parks to allow our dog to run and interact with other dogs without a leash. It would be another neighborhood bonding stop for CLIFTON.	3/14/2021 7:48 AM
115	We currently have to go to Armleder to let our dog off leash. Unless we sneak and use the women's club, which I'm sure they do not appreciate. I think this would be a great way for neighborhood folks to interact.	3/14/2021 7:48 AM
116	People abandon dogs at dog parks; turf gets ruined; would like our neighborhood park to be enjoyed primarily by neighbors. And just walking by a peaceful green space is just one way to define "enjoyment."	3/14/2021 12:00 AM
117	We have a dog but I am worried about other dogs being aggressive with her and other owners not taking responsibility for their pets.	3/13/2021 6:50 PM
118	A small park here, perhaps using Washington Park as a model, perhaps a bit smaller would be perfect. A place for some off leash time and to gather with friends. I walk to Dunore with a dog about 4 times a week currently. I would go more if this option presented itself. I've noticed more personal and neighborly pedestrian and dog walking in 2020 and would welcome an amenity like this.	3/13/2021 6:45 PM
119	Give dogs exercise off -leash in a responsible way.	3/13/2021 6:09 PM
120	Our dog is older.	3/13/2021 11:11 AM
121	Prefer to walk my dogs	3/13/2021 8:21 AM
122	It will become an eyesore and I don't want dogs barking all the time that close to my home.	3/11/2021 2:29 PM
123	We have a dog who loves to socialize with other dogs, and wants to have a good space to run. The next nearest dog park is quite a ways away, and we would love a walkable option.	3/10/2021 8:05 PM
124	I have a dog and love dogs, but I am concerned about a dog park becoming a mud pit and that owners will not be responsible about cleaning up after their dogs. I am also worried about the smell as our home is on Dunore Road and about 150 yards from the proposed site.	3/10/2021 6:40 PM
125	Because I love dogs and my dog loves dogs. We want to hangout with all the Cincinnati dogs!	3/10/2021 2:10 PM
126	It would be the closest dog park to where I live. And it's right near where my children and	3/10/2021 1:12 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

	grandchildren live.	
127	Innapropriaye	3/10/2021 12:52 PM
128	Children safety and concern about cleanliness after poop	3/10/2021 9:08 AM
129	I do not have a dog, but even if I did, I would not use it.	3/10/2021 8:53 AM
130	Lovely little park for my toddlers.	3/9/2021 4:15 PM
131	No because I don't have dogs as pets. I am a dog lover though .	3/9/2021 2:50 PM
132	I don't have a dog- but if I did... I would definitely use it. I support this idea!	3/9/2021 11:26 AM
133	childrens playground is more important	3/8/2021 9:33 PM
134	It's too close to major traffic for dog safety and it'd eliminate necessary green space	3/8/2021 6:46 PM
135	I do not have a dog.	3/8/2021 6:10 PM
136	I have three dogs, and would occasionally like a closer dog park, but I don't believe this is a good location for a dog park.	3/8/2021 5:15 PM
137	I don't want a dog park near my home.	3/8/2021 4:09 PM
138	This is a very nice area with restaurants that i can get food from, and it would be great if i could take my dog to enjoy the trip as well!	3/8/2021 12:58 PM
139	I walk my dogs around the park daily and it would be a good way for them to get unrestricted interaction with other dogs.	3/8/2021 7:30 AM
140	We have a very social dog. Our family takes regular walks in the neighborhood and to the playground. It would be nice to have a space for him to socialize.	3/7/2021 10:05 PM
141	To allow my dog a larger area to run around and get some exercise	3/7/2021 9:15 PM
142	Respect to neighbors	3/7/2021 8:42 PM
143	It would be awesome to have a dog park in this area where so many people walk their dogs, mine included.	3/7/2021 7:08 PM
144	I don't trust that other people take appropriate precautions with their dogs, such as avoiding bringing aggressive dogs and behavior training.	3/7/2021 6:46 PM
145	Because I have a dog. And dog parks are amazing. It is a great use of space. I love animals.	3/7/2021 6:41 PM
146	Dogs don't need parks	3/7/2021 6:33 PM
147	Do not like dog parks because of aggressive dogs and non responsible dog owners	3/7/2021 5:32 PM
148	I would be very enthusiastic to have such a convenient place for our young and sociable dog to run and play with other dogs.	3/7/2021 4:58 PM
149	Too close to major traffic to feel safe	3/7/2021 4:50 PM
150	A) Don't want it B)My dog doesn't play well with others	3/7/2021 4:45 PM
151	I do not own a dog nor do I think that this is a good location for a fenced in dog park. Many dog owners in Clifton walk their dogs there but use a leash. Why ruin the location for the rest of the Community just so dogs can run off leash?	3/7/2021 3:20 PM
152	Too small - it would be like the Washington Park dog park which my dog found just puzzling because there wasn't room to run.	3/7/2021 12:35 PM
153	Closest to my home. Unless you put in a dog park at Seasongood Park or the Mitchell Triangle.	3/7/2021 12:05 PM
154	We don't have a dog.	3/7/2021 11:51 AM
155	This park is already nearly unusable due to the high speed traffic on Ludlow. The proximity of the park to the street feels unsafe and unsuitable for high volume use. This added to the lack of parking in the area makes it not a place I would like to see increase its traffic.	3/7/2021 10:33 AM
156	No dogs	3/7/2021 8:20 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

157	No dogs in household	3/7/2021 8:14 AM
158	I do have a dog.	3/6/2021 5:49 PM
159	Regularly go by Dunore on dog walks	3/6/2021 5:36 PM
160	Don't currently have a dog.	3/6/2021 5:30 PM
161	Destroys the natural beauty of a green space.	3/6/2021 4:27 PM
162	A dog park would not be an appropriate use of the 3 acre park. It would make the park unusable for anyone other than dog owners. This issue has been reviewed by the Park service previously confirming the answer which is no to a dog park!!!	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
163	I have small children who love the park to run and play, we don't have dogs. I am afraid of unsafe dogs near my kids.	3/6/2021 2:49 PM
164	I prefer to walk our dog on a leash	3/6/2021 2:28 PM
165	My daughter and her friends use the park almost daily.	3/6/2021 2:23 PM
166	I'm getting a dog and it would be a great place to meet, socialize, and build a stronger bond with the people in my community.	3/6/2021 2:21 PM
167	A dog park is a great neighborhood benefit and it's a convenient location for me to bring my new puppy.	3/6/2021 2:16 PM
168	Would love an off-leash area in Clifton	3/6/2021 1:39 PM
169	As someone who has had to drive to other parks along with other Clifton friends it would be wonderful to walk to a park in my neighborhood and spend time with my fellow dog lovers. It would be especially positive coming from the quarantine we have all suffered regarding neighborhood bonding. It would also be nice to have a place to sit with friends and not worry about the dogs and automobile traffic.	3/6/2021 1:31 PM
170	Because it is close to my house and neighbors with dogs and would be a great community builder.	3/6/2021 1:17 PM
171	I don't have a dog	3/6/2021 10:09 AM
172	In front of cemetery, not a good place.	3/6/2021 9:56 AM
173	I don't own a dog.	3/5/2021 10:13 PM
174	I don't have a dog	3/5/2021 6:36 PM
175	it will be loud and there will be traffic and constant barking.	3/5/2021 5:35 PM
176	I don't have a dog	3/5/2021 5:18 PM
177	Too close to a main street.	3/5/2021 11:16 AM
178	Traffic	3/4/2021 2:54 PM
179	Have family with dogs. But I have kids who use the park. Would want the kids to be able to still safely use it	3/3/2021 6:30 PM
180	I would love to go to Dunore Park with my dog. I would enjoy parking along the business district, doing some shopping, then heading off with my dog to the park.	3/3/2021 4:40 PM
181	We have 2 dogs and on the advice of the Cincinnati Police Department having a dog is one of the best security systems you can have for your home not to mention the love and companionship they provide. There are days when I'm just tired to give them the 2 mile walk they deserve. I often drive to various dog parks in the city and it's a great way for my dogs to play with other dogs and get the socialization and exercise they need. I also think dog people enjoy each other's company and this would give me the opportunity to become better acquainted with my neighbors.	3/3/2021 8:53 AM
182	All of the other dog parks are such a far drive.	3/3/2021 8:13 AM
183	My dogs would love more social time.	3/3/2021 7:52 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

184	Proximity	3/2/2021 11:07 PM
185	We have a dog who likes going to dog parks. It would be close and convenient so I'm sure we would use it if it ends up being there.	3/2/2021 7:06 PM
186	Planning to get a dog by summer, would love to have a dog park in walking distance!!	3/2/2021 5:59 PM
187	I love to socialize and be a part of the community and so do my dogs so we would definitely use the park.	3/2/2021 1:48 PM
188	There are no other dog parks or off leash areas within a reasonable distance from my home. I don't have private outdoor space	3/2/2021 1:00 PM
189	I have a dog and live within walking distance, so would enjoy a dog park.	3/2/2021 12:05 PM
190	I have to travel very far to find an off-leash park	3/2/2021 11:54 AM
191	I don't have a dog yet.	3/2/2021 11:21 AM
192	I do not own a dog.	3/2/2021 11:17 AM
193	It would be easy to walk to the park.	3/2/2021 11:10 AM
194	I don't have a dog.	3/2/2021 11:08 AM
195	I have an old dog that I would take to the park more often if there was one closer.	3/2/2021 11:00 AM
196	There is nowhere in Clifton that our dog can run around without a leash. It would be wonderful to have something close so we wouldn't have to drive to let our dog run around.	3/2/2021 10:55 AM
197	Having a dog park that is walkable to our home would be a wonderful asset and amenity to us as well as the rest of our dog friendly people in the neighborhood.	3/2/2021 10:49 AM
198	We live close and would like a dog park close by.	3/1/2021 9:46 PM
199	I visit my girlfriend and she lives a block away. We both have dogs and it would be amazing if we didn't have to drive 15-30 minutes away to go to a dog park.	3/1/2021 4:28 PM
200	I live right around the corner from it	3/1/2021 4:26 PM
201	Why would anyone put a dog park next to Clifton Ave? God forbid a dog gets loose and bolts into heavy traffic. You want that blood on your hands?	3/1/2021 4:09 PM
202	I would financially support and participate in expanding the park with more amenities for children.	2/28/2021 6:29 PM
203	We don't have a dog	2/28/2021 2:22 PM
204	Don't have dog	2/27/2021 2:58 PM
205	Dogs already go there and its too small for a dog park	2/25/2021 8:37 PM
206	The closest dog park is in Westwood we're down by Lunken and there are a lot of dogs in this neighborhood most of the people know each other and we have discussed having a needing a dog park in Clifton	2/25/2021 10:44 AM
207	Prefer to keep my dog safe from other dogs.	2/25/2021 9:32 AM
208	Dunore park is a small roadside greenspace, not suitable for a dog park.	2/24/2021 11:15 PM
209	Dog parks tend to be loud and dirty. I have two dogs and never take them to dog parks because research shows the vast majority of dogs do not like them	2/24/2021 5:16 PM
210	Don't have a dog. When I did, I used my own fenced yard or walked it. I have no use or need for a dog park and resent those that don't live within 5 houses of this park for wanting it in our backyard.	2/24/2021 2:38 PM
211	I prefer the open space without fences for everyone to run and play.	2/24/2021 2:26 PM
212	Better spot for dog park in bigger park area around the corner.	2/24/2021 10:54 AM
213	Would be the closest dog park to my house.	2/24/2021 10:09 AM
214	There are plenty of other parks I can take my dog to. I wouldn't want the beautiful park outside	2/24/2021 9:32 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

	of our community to have a fenced area.	
215	It would look awful. It is a nice green space and a fence would make it look not appealing.	2/24/2021 9:08 AM
216	I walk my dog, or arrange play dates.	2/24/2021 8:23 AM
217	Do not have a dog	2/24/2021 7:42 AM
218	It would be a great location, close without having to go downtown.	2/22/2021 12:07 PM
219	Want Dundee Park to remain the same	2/22/2021 8:25 AM
220	We walk our dog to this park daily because it is a great place to sniff and explore on the leash. There are no other dog parks in Clifton and this would be a nice addition to the neighborhood.	2/21/2021 6:19 PM
221	Our dog at this time, has a big back yard that we are fortunate to have.	2/21/2021 5:33 PM
222	It's wonderful to have a dog park in the area!	2/21/2021 4:36 PM
223	I think it would be great to have a dog park in the neighborhood. Driving out to Lunken or downtown to Fido, etc. is kind of a pain in comparison to having one located right in the neighborhood.	2/21/2021 3:21 PM
224	My dog has a fenced backyard that isn't large enough for him to run to his desire. I think having a dog park so close would be nice for him to run off leash and get some exercise.	2/21/2021 1:27 PM
225	As a dog owner, I feel dog parks are unsafe for myself and my pet. I was once bitten by a dog at a dog park in Cincinnati. The owner took off before I could get any information and I had to get a tetanus shot because it broke skin. You cannot guarantee that everyone who brings their dog to the park is a responsible pet owner and it is a huge liability.	2/21/2021 10:04 AM
226	I have to drive to every dog park. One closely would be great.	2/20/2021 7:14 PM
227	No dog	2/19/2021 7:55 PM
228	It's a maybe.	2/19/2021 4:02 PM
229	We live directly across the street from Dunore and have a pretty small backyard. We would love to bring our dog over to make friends and play!	2/19/2021 2:01 PM
230	Any where I can go and let my dog run would be nice. We live in a high rise so he is always on a leash and we have no back yard.	2/19/2021 1:16 PM
231	There's usually no one in the park when I bring my dog. He loves running around freely.	2/19/2021 7:17 AM
232	They are gross and muddy; or worse.	2/19/2021 7:15 AM
233	We do not have a dog. Also we have young kids and would like to keep the dogs away from that particular park since it is the closest park to our house.	2/18/2021 7:02 PM
234	We don't have a dog.	2/18/2021 1:33 PM
235	I don't have/know/want a dog.	2/18/2021 12:45 AM
236	It's a social opportunity for dog and owner.	2/17/2021 8:57 PM
237	I don't have a dog.	2/17/2021 8:18 PM
238	I take my dogs elsewhere and limit their interactions with other dogs.	2/17/2021 6:08 PM
239	I don't have a yard and it would be awesome to meet other dog owners and let my dog get exercise!	2/17/2021 6:06 PM
240	I would also use a dog park in Burnet Woods or Mt. Storm. Not sure why Dunore is the only park being proposed since Dunore dog park is fraught with conflict. Can we vote on an option of parks?	2/17/2021 4:30 PM
241	Convenience	2/17/2021 11:24 AM
242	So my dog can exercise off-leash	2/17/2021 7:21 AM
243	I don't have a dog.	2/17/2021 7:15 AM
244	I go to school in Clifton therefore I wouldn't mind bringing my dogs to the park. I'm not a fan of	2/17/2021 12:28 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

	the dog parks near where I live and I'm always looking to bring them to a new environment.	
245	I don't have a dog.	2/16/2021 9:41 PM
246	Don't want a dog park ruining the pretty green space of Dunore Park. The park further down Ludlow would be a much better choice for a dog park, if I wanted a dog park on Ludlow, which I don't.	2/16/2021 9:36 PM
247	In general not comfortable with having my dog mingle with other dogs.	2/16/2021 9:32 PM
248	I love taking my dog to the dog park at Otto Amleder but don't often because of the drive	2/16/2021 9:22 PM
249	Close to my house where my dog can play.	2/16/2021 6:09 PM
250	It's a very small area and Ludlow is a busy street. Also the choice should be up to the people that live right across from it. It could be very loud and people don't pick up the dog poop. I have 4 dogs.	2/16/2021 5:55 PM
251	The nearby residents don't want this.	2/16/2021 5:37 PM
252	I don't currently have a dog.	2/16/2021 5:36 PM
253	There are currently no dog parks within walking distance of our house. A 15 minute walk is a perfect primer for a great session at the dog park, and a 15 minute walk home is a great cool-down. This would be a welcomed amenity to a City park with an impact well beyond folks within a 10 minute walk.	2/16/2021 5:29 PM
254	I don't really care for the idea of dog parks, especially small ones: dogs are often engaged by other dogs in unwanted ways and people get less exercise because they're standing or sitting around rather than walking their pets. And Clifton is a beautiful neighborhood in which to walk one's dog... Bottom line: MORE walking, LESS parking.	2/16/2021 4:46 PM
255	not currently a dog owner	2/16/2021 4:12 PM
256	I don't like dogs.	2/16/2021 3:49 PM
257	No dog	2/16/2021 2:57 PM
258	Park that is not used a lot and space for dogs to run around would be nice	2/16/2021 2:50 PM
259	While I don't have a dog, I would if my apartment allowed, and I would love to visit a park where I know there will be dogs around. I don't currently visit Dunore Park, but I would if it were a dog park.	2/16/2021 2:03 PM
260	I live nearby in Camp Washington and I work in the gaslight district of Clifton. It would be a wonderful addition to the neighborhood.	2/16/2021 1:59 PM
261	I have a dog	2/16/2021 12:51 PM
262	I use that area several times a week to go for walks with my toddler and she loves to run around in that park. The open space is the only space we have to run within walking distance of our house	2/16/2021 12:48 PM
263	I walk my dogs on sidewalk and have a spacious fenced in yard. Dog parks are gross with lots of poop and mud. Plus, I do not support the Dunore location for a Dog Park.	2/16/2021 12:08 PM
264	use park for people	2/16/2021 12:06 PM
265	Depends on the dogs that are there. Hopefully they would all be friendly and socialized dogs. People would have to clean up after their dogs	2/16/2021 11:40 AM
266	it is better served as a park for humans not a place for dogs to do their business and owners to leave it there for all of us to smell .	2/16/2021 11:06 AM
267	Many people do not watch their dogs at the dog park. Many people bring dogs that are not licensed or vaccinated	2/16/2021 10:58 AM
268	We use the playground and there is no room for a dog park	2/16/2021 10:53 AM
269	It's close to where I live.	2/16/2021 10:35 AM
270	I have lived in my Ludlow Avenue home for 40 years. I have used Dunore Park playground with	2/16/2021 10:34 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

	my 3 sons and now with my 4 grandsons. I love that little park. Please do not destroy the trees. Please preserve the benches and tables as well as the playground. I love dogs but do not currently have one.	
271	I am on the fence. If "I don't really care" were an option, I would put that. I would DEFINITELY like to see planting of trees to replace those that keep getting removed.	2/16/2021 10:07 AM
272	I have a high energy golden retriever who would love a dog park.	2/16/2021 10:01 AM
273	We have a sweet dog who loves to play, and our backyard is not fully fenced, so a dog park would be a welcome addition to Clifton!	2/16/2021 9:51 AM
274	I do not have a dog.	2/16/2021 9:35 AM
275	It's close to where I live	2/16/2021 9:26 AM
276	While I don't live close to denote park- a fog park in this location would be a good idea given all the multi family dwellings in the area. Also- I think it would be easier to maintain there vs Burnet Woods and would keep BW more undeveloped for other wildlife. I probably would not use it bc of distance from my home.	2/16/2021 9:09 AM
277	My current dog doesn't enjoy dog parks, but my old dog loved them.	2/16/2021 9:04 AM
278	Nice to let our dog run full speed and socialize	2/16/2021 8:54 AM
279	I don't own a dog	2/16/2021 8:10 AM
280	Not easy access for me Close to busy Ludlow traffic	2/16/2021 5:45 AM
281	Have dog.	2/16/2021 4:52 AM
282	Do not own dog.	2/15/2021 11:32 PM
283	They asked us to take survey	2/15/2021 10:46 PM
284	My dogs are Clifton residents, too, and they deserve a place to stretch their legs and freely socialize.	2/15/2021 10:44 PM
285	We have 2 dogs and would love to have a dog park within walking distance to our home.	2/15/2021 10:37 PM
286	We have a yard, and our dogs are not a good fit with a dog park.	2/15/2021 10:18 PM
287	We share our dog with our in-laws so do not walk him often.	2/15/2021 9:49 PM
288	I would never take my dog to a dog park, you never know what type of dogs may be encountered.	2/15/2021 9:45 PM
289	Too far for me.	2/15/2021 9:25 PM
290	I have a dog.	2/15/2021 8:57 PM
291	too small. used by small children now.	2/15/2021 8:42 PM
292	I would use it if my dog liked it, got along with other dogs.	2/15/2021 8:32 PM
293	We use this park for large group games because it is the perfect size and shape for a game of tag football or soccer. There isn't another useful place for this in walking distance. It's just the right size. I wouldn't want a dog park to take away from it's usefulness for this kind of big gathering.	2/15/2021 8:24 PM
294	Dog parts are great! Dogs love them, dog owners love them!	2/15/2021 7:59 PM
295	No dog.	2/15/2021 7:51 PM
296	I currently don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 7:49 PM
297	We have two really big dogs and it might not be big enough. Plus we like walking our dogs.	2/15/2021 7:41 PM
298	I have a dog but I am not interested in being around other people's dogs.	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
299	I don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
300	Not a big enough space. Burnett woods seems like a better fit	2/15/2021 7:36 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

301	Dont have a dog	2/15/2021 7:29 PM
302	No dog.	2/15/2021 7:27 PM
303	I wouldn't feel my dog would be safe in such a small park. And no, we do not take her to the dog park in Washington Park because it's too small and the fences are too short.	2/15/2021 7:13 PM
304	I like to walk through our various pocket parks as well as Burnet Woods & Mt. Storm Let your dogs run in your yard plus take them for walks or visit various dog parks throughout the city. We all need more exercise.	2/15/2021 7:06 PM
305	This is a nice space for children to play. I would not want to see it mixed with dogs off leash.	2/15/2021 7:04 PM
306	My dog gets frightened of itchy dogs.	2/15/2021 7:03 PM
307	have a dog but do not like most dog parks.	2/15/2021 7:01 PM
308	A park provides an opportunity for dogs to meet other dogs.	2/15/2021 6:57 PM
309	I have 2 dogs.... would love a dog park in Clifton	2/15/2021 6:55 PM
310	I don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 6:47 PM
311	I don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 6:44 PM
312	Don't own a dog	2/15/2021 6:34 PM
313	Don't have a dog	2/15/2021 6:29 PM
314	I already frequently walk my dog to Dunore park. As a 50+lb dog, he needs to run and places to do so, without having to worry about traffic, are rare.	2/15/2021 6:18 PM
315	It is convenient to our house and we would be able to exercise our "grand dog" there when we care for him.	2/15/2021 6:17 PM
316	There are no other off-leash dog parks nearby. This is a great and necessary idea.	2/15/2021 6:08 PM
317	No dog.	2/15/2021 6:05 PM
318	The surrounding traffic will be an unsafe environment if any dogs get loose. It is not worth the risk, so I would not use this park with my dog.	2/15/2021 6:03 PM
319	I don't want to smell the wafting essence of urine & feces on the hot, humid summer nights. If you've ever been to a dog park, you know that there is always an 'off' smell, no matter how much people clean up the poop. The trash cans get full and start to percolate...	2/15/2021 6:01 PM
320	Don't own a dog.	2/15/2021 5:57 PM
321	Dunore Park has a higher rate of pedestrian traffic than dog traffic. Mt Storm Park has the acreage to secure an area for a dog park.	2/15/2021 5:50 PM
322	My dogs have died	2/15/2021 5:45 PM
323	No Dog	2/15/2021 5:45 PM
324	Be very good for the dogs to be off leash	2/15/2021 5:42 PM
325	Unhealthy interactions, dog is a poop eater	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
326	I am a bit concerned of the noise (dunore is right behind my house) but ultimately I think it would be a nice, easy place for dogs and people to socialize	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
327	I don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
328	There are so few places to take a dog in our area, i think a dog park would be well used. It would also create another space for community gathering. I've seen some dog parks charge an annual fee to get access to help maintain them, and I'd be willing to do that.	2/15/2021 5:24 PM
329	No other dog parks close to Clifton. Closest ones to Clifton are downtown, but not convenient when you have to drive and pay for parking.	2/15/2021 5:21 PM
330	Dog Parks create a climate for dog fights. Most people control their dogs but, a significant number don't. The police don't monitor the activity.	2/15/2021 5:21 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

331	I do not have a dog.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
332	The nearby residents are not supporting this initiative.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
333	Our little dog doesn't like other dogs; hasn't been acclimated to others in a free setting like a dog park.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
334	Just got a puppy. But when she's bigger it would be nice to have a place in walking distance to make friends!	2/15/2021 5:18 PM
335	No dogs at home.	2/15/2021 5:15 PM
336	Currently don't have a dog; if we do get one (something that we are considering in the next couple years) we would potentially use a dog park at Dunore	2/15/2021 5:10 PM
337	I don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 4:06 PM
338	Love dog parks	2/15/2021 2:31 PM
339	Don't own a dog and strongly oppose a dog park in Dunore!	2/15/2021 2:28 PM
340	No need	2/15/2021 2:27 PM
341	Close to where my family lives	2/15/2021 1:27 PM
342	Great space. Close to home	2/15/2021 12:54 PM
343	Don't have a dog	2/15/2021 12:11 PM
344	Not sure at this point since it's not that close to my house.	2/15/2021 12:10 PM
345	I do not know of any close by dog park....	2/15/2021 12:00 PM
346	It would be really nice to not have to drive to get to a dog park and our australian shepherd would get more chances to run.	2/15/2021 11:58 AM
347	Too many irresponsible dog owners use dog parks.	2/15/2021 11:55 AM
348	I don't have a dog	2/15/2021 11:28 AM
349	Very poor location choice . Dunore is the only green space in that area and children play there frequently. It is not a good location and the "proposers" know it because there was a big argument about it in "NextDoor " for weeks. The neighbors there already stated they don't want a dog park in their front yards and I totally empathize seeing the dog poop I frequently have to clean from my own front yard likely from the dog owners that now propose an open dog park in Dunore. Why not at the Clifton park in Ludlow. Perfect location and out of sight to the neighborhood. Why taking your dogs to people's front yards to do their thing is ok?. Dogs in Dunore can't even run. Is a small space and it will be totally unhealthy for nearby playing kids. Horrendous choice when there is already a park in Ludlow	2/15/2021 11:04 AM
350	I would. Our yard is very small without enough room for our dogs to get adequate exercise.	2/15/2021 10:43 AM
351	It's closer than others.	2/15/2021 10:30 AM
352	My dog does not get along well with other dogs	2/15/2021 10:14 AM
353	Don't have a dog!	2/15/2021 10:05 AM
354	But I have small dogs and fear it would be overrun with big dogs. Perhaps it could be something like even hours =dogs over 20lbs 2pm,4pm etc and odd hours dogs under 20 lbs 3pm,5pm etc	2/15/2021 9:34 AM
355	No dog parks in the area	2/15/2021 9:30 AM
356	Too far from business district.	2/15/2021 9:28 AM
357	Even though we have a dog, I would not want a dog park. I think a fenced in area would detract from its beauty.	2/15/2021 9:01 AM
358	No. I've seen too many bad things come from dog parks. Dog fights, parasite spread and owners that are less than responsible with their dogs. The only park I would consider going to would be one that has a membership. That way owner info and medical status of the dog are known going in as opposed to just taking your chances. I also am concerned about lack of	2/15/2021 8:57 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

	parking in this residential area and other things that come with a dog park- noise, garbage and poop.	
359	Not fair to the people who live along the park to add people, cars, and noise to their front yards.	2/15/2021 8:31 AM
360	I don't have a dog, but hopefully soon!	2/15/2021 8:28 AM
361	We walk out dog daily but she loves those moments she gets to run off leash	2/15/2021 8:08 AM
362	Seeking a safe and social place for my family and dog.	2/15/2021 7:06 AM
363	no dog	2/15/2021 5:37 AM
364	No dog.	2/15/2021 12:03 AM
365	I use the park. But I don't have a dog.	2/15/2021 12:01 AM
366	I don't like dog parks - people are often irresponsible with their dogs in them.	2/14/2021 11:38 PM
367	Close to where I live	2/14/2021 11:38 PM
368	It would be the closest park for our two dogs	2/14/2021 11:33 PM
369	Depends on size and whether dog park interferes with other use	2/14/2021 11:24 PM
370	Convenient, and as my kids get older, would allow for them to play nearby (on the play equipment or freely in the field space) while I let the dog run/play too. (Currently they are too young to be unsupervised.)	2/14/2021 11:03 PM
371	Prefer to walk my dogs,	2/14/2021 10:22 PM
372	We need a dog park in the area!	2/14/2021 9:30 PM
373	Maybe...but that wasn't an option. I'm always looking for safe , clean , places to exercise and socialize my pup.	2/14/2021 9:17 PM
374	On nice days, the walk would be great exercise for both of us!	2/14/2021 8:59 PM
375	No dog(s)	2/14/2021 8:38 PM
376	They are all different. Need to find out what makes the one cool...if it is.	2/14/2021 8:00 PM
377	It would be the closest dog park to Clifton	2/14/2021 7:27 PM
378	Nice to have a place close for dogs to be off leash	2/14/2021 7:13 PM
379	I don't believe in dog parks	2/14/2021 6:42 PM
380	I enjoy the activity of actually walking my dog. Also, I do not trust other people to adequately socialize their dog prior to using a dog park.	2/14/2021 6:21 PM
381	Currently no dog parks nearby and it would be great to have a safe place to walk and play with the dogs not on cement.	2/14/2021 6:17 PM
382	I live on Dunore road. I won't use the dog park. I walk my dog. Many owners let their aggressive dogs go and ruin it for everyone. A few don't clean up and it's a muddy mess usually. People promising to clean isn't the same as rules with \$ set aside to do it.	2/14/2021 5:47 PM
383	Older dog; attacked once by a dog not on leash while were walking on sidewalk; so she is scared of other dogs she doesn't know	2/14/2021 5:38 PM
384	No dog	2/14/2021 4:49 PM
385	No dog	2/14/2021 4:26 PM
386	No dog	2/14/2021 4:01 PM
387	Very close to my home and walkable whereas other dog parks are not.	2/14/2021 2:40 PM
388	We have a dog	2/14/2021 2:37 PM
389	It is closer than other dog parks.	2/14/2021 2:18 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

390	its close to north avondale	2/14/2021 2:01 PM
391	My dogs don't go to parks	2/14/2021 1:43 PM
392	I have a large lot in Clifton so my dogs are free to run around frequently. I fully support the use of Dunore for dogs who aren't so fortunate.	2/14/2021 1:08 PM
393	I would not use a dog park because they are unsanitary and lead to incidents between dogs.	2/14/2021 12:55 PM
394	For a dog park I would use the large one on Westwood Northern Blvd; any dog park in Dunore Park would either make most of the park unusable for area residents or would be too small	2/14/2021 12:45 PM
395	We live in Northside. I know our neighbours have tried to get a dog park in Northside to no avail, so currently we have to drive to Mt Airy or Washington Park to take our dog to an off leash dog park. It would be amazing to have one just up the hill and much closer.	2/14/2021 12:34 PM
396	I'd love to have a local dog park. And please know, if you build one, I'd be more inclined to shop up there, get coffee, grab ice cream with my kids, shop at the local store, get take-out.	2/14/2021 12:29 PM
397	Close to our home	2/14/2021 12:27 PM
398	Dangerous location because of traffic. Terrible for nearby residents. Disrespectful for the cemetery.	2/14/2021 12:27 PM
399	It's a perfect, narrow space for a fenced in dog park. Many Clifton residents have dogs. Great idea!	2/14/2021 12:13 PM
400	So many clifton residents have dogs and no outlet for socializing them. This park is rarely used and seems a great use of the park space.	2/14/2021 12:03 PM
401	Prefer walking my dog freely (with extendable leash) in open parks (Burnet Woods, all throughout Clifton) and without destroying the natural spaces of our community. I walk my dog thru Dunore multiple times EACH DAY and it works just fine "as is" for dog exercise and interacting with others. I suspect upkeep on a dog park would be a challenge -- it's already hard to have the one non-fixed trash can receptacle properly emptied and is now overflowing with dog bags.	2/14/2021 11:59 AM
402	There are no close dog parks. However, I would prefer a dog park in a location such as Burnet Woods over Dunore Park, because Dunore Park is right next to a busy road.	2/14/2021 11:27 AM
403	Don't own a dog.	2/14/2021 11:25 AM
404	I would like that option for my dogs.	2/14/2021 11:05 AM
405	There are no off-leash parks anywhere near Clifton!	2/14/2021 11:03 AM
406	or my many friends who have dogs.	2/14/2021 10:49 AM
407	Because we have no legal spot in our neighborhood to allow our dogs to roam.	2/14/2021 10:30 AM
408	We walk our dog daily. Although we live a nearly 2 miles from this park, we would use it often.	2/14/2021 10:29 AM
409	It would be a great alternative to Armleder dog park, which is farther away from me.	2/14/2021 10:18 AM
410	Would be very close to home, and our dog loves dog parks!	2/14/2021 10:15 AM
411	Too small.	2/14/2021 10:13 AM
412	I have dogs, but one is too old. In general, my dog trainer thinks dog parks (especially small ones and it gout a lot of room to run and spread out) aren't great for larger dogs, like mine.	2/14/2021 9:50 AM
413	Because the nearby residents don't support it. I think there's large grassy areas of Burnet Woods that would be idea.	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
414	More off lease opportunities for my 4 dogs.	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
415	Distance	2/14/2021 8:47 AM
416	Too small. Too many dog fights are likely to ensue because of a lack of room to keep them apart	2/14/2021 8:44 AM
417	People can't be trusted to properly train their dogs. I won't take the chance my dogs won't be attacked.	2/14/2021 8:18 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

418	would be the closest one besides mt airy	2/14/2021 8:05 AM
419	This location is much closer to my home than the park we currently visit.	2/14/2021 7:59 AM
420	It's much closer than anything else in the area	2/14/2021 7:58 AM
421	Our dog can then run freely off the leash.	2/14/2021 7:57 AM
422	This would be a quick trip to get to the park. This would enclosed So no chance of dog's getting out	2/14/2021 7:35 AM
423	I don't have a dog	2/14/2021 6:15 AM
424	Ample space (if fenced area is big enough to accommodate the number of dogs I'd anticipate will use it). Close proximity.	2/14/2021 5:40 AM
425	Not all users of dog parks keep their dog under control. I will not put my dog in danger.	2/14/2021 5:04 AM
426	There are so many apartment dwellers with pet dogs in Clifton that do not have yards. We need a proper place to let the dogs off leash! I Walk by this park regularly and I feel there is plenty of room to have a playground for the children and events and dog park.	2/14/2021 3:33 AM
427	I don't have any dogs	2/14/2021 3:06 AM
428	I would love to walk to a safe place to let me dog run and chat with neighbors.	2/14/2021 2:59 AM
429	My day revolves around getting my pup enough activity. As it stands, the closest dog park is fifteen minutes away. We would be at a closer dog park OFTEN.	2/14/2021 2:36 AM
430	It would be the only dog park in my neighborhood.	2/14/2021 1:56 AM
431	I have a dog and this would be, by far, the closest dog park. I would love to be able to walk my dog to a dog park, which I'll be able to do here. This location will allow me to meet other dog owners in the area to arrange dog play dates and such. I also love the location in regards to other events, so I could take a dog to the dog park before an event and he could attend without acting like a crazy maniac!	2/14/2021 1:50 AM
432	So close and it would be fun!	2/14/2021 12:35 AM
433	Dunore Park is not the place for a dedicated dog park.	2/14/2021 12:22 AM
434	A dog park is not necessary at Dunore Park.	2/13/2021 11:50 PM
435	No longer a dog owner	2/13/2021 11:44 PM
436	I have no dog.	2/13/2021 11:39 PM
437	Would be closest fenced dog park to northside	2/13/2021 11:05 PM
438	I don't have a dog!	2/13/2021 11:02 PM
439	I have no dog	2/13/2021 10:45 PM
440	I would if I have a dog again !	2/13/2021 10:43 PM
441	Not big enough to support enough space for meaningful play between dogs	2/13/2021 10:17 PM
442	We don't have a dog.	2/13/2021 10:17 PM
443	I have a small dog and don't trust other dogs off leash.	2/13/2021 10:13 PM
444	Dog parks are prone to disease and dangerous when most do not understand K9 behavior	2/13/2021 10:04 PM
445	Close by. Can walk there. We take my granddaughter there for the play ground and it would be awesome to have a dog park also for the dog	2/13/2021 9:57 PM
446	It would be the only dog park within walking distance	2/13/2021 9:52 PM
447	I would prefer a dog park in burnet Woods. This park is for kids.	2/13/2021 9:51 PM
448	I live in Northside and have two dogs. This would be a perfect location for me to walk my dogs to or a short drive so they could play and socialize.	2/13/2021 9:28 PM
449	My dog is too old for a dog park	2/13/2021 9:14 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

450	It's a short drive from my house in Northside and I'm frequently in Clifton.	2/13/2021 9:09 PM
451	I own a dog.	2/13/2021 8:58 PM
452	I don't have a dog.	2/13/2021 8:57 PM
453	Good place for dogs.	2/13/2021 8:53 PM
454	My dog doesn't like dog parks	2/13/2021 8:51 PM
455	No dog	2/13/2021 8:41 PM
456	No dog	2/13/2021 8:38 PM
457	No dog at this time	2/13/2021 8:36 PM
458	Don't have a dog	2/13/2021 8:32 PM
459	I don't have a dog. But especially if it's a dog park, I will avoid it. On the otherhand I'm not opposed to it.	2/13/2021 8:31 PM
460	But I'd rather see ones at 1) my storm and 2)Burnett woods.	2/13/2021 8:28 PM
461	It's so small, there's no way there is enough room for more than 2 or 3 dogs to play safely.	2/13/2021 8:20 PM
462	We have a fenced in backyard and an old dog, but would use it if we had a younger dog	2/13/2021 8:18 PM
463	I don't have a dog- but if I did I would!	2/13/2021 8:18 PM
464	I don't have a dog.	2/13/2021 8:14 PM
465	My dogs don't like other dogs. I would probably use it if I had a friendlier dog.	2/13/2021 8:10 PM
466	It's within walking distance and I wouldn't have to drive elsewhere!	2/13/2021 8:10 PM
467	I don't have a dog and I'm allergic to dogs. Would be less likely to visit the park with my son if there were a dog park there.	2/13/2021 8:06 PM
468	While I don't have a dog this park is perfectly suited to include a dog park. It would be a good amenity for Clifton and not take up useful space in other parks like burnet Woods or Mount storm.	2/13/2021 8:04 PM
469	I lived for years at 801 Dunore Road, 45220, and took my children and grandchildren to that park frequently. It is too small for a dog park but us used by families. PLEASE do not add a dog park. Once they are on the car, they can e as I'll go to big dog parks. Thank you.	2/13/2021 7:54 PM
470	No, it would need too much unattractive infrastructure.	2/13/2021 7:35 PM
471	I do not take my dogs to dog parks.	2/13/2021 7:33 PM
472	I'd like part of it to be for small dogs only.	2/13/2021 5:55 PM
473	I disagree with the concept. It's too close to Ludlow for safety and noise issues(frequent sirens & in the spring, summer, fall even more frequent motorcycles)for the dogs. That area is a travel route for deer. Additionally, that park is an urban green space. There's more to it than a children's playground. Families play football there, frisbee, have picnics, read books, walk in the leaves and the grass. There are AT LEAST a dozen designated dog parks in the Cincinnati area; why must we destroy a small jewel of nature for a handful of people who don't want to drive to an already established dog park. I won't use it and will think long and hard before voting for any future park levies.	2/13/2021 5:45 PM
474	No dog but like dog parks as a neighborhood asset	2/13/2021 4:58 PM
475	I don't have a dog.	2/13/2021 4:07 PM
476	I have a dog, but don't want one there	2/13/2021 3:46 PM
477	We don't have a dog. And we've seen the dog parks around the city - erosion issues, noisy, eyesore at best. I also do not think Dunore Park is the best location - do w real siting study to find the best option. Why not Spring Grove along the Mill Creek park? Or where the credit union was along Central Parkway?	2/13/2021 3:45 PM

Dunore Park Feedback


478	No dog; have 2 small children who are afraid of dogs.	2/13/2021 3:44 PM
479	No other dog parks nearby	2/13/2021 3:43 PM
480	Would be able to walk to dog park which is very desirable for most dog owners!	2/13/2021 2:11 PM
481	It would be close. Hopefully it would have a small dog area.	2/13/2021 2:10 PM
482	Close to home.	2/13/2021 1:55 PM
483	It is a great way to socialize my dog, and meet other dog lovers.	2/13/2021 1:48 PM
484	It would be great for the neighborhood and community to have a dog park in Clifton.	2/13/2021 1:35 PM
485	My dog is a pit mix and if someone's designer dog started a fight, my dog would kill it	2/13/2021 1:31 PM
486	It would be a great place to take our dog to run around off leash. Other dog parks are too far away to walk, which makes it more of an event rather than a quick trip. Dunore seems largely underutilized currently, but it is in a fairly central location in Clifton.	2/13/2021 1:17 PM
487	No dog	2/13/2021 1:06 PM
488	Do not currently have dog. Had small dog and found dog parks /dogs and owners/ very uncomfortable	2/13/2021 12:58 PM
489	A dog park would be a great asset to Clifton. There isn't one within walking distance of this large neighborhood with lots of dogs. I know many of my neighbors have also wanted a dog park in the area of years.	2/13/2021 12:53 PM
490	I don't own a dog	2/13/2021 12:45 PM
491	I am currently driving 20-25 minutes to give my dogs the free running exercise they need. How wonderful it would be to walk to a dog park! Think if the fossil fuel savings. ☺	2/13/2021 12:02 PM
492	I have a dog. This dog park would be closer to where I live.	2/13/2021 11:57 AM
493	I have three dogs and would love to get them more playtime and socialization. In addition, it would be a good way to meet my neighbors.	2/13/2021 11:40 AM
494	We do not own any dogs	2/13/2021 11:18 AM
495	Do not have a dog	2/13/2021 10:36 AM
496	I am frequently at Dunore Park playing at the playground and the surrounding green space with my son. We meet neighbors there, explore the trees, enjoy the space. During the summer months we are there 3-4 times a week. During winter less so but we continue to use the space. A dog park would irrevocably alter the space.	2/13/2021 10:18 AM
497	This park is the only nearby outdoor play space for MANY children. Dogs already visit the park with owners and have plenty of room to run and play. The fact that there is no fenced area forces owners to properly supervise their dogs.	2/13/2021 9:48 AM
498	I have a dog and dog parks are breeding grounds for parasites and they smell bad. Too many dogs barking is annoying.	2/13/2021 8:52 AM
499	Having a dog, I would always choose to walk the dog on the street or enjoy a stroll at Burnet Woods, Mt Storm, and the greenspace at Dunore. This is what we have done for a number of years.	2/13/2021 7:17 AM
500	Don't use dog parks	2/13/2021 5:38 AM
501	Using the playground now	2/12/2021 11:51 PM
502	I have a dog and it would be convenient.	2/12/2021 10:56 PM
503	This would be great for my family and our dog. Otherwise we have to drive to a dog park.	2/12/2021 10:05 PM
504	Dog parks build community	2/12/2021 10:01 PM
505	It's within walking distance and I would use it nearly everyday.	2/12/2021 9:50 PM
506	Nuisance to neighborhood	2/12/2021 9:24 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

507	Dirty, disease filled places. Scar on the neighborhood and poor use of Park funds.	2/12/2021 9:11 PM
508	no dog	2/12/2021 9:02 PM
509	A dog park would be an absolute misuse of space and an eyesore to those driving/walking around Ludlow/Old Ludlow. There are so many beautiful routes to walk around the Gaslight with a pet. There's no need to sully a great Clifton park for the whims of dog owners who aren't willing to walk with their dogs.	2/12/2021 8:41 PM
510	We use the park to run play and explore. My child is afraid of dogs and will have to pass many dogs to get to her bus stop. The park is I'll sized for a dog park. There are 20 kids in the immediate surrounding area, for which space to play ball is much more needed than a dog park.	2/12/2021 8:22 PM
511	I live across the street from Dunore Park and have a dog. I would not use a dog park as I feel it would endanger my child, 15 months, from using the playground and my dog , 10, due to undisciplined dogs and owners	2/12/2021 8:18 PM
512	Too close to a busy street	2/12/2021 7:54 PM
513	This would be an excellent place for a dog park with safe, good parking options	2/12/2021 7:48 PM
514	The nearby residents don't want this to be a dog park. There are other Parks properties that are better suited and that would not Impact homeowners.	2/12/2021 7:03 PM
515	I have two dogs and have to drive to get to any dog park, this would be convenient and a good addition to Clifton.	2/12/2021 6:47 PM
516	A dog park would have a significant impact on the neighbors of Dunore, as well as the change the dynamic of the park. I think this is a not a good idea and those pushing this agenda have repeatedly ignored the feedback from the people who live in the area.	2/12/2021 6:35 PM
517	Constructing a dog park in Clifton (Dunore or other location like Mt. Storm) shows that we are a neighborhood on the move. Clifton is a neighborhood of active people - runners and dog walkers. Having a space where dogs can be off leash allows our community to get closer to one another.	2/12/2021 6:25 PM
518	I loved the community building that occurred when the pop up puppy party was at Ludlow Plaza across from Graeter's. And since the Westwood dog park opened I have been going there. I wish we had similar in Clifton.	2/12/2021 6:04 PM
519	Yes, if it's kept clean, well managed, has water, and isn't too crowded.	2/12/2021 5:48 PM
520	It's walkable, manageable and in a great, visible location to be a community asset. Would be used by a lot of people while not distracting from the character or function of the park or play equipment but can actually enhance it.	2/12/2021 5:43 PM
521	My yard is impossible to fence in so a local dog park would be great. I take mine to Washington Park now.	2/12/2021 5:23 PM
522	Would provide a safe place for dogs to exercise in the urban setting of Clifton.	2/12/2021 5:22 PM
523	My cat would be scared there with all those dogs around.	2/1/2021 4:40 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

Q4 I would describe my interest in constructing a dog park at Dunore Park as:



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly support	41.65%	354
Somewhat support	10.12%	86
Have not yet formed an opinion	5.18%	44
Somewhat disagree	5.76%	49
Strongly disagree	37.29%	317
TOTAL		850

#	LEAVE REASONING WHY HERE IF YOU SO CHOOSE.	DATE
1	Dirty, smelly, won't be maintained, will bring unwanted additional traffic to neighborhood and will increase congestion on Ludlow.	3/31/2021 11:47 PM
2	As a resident of the neighborhood I want to support our dog owners and make this an even more desirable place to live	3/31/2021 11:30 PM
3	Makes park inaccessible or useable for non dog owners including children who live in the neighborhood. There is no clear proposal for keeping dog park clean and it will result in mud everywhere.	3/31/2021 10:47 PM
4	It is not safe for the dogs with the high traffic. It would also be very noisy with lots of barking from dogs close to the park. This also would take away a play area for young adults.	3/31/2021 10:30 PM
5	Unless substantially funded and robustly maintained (e.g. Washington park) a dog park will be an eyesore to the neighborhood green space along one of the most prominent boulevards in Clifton. The park is not large enough to support rotating fields, which means the only viable solution results in installation of an artificial turf surface. A chain link or (more expensive) aluminum rail fence will be obtrusive to the park and the user experience. Dunore park is located within a distinctly residential neighborhood, largely zoned SF-6 in the immediate	3/31/2021 10:05 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

	surroundings. The noise and vehicular and pedestrian congestion will negatively impact the surrounding property owners. The site is not conducive to traffic access, parking, or increased circulation. City-wide attractions do not belong in the middle of residential neighborhoods.	
6	I would love to have a dog park closer to my house	3/31/2021 9:24 PM
7	I like the open space of the park. The dog park would take over the space and make it a less friendly space for people who are wary of being around dogs	3/31/2021 9:15 PM
8	Not a good location - too many people would be coming into the residential area.	3/31/2021 4:23 PM
9	It would ruin the park and be an offense to the Jewish Cemetery.	3/31/2021 4:21 PM
10	Too close to Ludlow road. Way too many cars use the road as a thorough fare at speeds above the posted speed limit. It would be a safety concern even with a fence. The park is too small to section off an area. Already limited green space for the general neighborhood. A dog park is too specialized towards one population. Dogs are already allowed at the park	3/31/2021 4:01 PM
11	I can see pros and cons	3/31/2021 11:19 AM
12	Park too small for multiple uses and a dog park	3/31/2021 9:47 AM
13	This is a bad idea. Cars speed up and down Ludlow Avenue daily. The smell coming into my house/homes would be horrible. There are lots of children on street and dogs running away from that park would create a dangerous situation. Whose going to pick up the feces on a daily bases?	3/30/2021 7:29 PM
14	TERRIBLE TERRIBLE IDEA!! WHAT IS THE POINT??? PEOPLE CAN TAKE THEIR DOGS ELSEWHERE	3/30/2021 7:26 PM
15	In my neighborhood, there are no dog parks within walking distance. This would be the first one. Once of the great things about Clifton is it's walkability. This would add another walkable amenity. Also, since the pandemic, I have noticed that many more people have gotten dogs in Clifton. It would be a great place for dog owners in the neighborhood to socialize.	3/30/2021 5:15 PM
16	It's a perfect spot.	3/30/2021 3:20 PM
17	See above. Not every green space needs to be "something." Right now it is used for picnics, pickup soccer, baseball and tag football, and by kids just being kids. The parking/traffic situation if it becomes a "destination" will be terrible. I also think it's disrespectful to the cemetery right near it. And, I have extremely serious concerns that it will be maintained, kept clean, etc. NO NO NO!	3/30/2021 2:35 PM
18	Why would the city budget \$2,000,000 on a dog park? Certainly there are more pressing & important funding issues.	3/30/2021 1:52 PM
19	This neighborhood does not have one, and a lot of people have dogs in this area.	3/30/2021 11:19 AM
20	Dogs need a place to safely be off leash	3/30/2021 11:16 AM
21	Dunore Park is a GREEN gateway into the Clifton/Gaslight area. It is beautiful as it is now. It is used by many residents, dog owners, families, etc. It is not "underutilized". The street that borders the north side of the park by the cemetery is a quiet and peaceful walk vs the louder, Ludlow Avenue side with heavy traffic and drivers who often exceed the speed limit. Adding lots of traffic and cars for the dog park would DIMINISH the entire park and cemetery area....I do not feel the dog park would have a positive impact for area businesses and property owners. People go to a dog park with their dog/dogs, and don't usually frequent businesses in the same trip....A dog park would not make Dunore Park safer. Asking people if they are willing to maintain a dog park is not really viable. People can express an interest and then not follow through or move...Many people are not even willing to pick up their dog waste and carry it home or put it in a trash can. There are so few cans maintained by the city in the Clifton Area, that can be utilized by dog walkers...	3/30/2021 9:16 AM
22	very few dog parks in the area, so it would be great to have one close to home!	3/30/2021 7:48 AM
23	Much better as a park, used by children and dogs already and would create too much traffic if a dog park	3/29/2021 4:47 PM
24	Same reasoning as above. Accessible dog park	3/29/2021 3:41 PM
25	This would be a dog park within walking distance from my home and a large dog owning	3/29/2021 2:32 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

	community in Northside	
26	Dogs need free exercise, too.	3/29/2021 1:35 PM
27	this park is used for children and walking course new playset just installed this is a residential neighborhood and across from a cemetery -	3/29/2021 1:32 PM
28	THIS IS A DISGUSTING IDEA. When my children were young, they regularly played in this park. Many neighborhood children still do. Fencing off a portion of this small park for dogs to use as a toilet is an insult to children.	3/28/2021 11:52 PM
29	My wife and I used to take our 2 boys to play at the park. I wouldn't want to lose any of that park.	3/28/2021 8:43 PM
30	We take our dog to Mt Storm for walks a lot and would love to be able to let our dog run around.	3/28/2021 8:09 PM
31	I've seen pictures of what happens to other dog parks in this city; keep it verdant and focused on people.	3/28/2021 3:11 PM
32	It would make that spot unusable for picnics	3/28/2021 12:43 PM
33	We have so many dog owners and dog lovers in the community that I know would love a dog park with our neighborhood which would allow them to play with each other. Also many Clifton homes do not have a lot of yard space for dogs to exercise and this park would give Clifton residents that option for them to have a place for their dogs to safely run around and exercise.	3/28/2021 8:43 AM
34	It's a quiet community and a quiet park. It should remain that way. It's right next to a cemetery.	3/27/2021 10:53 PM
35	Vocal minority wants something that is already provided at multiple parks around the city. Burnet woods has far more space to give up for something like this.	3/27/2021 10:49 PM
36	I think the space is too small, and too close to a busy road with no crosswalk. There is much more open and somewhat secluded space in Burnt Woods.	3/27/2021 8:46 PM
37	We don't need obstruction in the pocket park.	3/27/2021 8:12 PM
38	We have plenty of dog parks in the Cincinnati area. This location is not ideal due to proximity of a busy road. I'd hate to see a lovely park that anyone can enjoy "go to the dogs". If I lived near/across from the park, I would not appreciate it being there.	3/27/2021 7:48 PM
39	Dogs and everyone can use the park as it is. Dogs are supposed to be on leash, but rarely enforced. Creating a dog park only benefits a small part of the community. A better solution would be leaving the park as is, no fence, but allowing dogs off leash. That way it would mainly be well trained dogs and those with fears of dogs would be less concerned.	3/27/2021 1:39 PM
40	The green space is pretty as is and fencing would be an eyesore.	3/27/2021 1:35 PM
41	It is much better to have a designated space for dogs than just open space for occasional use. As it stands now, this space is hardly ever used.	3/27/2021 1:15 PM
42	park is small and is already used by residents for the playground and as green space. Also dog parks often destroy the natural turf.	3/27/2021 12:45 PM
43	Dogs need a space too and to socialize	3/27/2021 11:30 AM
44	Smell, noise, traffic	3/27/2021 9:52 AM
45	Want to enjoy with friends and family	3/27/2021 9:29 AM
46	It would completely ruin the entire essence of Dunore Park	3/27/2021 9:21 AM
47	Because I am a dog owner	3/26/2021 10:47 PM
48	See above	3/26/2021 10:20 PM
49	There's currently no other dog park available within the vicinity, yet there are a lot of dog owners.	3/26/2021 10:11 PM
50	See above.	3/26/2021 7:59 PM
51	Prefer to see children and human activity.	3/26/2021 1:25 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

52	Cars drive fast in the area.	3/26/2021 11:34 AM
53	Having a local dog park in Clifton would improve the quality of life in the neighborhood.	3/26/2021 11:25 AM
54	I have two dogs, but I just don't think this is a best space for a dog park. I agree that the space is underutilized, but would much prefer enhancing the green space to be something EVERYONE can enjoy.	3/26/2021 9:20 AM
55	My dogs would be way happier to be able to run free in a fenced in area. I would be super happy if this dog park had one side for big dogs and one for small dogs. Also I know some people already walk their dogs off a leash because we don't have a dog park yet but some community members have been scared to see free dogs.	3/26/2021 7:43 AM
56	This would erase most of what is the only large greenspace left in Dunore — a space enjoyed by countless families in the area. Moreover, it is highly dangerous for any dogs that would get out of the park and run toward Ludlow, where cars often travel at very high speeds in front of the park. And, btw, there is no money to maintain it! A trifecta of reasons not to do this.	3/25/2021 6:46 PM
57	It would disrupt the appearance and peaceful nature of the park. I believe it could potentially become an eyesore.	3/25/2021 6:17 PM
58	It's a neighborhood FAMILY park - not a dog park. We need more picnic benches from people in the neighborhood. Not attract outsiders to fill the park with dog shit.	3/25/2021 5:46 PM
59	This isa neighborhood park, there are small children playing, there isn't enough parking.	3/25/2021 5:04 PM
60	I also have empathy for the homeowners immediately surrounding the park who will be confronted by the traffic, noise, litter and smells if the park is not meticulously maintained (which none of the smaller parks are these days because of constrained budgets)	3/25/2021 4:42 PM
61	Residents nearby don't want it!	3/25/2021 2:43 PM
62	Filth, noise, ugliness.	3/25/2021 1:13 PM
63	Lack of funds for keeping up present parks.	3/25/2021 12:46 PM
64	Anecdotally, Clifton appears to have a high rate of dog ownership and many could walk to the Dunore dog park rather than having to drive 4 -5 miles to the next closest ones. It appears there is plenty of room for a good sized dog park while still maintaining the existing "people-park".	3/25/2021 12:27 PM
65	Dog parks are great - community building, exercise, etc.	3/25/2021 11:56 AM
66	Doesn't affect our household, although I think dogs should have more places to run than currently exist.	3/25/2021 9:28 AM
67	I walk by the park regularly. No one is ever there. This is an unused parks area. A dog park would bring people to the park (which I think is the goal, right?)	3/25/2021 8:07 AM
68	I utilized all the green space at the park when my son was young, and I feel all the young children that live around me should have that ability as well. People will not keep the dog park clean,it will be noisy, and risky to the children who will be in the area	3/25/2021 7:58 AM
69	Many reasons. Clifton has too few parks. The space is too small for a dog park.	3/24/2021 10:47 PM
70	I have a young family and would love to be able to take my dog somewhere to play safely. I also think it would be great as a community building asset to better know some of the people in the neighborhood.	3/24/2021 7:40 PM
71	The park serves a valuable neighborhood need - it provides calm, clean green space for all who want to take advantage of it. It does not need to be fenced in and torn up to create a dog park.	3/24/2021 1:59 PM
72	I've seen a lot of dogs off leash in the Dunore Park during my commute to the UC campus and it would be much safer to have a designated area for dogs, owners and children. I also think that it would be great to have a water feature in the dog park if it was possible. It doesn't have to be a fountain (like Washington Park), but a well/hose (like Otto Amleader) would be beneficial to reduce heat exhaustion in the summer.	3/23/2021 12:47 PM
73	I walk by there every day and the park is rarely used. This would give a lot of neighbors a place to meet with their dogs in a central location.	3/22/2021 5:00 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

74	Park is rarely used so this would be a good way for more people to use the public park.	3/22/2021 4:54 PM
75	As sympathetic as I am to the desires of dog owners (and am one myself), I would find it inconsiderate as a public nuisance to those who live nearby. My neighbors living near Dunore Park, who use it for recreation (exercise, child play, quiet reading or meditation, etc.) would certainly be annoyed by incessant barking and litter. Experience in other City dog parks would lead one to expect deterioration of the ground, and the attendant public expense of cleaning, repairing and maintaining a facility which serves only dog owners.	3/22/2021 9:08 AM
76	Same as above	3/21/2021 12:36 PM
77	Would be nice to have a bigger park for kids as well. Possibly for older kids.	3/20/2021 5:25 PM
78	It is a residential area. Parking on the street on Ludlow has already been limited by the newer rules. Also, dogs barking would be a daily nuisance and take away from the atmosphere of the park, not to mention disrupt the daily routines of people who live close by. Plus dog park areas are not nice looking so it would also take away from a park atmosphere.	3/17/2021 6:14 PM
79	Greatly interferes with family and kids. Noisy, smelly, erosion. Key guideline for dog parks is to site them AWAY from residential areas.	3/17/2021 12:51 PM
80	Takes space from kids and families, Noisy, dirty, traffic issues,	3/17/2021 12:41 PM
81	Dog parks bring together community members in a meaningful way.	3/17/2021 9:02 AM
82	I want to take my dog there.	3/16/2021 9:47 AM
83	The more the better. Dogs and their humans need more places to socialize.	3/15/2021 5:50 PM
84	doesn't seem large enough spsce for dogs to exercise, especially if crowded. On the other hand, dogs need space too and where else is there?	3/15/2021 4:45 PM
85	This is a good space for a dog park, it looks as though it was made for that very reason.	3/15/2021 3:56 PM
86	They will destroy it and face it that's not what it was built for. You people know that. Some dogs in that area are as big as horses . Some people can not control there dogs.	3/15/2021 10:44 AM
87	It's not meant for the dogs. It's for people who don't want to walk their dogs	3/15/2021 9:43 AM
88	We enjoy the park as is, walk dogs on leash. Ludlow is already too busy and people drive too fast. We don't need to draw more people to the park area contributing to this	3/15/2021 9:12 AM
89	Further improve the neighborhood of Clifton and provide more options for the central neighborhoods for their dogs to play.	3/14/2021 7:48 AM
90	It is a highly residential area and would devalue surrounding property. The neighborhood really can't take that. I strongly disagree with a dog park. Dog park at Armletter works well. A dog park in a residential area in Clifton that devalues property is not helpful during these economic times.	3/13/2021 6:50 PM
91	Bad space. Record of poor maintenance/sanitation at other dog parks. Smell. Trash.	3/13/2021 11:11 AM
92	Eye sore, traffic issues, too small, not equipped for additional people and dogs	3/12/2021 10:38 AM
93	I don't want a dog park near my home	3/11/2021 2:29 PM
94	My concerns were stated above. I believe many dog owners are well intentioned about their desire for a dog park, but that, like most dog parks, the reality will be much different than what the supporters have in their mind. Dunore is getting great use in its current format. Let's not ruin that.	3/10/2021 6:40 PM
95	Property value lowered traffic mess out of neighborhood traffic	3/10/2021 5:31 PM
96	You can never have too many dog parks.	3/10/2021 2:10 PM
97	Would tear up the grass and bring crowds of people to my street, loud	3/10/2021 2:04 PM
98	convenience and Waffle would love it.	3/10/2021 1:12 PM
99	Too small. Too near residences. Parking limit	3/10/2021 12:52 PM
100	Safety concern of children	3/10/2021 9:08 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

101	It's just not the right area for a dog park and the park area is too small. A fence around it would look terrible. It would bring congestion into this residential area. it is right in front of a cemetery and may cause disruption during funerals.	3/10/2021 8:53 AM
102	I am in the unique position of having lived next door to an unofficial dog park: an empty lot (due to the demolition of a house) which the owner unofficially donated to our very nice historic neighborhood for use as a dog park. Due to antiquated zoning laws in our small Illinois city and to the very deep pockets of this neighbor, we could not legally fight this unbelievable intrusion into our privacy. A dog park at Dunore Park would not be nearly as intrusive as the one we had to endure, but it has some similar issues. 1) Parking: It is incorrect to assume that only neighbors will use the dog park and that they will mostly walk there. People will drive to get there, even if they only live half a mile away--I saw this happen all the time. The lack of parking alone is reason enough to kill this project. 2) Noise: People don't just go to dog parks to sip coffee and talk to other dog owners in a leisurely way; some take their dogs to the park for exercise before or after work and then they loudly call their dogs when they need to leave. This can happen early in the morning and late at night. Of course, dogs also bark at each other. 3) Dog waste: Not all people will pick up after their dogs. We lived in an similarly genteel neighborhood before--people were irresponsible there and they will be irresponsible here. I do not dislike dogs, but I feel that people who get pets should be able to care for them properly without imposing on others. That means if people want big dogs who need space to run, they should have a place to exercise them. It is not their neighbors' obligation to provide that place. Dog parks need to be far enough from residences that they don't create a nuisance for people who bought their homes not knowing that their privacy and their ability to park by their houses might be compromised.	3/9/2021 4:56 PM
103	I would like to see a dog park in Clifton, just not in this location. I feel the fence and worn out grass would be unsightly.	3/9/2021 2:50 PM
104	The physical areas available seem sufficient that there is NO NEED for additional public space to be isolated for more limited use for fewer residents/citizens	3/9/2021 1:28 PM
105	There are a lot of people with dogs. It would be good for the community.	3/9/2021 11:26 AM
106	not compatible with playground	3/8/2021 9:33 PM
107	See above	3/8/2021 6:46 PM
108	So many Clifton residents have dogs and Dunore park is often empty. Why not use the space for our neighborhood dogs to be off leash!	3/8/2021 6:10 PM
109	I believe a dog park would completely strip this area of vegetation, causing erosion and leaving an unsightly area despite efforts to maintain it. It's also borders an thoroughfare where many cars travel throughout the day. Animals which get loose may be at great risk.	3/8/2021 5:15 PM
110	I don't want more barking dogs near my home.	3/8/2021 4:09 PM
111	A dog park in Clifton would be an asset. Having lived within 2 blocks of Dunore and having young children I personally experienced the value of the green space and play sets (need an update) in this location. If a dog park did not eliminate the green space where children play catch and run and fly kites, then I could be strongly in favor.	3/8/2021 4:02 PM
112	I understand somewhat why the immediate local residents are against this park, but I think it would be a great utilization of a park that is entirely underutilized (and can only really be used in a certain number of ways given its slope). Think parking and noise concerns are real, but somewhat over-exaggerated. Would be useful for a number of students who live nearby, many of whom have dogs in small apartments, and lack a good place to let their dogs get out. If not a dog park, would also support a community garden, arboretum or other use than a small swing set and sloped grass.	3/8/2021 1:19 PM
113	Noise, safety, smell	3/8/2021 12:27 PM
114	I would definitely utilize the park since the closest park I currently visit is fifteen minutes away.	3/8/2021 7:30 AM
115	See above	3/7/2021 10:05 PM
116	There is no large area close by to play with my dog off-leash. This area would allow for games of fetch.	3/7/2021 9:15 PM
117	Eyesore for nearby residents	3/7/2021 8:42 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

118	I live on Ludlow and can see Dunore from my front door. I do not want to hear dogs barking all day. Also, I take my young children to the park and we enjoy the open green space.	3/7/2021 6:46 PM
119	Dog parks are awesome. People that oppose dog parks are probably unhappy people. Most of the anti - dog park statements are false.	3/7/2021 6:41 PM
120	Dogs don't need parks	3/7/2021 6:33 PM
121	High traffic from outside Clifton and noise that will decrease property value	3/7/2021 5:32 PM
122	Wrong location for traffic control	3/7/2021 4:50 PM
123	Very unsightly. Messy. Prefer Park be used by Families and Children.	3/7/2021 4:45 PM
124	I am most against a fence being constructed on this site and obscuring or interrupting the view of this area. It works well as it is a well used community open space.	3/7/2021 3:20 PM
125	Park is used by community for picnics, playing catch and soccer, walking on leash dogs, and enjoying the playground for young children. There is inadequate parking. It would be ugly. Dunore Park is a green space in a residential neighborhood. Too close to a very busy street if dogs get loose. Danger of loose dogs to pedestrians with and without dogs who are passing by.	3/7/2021 12:35 PM
126	It's a very small green space and a dog park would take away some of the little green space that is there.	3/7/2021 12:33 PM
127	Would draw neighbors to the park to make it more used. Would get more city service such as trash pickup (The current trash bin is frequently overflowing with dog poop bags). Lots of dogs are currently off leash at this park and it's not safe for little kids at the playground.	3/7/2021 11:51 AM
128	For the same reasons I wouldn't take my dogs to the park in this location, I wouldn't recommend others to do so. This street needs serious infrastructure work to sustain more pedestrian use.	3/7/2021 10:33 AM
129	Loss of community space. Poor parking near busy road. Likely deterioration of conditions, mud, trash, required fencing.	3/7/2021 8:20 AM
130	Greenspace will be destroyed (mudd), people won't pick up after their dogs (they don't now walking them), too busy of a street (Ludlow).	3/7/2021 8:14 AM
131	None available nearby, but other park space is available in the neighborhood.	3/6/2021 5:30 PM
132	I love to see dogs on our walks but we use the park for family soccer games, picnics, tree climbing and playground play. I have seen some nice dog parks, but they are usually wooded or utilize AstroTurf (Washington Park) because the dogs are hard on the landscape. To fence off this beautiful open space and destroy the field with heavy paw traffic and urine would be a shame. A community garden, natuescape playground or outdoor exercise equipment would suite the space better.	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
133	InCorrect use of taxpayer money to pay for pet /owners privileges! In 1997 the park board was paying \$8750 each year for Mutt mitts. Only available in upscale parks.Would the Park service also pay for baby diapers? This is a biased survey. The word "why" is highly inappropriate Challenging the participant who does not agree with the dog park construction.	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
134	This site is not suitable and appropriate for a dog park based on the objective measures and requirement of determining if a dog park should be constructed at a specific site.	3/6/2021 2:55 PM
135	The park is good as is. A dog park here will disrupt a green space that's important to this neighborhood.	3/6/2021 2:53 PM
136	See above comments. I have kids who use the park and no dogs.	3/6/2021 2:49 PM
137	Dunore Park is a beautiful greenspace in a residential neighborhood. A dogpark would be an eyesore that would make poor use of our very limited green places.	3/6/2021 2:28 PM
138	It would ruin a neighborhood park that children use	3/6/2021 2:23 PM
139	See above. It's more than about having a place for your dog to run around. It's about being friendly with your neighbors.	3/6/2021 2:21 PM
140	Limited parking, no cross walks or lights to control traffic, how would it be maintained?	3/6/2021 2:17 PM
141	I can't think of a community that more needs or deserves this aspect to be present. I also	3/6/2021 1:31 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

	believe it is important so so as to have a healthy way to socialize our dogs (especially young puppies) so we create a safer dog community in Clifton. The walks through the business district will be full of more dogs that know each other and encounters will be safer and more appealing even for non dog owners.	
142	I think we need a walkable area for people/families with dogs to have an off leash location.	3/6/2021 1:17 PM
143	Eyesore	3/6/2021 12:32 PM
144	It will limit the access to children and residents and make it unpleasant (odor and destroyed surface) for human use. The current model of shared use works fine for everybody.	3/6/2021 10:16 AM
145	I do not support building a dog park at Dunore Park for several reasons. My family and I have used the park almost daily for the last 12 years. We love it. It is our backyard. I am concerned about the increased traffic, lack of parking and safety issues that a dog park would create. There is not enough parking, lighting, bathrooms, trash receptacles to accommodate a dog park. The park has no barrier onto Ludlow so I am concerned about the safety of dogs off leash who may potentially run into traffic. In addition, I'm concerned about the safety of children at the park who may encounter a dog off leash. I love dogs and support the importance of dog parks. I recommend creating a dog park at a park with more land and parking.	3/6/2021 10:09 AM
146	That stretch of land is small and I'm concerned about the children who do play on the playground. Since the dogs would be unleashed, it is possible for many instances of dogs running out of the fenced area and attacking the children on the playground. Also, there is enough poop on the sidewalks and in the grass throughout the Ludlow, Lafayette, McAlpin and just the overall Clifton area as a whole without a dog park; the prospect of a dog park at Dunore Park would lead to more dog poop everywhere from the already lazy Clifton residents, not to mention the non-Clifton residents who don't care for the neighborhood who will ultimately be attracted to the park. In my experience, dog parks are just there for owners to drop their dogs off and laze about on their phones not watching their dogs. This type of behavior does not belong in a children's park and playground area where there will be a surge in incidents of the dogs of negligent owners attacking children. Finally, people have allergies to dogs, and especially in this climate of school closures, that park is the only area for some children to play and release their energy, so they deserve to do so without worrying about having an allergic reaction or being attacked by dogs.	3/5/2021 10:13 PM
147	I don't want dogs that close to a children's play area with swings etc.	3/5/2021 6:36 PM
148	it is loud and will disrupt the peace in this area.	3/5/2021 5:35 PM
149	Many of the nearby residents are opposed and their reasons are valid	3/5/2021 5:18 PM
150	Park is too small an area and too many kids play in the park. Burnet Woods is a much better park and has better parking, way more space and areas that can be isolated from kids and hikers. I would support/pay to see this happen.	3/5/2021 2:10 PM
151	Too close to a main street. Would not be attractive to have fencing so close to the street and take away from the natural looking park that is already there.	3/5/2021 11:16 AM
152	Too dangerous unless / until better traffic (speed) control on Ludlow.	3/4/2021 2:54 PM
153	We should have a dog park. It's a sociable place and I love talking with other dog owners.	3/3/2021 4:40 PM
154	There are now only a few city trash cans on the streets of Clifton and many dog walkers drop their poop bags on the sidewalks because there are no cans. I believe there would be less dog walkers because people will take advantage of the dog park. Having a dog park in a community will set the tone of how the dog park will be operated. We often had well attended PUPP parties on Clifton Avenue and everyone was respectful to each other. I have no problem telling someone to pick up their dog's poo if it happens in my neighborhood. From the attendance that the PUPP parties brought I think it would be well attended and appreciated	3/3/2021 8:53 AM
155	Having a closer dog park would be nice!	3/3/2021 8:13 AM
156	Just worry about state of finances of our governments and if this is the best use of funds at this time.	3/3/2021 7:52 AM
157	Good use for an underused small park	3/2/2021 11:07 PM
158	Although I like the idea of a dog park in the neighborhood, I am not sure Dunore Park is the	3/2/2021 7:06 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

	best place for one. I know of many families that live close to Dunore (with and without dogs) that are not in favor of a dog park so close to their house. We have a dog and she barks at other people and dogs that walk past on Ludlow. I think she will bark even more with all the dogs and people she sees. The excessive barking at the park will disrupt the peace people enjoy in their homes and while using the park. I know many families who live around Dunore park go there to utilize the playground and play ball in the large open space that you can't find in most yards around here. I think a different park not on a busy road so close to houses would be better. I also think the fencing would take away the beauty of the park. We love just cutting through the open grass with our family and it is a nice open green space in our neighborhood.	
159	It would bring liveliness and love to a wonderful neighborhood	3/2/2021 1:48 PM
160	Clifton does not currently have a dog park. It seems that our neighborhood would benefit from one and we have a lot of spaces that could become home to a dog park, like Dunore Park or Burnet Woods.	3/2/2021 12:05 PM
161	I am a dog park fan	3/2/2021 11:54 AM
162	There isn't another place to let dogs off leash that we are able to walk to easily.	3/2/2021 11:10 AM
163	Lots of my friends have dogs.	3/2/2021 11:08 AM
164	It would be a good place to build a park	3/2/2021 11:00 AM
165	Clifton has so many dogs, it would be a much welcome addition to the community. My house actually overlooks the park, and we would love to have that addition. There is so much space in that park that is unused. We see dogs down there all the time, anyway.	3/2/2021 10:55 AM
166	I would like to see other locations explored.	3/1/2021 8:36 PM
167	I think it's a good spot for one because there isn't one around that area. There's an apartment complex that allows dogs right near that area so it would be nice for those people's dogs to be able to exercise without driving far.	3/1/2021 4:28 PM
168	Not only would it be dangerous to have a dog park next to an extremely busy road, the limited size would contribute to the spread of canine disease. The space is not large enough for a healthy park.	3/1/2021 4:09 PM
169	Why not use underutilized/off hours parking lots around the city for dog parks instead of mudding up lovely green space? What about the parking lot off Howell Ave? (BONUS: close to Howell Ave. Pet Hospital and the pet store next door.) Take up some of that concrete (ugly and bad for the environment) and resurface it with something dog-friendly/environmentally friendly.	3/1/2021 2:39 PM
170	I'm afraid of dogs.	2/28/2021 2:30 PM
171	The place would be really messy and ruin a place that we like to play.	2/28/2021 2:22 PM
172	Dunore Park is too small for a dog park. Dunore is a nice, calm, small green space on a busy thoroughfare; this plan would ruin it.	2/27/2021 9:30 PM
173	Super fun as long as it doesn't impede on kids playground. But great for dogs	2/27/2021 2:58 PM
174	Ruining a beautiful green space due to selfish dog owners. I am a dog owner, there is no need to ruin the park.	2/25/2021 9:32 AM
175	Even without amenities this park is heavily utilized. A dog park would be unsightly and disturb the peace.	2/24/2021 11:15 PM
176	Smell, noise of barking dogs, those that don't clean up after their dog. I have dog poop in my garbage can on garbage day. My can sits out and is in the sun. Take your dog poop home with you. Don't just think it is ok to put it in anyone's garbage can. AND DON'T LEAVE IT IN THE PARK OR EVEN THE DOG PARK.	2/24/2021 2:38 PM
177	I like to think, what would Rocky Merz do and frankly he probably wouldn't care either way.	2/24/2021 2:26 PM
178	poor spot for dog park, next to a busy street, will cause litter.	2/24/2021 11:07 AM
179	Not the best place - too much traffic and could pose a threat to the safety of the dogs.	2/24/2021 10:54 AM
180	Would love more parks near Northside that would allow myself to connect with my community and let my dogs run free.	2/24/2021 10:09 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

181	Keeping the natural area outside our community is in everyone's best interest including the dogs and dog owners that already enjoy the park.	2/24/2021 9:32 AM
182	It would look awful, and take up valuable green space.	2/24/2021 9:08 AM
183	It is a nice park to bring my daughter to.	2/24/2021 8:49 AM
184	The neighborhood park was a significant selling point for us when we bought the house a couple of years ago. My wife and I have a 7 month old daughter and are very excited about the ability to take her to the clean green space at the bottom of the street and to have the chance to spread out in a large grass area in the middle of a dense neighborhood. We also love the beautiful green space, trees, lush grass, and the natural habitat for our squirrels and birds along a busy corridor like Ludlow. We are concerned that a dog park will compromise all of this.	2/24/2021 8:41 AM
185	It's in a spot that would be an eyesore for Clifton. Very messy. Should be tucked away somewhere.	2/24/2021 8:23 AM
186	Cause too much traffic and parking on street for residents would become sparse	2/24/2021 8:03 AM
187	We have problems with loitering and men hanging out in their cars and I feel like this will only add to the problem	2/24/2021 7:42 AM
188	Safe recreation area for dogs in a neighborhood that doesn't have a lot of open areas for dogs to run off leash.	2/23/2021 8:18 AM
189	Only place close-by where there kids can play (jungle gym, etc...)	2/22/2021 12:48 PM
190	I don't know enough and feel the residents there should have a strong say.	2/21/2021 5:33 PM
191	Helps to enhance our community & quality of life!	2/21/2021 4:36 PM
192	No real dog park close by in Clifton.	2/21/2021 3:21 PM
193	I'm a former resident of this neighborhood with many friends who still live on the streets adjacent to Dunore. We had a dog when we lived in Clifton and loved the vibrant dog walking scene — we miss it quite a bit! We would even frequently walk our dog to Dunore and we still visit with our friends and children. It makes me sad to think that this lovely, quiet spot in the city might be turned into a busy, rowdy mess by a few entitled people who will bring increased traffic and leave dog poop all over the rest of the park.	2/21/2021 10:04 AM
194	Dog parks are very poorly maintained, a health hazard to children, noisy, and dangerous for dogs. We also need the green space. There is an effort to replant the trees lost over the last 10 years.	2/20/2021 4:55 AM
195	Traffic and noise and garbage.	2/19/2021 8:16 PM
196	Intrudes on current peaceful park. I walk past there frequently. Not looking forward to walking past a dog park.	2/19/2021 7:55 PM
197	My dog is small and not very friendly with other dogs. It would be nice to have if my dog loved to run and associate with other dogs, but that is not the case.	2/19/2021 4:02 PM
198	Need places for dogs to run and play safely.	2/19/2021 1:16 PM
199	The park itself is beautiful being so open. I would feel like the aesthetic of the opened area will be ruined by fencing by breaking the natural look the park gives off.	2/19/2021 7:17 AM
200	Seems like a lot of additional expense for a segment of the population that is already allowed access to the park. or the inverse is fencing off a segment of the park excludes the population without dogs.	2/19/2021 7:15 AM
201	Not enough space	2/18/2021 9:27 PM
202	My opinion depends on how the park is designed and how well it is maintained. If it's well-separated from the rest of the park and if it is consistently, properly cleaned, I would support it. If parks department fails to maintain it, I would be strongly opposed.	2/18/2021 1:33 PM
203	It is currently a park for children and we use it daily for that purpose.	2/18/2021 7:34 AM
204	My grand person and I have used the play area for many years. Don't know how a dog park might hinder that area.	2/18/2021 12:45 AM

10 / 21

Dunore Park Feedback

205	I would also support a dog park if it was placed in Burnett Woods. Having a dog park there would really help with safety by attracting visitors!!	2/18/2021 12:06 AM
206	I'd go just to watch the pooches play.	2/17/2021 8:57 PM
207	Not needed. We are not a community of high-rise apartment buildings with no green space. There are lots of places to walk your dog and exercise your animal.	2/17/2021 8:18 PM
208	I like the green space and dogs can already be taken around there - provided owners pick up after them.	2/17/2021 6:08 PM
209	Why does everyone want to destroy this beautiful, peaceful park in Clifton? When our children were old enough to walk to Dunore Park without us to swing on the swings, was a rite of passage that proved to them and to us that they were becoming responsible children. We talked about safely crossing the street and how long they could stay at the Park. Today, my husband and I take walks around Dunore Park and Bowdle Park for exercise and to enjoy the peaceful environment of our Parks. With the cemetery on one side and Dunore on the other, where else in Clifton can you find such a serene area. Please do not let the minority change this for the benefit of dogs.	2/17/2021 5:40 PM
210	Busy street. I don't want a dog to get out and get hit by a car	2/17/2021 4:53 PM
211	I say I strongly support it because no matter what, I would attend a dog park but in fairness to the whole community I don't think one dog park is the same as the next. Compare Westwood, for example, to auto amleder. What type of dog park are you proposing here? I think we need to know more	2/17/2021 4:30 PM
212	This beautiful small neighborhood park should not be taken, even partially, for the purpose of a fenced dog park! Such a dog park will ruin the beauty of the park and the open space and create a nuisance area which will be ugly and not usable for any other purpose. We do not favor this construction even if it is privately funded and maintained!	2/17/2021 3:40 PM
213	Would benefit from a park in the Clifton area? Would prefer use of Burnett Woods instead of Dunore Park as Dunore is already a small park that is heavily utilized by families.	2/17/2021 9:03 AM
214	No other dog park w/in walking distance.	2/17/2021 7:21 AM
215	Small area. Existing playground. Mature trees might be removed. Major street to cross to access potential dog park.	2/16/2021 9:41 PM
216	Great space that will be ruined. Small dog parks always attract too many undesirables or irresponsible dog owners.	2/16/2021 9:36 PM
217	There are a lot of dogs in the neighborhood and people already use the park for playing fetch, etc. I'd feel better knowing that the dogs couldn't risk getting onto Ludlow. We have seen multiple dogs killed on Ludlow since we moved here and it's so tragic. Anything to keep them safer would be good.	2/16/2021 9:32 PM
218	I would like to know the details about the size and specific location of the dog park within Dunore Park	2/16/2021 7:42 PM
219	Hard on the people who live there.	2/16/2021 5:55 PM
220	The nearby residents don't want this.	2/16/2021 5:37 PM
221	I find dog parks to be wonderful assets for dog owners in a community and the Clifton area seems sorely lacking.	2/16/2021 5:36 PM
222	There are no dog parks in any of the uptown neighborhoods despite it being one of the most densely populated areas in our city. This is a great location.	2/16/2021 5:29 PM
223	Hesitant due to speed of traffic trying to access the park. There would need to be a light with a crosswalk added at Morrison. Of all the parks in the zip code, this and Bowdle are the most urban with least impacted natural habitat/no wooded areas or trails. Community has expressed a desire for the amenity and having some dog agility equipment in the park would be fun for everyone (could offer training classes to help pay for the maintenance).	2/16/2021 4:47 PM
224	The park would feel cramped with a dog park squeezed into the far end...and I certainly wouldn't want to see it put in the middle portions running into the west end since that's the only place for frisbee, field games, etc.	2/16/2021 4:46 PM

11 / 21

Dunore Park Feedback

225	Having a nearby place to socialize DOGS and also socialize NEIGHBORS would help Clifton continue to grow as a neighborhood!	2/16/2021 4:12 PM
226	I believe a dog park next to a busy street is asking for injuries to the dogs. And interfere with families using the park.	2/16/2021 3:49 PM
227	It's small area used by parents and kids and dog park would be dirt eyesore and filled with dog waste.	2/16/2021 3:13 PM
228	There's not really a spot in the Gaslight District to take a dog, and especially not one where it's okay to let them off a leash.	2/16/2021 2:03 PM
229	Dogs are great! And Clifton has many. Also, the nearest dog park otherwise is Fido Field which is great but often very busy and parking is tough around there.	2/16/2021 1:59 PM
230	I would like to leave it as an open park for kids to enjoy.	2/16/2021 12:48 PM
231	It's a small green space for families and children to enjoy play. My own children spent many hours there with playing when little. We met for play dates with other children there. Sweet little safe park for kiddos.	2/16/2021 12:08 PM
232	keep park for children and human game activities, picnic dog owner history of imposing on people. dog clean up, uncontrolled parking and sense of entitlement	2/16/2021 12:06 PM
233	Would be nice to have a space for my dog to run close to house	2/16/2021 11:40 AM
234	The area already breeds unsavory individuals. I believe a dog leak would increase this.	2/16/2021 10:58 AM
235	We use the playground and there is no room for a dog park. The neighborhood does not want a dog park in this inconvenient location.	2/16/2021 10:53 AM
236	We need a new dog park. So many dogs don't have access to let their dogs run free.	2/16/2021 10:35 AM
237	I think it would be nice to have a dog park in Clifton area. I think Mt. Storm or Burnet Woods would be a better location. We have many dog owners who do not pick up after their dogs in both Dunore and Bowdle Parks as well as along the sidewalks. I do not believe Dunore Park is underutilized. That should not be a reason for picking it as a dog park location.	2/16/2021 10:34 AM
238	I have friends on Denore who do not support the dog park (traffic concerns) which gives me pause to fully supporting the idea ...	2/16/2021 9:51 AM
239	Annoying traffic & noise would hurt neighborhood.	2/16/2021 9:40 AM
240	I understand that the circumstances may be different for the Dunore Park dog park, but generally I find that dog parks are not appropriately maintained. I also find that there are constant disagreements regarding the appropriate amount of control of the dogs using the park.	2/16/2021 9:35 AM
241	It's too loud and trafficked for a residential area.	2/16/2021 9:04 AM
242	Depends on size and location of fenced area. Should not be whole park "island." Just western area. Fence should be decorative, not chain link. Hedge around outside of fence.	2/16/2021 4:52 AM
243	Not enough dog parks near my area	2/16/2021 12:17 AM
244	Need to see proposal details. Size, elevation views, initial costs, ongoing costs, expected use, any displaced current uses.	2/15/2021 11:32 PM
245	I visit the cemetery family member buried there. Don't like idea of lots of parked cars.	2/15/2021 10:46 PM
246	We visit dog parks all over Cincinnati, but must drive there. That's not in the spirit of walkable, sustainable Clifton. I would help maintain and improve a Clifton dog park. I would use it every day.	2/15/2021 10:44 PM
247	I walk by that park almost every day and in the cemetery nearby. It feels like it would be disrespectful to help the dog park right now at the cemetery and also disruptive for the many people who walk by the park. Keeping that as a green space would be a gift to Us all.	2/15/2021 10:43 PM
248	I would not use it for my dogs, and I don't go to it in general.	2/15/2021 10:18 PM
249	I think the park is too close to residences and it would be unfair to subject them to the possible noise.	2/15/2021 9:45 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

250	If it would get used and people would take care of it I'm all for it. There isn't a dog park close to Clifton. I think this one would be small and therefore more for the people than the dogs.	2/15/2021 9:25 PM
251	Clifton has is a great walking community, including our dogs, and a dog park to let the dogs run together and neighbors to chat with each other is a natural fit.	2/15/2021 9:21 PM
252	I need to read about pros and cons.	2/15/2021 8:57 PM
253	parking, litter.	2/15/2021 8:42 PM
254	My sense is that families nearby strong oppose it.	2/15/2021 8:32 PM
255	In my experience, dog parks mixed into parks with recreational uses cause huge problems. Owners get to chatting and lose track of what their dog is doing, they fail to clean up their poop. They let their dog off the leash. Dog parks should be in dedicated locations not mixed in with other recreational uses. I understand that some in Clifton would like a dog park, but this is the wrong location. How about building a dedicated dog park in the site of the former police station?	2/15/2021 8:24 PM
256	Noise of their barking, and clean-up issues.	2/15/2021 7:51 PM
257	I support the families on and near Dunore who would be negatively effected by a dog park	2/15/2021 7:50 PM
258	There are lots of dog owners in Clifton and a dog park would be a great selling point for Clifton as neighborhood!	2/15/2021 7:49 PM
259	I don't think it is a good idea to have it near the playground. I don't think it is a good idea to have it so close to a busy street... the cars go very fast up and down Ludlow. It would be right next to a cemetery, seems rather disrespectful and inconsiderate. Residents across from the park don't want it there, I think that should be taken into consideration, seems like it could lower the desirability of owning a home next to it	2/15/2021 7:46 PM
260	It's just not necessary and the space is just to small for a fog park. It would look really ugly there.	2/15/2021 7:41 PM
261	This is a terrible idea because it's a poor location. Kids play there, families gather there and use the playground and people relax or exercise there. Also people visiting the cemetery should not be subjected to the noise of barking dogs. A dog park would destroy this peaceful area.	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
262	Get more people to use the park.	2/15/2021 7:29 PM
263	We need a dog park in Clifton.	2/15/2021 7:27 PM
264	The park is way too small to ensure safety to children and dogs. There are already several options for dog parks nearby (some of which are already overburdened and don't keep up with the maintenance of the facilities)	2/15/2021 7:13 PM
265	Walk your pets. Visit the many dog parks throughout the city. Good exercise for you and your pets.	2/15/2021 7:06 PM
266	This needs to be kept a place for kids to play and run. I see other people using this open green space for soccer and football.	2/15/2021 7:04 PM
267	Too small an area	2/15/2021 7:01 PM
268	I hate the idea of losing open green space in Clifton.	2/15/2021 6:47 PM
269	I have not seen a plan. Open to having a place where dogs can run off-leash, but need to understand the trade-offs	2/15/2021 6:44 PM
270	I've been to engagement sessions and there are people strongly opposed to this. This isn't enough of a benefit to alienate these neighbors	2/15/2021 6:34 PM
271	I would like to see designated off leash areas so people do not take their dogs off leash in open areas like Burnet Woods	2/15/2021 6:29 PM
272	See comments for last question. Also, I do not notice this area of the park being used much, other than by dog walkers.	2/15/2021 6:18 PM
273	High number of Dog owners in Clifton. No dog parks nearby.	2/15/2021 6:08 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

274	The surrounding traffic will be an unsafe environment if any dogs get loose. It is not worth the risk, so I would not use this park with my dog. In contrast, having a dog park within Burnet woods could be an ideal location.	2/15/2021 6:03 PM
275	Ludlow Avenue is a very busy street, what happens when a dog gets loose and runs into the street? The small Old Ludlow cut-away does not have enough adequate parking. I feel sorry for anyone who actually lives on Dunore as the little quaint street will be bombarded with unwanted traffic. When I had dogs, I would take them over to the Doris Day dog park over in Mt. Airy Forest off Westwood Northern Blvd., and it is only a 15 minute drive.	2/15/2021 6:01 PM
276	See above.	2/15/2021 5:50 PM
277	Find an area in Burnet Woods	2/15/2021 5:45 PM
278	Any real discussion about a dog park should include the possibility of multiple locations. Last year's discussion clearly demonstrated that the residents immediately adjacent to Dunore are vehemently opposed to that location. I am not sure why the Park Board continues to completely miss the basic rules of Community Engagement. Clifton deserves better!	2/15/2021 5:42 PM
279	My hesitation is people not picking up after their dogs.	2/15/2021 5:41 PM
280	The space is too small, the surrounding property owners would be negatively impacted and are opposed, dog parks can be unsightly and require a great deal of maintenance, and there are other, better ways to increase use of Dunore Park such as putting better playground equipment in and increasing plantings.	2/15/2021 5:32 PM
281	There are so few places to take a dog in our area, i think a dog park would be well used. It would also create another space for community gathering. I've seen some dog parks charge an annual fee to get access to help maintain them, and I'd be willing to do that.	2/15/2021 5:24 PM
282	No dog park within walking distance of Clifton.	2/15/2021 5:21 PM
283	See 3 above.	2/15/2021 5:21 PM
284	I do not have a personal interest. I think dog parks in general, are an amenity for neighbors who are dog owners. I would like to see more information, pro and con, on the specifics for this dog park.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
285	Where are your alternative locations to consider in Clifton?? This is not a well thought out survey.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
286	I think dogs need to be able to run and play freely. There is nothing in our neighborhood that allows this safely and lawfully.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
287	Many friends in the neighborhood have dogs and Dunore is a convenient place for some of them to walk.	2/15/2021 5:15 PM
288	I am concerned that Dunore area residents strongly oppose the establishment of a dog park. I also am concerned about the upkeep and maintenance that a dog park would require.	2/15/2021 5:10 PM
289	Clifton is already a very dog friendly neighborhood; not worth the expense.	2/15/2021 2:43 PM
290	This is a small urban park that is well used by children and others. It is a rare oasis in the city and not well suited for dogs.	2/15/2021 2:28 PM
291	Better as green space. Cost of upkeep? Will the budget Allie not just the initial build but also ongoing maintenance. Where will parking be? How will it affect neighbors?	2/15/2021 2:27 PM
292	No dog parks close to this area and many dog owners. It's a great way to meet neighbors and build community.	2/15/2021 1:27 PM
293	Convenience	2/15/2021 12:54 PM
294	Is it safe for the dogs? Any traffic?	2/15/2021 12:11 PM
295	I don't live that close unless I drive to it. I can walk my dog there in good weather but it's a long walk.	2/15/2021 12:10 PM
296	People and their dogs are treated as one of the family...need to run and play	2/15/2021 12:00 PM
297	Would seriously harm the neighborhood's aesthetics and ambiance.	2/15/2021 11:55 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

298	Small space for dogs to even run. Location just in the "face" of residents and children's playground already there. Very unhealthy. There's a park in Clifton (Ludlow) perfect to create a " poop park" which is what the proposers are looking for. A dog park for real cannot fit in Dunore. Only the " poop" will fit. Very imposing to nearby residents. Neighborhood there already expressed their disagreement in NextDoor.	2/15/2021 11:04 AM
299	It is a relatively small space. The immediate neighbors must be considered.	2/15/2021 10:43 AM
300	No dog parks near me.	2/15/2021 10:30 AM
301	Dunore park is a very nice place for my children and the children in the neighborhood to play. Adding a dog park area will just bring noise and potentially dangerous dog interactions to a park used by children. Also, I know there would be more dog waste throughout the park that would make the whole park unpleasant to visit. Finally, Dunore is a small park meant to be used most by the local neighborhood, and a dog park would start bringing people from a wider area. This will cause more crowding, noise, parking congestion, and wear and tear on the park.	2/15/2021 10:08 AM
302	Huge benefits to the neighborhood.	2/15/2021 10:05 AM
303	I think the pit in burnet woods would be better. Room for large and small dog areas	2/15/2021 9:34 AM
304	See previous answer. Also I have concerns about the playground and dog area together. This park is not very large at all.	2/15/2021 8:57 AM
305	Pedestrian, especially children safety. Appearance	2/15/2021 7:37 AM
306	To make other non-dog parks safer and recreation more pleasant for my family.	2/15/2021 7:06 AM
307	Too close to tons of traffic on Ludlow. There's got to be quieter locations. I also see lots of parents with their kids using this park.	2/15/2021 5:37 AM
308	The nearest neighbors are against it.	2/15/2021 12:03 AM
309	I haven't seen a map as to the footprint of the dog park on the overall park.	2/15/2021 12:01 AM
310	It's small, and unnecessary. I do t think the city keeps up the ones we have and it will make that small area look junky.	2/14/2021 11:38 PM
311	IMO, having lived in Gaslight Clifton for 5.5 years now, Dunore is the best spot for a modest but well designed dog park. Mt. Storm is not central enough; Burnet Woods should be left to the birds and hikers (so to speak). Putting a modest dog run/park at Dunore will not interfere with anything else.	2/14/2021 11:03 PM
312	Too close to residences. There is already an issue with trash being left in the park—am very concerned about increase in traffic, trash and dog poop. I'd like to see park funds go toward improving the play area for CHILDREN and add more picnic tables (currently one table)	2/14/2021 10:22 PM
313	Park is intended for children and families	2/14/2021 9:40 PM
314	I'd love a closer dog park, but I'm not familiar with all the ideas/plans for this location.	2/14/2021 9:17 PM
315	Just no.	2/14/2021 8:38 PM
316	see in concerns section below	2/14/2021 6:42 PM
317	This is a rather affluent area. Properties already have large lots and do not need a dog park. It also has the potential to diminish property values in the area.	2/14/2021 6:21 PM
318	No one wants a dog park in their backyard. No one wants their park to have a dog park. Only a few want it. Most don't know this movement is happening and if they suddenly find a dog park in Dunore Park will be upset and angry about it. The whole thing coming up again seems like the same sneaky attempt by a few to get what they want. I'm suspicious about this coming up after the new tiny playground was updated. This is hardly what families thought was going to be done at Dunore park when talk was of replacing the playground equipment.	2/14/2021 5:47 PM
319	too small of an area	2/14/2021 5:38 PM
320	I lived on Dunore for more than 10 years, until six months ago. There is strong opposition from my former neighbors, and I believe they should be listened to.	2/14/2021 5:01 PM
321	More activity there would keep out thugs and drugs	2/14/2021 4:49 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

322	Limits park use by others and will be a noise issue. I believe the park is too small for a dog park.	2/14/2021 4:26 PM
323	Although it would not interfere with the playground area, children do use the entire part.	2/14/2021 2:42 PM
324	There are many dog owners in Clifton who would use this park. There is room for a park AND the playground that is currently there. The green space already exists and would require minimal landscaping. There is also room for parking.	2/14/2021 2:40 PM
325	Because we have a dog	2/14/2021 2:37 PM
326	Much better locations elsewhere in Clifton - Burnet Woods, Mt. Storm, soccer fields next to Mt Storm	2/14/2021 1:42 PM
327	Kids and families play there. Neighbors are against it. Respect the neighbors. Why is this even an issue? Stop purposefully pissing off your friends and neighbors.	2/14/2021 1:35 PM
328	I would support it with a clearly posted warning about the city's lack of liability for dogs biting one another, so "use at your own risk"	2/14/2021 1:08 PM
329	I am a homeowner within one block of the park, which already is ill- maintained sanitation wise, even without a dog park. Constant liquor bottles, beer cans, and overflowing trash cans are a common sight. If sanitation cannot be kept up under its current use, adding sanitation issues would be unwise. Additionally, there are already traffic and pedestrian issues (and incidents) at Morrison and Ludlow. Adding cars and pedestrians into the mix, again, when the current issues have not been addressed is counter-intuitive. I chose to buy a home in this area because while it has a few amenities it is mostly away from the busy-ness of downtown and busy-ness of the university. As a homeowner I would prefer to keep the park a calm, clean family area for residents, with any changes being guided by those that are homeowners that live closest to the park.	2/14/2021 12:55 PM
330	see comment above	2/14/2021 12:45 PM
331	Need to see a series of conceptual drawings otherwise everyone visualizes their own idea.	2/14/2021 12:35 PM
332	I'd love to have something more local, able to chat with local neighbors, etc.	2/14/2021 12:29 PM
333	Terrible location for safety, noise, etc. Also, displaces the current uses of the park. This is the only park nearby for kids to play pickup games, swing, and for older folks to lie on a blanket, watch birds, etc. Who is going to keep it up? Disastrous idea. Finally, Bowdle Park would be better if you had to have one because we could call it BowWowdle Park. Drop this terrible idea!	2/14/2021 12:27 PM
334	We need this and much of the park space is un-used.	2/14/2021 12:13 PM
335	I've had dogs for years and would love to have a designated place for them to enjoy. They are as much a part of the diversity of clifton as its human residents!	2/14/2021 12:03 PM
336	As stated above.	2/14/2021 11:59 AM
337	The playground is for very young children. My kids are 6 and 8 and We often use the wide open green space for throwing balls and playing tag. I don't want to lose that.	2/14/2021 11:54 AM
338	I like the green space for the children to enjoy. Older children use the entire park for tag, ball tossing, soccer, hide and seek, frisbee, etc.	2/14/2021 11:52 AM
339	It would be nice to have a local dog park as it would build community, entertain dog owners and others alike, and reduce driving to further parks.	2/14/2021 11:27 AM
340	I'd prefer the whole of this park stay available to kids and families and dog walkers and folks out for a stroll, etc.	2/14/2021 11:25 AM
341	see above.	2/14/2021 10:49 AM
342	I think it should be a playground for kids.	2/14/2021 10:45 AM
343	I think all communities benefit from having a dog park where animals can safely play and residents can meet and talk.	2/14/2021 10:18 AM
344	Always see dogs being walked in this park, seems like a good use of the space.	2/14/2021 10:15 AM
345	Great use of an under utilized park! We have a dog and would love to have a park in our neighborhood to take him to...we take him to other dog parks. Love the idea!!	2/14/2021 9:04 AM

16 / 21

Dunore Park Feedback

346	Nearby residents don't support it	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
347	Currently there isn't a dog park conveniently located to my house.	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
348	It's a peaceful park with kids playing. I don't want to hear dogs barking or people yelling at their dogs.	2/14/2021 8:18 AM
349	there needs to be more spaces where dogs can run off leash	2/14/2021 8:05 AM
350	This location is much closer to my home.	2/14/2021 7:59 AM
351	expense and maintenance too high. Parks should be for people.	2/14/2021 7:55 AM
352	The closest dog park to me is Washington park.	2/14/2021 7:35 AM
353	I think it would destroy the appeal of the Park, make it noisy and messy, attract too much car traffic.	2/14/2021 7:32 AM
354	Most interested in a dog park of significant size so dogs can run without being cramped together.	2/14/2021 5:40 AM
355	Many dog owners do not clean up after their dog.	2/14/2021 5:04 AM
356	I don't want dogs that close to my yard!	2/14/2021 3:06 AM
357	This would literally be a life-changing alteration for myself, my dog, and the abundant dog owners in the Clifton/Northside neighborhoods!	2/14/2021 2:36 AM
358	It would diminish the value of having this green oasis on a rather busy stretch of road/neighborhood. If the Park Board were to want to spruce up the picnic tables that would be OK. Otherwise, please leave it alone.	2/14/2021 12:22 AM
359	Some dog owners do not clean up after their dogs.	2/13/2021 11:50 PM
360	Detracts from the peaceful green space in the neighborhood. Non-residence will come and bring an influx of non residents.	2/13/2021 11:44 PM
361	I'd like to see the plan before forming an opinion.	2/13/2021 11:39 PM
362	Too small. Too near people's houses. The grass is already used by families.	2/13/2021 11:12 PM
363	Too much traffic, too close to homes, unattractive, and pointless. Dogs don't like dog parks and Dunore park is tiny. It's just a dumb idea.	2/13/2021 11:08 PM
364	I see neighborhood residents using non dog park areas as dog parks all the time. Off leash dogs in the woods and on walks. Clearly we need a place that is safe for dogs to run off leash!	2/13/2021 11:02 PM
365	The space is beautiful and open. A dog park will be neither. Dog owners can use it now as is. And it's a residential area. Put up an ugly fence and let dogs tear up the grass in some area of Mt Storm or Burnet Woods where others wouldn't be excluded and disturbed. In Burnet or Mt Storm, the area could be more protected and less visible. A dog park will not enhance the look or appeal of Ludlow. Please preserve Clifton's beautiful green spaces. They are a large part of what makes Clifton livable.	2/13/2021 10:51 PM
366	Dunore is a lovely little park that's a real asset for those of us who have tiny yards. I've taken my grandkids there for years and also just enjoy having that nice green space nearby. I am tired of dog owners assuming that everyone should accommodate their pets.	2/13/2021 10:45 PM
367	People who live very close seem to be against it.	2/13/2021 10:24 PM
368	We need to maintain our green spaces. Also, a dog park belongs somewhere large. The Washington park one is so crowded and would probably be the same size as dunore. It just doesn't make sense	2/13/2021 10:17 PM
369	I took my daughter to Dunore nearly every day when she was young. I'm not sure I would have been comfortable doing so with a dog park there.	2/13/2021 10:13 PM
370	I think that Ludlow Ave is a corridor into the Clifton business area and green space should be enhanced, not a fenced dog park. Busy street could startle dogs, leading to accidents that cause injury to dogs, pedestrians, drivers. Dogs and small children nearby do not mix. No water to the park. Overflowing trash cans at times and there is not a dog park there presently.	2/13/2021 10:10 PM

17 / 21

Dunore Park Feedback

371	Fencing that beautiful park in would be an eyesore. And just look at the overflowing garbage can in the park now- if that can't be addressed, how would a dog park be kept clean	2/13/2021 10:09 PM
372	Not a benefit to the neighborhood. Dangerous for dogs.	2/13/2021 10:04 PM
373	I live close by, do not want the added traffic, cars, noise.	2/13/2021 9:54 PM
374	This should stay the way it is. This will create a parking problem.	2/13/2021 9:51 PM
375	Think dog parks are great but would want to know/be involved in some of the details about exact size and location of this within denore park	2/13/2021 9:14 PM
376	The playground is already so small, my children rely on the open space to run and play.	2/13/2021 9:05 PM
377	The park is beautiful and open in its current state and a fenced area may detract from its beauty. Why not have a dog park in Burnet Woods instead?	2/13/2021 8:51 PM
378	I like it like it is.	2/13/2021 8:42 PM
379	Good amenity for the neighborhood	2/13/2021 8:41 PM
380	It' a good spot for a dog park	2/13/2021 8:38 PM
381	Wish there was one when I had a dog	2/13/2021 8:36 PM
382	Would be great for Clifton dog owners to have a dog park!	2/13/2021 8:32 PM
383	First I've heard of it.	2/13/2021 8:31 PM
384	But I'd rather see ones at 1) my storm and 2)Burnett woods.	2/13/2021 8:28 PM
385	It's just too small	2/13/2021 8:20 PM
386	I would rather see funds fo towards restoring garbage cans and landscaping to the park that make it more pleasant to visit.	2/13/2021 8:20 PM
387	Good use of space. Would also like to see the playground built up and fenced in.	2/13/2021 8:18 PM
388	I see so many people walking dogs, it would be nice to see people build a community with other dog owners. Also to see all the pups around. I love taking my small kids to the park and often feel a tad nervous because we are usually the only ones there- I would feel safer with more people.	2/13/2021 8:18 PM
389	Not only would I not use it, I know the residents on Denore do not support a dog park in this location, and I support the residents.	2/13/2021 8:06 PM
390	As I said previously it's the best suited park to handle this type of amenity Without disruption.	2/13/2021 8:04 PM
391	See above. I lived there for years, so I understand the pros and cons.	2/13/2021 7:54 PM
392	A dog park alienates young children from playing safely, or at all. Even if it is fenced.	2/13/2021 7:35 PM
393	I know that some people find dog parks very beneficial. However I don't know if such a thing would be an advantage in Dunore Park. The dog parks I've seen (with the exception of the one downtown) are ugly, attract people from outside the neighborhood, and are loud.	2/13/2021 7:33 PM
394	Noise , Litter, Traffic, Unsupervised dogs, Destruction of a beautiful park, a better location is Burnett Woods, the families most impacted — do not want a dog park at Dunore	2/13/2021 6:24 PM
395	Please see above comment. And, this is definitely not an underutilized park nor is it unsafe. It will not be an attractive amenity--in fact, it will destroy a beautiful green space--and it's too far from the business district to provide a positive impact.	2/13/2021 5:45 PM
396	I am concerned that green space in a small plot park would be made even smaller for children to play.	2/13/2021 4:57 PM
397	Kids use the park!	2/13/2021 4:07 PM
398	I'm worried about the lack of community support for it and the disruption to the park as it is. I do not think we should be re-engaging the community in this project right now	2/13/2021 3:46 PM
399	Dunore Park is used by the increasing number of families moving into the area. The playground is small. But the play area is decent size for families to play. As stated above the	2/13/2021 3:45 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

	dog parks in Cincinnati are either very expensive per square foot (Washington Park, Westwood Town Hall) or very, very poorly maintained (Doris Day Dog PArk off Westwood Northern Blvd)	
400	Would rather see the playground improved than a dog park installed. No interest in having the additional noise, traffic, and other nuisances related to a dog park so close to my house.	2/13/2021 3:44 PM
401	The space is too small, dog parks are unsightly and I question whether Parks will properly maintain it, and there are other opportunities to increase use of Dunore Park (such as by putting in better playground equipment) that should be done before putting in a new feature.	2/13/2021 3:37 PM
402	Would rather have the green space for humans!	2/13/2021 2:54 PM
403	Too much park space would be lost.	2/13/2021 2:29 PM
404	I would be able to get my dog to the dog park much more frequently.	2/13/2021 2:11 PM
405	Can walk to it	2/13/2021 1:55 PM
406	I live across the street from Dunore Park, selfishly, this would be the most convenient dog park option for me. Additionally, the park is largely unused. While children do play on the equipment, and there are occasional "picnickers", they are only occasional. Much of the green space is largely unused. I think a dog park would be a great addition.	2/13/2021 1:48 PM
407	It is a green space. Besides the little playground there is a space where people picnic, throw frisbees, toss baseball or footballs. This is NOT the place for a dog park. This group of people in Clifton are so used to getting what they want, when they want it. This is not a necessity. There are parks they can drive to. I'll bet the rich people up by Mt Storm wood not tolerate a dog park in their (much bigger) park.	2/13/2021 1:31 PM
408	My dog likes to play with other dogs, but there aren't places near by for him to do that. It would be nice to be able to meet other people who have dogs while our pups are playing.	2/13/2021 1:17 PM
409	there are plenty of dog parks no need for another one in such a small green space	2/13/2021 1:11 PM
410	Makes green space of park unavailable to non-dog owners	2/13/2021 1:06 PM
411	Children's playground. Need pls space for children to feel safe and some dog owners do not respect boundaries ('my dog is friendly— must be You that is the problem').	2/13/2021 12:58 PM
412	A dog park would be well utilized by many residents and add much value to the neighborhood.	2/13/2021 12:53 PM
413	The park is for young children, not for defecating dogs.	2/13/2021 12:09 PM
414	This would foster relationships within the community. It could be a place to promote responsible practices like picking up after pets. It could be a place to promote other neighborhood events and groups, like CTM, and CBA.	2/13/2021 12:02 PM
415	Dunore Park has ample space.	2/13/2021 11:57 AM
416	Increased noise and traffic.	2/13/2021 11:18 AM
417	My children like to play in the park and I would like it to remain a safe place for kids to play without too many cars clogging the space and making it less safe for kids due to increased traffic	2/13/2021 10:36 AM
418	The playground and surrounding green space is a wonderful asset to the community. The smell, destroyed grass, increased cars and congestion that a dog park would bring are all negative changes. We should be investing in the park for our human residents who regularly use the space.	2/13/2021 10:18 AM
419	As a nearby resident I do not want the increased gathering, street parking, noise, or refuse involved in proposed dog park. As a parent whose young child regularly uses Dunore, it is the only green space a kid can run around in- not just the playground area, the whole park is used for exploration, discovery , and imaginative play. The assertion that the park is "underused" is a motivated distortion. It is not underused. It is under equipped, but that should be fixed by improving play equipment, not taking away play space.	2/13/2021 9:48 AM
420	In addition to the reasons listed later in this survey, I live on Dunore and use both the playground AND the greenspace frequently with my two young children. Many other people use the entire park as well and this has increased over the past year. Since the pandemic started, going to this park and other parks in the area have been one of the few activities I feel are safe	2/13/2021 9:30 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

	for my children and enable us to abide by CDC guidelines. As a long-time resident of Clifton and a tax-paying property owner who lives immediately by the park, it is extremely discouraging to see that the Parks Department is considering turning a pleasant greenspace increasingly used by all types of people into a dog park that would overtake much of the park. I also disagree with the introduction to this survey stating, "A dog park would physically fit on site without interfering with the small playground there." I have never seen a professional plan, designed by someone with the appropriate credentials, showing how a dog park would actually fit in to Dunore Park. If the Parks Department is seriously considering investing money in the park, I would suggest instead that we focus on improved playground equipment for children, replacing trees that have died, and increasing plantings in the park. These are efforts for which I would donate money and help fundraise.	
421	We would lose the open green space that my family and neighbors use frequently.	2/13/2021 9:12 AM
422	Bad location. Too close to a residential area.	2/13/2021 8:52 AM
423	Take a look at the overflowing trash can that never gets emptied. In warmer weather it stinks to high heaven. Can the Park Board guarantee dog waste pick up?	2/13/2021 8:23 AM
424	A smelly, noisy blight on a family park.	2/13/2021 8:20 AM
425	A dog park does not belong in a residential area such as the area around Dunore Park.	2/13/2021 8:10 AM
426	I think they are unsanitary and a noise hazard. That park is used by humans, and near human housing. I would suggest the now soccer field across from Mt. Storm, already partly fenced and with parking, and rarely used.	2/13/2021 7:35 AM
427	Very close to residences in a neighborhood built on community. With Ludlow Ave becoming busier and busier (working with the City on a "calming" solution, we need a green space respite instead of a messy, possibly noisy, dog park at the Dunore location. Please help us preserve this precious green space, and do think about improving the very out of date playground instead.	2/13/2021 7:17 AM
428	The park is not big enough - and it would become unsightly because people wouldn't clean up after their dogs	2/13/2021 5:38 AM
429	Good addition to the neighborhood and use of underutilized space.	2/12/2021 10:56 PM
430	A dog park within walking distance would be great for my family and our dog.	2/12/2021 10:05 PM
431	Better parks would raise desirability of my neighborhood and improve my quality of life.	2/12/2021 10:01 PM
432	We bought a home here because of the walkability of this wonderful neighborhood. A dog park is lacking and would be a great amenity in this wonderful urban neighborhood.	2/12/2021 9:50 PM
433	Noisy. Unclean. Abuse of green space. No neighborhood support other than few activists. The park is not underutilized.	2/12/2021 9:24 PM
434	It will create a disruptive traffic situation for our neighborhood, and attract unwanted visitors to our neighborhood. It will cause a noise nuisance to the property owners around the park, and will cost millions of dollars.	2/12/2021 9:17 PM
435	Dirty, disease filled places. Scar on the neighborhood and poor use of Park funds.	2/12/2021 9:11 PM
436	Too small an area to allow a good plan- double fence, running room, small and large dog areas, etc. Would require more frequent refuse pick-up, something that doesn't happen enough already. Garbage can by playground is often overflowing.	2/12/2021 9:02 PM
437	Dunore park is a wonderful green-space that is a crown jewel of Ludlow Ave. It accentuates the stunning, well-kept properties around that part of the Gaslight district. The sanctity of Old Ludlow and the Jewish cemetery is ultimate to the neighborhood's preservation and aesthetic.	2/12/2021 8:41 PM
438	I live across the street from Dunore Park and have both a dog and a young son. We depend on the playground and open grassy space in Dunore park for gross motor activity and playing with both as our hilly property has no yard and the only other option is to play in the street. I look out the window at the grassy section of this park. Dog parks, as proven by others in the area, become dust and trash havens. Open space is needed for soccer and Tball and tag. A dog park would lower my property value, become an eyesore for the neighborhood, add incredible noise and traffic to an area flanked by a cemetery, and disturb the one safe place we have to play.	2/12/2021 8:18 PM


Dunore Park Feedback

439	Residents who live near Dunore Park are very unhappy about the idea, and I don't blame them	2/12/2021 7:54 PM
440	Nearby property owners don't want this.	2/12/2021 7:03 PM
441	I have two dogs and have to drive to get to any dog park, this would be convenient and a good addition to Clifton.	2/12/2021 6:47 PM
442	There is a shortage of off leash options in the Clifton area.	2/12/2021 6:37 PM
443	See above.	2/12/2021 6:35 PM
444	I feel Clifton's parks have been forgotten and I adore them. Something needs to happen to improve these parks and a dog park is the best first step.	2/12/2021 6:25 PM
445	The best place for a dog park is in burnet wood. In the valley	2/12/2021 6:20 PM
446	The site could house a dog park like Westwood or Washington Park in one small area while still allowing for the playground and the open area. The area is visible from Ludlow area and highly trafficked so no one would feel isolated and worried about being at the dog park. Both Westwood and Washington Park are in super busy areas or along streets so dig ow era feel the presence of eyes on them.	2/12/2021 6:04 PM
447	Loss of peaceful green environment for adjacent property owners is a legitimate concern to be factored into the decision,	2/12/2021 5:48 PM
448	There are a lot of dogs in Clifton. The Pop up dog park they had on the plaza was very well attended and was a community builder.	2/12/2021 5:23 PM
449	That park is very underutilized and provides space sufficient for a fenced dog park without precluding others to use the remainder of the park.	2/12/2021 5:22 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

Dunore Park Feedback

Q5 The primary benefits I see in constructing a dog park at Dunore are:
(Check all that apply)



ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSES
Improved safety through attracting park visitors		26.57% 173
It adds an attractive amenity for area residents and visitors to enjoy		60.83% 396
It provides a safe environment for dogs and owners to enjoy		70.81% 461
It enhances an underutilized park		56.53% 368
The positive impact it will have for area businesses and property owners		27.50% 179
Other (please specify)		27.34% 178
Total Respondents: 651		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	I do not think the dog park offers any positive benefit	3/31/2021 10:47 PM
2	None of the above- this park is not underutilized!!	3/31/2021 10:30 PM
3	I don't support the dog park at Dunore. The Parks Board should put their budgeted money to upkeep and repairs at existing parks	3/31/2021 9:15 PM
4	No benefits	3/30/2021 7:29 PM
5	None	3/30/2021 7:26 PM
6	None	3/30/2021 7:25 PM
7	None. This survey question is a "push-poll."	3/30/2021 2:35 PM

8	I SEE NO BENEFIT TO THIS PARK!!!	3/30/2021 1:52 PM
9	NONE	3/30/2021 9:16 AM
10	I CAN'T BELIEVE THIS ISSUE IS STILL BEING DEBATED. When this issue was first raised, the response was almost totally opposed by the neighborhood. The people behind this proposal are tone deaf and have no respect for the wishes of their neighbors. deaf and	3/28/2021 11:52 PM
11	None. It doesn't beautify. It will only poop-ify.	3/27/2021 10:49 PM
12	None.	3/27/2021 7:48 PM
13	A big & small dog park section would also be beneficial.	3/26/2021 10:29 PM
14	Local dog owners can meet, which is a significant source of socialization for me, especially since COVID.	3/26/2021 7:59 PM
15	Happiness and desire to stay in the neighborhood	3/26/2021 7:43 AM
16	It's underutilized because of only one picnic bench?pin picnic benches!!!!	3/25/2021 5:46 PM
17	None	3/25/2021 1:13 PM
18	None	3/25/2021 12:46 PM
19	People meet each other - community building	3/25/2021 11:56 AM
20	Builds a sense of community	3/24/2021 7:36 PM
21	Speeding a problem coming down Ludlow. It's not safe walking on side walks to exercise dogs.	3/21/2021 12:36 PM
22	The park is NOT underutilized! Even trees are beneficial!	3/17/2021 12:41 PM
23	Who are u pandering to	3/15/2021 10:44 AM
24	None	3/14/2021 11:19 PM
25	It will many dogs happy	3/14/2021 7:48 AM
26	No benefits	3/13/2021 6:50 PM
27	It would make my family more committed to Clifton.	3/13/2021 6:45 PM
28	None!	3/13/2021 11:11 AM
29	None	3/11/2021 2:29 PM
30	No positive	3/10/2021 5:31 PM
31	It brings community members together.	3/10/2021 1:12 PM
32	NoneD	3/10/2021 12:52 PM
33	Coz i still see lot of Dog litter	3/10/2021 9:08 AM
34	None. The park is already attractive, it doesn't need this.	3/10/2021 8:53 AM
35	I see no positive benefit for a dog park w/in Dunore	3/9/2021 1:28 PM
36	not one	3/8/2021 9:33 PM
37	I don't believe any the statements are entirely true.	3/8/2021 5:15 PM
38	None. We don't need a dog here.	3/8/2021 4:09 PM
39	Promotes community	3/8/2021 4:02 PM
40	Meeting neighbors building community	3/7/2021 10:05 PM
41	None	3/7/2021 8:42 PM
42	None	3/7/2021 5:32 PM
43	None	3/7/2021 4:50 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

44	None!	3/7/2021 4:45 PM
45	I don't see any benefit. Only to some owners of some dogs.	3/7/2021 3:20 PM
46	none. It's a bad idea.	3/7/2021 12:35 PM
47	Don't see any benefits	3/7/2021 8:14 AM
48	No benefits	3/6/2021 4:29 PM
49	No benefit	3/6/2021 4:27 PM
50	None of The above are correct or true	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
51	None	3/6/2021 2:23 PM
52	There is no benefit to having a dog park at Dunore Park.	3/6/2021 10:09 AM
53	I see no benefit.	3/6/2021 9:56 AM
54	i don't want one.	3/5/2021 5:35 PM
55	I don't agree with any of the items above	3/5/2021 2:10 PM
56	I don't agree with any of the above.	3/5/2021 11:16 AM
57	I don't see a benefit	3/4/2021 3:08 PM
58	I think it leads to exercise as people will walk to the park.	3/3/2021 4:40 PM
59	I drive by that park several times a day and the only people I see there are people with their dogs who are breaking the law by having them off leash	3/3/2021 8:53 AM
60	Dunore Park is on a busy street so it's doesn't always feel very safe for kids to run and play soccer there. A fenced in dog park would provide some safety from the busy street.	3/2/2021 12:05 PM
61	Nope	3/2/2021 11:02 AM
62	Clifton is a very "walkable" neighborhood and having a dog park here would add to that "walkability."	3/2/2021 10:49 AM
63	Oppose it in this location	3/1/2021 8:36 PM
64	This is an extremely biased question.	3/1/2021 4:09 PM
65	The park is NOT underutilized. A dog park would make it overutilized.	2/25/2021 9:32 AM
66	I am not sure there is a true benefit. Some believe these parks to be safe for dogs. The park is safe on a main road and directly adjacent to the residences. Anyone who lives by the park knows it is not underutilized. This will have no impact on buisneses that are over 1/2 mile away and will negatively affect property owners in the immediate area.	2/24/2021 11:15 PM
67	no benefit whatsoever.	2/24/2021 2:38 PM
68	Not sure I see a benefit for anyone other than dog owners. Now what would be great there would a Pub. Used to work at one in Hartwell that would be perfect there. Great cooks and staff!	2/24/2021 2:26 PM
69	no benefit.	2/24/2021 10:54 AM
70	See	2/24/2021 9:32 AM
71	Shows that we care about dogs!	2/21/2021 4:36 PM
72	None	2/20/2021 4:55 AM
73	Not a positive.	2/19/2021 8:16 PM
74	There is not another dog park close by.	2/19/2021 4:02 PM
75	the park does not exclude dogs in anyway.	2/19/2021 7:17 AM
76	No benefits to residents.	2/17/2021 8:18 PM
77	None	2/17/2021 5:40 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

78	Can you describe if the amenity would be attractive? Beauty is a visual attribute and you are not showing a picture. But since I think dogs are beautiful I went with yes. Also, you were saying "the positive impact it will have four area businesses." Is this factual? If so can you cite those facts for interested parties?	2/17/2021 4:30 PM
79	No positive impact.	2/16/2021 9:41 PM
80	None	2/16/2021 9:36 PM
81	Giving people more ways to connect in the neighborhood is good.	2/16/2021 9:32 PM
82	There's no proximity to the businesses so why pretend that this is a boon for them ?	2/16/2021 5:37 PM
83	Promoting and supporting dog ownership creates health and wellness benefits for communities.	2/16/2021 5:29 PM
84	None: I'm afraid I just don't discern any benefits.	2/16/2021 4:46 PM
85	None and I feel it will damage property values. It will be worse than having a drive thru in Clifton	2/16/2021 3:49 PM
86	Would rather see park utilized better to benefit adults and kids	2/16/2021 3:13 PM
87	N/a	2/16/2021 12:48 PM
88	Dog Park makes more sense in Burnet Woods. Bigger and more centrally located.	2/16/2021 12:08 PM
89	i do not see ANY reason home owners need to supplement pets	2/16/2021 12:06 PM
90	none of the above	2/16/2021 11:06 AM
91	No Benefits -- traffic and noise would hurt neighborhood.	2/16/2021 9:40 AM
92	Having more people and parked vehicles in the area may help calm the traffic on Ludlow	2/16/2021 8:54 AM
93	I don't see these as benefits.	2/15/2021 10:43 PM
94	Ludlow is too wide there. One lane would suffice. More green space.	2/15/2021 9:25 PM
95	I see zero positives. All I see would be dog poop interfering with my family's use of the park.	2/15/2021 8:24 PM
96	the questions in this survey are very skewed. I used to work in marketing research. This survey is not well constructed	2/15/2021 7:46 PM
97	It's a terrible idea	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
98	Selfish motivation	2/15/2021 7:06 PM
99	I do not see a benefit.	2/15/2021 7:04 PM
100	Yes	2/15/2021 7:03 PM
101	Clifton residents need a dog park, just not here.	2/15/2021 6:03 PM
102	It will consolidate the dogs in one area, rather than throughout the neighborhood	2/15/2021 5:57 PM
103	I don't see any benefits	2/15/2021 5:32 PM
104	None	2/15/2021 5:21 PM
105	None of the above	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
106	There are no benefits! Detracts from the neighborhood!	2/15/2021 2:28 PM
107	I see a negative not positive impact	2/15/2021 2:27 PM
108	Would be the closest dog park to me.	2/15/2021 12:27 PM
109	None	2/15/2021 11:04 AM
110	Creates community	2/15/2021 10:30 AM
111	Three are no benefits, only detriments.	2/15/2021 10:08 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

112	No impact on business district	2/15/2021 9:21 AM
113	No advantages.	2/15/2021 8:57 AM
114	I don't see any primary benefits.	2/15/2021 5:37 AM
115	I don't agree that the park is underutilized or that a dog park adds value	2/14/2021 10:22 PM
116	None.	2/14/2021 8:38 PM
117	I do not want this dog Park. While it may increase utilization, the fencing would be an eye-sore	2/14/2021 6:21 PM
118	Responding to the question of helping to fund or maintain the dog park - I don't know what either entails so don't want to offer help that I can't give but I'll sign my name so you can keep me informed.	2/14/2021 6:17 PM
119	I don't see the benefit.	2/14/2021 5:47 PM
120	See no upside	2/14/2021 5:38 PM
121	none of the above	2/14/2021 4:55 PM
122	I see no benefit	2/14/2021 4:26 PM
123	Safe place for dogs to play that does not interfere with people space	2/14/2021 3:23 PM
124	It's ridiculous and the immediate neighbors do not want it.	2/14/2021 1:35 PM
125	this would be counter-productive	2/14/2021 12:45 PM
126	I can't think of a single positive.	2/14/2021 12:27 PM
127	Negative impact. This park is used frequently by all ages of children.	2/14/2021 11:52 AM
128	Reduce driving to further dog parks.	2/14/2021 11:27 AM
129	None!	2/14/2021 10:13 AM
130	Seems like a reasonable amenity for the neighborhood, especially for smaller dogs.	2/14/2021 9:50 AM
131	1) Do we need improved safety? That's hardly a hot spot for crime. 2) it's a residential area, I don't want to attract MORE people. 3) dogs parks are not necessarily safe when people don't control their pets. 4) The park is NOT underutilized. I live across the street and there are people using it all the time.	2/14/2021 8:18 AM
132	none of the above	2/14/2021 7:49 AM
133	None of the above	2/14/2021 7:32 AM
134	No benefits.	2/14/2021 5:04 AM
135	Would create a space for socially distanced community engagement	2/14/2021 2:36 AM
136	Increases connection and sense of community!	2/14/2021 12:35 AM
137	I don't see any positive to it except to the dog owners who want to shift responsibility for the care of their pet on to the public at large.	2/14/2021 12:22 AM
138	No benefit!	2/13/2021 11:50 PM
139	NONE!	2/13/2021 10:51 PM
140	NONE	2/13/2021 10:10 PM
141	Nothing lositive about this	2/13/2021 10:04 PM
142	I don't see any, really.	2/13/2021 8:42 PM
143	Not obvious to me, but maybe having a dog park in a neighborhood is important.	2/13/2021 8:31 PM
144	Avoiding figuring out how to build dog parks in mt storm and Burnett woods	2/13/2021 8:28 PM
145	Absolutely none.	2/13/2021 7:54 PM
146	Zero benefit.	2/13/2021 7:35 PM


Dunore Park Feedback

147	I don't agree with these	2/13/2021 6:24 PM
148	None	2/13/2021 4:07 PM
149	This survey seems very pro-dog park - not well balanced	2/13/2021 3:45 PM
150	I don't see any benefits.	2/13/2021 3:37 PM
151	None	2/13/2021 2:54 PM
152	I see no benefit to property or people	2/13/2021 2:30 PM
153	None of these are valid reasons	2/13/2021 1:31 PM
154	Only benefits a small number or residents who can't let their dogs run in their yards	2/13/2021 1:06 PM
155	There is no benefit to this proposed horror story. I am vehemently opposed.	2/13/2021 12:09 PM
156	See above	2/13/2021 12:02 PM
157	The park seems to get quite a bit of use right now, from picnickers and families with young children especially. I see no reason to change.	2/13/2021 11:18 AM
158	There are no positive impacts to constructing a dog park. This question is skewed towards supporters and the resulting statistics will be artificially heightened.	2/13/2021 10:18 AM
159	None	2/13/2021 8:20 AM
160	No positive impact whatsoever	2/13/2021 8:10 AM
161	Wealthy pet owners get a free service for their filthy animals.	2/13/2021 7:35 AM
162	I see no reason to construct a dog park at Dunore.	2/13/2021 7:17 AM
163	Builds community	2/12/2021 10:56 PM
164	None, it will disrupt the lives of residents that live close by and disrupt the people that visit their loved ones at the cemetery.	2/12/2021 9:22 PM
165	There are no benefits except to lazy, selfish people.	2/12/2021 9:11 PM
166	NONE	2/12/2021 8:41 PM
167	Non of the above are legit positives. This will have zero impact on the business district which is a 15 minute walk away, unless people are driving to our tiny park from across the city. Which would a residential street.	2/12/2021 8:22 PM
168	I see no positives	2/12/2021 8:18 PM
169	none--Dunore is not a good choice	2/12/2021 7:54 PM
170	Don't impose this on the nearby property owners!	2/12/2021 7:03 PM
171	No point	2/12/2021 6:39 PM
172	This is not a good idea, please stop pushing this agenda.	2/12/2021 6:35 PM
173	No benefits, too far from business district	2/12/2021 6:20 PM
174	It will be something positive for Clifton. It must be a quality built area without mud that is attractive and makes neighbors proud.	2/12/2021 6:04 PM
175	Probably only really benefits some dogs and dog owners.	2/12/2021 5:48 PM
176	Great community builder.	2/12/2021 5:43 PM
177	Allows dogs to run and play which they can't do on a leash.	2/12/2021 5:23 PM
178	Would provide a community gathering space for neighbors who own and love dogs	2/12/2021 5:22 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

Q6 The main concerns I have about the construction of a dog park at Dunore are: (Check all that apply)

Answered: 693 Skipped: 158



ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSES
Lack of parking		40.84% 283
Pedestrian safety		37.66% 261
Noise		40.40% 280
Litter		62.48% 433
Smell		45.02% 312
Reduced greenspace		55.99% 388
Other (please specify)		33.77% 234
Total Respondents: 693		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Dunore Park is a terrible location for a dog park.	3/31/2021 11:47 PM
2	All of the above	3/31/2021 10:47 PM
3	Eyesore	3/31/2021 10:05 PM
4	Dogs, Dangerous high speed vehicles, Danger to the Cincinnati State students parking near the dog park.	3/30/2021 7:29 PM
5	Concern for people that don't want a dog park	3/30/2021 4:17 PM
6	See above.	3/30/2021 2:35 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

7	Spending \$2,000,000 on a dog park?	3/30/2021 1:52 PM
8	None	3/30/2021 11:33 AM
9	unsightly fenced in area, that will probably turn into a mudpie with now grass	3/30/2021 9:16 AM
10	it is across from a cemetery and in a residential neighborhood that could benefit from a pedestrian park for children playin ball and picnics	3/29/2021 1:32 PM
11	disease	3/28/2021 11:52 PM
12	Possibly irresponsible owners not picking up after their pet	3/28/2021 12:10 PM
13	It will become an ugly fenced-in mud pit and people will quickly lose interest.	3/28/2021 7:25 AM
14	Park is already poorly maintained; what would adding more responsibility do?	3/27/2021 10:49 PM
15	Dunore Park is not underutilized. Many people just love to look at the park as they walk by, especially not in the spring.	3/27/2021 8:46 PM
16	High traffic area, speeding cars. Far too often, people with dog aggressive dogs insist on taking them to dog parks as some sort of "cure". See it all the time, it does not work and other dogs are jeopardized.	3/27/2021 7:48 PM
17	Everything about this dog park is a concern of mine. No dog park.	3/27/2021 7:43 PM
18	Ugly fencing	3/27/2021 1:39 PM
19	None.	3/27/2021 11:30 AM
20	It is directly adjacent to a cemetery. This would be immensely disrespectful.	3/27/2021 9:21 AM
21	I think a dog park is a great idea!	3/27/2021 7:16 AM
22	Ugliness of such a "park"	3/26/2021 10:33 PM
23	None	3/26/2021 10:20 PM
24	Impact to immediate neighbors	3/26/2021 11:25 AM
25	Dog safety (too close to a very busy street), tearing up the grass,	3/26/2021 9:20 AM
26	A side for small dogs and a side for big dogs.	3/26/2021 7:43 AM
27	potential disturbance to nearby homes	3/25/2021 6:17 PM
28	Why us? Stupid stupid idea!	3/25/2021 5:46 PM
29	The neighbors don't want it.	3/25/2021 5:38 PM
30	destruction of the property, safety of other park users.	3/25/2021 5:04 PM
31	attracting people from other neighborhoods who will feel no compulsion to respect and maintain an attractive park	3/25/2021 4:42 PM
32	Residents nearby don't want it	3/25/2021 2:43 PM
33	Don't believe the dog park will look good or be well maintained.	3/25/2021 1:13 PM
34	Maintenance/erosion of ground within the dog park space.	3/25/2021 12:27 PM
35	Too many pitbulls in this city. Degrades adjacent property.	3/25/2021 11:53 AM
36	N/A	3/25/2021 11:13 AM
37	We have asked for a light/crosswalk across Ludlow and this would be another reason to install.	3/22/2021 5:00 PM
38	We need a light to cross Ludlow. We have been asking for a crosswalk here anyway!	3/22/2021 4:54 PM
39	Public expense to maintain, and degradation of environment	3/22/2021 9:08 AM
40	None	3/20/2021 5:25 PM
41	Reduced play space	3/17/2021 12:51 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

42	We've been trying to replant trees and expand play area	3/17/2021 12:41 PM
43	None	3/16/2021 9:47 AM
44	Pedestrian and dogs safety crossing street.	3/15/2021 4:34 PM
45	The rich people who walk the animals with out a leash. Its not under used	3/15/2021 10:44 AM
46	Dogs feel secure and happy when sharing time with their family. The dog park provides neither	3/15/2021 9:43 AM
47	Could draw too many people to a small park	3/14/2021 11:19 PM
48	More abandoned dogs	3/14/2021 12:00 AM
49	It is also near the Jewish cemetery and I feel it makes the area less peaceful and accessible for funerals as well.	3/13/2021 6:50 PM
50	People won't take care of it. Will turn beautiful green space into a public nuisance/eyesore.	3/13/2021 11:11 AM
51	People who are opposed are being misled by a former Superintendent of Parks about the size and scope of the project and is leading the group in fighting the plan	3/13/2021 8:21 AM
52	I don't want a dog park near my home	3/11/2021 2:29 PM
53	Children afraid of dogs running in their green space and mine I walk past the park am I going to be attacked by large dog 40 yrs here I have invisible fence to protect my dogs plus's backyard I'm one block away I do not want this nor need it	3/10/2021 5:31 PM
54	It may be disruptive to funerals at the cemetery in ack of it.	3/10/2021 8:53 AM
55	Dunore Park is an attractive gateway up Ludlow Ave. into our business district. A chain link fence and worn out grass would be ugly. Find a different location. Mt Storm? More out of sight.	3/9/2021 2:50 PM
56	Reducing free space. Safety for the dogs.	3/8/2021 5:15 PM
57	I don't want a dog park next to my home!	3/8/2021 4:09 PM
58	Ludlow is an extremely busy street. It is unsafe for dogs	3/7/2021 7:19 PM
59	None. The reasons listed above are false.	3/7/2021 6:41 PM
60	Other dog parks turn to mud most of the year	3/7/2021 4:50 PM
61	Prefer to not have to worry about my Grand children's safety around a loss of dogs. And prefer to not have to worry about piles of poop that might not be picked up by owners.	3/7/2021 4:45 PM
62	A fence being constructed in open community park space that diminishes the visual esthetics of our community.	3/7/2021 3:20 PM
63	Danger of off leash dogs.	3/7/2021 12:35 PM
64	Safety for users to cross Ludlow near the park.	3/7/2021 12:05 PM
65	Distracted driving while going past	3/7/2021 8:14 AM
66	The sweet jewish cemetery that rests on the hill is a peaceful place that would be greatly impacted by this decision	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
67	Unfair imposition to local residents	3/6/2021 3:50 PM
68	Cost is also too high for how few would benefit from it.	3/6/2021 2:55 PM
69	Dogs near children	3/6/2021 2:49 PM
70	Aesthetics: dogparks are not attractive additions to a neighborhood	3/6/2021 2:28 PM
71	Loosing a park that is convenient to the neighborhood	3/6/2021 2:23 PM
72	I don't see any downside except cost considerations	3/6/2021 1:17 PM
73	reducing access for children	3/6/2021 10:16 AM
74	None it's all in your mind.	3/6/2021 10:13 AM
75	Safety of dogs and Ludlow traffic. Safety of other people in relations to the dogs.	3/6/2021 10:09 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

76	Terrible idea.	3/6/2021 9:56 AM
77	Safety of children	3/5/2021 10:13 PM
78	Too close to children's play area	3/5/2021 6:36 PM
79	there are other parks that would benefit better for a dog park	3/5/2021 2:10 PM
80	would be a distraction as one drives by so I also see a safety issue for drivers	3/5/2021 11:16 AM
81	Don't want to reduce safe useable space for kids. Playground area should be enhanced at the same time and fenced off from open access areas for dogs.	3/3/2021 6:30 PM
82	I suppose at all dog parks, someone needs to deal with cleaning up garbage and putting out dog poop bags. Also, there are owners who don't clean up after dogs so someone must.	3/3/2021 4:40 PM
83	Some residents will be disappointed because they've been enjoying their own private park for years - but they don't own it	3/3/2021 8:53 AM
84	Use of funds	3/3/2021 7:52 AM
85	None	3/2/2021 11:07 PM
86	Safety concerns for dogs due to proximity to a busy thoroughfare	3/2/2021 11:17 AM
87	Property owners adjacent do not want it	3/2/2021 11:02 AM
88	This is not a safe or healthful plan for DOGS. It might be nice for humans, but it is a bad idea for dogs.	3/1/2021 4:09 PM
89	I disagree this park is underutilized. The trees and grass enhance the health of the environment. Walking/driving by it enhances personal peace of mind/mental health.	3/1/2021 2:39 PM
90	none	2/27/2021 3:35 PM
91	Dog parks are unattractive and would be right on the main gateway into clifton and in a residential area.	2/24/2021 11:15 PM
92	Grass in dog park will disappear due to animals. Water for dogs in summer. Who is going to pay for city to install that or even empty the trash can full of dog poop?	2/24/2021 2:38 PM
93	Loss of local habitat.	2/24/2021 8:41 AM
94	will remove a space for neighborhood kids	2/22/2021 12:48 PM
95	Improper use of the dog park	2/21/2021 4:36 PM
96	No concerns	2/21/2021 9:23 AM
97	Safety: of children and dogs. And dog park would be downwind of playground.	2/20/2021 4:55 AM
98	Cost	2/19/2021 8:41 PM
99	A cross walk is definitely in order closer to the park. Ludlow can be extremely unsafe to cross	2/19/2021 2:01 PM
100	Think of the TREES	2/19/2021 7:17 AM
101	Tree and plant loss through compaction and soil ph changes.	2/19/2021 7:15 AM
102	Impact on play area	2/18/2021 9:27 PM
103	Safety and comfort of young children playing on the playground	2/18/2021 1:33 PM
104	Traffic speeding on Ludlow	2/17/2021 6:06 PM
105	Dogs getting hit by cars	2/17/2021 4:53 PM
106	I currently use Fido Field and there is a heavy volunteer commitment to make sure that park is maintained. We would need that commitment for this park to be clean and well kept.	2/17/2021 9:03 AM
107	Close to busy road - if dogs jump fence it could be dangerous	2/17/2021 7:21 AM
108	Would not want it to affect people's comfort in using the playground.	2/16/2021 9:32 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

109	The nearby residents don't want this	2/16/2021 5:37 PM
110	Maintenance and upkeep not being met; no rules enforcement.	2/16/2021 4:47 PM
111	Dog safety. I would only take my dog if there weren't other dogs.	2/16/2021 3:56 PM
112	Dog Safety. Making sure it is properly built so dogs cannot escape and possibly run into traffic.	2/16/2021 1:59 PM
113	potential for dogs to escape near a very busy, high speed road	2/16/2021 1:22 PM
114	2017 park budget spent \$8,628.00 on MUTT MITTS. this is corrupt use of tax payer funds. fair would be to supply baby diapers! better to have trainings for dog owners to teach their dogs to poop in THEIR yards. why should others pay for the pet of irresponsible entitled!	2/16/2021 12:06 PM
115	Poorly socialized dogs and owners that are not responsible or respectful of others	2/16/2021 11:40 AM
116	all of the above and more	2/16/2021 11:06 AM
117	already in use by families	2/16/2021 10:53 AM
118	Discourteous dog owners ruining the park for others	2/16/2021 10:34 AM
119	Safety. Cars are often speeding along that stretch of Ludlow Avenue.	2/16/2021 9:00 AM
120	No real concerns. The listed concerns can be mitigated with design	2/16/2021 8:54 AM
121	What would the space look like?	2/15/2021 11:32 PM
122	Disruption to peace on my daily walk.	2/15/2021 10:43 PM
123	Traffic on that street is not great -- too much speeding. Unsafe.	2/15/2021 10:18 PM
124	I'd remove a lane from Ludlow.	2/15/2021 9:25 PM
125	Well there still be space for families to be in the swings and run around? If no, I'm less enthusiastic.	2/15/2021 8:57 PM
126	If you think that the citizens of Clifton are going to fund and maintain the dog park, just think back to Clifton Market. A dog park should not be a community project !!!!!!!	2/15/2021 7:46 PM
127	The fence would be too high and I don't think it would be attractive. Plus kids in the neighborhood use the space for football and other outdoor games.	2/15/2021 7:41 PM
128	It would be an eyesore	2/15/2021 7:39 PM
129	Reduced space for kids to run and play.	2/15/2021 7:04 PM
130	Too small an area	2/15/2021 7:01 PM
131	Ugly in a visible are that is a main thoroughfare that should be kept beautiful like it is	2/15/2021 6:47 PM
132	Neighbors do not want it	2/15/2021 6:34 PM
133	None of the problems described above are real problems.	2/15/2021 6:08 PM
134	dog safety in this park right next to a fast busy street	2/15/2021 6:03 PM
135	Restricts those of us who do not have dogs when there are already adequate nearby dog parks. I see people already using the park, all of the time! There are a lot of small houses clustered up Morrison and why should they have to put up with the noise & smell. Sorry, why don't you put it down by Bowdle Park?	2/15/2021 6:01 PM
136	What's wrong with "underutilized" space?	2/15/2021 5:45 PM
137	Not picking up after dogs	2/15/2021 5:41 PM
138	Dog safety, i.e. enforcement of the rules for dogs who are vicious, etc	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
139	The playground is there - can we make that better?	2/15/2021 5:26 PM
140	I do not have sufficient information to have a concern.	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
141	Complete disregard for nearby residents	2/15/2021 5:19 PM
142	I need more information: size of dog run, diagram, type of fence, rules for use..	2/15/2021 4:06 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

143	a lot of kids are afraid of dogs	2/15/2021 2:43 PM
144	dog owners don't clean up after their pets now - why would they do so if it was a dog park?	2/15/2021 2:28 PM
145	Negative impact on appearance.	2/15/2021 11:55 AM
146	Impacts to visitors of Jewish Cemetery and appropriateness of proximity	2/15/2021 11:28 AM
147	Unhealthy to children and even dogs. Not enough space	2/15/2021 11:04 AM
148	Parks are already challenged to take care of what they have. Upcoming budget and foreseeable budgets will be challenging. No needs to add additional amenities, particularly a dog park which requires EVEN MORE maintenance. Pretending that volunteers would take care of it is naive. Volunteers cannot do daily tasks but only projects	2/15/2021 9:28 AM
149	Appearance from Ludlow	2/15/2021 7:37 AM
150	This survey is biased.	2/15/2021 12:53 AM
151	No money for maintenance or construction.	2/15/2021 12:03 AM
152	It is a wonderful space for contemplation and reflecting on the historic cemetery directly across Old Ludlow. In my experience, dog parks can be quite disruptive to those seeking solitude and quiet. Despite Ludlow Avenue being so close, Dunore Park is remarkably peaceful. One more comment. This survey seems less interested in collecting opinions about a dog park than it does encouraging people to support it. It feels like the Park Board has already made up its mind.	2/15/2021 12:01 AM
153	Size of park, preferably want one closer to northside	2/14/2021 9:30 PM
154	Safety of the dogs being so close to a busy road	2/14/2021 9:17 PM
155	disengaged dog owners / small dog safety	2/14/2021 6:42 PM
156	Neighborhood safety	2/14/2021 6:21 PM
157	Bringing more people from other areas to our neighborhood. Loitering. People sleeping in vehicles.	2/14/2021 5:47 PM
158	I understand the neighbors don't want it.	2/14/2021 1:43 PM
159	Strong resistance from adjacent neighbors	2/14/2021 1:42 PM
160	The homeowners closest to Dunore Park do not want it. Respect them. Why piss off your friends & neighbors over a dog park?	2/14/2021 1:35 PM
161	park is quite small and heavily used, for activities like kids playing ball. Any dog park would infringe on the space available for other uses	2/14/2021 12:45 PM
162	There is no litter or smell at other local dog parks?	2/14/2021 12:29 PM
163	It will add yet another hazard as I traverse the park area to get to the Gaslight area. The area across Ludlow from the park is poorly kept (leaves, snow, ice). So adding a "new attraction" with cars will just make Clifton overall "less walkable" -- taking it in the wrong direction.	2/14/2021 11:59 AM
164	Dunore Park is for children to play and swing.	2/14/2021 11:46 AM
165	Unclaimed poop.	2/14/2021 11:25 AM
166	None of the above	2/14/2021 10:15 AM
167	Leave it for the kids!	2/14/2021 10:13 AM
168	It seems like the surrounding residents have serious concerns, especially about who would ensure it stays clean. There is often a lot of dog poo on the sidewalks of Clifton and if people don't pick up after their dogs in other peoples' yards and sidewalks, will they at a dog park? How often will trash be removed and by whom?	2/14/2021 9:50 AM
169	Nearby Residents don't want it	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
170	Irresponsible dog owners	2/14/2021 8:52 AM
171	I don't think it is a big enough space	2/14/2021 8:44 AM

Dunore Park Feedback

172	1) Do we need improved safety? That's hardly a hot spot for crime. 2) it's a residential area, I don't want to attract MORE people. 3) dogs parks are not necessarily safe when people don't control their pets. 4) The park is NOT underutilized. I live across the street and there are people using it all the time.	2/14/2021 8:18 AM
173	cost of maintenance	2/14/2021 7:55 AM
174	Na	2/14/2021 7:35 AM
175	Please keep all the current trees	2/14/2021 6:06 AM
176	None other than I will not use the park if the fenced area is too small. It is critically important that dogs have a long area to run. Like at Fido Field.	2/14/2021 5:40 AM
177	Necessary upkeep and maintenance	2/14/2021 12:46 AM
178	Fencing and other vertical obstructions, both physical and visual.	2/14/2021 12:22 AM
179	People who don't always clean up after their dogs	2/13/2021 11:39 PM
180	Dogs actually don't like dog parks!	2/13/2021 11:08 PM
181	Not sure what the parking situation is	2/13/2021 11:02 PM
182	Ugly fencing, fewer places for children, special interest eating up beautiful, open, public space.	2/13/2021 10:51 PM
183	Expense of construction and ongoing maintenance	2/13/2021 10:45 PM
184	Too close to a major road. I worry about dogs getting loose.	2/13/2021 10:24 PM
185	Car safety if dog escapes	2/13/2021 10:17 PM
186	Safety of others using the park	2/13/2021 10:13 PM
187	Dog fights are dangerous. Dogs get killed in dog parks and injured. No regulation in vaccination.	2/13/2021 10:04 PM
188	Also what if there is a funeral at the cemetery- this does happen on a regular basis.	2/13/2021 9:54 PM
189	Safety as it relates to dogs on a busy street such as Ludlow	2/13/2021 9:52 PM
190	Would like to have enough lawn/Green space left over for people to play soccer/sports in the park	2/13/2021 9:14 PM
191	My family would prefer to use the space for children to play. A dog park will only reduce our play space in an already lacking park for families. I would much rather see expanded play equipment or keeping space natural and open.	2/13/2021 9:05 PM
192	Maintenance budgets need to be included in the long-term proposal.	2/13/2021 8:31 PM
193	Funds that should be spent on general park upkeep	2/13/2021 8:20 PM
194	That the racist neighbors will call the police on Africa Americans using the dog park.	2/13/2021 8:04 PM
195	All of above plus more. Good dogs can bite good children.	2/13/2021 7:54 PM
196	That it would be ugly - a big fence around a lot of mulch.	2/13/2021 7:33 PM
197	None	2/13/2021 6:50 PM
198	A better site is available	2/13/2021 6:24 PM
199	Ludlow is too noisy for the dogs.	2/13/2021 5:45 PM
200	Loss of a green space for the neighbors and kids.	2/13/2021 4:07 PM
201	Erosion. Reduction of children/family play areas.	2/13/2021 3:45 PM
202	My kids don't like dogs but want to use the playground.	2/13/2021 3:44 PM
203	Dog safety, resident safety, child safety	2/13/2021 2:30 PM
204	I don't have any concerns.	2/13/2021 1:48 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

205	If Dunore became a dog park, it would stop being kid-friendly.	2/13/2021 1:24 PM
206	None. There is parking on both sides of the street between the park and the cemetery. There are already sidewalks in the area. A dog park could make it safer because people that drive would slow down to turn or park which would slow traffic. The noise from the dog park would not be any louder than the cars and sirens coming from Ludlow. If there is a trash can on site that is regularly emptied people would use it and not litter. Again, if the trash is regularly emptied there should be no smell. The dog park likely wouldn't take up the entire park so there would still be lots of green space.	2/13/2021 1:17 PM
207	Intrusion on playground safety.	2/13/2021 12:58 PM
208	Lack of water supply.	2/13/2021 12:26 PM
209	Dog biting, excrement and increased traffic.	2/13/2021 12:09 PM
210	Concern for area residents. I would not feel comfortable utilizing the playground with so many off leash dogs and distracted owners.	2/13/2021 10:18 AM
211	This is not an enhancement of an underused park. It is an elbowing out of the current function of the park, which needs to be better served rather than sidelined. It's a reduction of already underserved and under resourced green space for children to safely move around in.	2/13/2021 9:48 AM
212	extremely detrimental impact to closest residents (on Dunore); safety for children using the park (playground and greenspace); increased animal waste; possible negative impact to property values for those on Dunore; proximity to high volume of traffic on Ludlow; long term maintenance unlikely; aesthetics of dog park	2/13/2021 9:30 AM
213	Turns into a mud pit.	2/13/2021 8:23 AM
214	Plans underway for significant road calming on Ludlow Avenue including bike lanes and loss of parking.	2/13/2021 8:10 AM
215	The principle. Clifton already has to accommodate too many pets with their waste.	2/13/2021 7:35 AM
216	Will miss the neighborhood	2/12/2021 11:51 PM
217	There needs to be a crosswalk for pedestrians to Dunore, regardless of any park changes.	2/12/2021 10:56 PM
218	My kids use the park daily, and they are afraid of some dogs.	2/12/2021 9:22 PM
219	Ugly	2/12/2021 9:11 PM
220	Not enough room for quality dog park plus play area and room for families to play ball, etc.	2/12/2021 9:02 PM
221	Lowered pet safety and less flexibility for the use of the green-space be in the future	2/12/2021 8:41 PM
222	I visit this park daily and must drive or walk past it to leave my no outlet street. I will literally have to move if a dog park is placed there due to my daughters phobia of dogs.	2/12/2021 8:22 PM
223	Safety, more people driving and coming to the neighborhood that I don't know (we have surprisingly high crime on this street)	2/12/2021 8:18 PM
224	safety of dogs	2/12/2021 7:54 PM
225	None	2/12/2021 7:48 PM
226	The property owners don't want this. Pay attention!	2/12/2021 7:03 PM
227	Adjacent neighbors do not want it	2/12/2021 6:41 PM
228	Disrespect to visitors of Jewish Cemetery.	2/12/2021 6:39 PM
229	The imposition of the will of a small group of activists over the objections of the people who actually live nearby.	2/12/2021 6:35 PM
230	Immediate Neighbors do not want it	2/12/2021 6:20 PM
231	I am not concerned. None of these issues seem present at Westwood or Washington Park.	2/12/2021 6:04 PM
232	None.	2/12/2021 5:43 PM
233	No concern	2/12/2021 5:22 PM

Dunore Park Feedback


234

Rude dog owners

2/12/2021 5:10 PM

Dunore Park Feedback

Q7 Would you help fund the construction of the dog park?




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	21.29%	178
No	78.71%	658
TOTAL		836

Dunore Park Feedback

Q8 Would you be willing to help maintain the dog park?

Answered: 831 Skipped: 20



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	20.10%	167
No	79.90%	664
TOTAL		831

Fwd: [External Email] Re: Dunore Dog Park Engagement Survey

Merz, Rocky <Rocky.Merz@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Sat 2/13/2021 11:11 AM

To: Schuckman, Steven <Steven.Schuckman@cincinnati-oh.gov>; Kish, Kara <Kara.Kish@cincinnati-oh.gov>; Unterreiner, Mary <Mary.Unterreiner@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Sending some feedback. Mary thought you might keep these so they can be sent to the CPB in an organized way.

Thank you,
Rocky

Begin forwarded message:

From: Maura Gill

Date: February 13, 2021 at 9:53:56 AM EST

To: "Merz, Rocky" <Rocky.Merz@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Subject: [External Email] Re: Dunore Dog Park Engagement Survey

External Email Communication

Rocky,

Thanks for sharing. Disheartening after the conversation last year regarding the viability for a dog park with facts - guidance from engineers and what needs to be true (running water being an important one!) not being available or extremely expensive to install at Dunore. Additionally saddening to see the Park Board (not the Foundation) sending out a survey that solicits funds from private citizens in favor of an initiative that has not yet been approved. Obviously they are learning that it's ok from their City Council members arrested this summer.

I'll follow with more specific details regarding the case I shared at Clifton Town Meeting. Nearby neighbors support the idea of a dog park in Clifton, with a proper unbiased siting study of true viability - soil, community, traffic, water, etc.

I look forward to continued engagement on this issue

Maura McVey

Dunore resident

On Fri, Feb 12, 2021 at 4:51 PM Merz, Rocky <Rocky.Merz@cincinnati-oh.gov> wrote:
Hello,

As you may be aware, a group of area residents have approached the Cincinnati Park Board with a proposal to build a dog park (a fenced area for off-leash dogs), for Dunore Park, the park along Ludlow Avenue just west of Morrison Avenue. A dog park would physically fit on the site without interfering with the small playground. As a next step in assessing the proposal, the Park Board is seeking feedback from park users and stakeholders through this brief [survey](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MXPROJ5):
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MXPROJ5>

Please take a moment to fill out the survey and feel to share with other individuals or groups you are involved with who may have an interest.

The survey will remain open until March 31st.

Thank you,

Rocky Merz | Communications, Engagement & Volunteers, Division Manager

Cincinnati Park Board | 950 Eden Park Drive | Cincinnati, OH | 513.357.2619
www.cincinnati-parks.com



Better Lives
Better Community
Come Join Us!
#CincyParks

--
Maura Gill

[External Email] proposed dog park at Dunore Park in Clifton

Alice Palmer

Sat 2/27/2021 9:30 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Dear Commissioners,

As a resident on Dunore Road I strongly oppose the suggestion that a dog park be constructed in Dunore Park. There are several reasons why this is a poor idea:

1. The open space at the park is frequently used by families and dog owners to play ball, throw frisbees, exercise dogs, and just enjoy the green space
2. The park system is having difficulty finding money to repair what is currently in our parks; now is not the time to add to the infrastructure
3. The space is too small to build an adequate, two-gated dog park with benches, water, trash cans, etc.
4. There is no water supply at the park currently; an expensive connector to the main under a street would have to be built
5. Residents of Dunore are not in favor of the dog park, including the dog owners
6. Improvements to the park that would be welcomed include better maintenance of trees, improved plantings, enlarged playground, and more frequent trash pick up from the one, often overflowing, trash can.

Work with the residents of the area to improve our park to better welcome children, families, and their pets. Partner with us!

Cordially,
Alice Palmer

[External Email] Dunore Dog Park proposal

Mitchell, Pama

Sun 2/28/2021 4:16 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

To the Board Members:

I have lived on Dunore Road since 1996 and have enjoyed the park for all these years. While many people bring their dogs to/through the park, they are leashed and for the most part their owners clean up after them.

However, the single trash barrel in the park (filled mostly by “poop bags”) is not emptied until it’s overflowing. We call or email the Parks Department and eventually someone cleans up. We who live nearby are horrified at how messy an entire “dog park” would be for our neighborhood. That is my chief, and strong, objection to the placement of it in our small park.

I’m sure you’ve heard other objections from my neighbors. We have a lot of children under 12 on our street, and several under 3. Every one of those families (and others from nearby streets) uses the park. The parents universally oppose adding a dog park to the space. The extra noise, traffic, waste and “drama” (dogs that get into fights, for instance) would be dreadful.

Finally, I don’t see how the Parks Department can commit to supporting such a venture given the restrictions on its current and likely future budget. Maintenance alone – already a problem in our parks, as you know – would be expensive. Doing a halfway job with it would mean a blight on our city that would reflect poorly on the parks system. After all, our parks are some of the best features of Cincinnati. I think the emphasis should be on maintenance and small upgrades and enhancements of these spaces – including Dunore Park, where we’d love to see a few equipment and planting improvements.

But please, NOT a dog park!

Thank you very much,

Pama Mitchell

Pama Mitchell
Associate Professor, Emerita
University of Cincinnati

Cincinnati OH 45220

[External Email] Dunore Dog Park - Opposed

Wilson Palmer

Sun 2/28/2021 9:44 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Dear Park Board Commissioners,

I am one of the majority of people in the Clifton area opposed to turning Dunore Park into Dog Park. Families regularly use the open grass area of the park to kick soccer balls, throw footballs and Frisbees, put blankets on the grass to watch their toddlers tumble around, fly kites and many other activities. And, of course there are already way too many dog walkers spreading their poop around where these same children play. I have personally witnessed some yahoo who looked like a Nazi let his attack dog maul the swing seats in the children’s play area.

It is well known the Park Board does not have the money to maintain the parks they now have. You won’t even empty the trash can in the park. The grass cutters come very regularly. Perhaps you could save a few dollars if you let the grass grow a few more days before cutting. It is often re-mowed before it needs it.

It is very disconcerting to hear of your plans to build a marina for rich people and dog parks for 20 people while ignoring the thousands of people all over Cincinnati that love and depend on the green spaces and woods of your many fine parks. Please stop selling out to any special interest groups and focus on supporting the real fans of Cincinnati Parks.

Thank you,

Wilson Palmer,

[External Email] Proposal for Dog Park in Dunore Park

Sumir Khurma

Thu 3/4/2021 10:19 AM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

March 4, 2021

Dear Parks Staff and Board,

I am writing to express my concerns over the proposed dog park in Dunore Park. My name is Sumir Baird and I have been a resident of Clifton for the past 14 years. My family and I have lived on Howell Avenue, Morrison Avenue, and now live on Dunore Road (4years). My husband and I have been taking our three children to Dunore Park since they were babies. Even now as they are older, they still use the play structure and the green space for soccer and football, but also for collecting leaves, sticks, and looking for bugs. Dunore Park has always been a peaceful park for families with children of all ages, for folks that like to walk their dogs, and for anyone who walks by that wants to take a rest. Putting a dog park in Dunore Park would destroy that space, especially for my family and other families who have moved to Dunore Road and the neighboring streets to have a quiet, safe place for their kids to grow up.

This last year has been a tough one for many. The pandemic forced folks to appreciate the things around them that they may not have before, including the many parks in Cincinnati. We have seen many more people spending time in Dunore Park because they are able to properly distance. We have seen individuals hang their own hammocks in the trees and read all afternoon, and as always there are families with kids that come to spend time there. More than ever right now, it is important for people to have access to open green spaces to go to with their families and friends. These spaces were created by Cincinnati Parks to improve the quality of life for citizens. Dunore Park has become a place that our family and many others cherish and we would be heartbroken to see it destroyed by the addition of a dog park. A dog park would destroy the quality of life for residents that live near the park by creating more noise, more trash, parking issues on the street, and safety concerns for the dogs and for children that will be playing in the park. I am asking you to please preserve the green space at Dunore Park.

Thank you for your time,
Sumir Baird

"In every walk with nature one receives far more than he seeks." - John Muir

[External Email] Dunore Park

Shawn Baird

Thu 3/4/2021 3:48 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Hello and thank you for taking the time to read this email. My name is Shawn Baird, and I've been privileged to live in Clifton for over 20 years.

I am writing on the behalf of residents on Dunore Rd., and many other people on neighboring streets, to express our strong and organized opposition to this proposal.

Dunore Park is, at it's heart, a peaceful urban green space. Alongside it's picturesque companionship to the historic Jewish Cemetery, it also serves as a buffer from the haste of Ludlow Avenue. It is a quiet respite, in the true spirit of what a city park should provide. For decades, it has been a beloved place where children learned how to swing, kick a soccer ball, or just run around free to look for pretty flowers and cool bugs. More than ever during this pandemic, it's been a place where people are able to gather safely, spending time with friends and loved ones, and can enjoy a few hours away from their burdens. Far from underutilized, the park is cherished and loved by many, and is welcoming to all: individuals, families, passers by, and yes, many a dog who has excitedly chased after a stick or a tennis ball.

It is our view that the addition of a dog run would ruin the park. A substantial portion of Dunore's open green space would surely be co-opted and reworked in order to support a project of this nature. The large area required for the enclosure itself would trade lovely grass for either a muddy mess, a dusty plume, or at best, a dull synthetic surface. The space necessary for large gatherings and bathroom facilities will further expand the footprint. Old Ludlow, which provides a safe side street on which to casually stroll or ride a bike, would quickly be taken over by parking competition and a dangerous increase in traffic. The noise of barking will be a constant nuisance to neighbors, and the trash overflowing with dog waste would quite simply be a blight.

A dog park would also permanently and severely disrupt the Jewish cemetery, a sacred place where mourners gather to pay final respects, and where loved ones visit to remember those dear to them. We fear that this peace would be forever shattered by the loud activity of dogs, and the bustle of people continuously arriving and exiting the busy area. Even if every household and entity were united in our desire for a dog park here, none of us would have the right to disturb those grounds in such a way.

Looming large in addition, is the enormous financial burden of this proposal. Would it be worth it, the cost to level the natural slope of the park, or the cost to run adequate plumbing, drainage, and other necessary infrastructure? Is it worth allocating the resources of an already strained budget to perpetually handle increased trash and waste, and to otherwise maintain the enclosure...simply to provide a play area for pets? In our view it is most certainly not. It is also our view that any compromises made to lessen costs or spatial impact, would in fact result in the worst of all worlds; a fenced-off neglected pit.

It is for these reasons and numerous others, that homeowners on Dunore Rd. and many property owners in the surrounding neighborhoods are vehemently opposed to any such plan in Dunore Park. If there is to be a dog park in Clifton, it needs to happen from an open, community based effort. It must seek to find a harmonious solution based upon diverse input, outreach and understanding. This effort is not that.

While we all love Dunore as it is, we of course would like to make it better. As a group, we have developed lovedunorepark.com, and are actively putting together plans for independently funded improvements such as tree planting, landscaping, and modern play equipment. Our goal as stewards of the park is to ensure that current and future generations will always be able to take a moment to rest in the fresh grass beneath the shade of it's old sycamore trees, and to enjoy it's quiet beauty on a sunny spring afternoon.

It is in this spirit of love for Dunore that we ask you to join us in our conclusion that a dog park is simply a bad fit for this location, and that any such plans to fundamentally alter the character of the park should be rejected. We humbly thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Shawn Baird
and the residents of Dunore Rd.

lovedunorepark.com

[External Email] Dunmore Park Dog Park

Fri 3/5/2021 11:28 AM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the dog park proposed for Dunmore Park. I have never understood why one would have a dog park that most of it borders a major street in the Clifton area. We live a short walk from the park and have two dogs. I would NEVER use the park. We have taken our dogs to Doris Day Dog Park which has minimum frontage on a busy street. I have not used the dog park at Washington Park as I feel it is an area for those live in apartments/condos in the area to use since they have minimal green space in the area. I think it would be a distraction to drivers on the stretch on Ludlow as they drive by, causing safety issues, also a distraction to dogs. Why not do something at Mt Storm?

Happy to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Mary Pat Lienhart

Cincinnati, OH 45220

[External Email] Opposing dog park at Dunore Park

Alexis Amsterdam

Sat 3/6/2021 11:29 AM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Dear Cincinnati Parks Board,

I'm writing to **oppose** the proposal for the creation of a dog park at Dunore Park in Clifton. I live around the corner from the park on Morrison Place and my family has used the park as an extension of our backyard for 12 years. It is a small, beautiful green space and it is not suitable for a dog park. Dunore Park is a fully residential area and serves families, small children and leashed dogs. There is not adequate parking or space to accommodate the increased human and car traffic. The noise, smell, litter, traffic and safety issues will be a burden to our quiet neighborhood. I encourage the park board to consider an alternate location for a dog park in Clifton.

Thank you for your support in keeping Dunore Park the beautiful, safe, quiet green space that it currently is.

Alexis Amsterdam

Alexis Amsterdam, MPH

Clinical Research Coordinator

Division of General and Community Pediatrics

Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center



[External Email] Dunore Park plans

Nancy

Sun 3/7/2021 4:05 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Dear sir or Madam:

As a resident of Clifton, I have been aware of the discussion and plans for locating a dog park in Dunore Park. I urge you not to continue with this proposal. Dunore is a small, narrow park used most often by young families and single dog owners walking their leashed dogs. It has a small, limited playground. Our children and grandchildren have enjoyed using the equipment and have loved being able to run the length of the park in their young childhoods. It gives children a sense of freedom and empowerment in a very safe grassy area. A dog park would monopolize this green space. Burnet Woods is also in this neighborhood and contains large, flat, green spaces that are much better suited to a dog park. Please consider relocating any future dog park in Clifton to Burnet Woods and not small, hilly Dunore Park.

Sincerely,
Nancy Fluharty

Cincinnati, OH 45220

[External Email] Pro Dog Park at dunore

Clark, Eric

Sun 3/7/2021 6:44 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

I know most of the emails you get about new things and ideas are negative. So, I just want to be a voice of positive support for the dog park at Dunore. It's a great idea. The park is underutilized, there is plenty of parking, and it makes the neighborhood more dog friendly and allows new people to meet - which is essential in a city. Thank you for your consideration.

Eric Clark

[External Email] Proposed dog park in Dunore Park

Giles Dillingham

Mon 3/8/2021 8:36 AM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Hello! I want to make some comments about the proposed dog park. We live a couple of blocks away on Morrison Avenue and use Dunore Park frequently. We are strongly opposed to installing a dog park. We feel it would be an eyesore that would detract greatly from the neighborhood's beauty. Green space is so precious.

We feel that the best 'upgrade' to Dunore Park would be a crosswalk on Ludlow. Accessing Dunore Park is difficult and dangerous as traffic on Ludlow is very fast. Families (and older people like my wife and I) always feel like we're taking our lives in our hands when we cross the street to get to the park! It's especially painful to watch parents with small children or strollers trying to get across.

We LOVE Cincinna. 's parks, and feel that you do a GREAT job enhancing our city. Thank you so much. Please feel free to reach out if you'd like more comments or information.

Respectfully,

Giles Dillingham

Cincinnati, OH 45220

[External Email] Dunore Park proposed for a dog park

Carol Wright

Mon 3/8/2021 12:14 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Carol Wright

Clifton

Do not put a dog park in Dunore Park!

One does not belong in a residential area.

It is a challenge to cross Ludlow Ave at Morrison Ave as it is, more cars will make it even more hazardous.

As a elder, I walk that area almost daily, as do parents with strollers and small children.

Many generations of children have used that park area to swing as little ones, play football, throw frisbees, or climb trees, as youngsters, take their own children to where they played in years past. Greenspace needs to stay green.

No dog park in Dunore Park!!

Sent from my iPad

[External Email] Dog Park at Dunore Park**Daniel Deering**

Mon 3/8/2021 3:00 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my opposition to creating an off leash dog park at Dunore Park. I am a home owner within one block of the proposed dog park and I have been paying property tax in Clifton for over 25 years. I do not want to see Dunore Park destroyed by off leash dogs contained in an unsightly fence. Presently it is a beautiful open green park enjoyed by individuals, families, dogs on leashes and surrounding neighborhoods. It is a gateway into our community.

I fear that a fenced in dog park will only distract from the natural beauty that presently exists and it would quickly become an eyesore, as many soft scape dog parks that are heavily utilized have become.

Please do NOT allow a fenced in, off leashed dog park to be constructed and ruin a beautiful green space that already brings joy and utility to our entire community and city. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dan Deering

Home Owner

Cincinnati, Ohio 45220

[External Email] Dunore Dog Park**Wendy Deering**

Tue 3/9/2021 3:28 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to share my thoughts about the proposed off leash dog park at Dunore Park in Clifton. I have lived on Manor Hill Drive, a block away from Dunore Park, for over 25 years. I have lived in Clifton for 40 years. I have always thought Clifton should have a dog park. I don't think Dunore Park is the right location though. How about an area more tucked away and quiet? Mt. Storm perhaps?

Dunore Park is a green and peaceful gateway up Ludlow Avenue and into our business district. I don't want to see an ugly chain link fence, torn up grass and loud barking dogs in such a prominent and lovely green space that is currently enjoyed by all Cliftonites.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Wendy Neal Deering

Cincinnati, Ohio

45220

[External Email] Dunore Park

Wed 3/10/2021 9:35 AM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Please do not make Dunore Park into a dog park. This is not the right use for this space in this neighborhood.

I would actually like to speak to someone in more detail about this. If someone would like to call me, I can be reached on my cell.

[External Email] Dunore Dog Park

Dave Allen

Wed 3/10/2021 4:16 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Hello Park Board,

I live in Clifton on Manor Hill. A dog park at Dunore would be an asset for me and many others. You constantly see people walking their dogs in Clifton. A lot more people than you ever see utilizing Dunore Park as it is now. I often walk my dogs down Ludlow, around Dunore and back up Ludlow. I seldom see Dunore Park being used. When I do it is usually a parent with a kid or two using the playground. I have a few times seen people using the grassy area but not very much at all. What I have often seen are people parking in the back secluded area and staying in their cars. It may be innocent or maybe not. I have a feeling more people using the park would cut down on that.

A dog park at Dunore would bring more people to the area. I now take my dogs to Washington Parks Dog Park. A couple days ago a mom and dad came in with their daughter. They all stayed in the dog park for a little while then the mom took the daughter to the playground while the dad stayed with the dog. I'm sure that would happen at Dunore. When we had a warm day a week or so ago there were over 50 people using that dog park. Once in a while a barking dog will show up but most of the time it is fairly quiet.

One thing I don't like about Washington Park Dog Park is its layout. It is hard to keep an eye on your dog because dogs can go into areas that you can't see them unless you follow them constantly. I have two Boston Terriers so it is hard to follow two. I would recommend a dog park that is open so you can view all of it no matter where you are.

I understand the neighbors concern to a point. Unfortunately public land is for the public not just the people living in the area. Some of the neighbors arguments are stretching reality. One is that the park is sloped. So why did they put a picture of a very flat Dunore Park on their flyer? That the feces would not be picked up, dry, turn into feces dust and blow in the air. Really? The complaint about traffic control. One objective of having a dog park there is better traffic control: crosswalks, perhaps a traffic light or two, more people and cars at the park may slow drivers down. You can't consider just how it is now, some of the things they complain about would be fixed by the construction of a dog park.

As you can tell I'm definitely for the dog park at Dunore. I love Clifton and feel a dog park would only be an asset.

Dave Allen

[External Email] Dunore Park - no dog park but alternative site suggestion

Joyce Steiner

Sun 3/14/2021 3:25 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

External Email Communication

Hello, Parks Board.

First, we love our Cincinnati. Parks! Thank you especially for all that you have done during the last 12 months. Like many families, we have been to a number of Cincinnati Parks over the last year. Saved us on many levels. So thank you!

Second, I am writing regarding a proposal for a dog park at Dunore Park.

1. We have a dog and would NOT use a Dunore Park dog park – I am concerned about other dogs being aggressive with our senior dog.
2. A fenced dog park in a residential area would devalue properties nearby. Also, as this road/park is a gateway to the neighborhood it potentially has a negative economic impact to property values and the community overall. In these financial times, it is too much of a risk.
3. I understand many people do like off-leash time for their dogs.
4. I would recommend the Parks Board look at the land across from Spring Grove cemetery. There are soccer fields, a baseball diamond, playground area, trail head. Adding a dog park there would help provide for those in Clifton, Northside and other areas that have asked for a dog park.
5. Using the land across from Spring Grove cemetery, which is not heavily residential, would create a similar use dog park as is in the Otto Amleder park area – which is near Hyde Park, Mt. Lookout, etc. And that dog park is very successful.
6. Keeping Dunore Park well-maintained and the playground area clean and in good repair is important. Having a few well-maintained picnic tables and benches are also a good idea so folks can come to sit outside. Regular trash-pick up and curb clean-up.
7. People do use the park. When my children were smaller, we used the playground regularly. It is a park where teens have gathered to be outside during Covid-19. I have seen the park be used for smaller children running outside, frisbee golf, reading outside, swinging on the swings, older adults sitting on a bench, etc. Let's encourage a warm and inviting atmosphere so Dunore Park is used and enjoyed by many people.

In conclusion, I am NOT in favor of a dog park in Dunore Park. But feel it is important to provide ideas for another site to the Park Board. The area across from Spring Grove Cemetery seems to be a viable option for your consideration.

Thank you,

Joyce Steiner

Cincinnati, OH 45220

Fw: [External Email] Dunore Park

Schuckman, Steven <Steven.Schuckman@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Mon 3/15/2021 11:00 AM

To: Kish, Kara <Kara.Kish@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Cc: Unterreiner, Mary <Mary.Unterreiner@cincinnati-oh.gov>

 2 attachments (15 MB)

Preserve Dunore Park MM March 2020.pptx; Dog Park Examples 2021-03 update.docx

From: Laura Hils**Sent:** Monday, March 15, 2021 10:45 AM**To:** Hood, Matthew <Matthew.Hood@cincinnati-oh.gov>**Cc:** Schuckman, Steven <Steven.Schuckman@cincinnati-oh.gov>; Mobley, Jenny <Jenny.Mobley@cincinnati-oh.gov>; Merz, Rocky <Rocky.Merz@cincinnati-oh.gov>**Subject:** Re: [External Email] Dunore Park

Good morning,

I hope that you all had a nice weekend. We are looking forward to the meeting on Wednesday at 1:30. In addition to myself, Donna Thie, Sumir Baird, and Marcia McLaughlin will be attending. We all live on Dunore and/or Crooked Stone. Should we meet at the park across from the entrance to Dunore Rd?

As background for some of our concerns, I'm attaching two documents:

1) A presentation that Dunore/Crooked Stone residents gave to Clifton Town Meeting on March 2, 2020. Some of the information about community engagement is outdated now that Cincinnati Parks has started the community engagement process, but the presentation otherwise provides an overview of the issue from our perspective.

2) A working/draft document that compares several area dog parks (and Dunore Park) against suggested criteria for dog parks. The first page of the document explains the process of developing this document given that it is obviously not a formal study. Because there is not a specific proposal/plan for Dunore Park, some of the information is tentative. For example, I believe that the tentative cost of a dog park in Dunore Park (including an integrated plan for infrastructure and other improvements) was based on statements the Park Board made about the cost of the dog park in Washington Park.

Please let me know if you have any trouble opening these documents, or if you have any questions.

Thanks again for your time.

Laura

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.
Dog Park Examples Discussion Points - DRAFT

- Dunore Park Residents are not saying we're against Dog Parks.
- Dunore Park is not the right location for a Clifton dog park.
- What are the Guidelines & Best Practices in Cincinnati/other areas?
 - Who is the community? Community Need? Goals & Objective?
 - Best Practices? Community Criteria? Community Siting Study?
 - i.e. if Northside and Norwood are included in pro count, their potential sites should be included in siting study.
 - Preliminary plans including preliminary cost for **all** siting options.
 - Alignment with community input
 - Select **THE** right option and location
 - Detailed Plans including cost
 - etc
- Without access to agreed to objective process/criteria, we took a rough assessment of Cincinnati area dog parks referenced in the evolving discussion:

Washington Park Dog Park Mt Airy Dog Park (Doris Day)

Westwood Town Hall Dog Park Dunore Park (**an** option, not **the** answer)
- Design Elements taken from pro & con discussions, google searches, Ann Arbor Dog Park Guidelines
- Big Points why Dunore Park is not a good site
 - No traffic control at Dunore Park.
 - Old Ludlow is the only access to over 30 houses
 - Lacking costly infrastructure: area lighting, water, drainage
 - Sloped terrain leading to major erosion or costly drainage
 - Too close to residences. Additional noise is cumulative, not canceling.
 - High pitch noises from children at playground and all-day sirens can excite dogs
- Iff Clifton wants a Clifton Community Dog Park, then set up an objective siting study with clear criteria.

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.
Dunore Park is not a good site for a dog park - Draft

Good Design Elements of a Dog Park	Washington Park Dog Park	Mt Airy Dog Park (Doris Day Dog Park)	Westwood Town Hall Mini Dog Park	"Proposed" Dunore Dog Park – existing conditions
Flat Terrain	Flat	Sloped	Flat	Sloped
Plenty of Shade	Yes	Yes	Yes	50% tree loss in 10 years
Artificial Surfaces	Artificial	Grass, mud	Artificial	Current is grass
Size – reco ½ acre min (21780 sf)	Medium	Large	Small 3000 sf	Proposed varies 3000 to 10000 sf
Fenced areas – big/small dogs	Single – all dogs	Two – small / large Aggressive/all	Single – all dogs	Current - no
Lighting	High	Medium	High	Gas Light – low
Drainage – frequent surface cleanings	Yes	No major erosion	Yes	None available on site
Drinking Water	Yes At entry	Yes Inside	Yes Outside fence	No
Bathrooms	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Residential impact (noise, odor, traffic)	Condo/apartments, across large street.	No	Some homes across avenues	Across small access street
Residential impact (access)	No impact on access to residences	No	No impact on access to residences	Proposed parking area & entrance on only access road to 30 homes.
Proximity to business	Theaters, Music Hall, 1-2 blocks to OTR	No	Flanked by business, CRC, school, library, restaurants	+0.5 mile to Clifton business district. +1.0 mile to Northside
Near playground	Close. Not adjacent use.	No	Close. Not adjacent use.	Close
Traffic control	Block has all 4 intersections w/ traffic lights. 20-25 mph	Separate entrance that serves dog park only. R-turn only in/out. 35 mph	Triangle block has all 3 intersections w/ traffic lights. 20-25 mph	No traffic control at 2 entrances on single access street to park & residence. 35 mph
Maintenance	High	Volunteers. Poor (mud pits, tunnels, feces along fence, bags tied to fence). Annual mulch.	Just opened in the Fall 2019 – tbc. Added 1/2 person to maintain.	Volunteer. CoC: 2 week mows. Annual mulch. Weekly garbage (insufficient)
Cost – initial	High Part of Washington Park renovation	Medium (a lot of fencing)	~ \$5 million for triangle - CRC/ TownHall update, play, dog park	Integrated plan - roughly \$2 million. Does not include traffic control.
Annual Cost	High	?	?	Roughly \$25,000

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

A Few "Referenced" Dog Parks - - *Draft***Dunore Park is not a good site for a dog park****Mt Airy Dog Park (Doris Day Dog Park)**

- 2 fenced areas (small / all, aggressive, others)
- Sloped area, "grass" areas
- Shade, lighting, available water, bathrooms
- Cost to install? Cost to maintain?
- Major erosion across all areas
- Perimeter of fence both sides of fence: mud, tunnels, dog feces, major erosion
- Waste management: full cans, bags tied to fence



Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Washington Park Dog Park

- Single fenced area
- Flat. Constructed surfaces.
- Shade, lighting, available water, bathrooms
- Cost to install? Cost to maintain?
- Well maintained

**Newport City Dog Park Plans**

- Proposal to relocate dog park as a result of:
 - Neighborhood traffic concerns
 - Alley Traffic Survey – 100+ vehicles down Ader Alley
 - Parking issues blocking alley, clogging Linden Ave
 - Noise from dog park early mornings and evenings
 - Pet Parents not leashing their dogs when getting out of car
 - Dogs relieving themselves in our neighbors yards
 - Excessive dirt and dust coming from Dog park



NEWPORT, RI
EAST-ROW
HISTORIC DISTRICT



Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Westwood Town Hall Dog Park

- Part of integrated design (CRC/Town Hall reno, Playscape, Dog Park, greenspace)
- In the center of business district (restaurants, businesses, elementary school, library, etc)
- 3000 sf, single fenced area
- Flat. Constructed surfaces. Washable
- Shade, lighting, available water, bathrooms
- Cost to install - \$5M. Cost to maintain - ?
- Well maintained - tbc/ brand new
- Concern - too small as weather warms up
- Small fence is not protecting trees and grass area - erosion



Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Health & Safety - - Draft**Dogs' Health & Safety**

- Dog Vaccinations
- Heavy Ludlow traffic especially during rush hour which also is busiest time for Dog Parks
 - Vehicles (cars, trucks, motorcycles)
 - Bus Stop at Dunore Park corner
- Pedestrians and bicycles on Old Ludlow and Ludlow Aves
- Increases traffic on Old Ludlow
- High pitch noises often excites dogs:
 - Emergency vehicle sirens: fire, police, ambulance
 - Children's high pitch voices often irritates/excites dogs
- Shade
- Water (not currently available)
- Lighting (typically more than Gas Light levels)
- Solid waste & urine management
 - Bags often tied to fence after trash can full so animals don't tear into bags
- Mud & dust
- Common canine diseases:
 - Parainfluenza — Transmitted by nasal secretions. ...
 - Bordetella — Transmitted by nasal secretions. ...
 - Lyme disease — Transmitted by ticks. ...
 - Leptospirosis — Picked up from water contaminated by infected urine. ...
 - Giardia — Picked up by drinking contaminated water.

People's Health & Safety

- Increased Dust — aggravate respiratory illness
- **"Dogs are a major reservoir for zoonotic infections. Dogs transmit several viral and bacterial diseases to humans. Zoonotic diseases can be transmitted to human by infected saliva, aerosols, contaminated urine or feces and direct contact with the dog."**
- Need sufficient buffer between children play area and dog park
- Many children are afraid of dogs
- Extra dogs in the rest of Dunore Park:
 - coming and going to Dog Park
 - too crowded inside fenced area so owners with dogs walk outside fenced area
 - aggressive dogs being "asked" to leave
- Typically urine (marking spots) and feces along perimeter of fence on outside
- Pedestrian sidewalk traffic on Ludlow Ave:
 - Barking dogs
 - "Grass" strip between fence and sidewalk on Old Ludlow becomes mud pit encroaching onto sidewalk — very slippery. Same at Mt Airy Dog Park.

Dunore Park is not a good site for a dog park

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Preserve Dunore Park

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

This requests CTM's active, neutral engagement in the discussion regarding a Dog Park in Clifton, specifically at Dunore Park



Current efforts have demonstrated:

- Misrepresentation of public support and lack of appropriate public engagement for proposed location
- Lack of long term vision and planning for proposed park location, keeping city criteria in mind
- Lack of planning for long-term funding and maintenance
- Dismissal of valid concerns regarding health, safety, and environment from the neighboring community

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Misrepresentation of Public Support

- Started with P.U.P.P. attendees and Next Door survey
 - NextDoor represents at most 30% of Clifton homes
 - Survey included surrounding communities (Northside, CUF, Spring Grove, etc.)
- Meetings with parks officials, Clifton Business Association, and other "partners" without engaging with any local neighbors
- Lack of proper engagement with public prior to Parks engagement
- Conflicting messaging:
 - Will only be people walking to the park, but need parking
 - Will only be Clifton residents, but engaging Northside and other nearby communities

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.



Long Term Vision & Planning

Aerial View of Dunore Park

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Long Term Vision and Planning for Dunore Park

- Currently targeted for families with young children
- 3-3.5 acre playground and greenspace
 - Playground with benches
 - Small play structure with 2 regular swings and 2 infant swings
 - Small climbing/slide structure targeted for children under 3 years old
 - Woodchip/mulch surface with log perimeter
 - Open Field with Picnic Table
 - 8 mature trees removed this last winter with no replanting
 - No running water
 - No grilling area
- Approximately ½ mile from Clifton Business District
- Access road to no outlet streets: Old Ludlow, Dunore Rd. and Crooked Stone Rd. (~30 homes)




Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Cincinnati Parks Criteria for Dog Parks

- Written by John Osterman in January 2020
- Recommendations:
 - Minimum of 2 Acre site to provide adequate space
 - Dog Parks are extremely popular. Mt Airy park was expanded due to popularity, Armleder Park is 10+ acres, with 4 acre rotations in use. Washington Park and Westwood both include hard surfaces
 - Due to noise and traffic concerns, sites should not be selected that are not adjacent to residences
 - 4-6 foot fencing, running water for dogs and people, trash cans with lids, parking, shade, benches/tables, appropriate surfaces and ongoing plan for maintenance
- See handout or link for more information

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1SsYo3JWCE-dUJYSzI3WklWelhwOWJYUvhyUW80UzBYyzBZ/view>

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.



Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Examples from Mt. Airy Park



Overflowing trash bins



Waste bags tied to fencing



Trash near picnic areas

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Planning for Long Term Funding



- Minimum \$150,000 start up costs plus \$22,000 yearly maintenance (requires endowment)
- Currently not on Park Foundation nor City Priorities
- City turned down ideas for a Dog Park in Dunore Park in 2016 and 2020 as a part of the Community Budget Request/Neighborhood Project Suggestions (CBR/NPS) processes:
 - 7 requests in 2020, 3 specific to Dunore. All rejected
- Building a new Dog Park as a priority over maintaining/improving current parks demonstrates priorities of Clifton and City

[https://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/finance/assets/File/Attachment%20-%20NPS%20Summary%20\(1\).pdf](https://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/finance/assets/File/Attachment%20-%20NPS%20Summary%20(1).pdf)

<https://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/finance/assets/File/NPS%20MergedDoc%20FY20-21.pdf>

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Sample FY 2020 NPS Response

- 7 Similar requests for a Dog Park in Clifton in 2020 Neighborhood Project Suggestion Process
- 3 requests were specific to Dunore Park
- Dunore Park deemed unsuitable by Parks Staff experts due to "size, use, and topography of the site"
- All 7 requests had similar responses from the Department

FY 2020	
id:	Clifton
assigned:	Parks
category:	Dog park
status:	Not Funded
source:	Capital
id Project	Dog park, please. Thanks!
Comments:	Thank you for your suggestion. A number of people have requested a dog park in Clifton and have suggested several park sites. Sites at Dunore and Mt. Storm are not feasible for a dog park due to the size, use, and topography of the sites. As plans develop for enhancements to Burnet Woods, the idea of a future dog park will be considered, although the costs of on-going maintenance for dog parks is an issue with our limited operating budget. We do appreciate your suggestion and your participation in the Neighborhood Project Suggestion process.

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Sample FY 2016 NPS Response

- 3 Requests for a Dog Park in Clifton, including in Dunore, in Neighborhood Project Suggestion Process for 2016
- Dunore Park deemed unsuitable by Parks Staff experts: "Dunore is a relatively small greenspace and adding additional play equipment or a dog run is not advisable. Also, there are no funds to create a dog park at Dunore... As well as funding being available for maintenance of additional dog parks."
- All requests had similar responses from the Department

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Concerns of Neighbors

Residents of Directly Surrounding Streets

Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

Sample of Concerns to be Addressed:

- Safety:
 - Proximity to Ludlow Ave
 - Traffic speeds on Ludlow and impact of forthcoming calming project
 - Increased traffic on Old Ludlow
 - Street crossings across Ludlow and Old Ludlow
 - Access to homes via Old Ludlow
 - Parking for residents, park users and cemetery visitors
 - Safety for children using playground and open field for play
- Health & Environment
 - Trash – current weekly pickup insufficient for current usage of park
 - Maintenance by volunteer corps will be insufficient
 - Smell from waste
 - Noise pollution of dogs in park
 - Percentage of park going to use as Dog Park
 - Surfacing used in dog park – health and drainage of grass & soil
 - Aesthetics of park and fencing – no buffer from homes sightlines



Attachment to "Dunore Park" - 3/15 - 11:00 A.M.

What CTM Must Do

1. Remain Neutral and Fact-Based
 - a) If someone claims an organization has endorsed something, fact check with those organizations and parties
 - b) Ensure facts are represented accurately
2. Demand an open & transparent dialogue, listening to the needs & concerns of both sides
3. Facilitate neighborhood engagement by using CTM communication vehicles to increase awareness
4. Encourage the honest, transparent, fact-based discussions via your other connections to boards, Clifton residents, and those of the surrounding communities
5. Respect, hear, and reflect in communications the views of those who will be most directly impacted



[External Email] Public Comment for Dog Park Proposal in Dunore Park

Laura Hils

Tue 3/30/2021 4:02 PM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Cc: Kish, Kara <Kara.Kish@cincinnati-oh.gov>

2 attachments (2 MB)

Letter Regarding Dunore Park.pdf; Dunore Park Drawing.pdf;

External Email Communication

Please find attached my letter concerning the dog park proposal in Dunore Park, as well as a drawing/note from my son on the same topic. Please let me know if you have any difficulty opening the attachments.

Thank you,

Laura Hils

Attachment to "Public Comment for Dog Park Proposal in Dunore Park" - 3/30 - 4:02 P.M.

Dear Board of Park Commissioners,

I live on Dunore Road in Clifton and am writing to request that you do not move forward with a dog park in Dunore Park. I'm including a drawing from my son, who makes the same request. Deciding not to pursue a dog park would show that the Park Board exercises common sense, protects valuable greenspace, prioritizes children, and respects the park's immediate neighbors.

Common Sense: Dunore Park is a poor site for a dog park. It is a small area in between Ludlow Avenue and Old Ludlow Avenue and lacks basic infrastructure needed for a dog park, such as water, drainage, and adequate lighting. Ludlow is a busy road traveled by ambulances, buses, and speeding cars and motorcycles. There are no traffic lights or crosswalks at the park. A dog park at this site would be expensive and would create safety risks on Ludlow and Old Ludlow due to increased traffic to and from a dog park.

Greenspace: People of all ages use the park for picnics, reading, playing sports, sunbathing, practicing yoga, slacklining, and strolling through the neighborhood (with and without dogs). Dunore Park has especially been a place of respite during the pandemic. A dog park would take away much of this greenspace from the community--due to the dog park itself as well as the sidewalks that would cut through the park in order to reach the dog park.

Children: Dunore Park has a set of swings and a small play structure that children outgrow by the time they are 3 years old. Many children visit Dunore Park and would love better play equipment. Twelve children of grade-school age or younger live on Dunore Road alone. Children also play in the park's open areas by kicking or throwing a ball, running around, climbing trees, and exploring nature. While other parks in Clifton are great community assets, they are not a substitute. I have two children--ages 4.5 and 1.5--and it takes us 5 minutes to walk to Dunore Park, but 30 minutes to walk to Mt. Storm or the new playground at Burnet Woods (assuming my kids don't insist on hopping out of the stroller). Spending resources on a dog park, while taking away greenspace and leaving an inadequate play structure, would send a message that dogs are more important than children.

Neighbors: Dunore Park is across from Clifton United Jewish Cemetery, an active cemetery. Old Ludlow is the only access road for about 30 houses. These immediate neighbors would bear the brunt of increased traffic, noise, smell, and waste that those living a block in another direction, much less another neighborhood, would not. A dog park would diminish the use and enjoyment of our homes and I respectfully request that the Park Board not pursue the proposal.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Laura Hills

Laura Hills

Cc: Kara Kish, Director

Attachment to "Public Comment for Dog Park Proposal in Dunore Park" - 3/30 - 4:02 P.M.



**Dunore Dog Park Feedback
Phone Calls**

Date	Name	Message/Feedback Summary
3/19/2021	John Ryan	Feels Dunore is wrong park for a dog park.
3/30/2021	Irene Moore	Opposed to dog park in Dunore. Feels it will destroy grass and is unfair to have dedicated space exclusive to one use.

Resolution on Dog Park in Dunore Park
For Consideration April 5, 2021 Board Meeting

Whereas in early 2020, the Cincinnati Parks Board of Commissioners and Clifton Town Meeting (CTM) had separate meetings to consider a proposed dog park in Dunore Park; and

Whereas, with the pandemic, this proposal went dormant for a year until January 2021 when in a Cincinnati Parks Board of Commissioners board meeting it was raised again. In February 2021, Cincinnati Parks distributed a survey to gather input into the Dunore Park dog park proposal, a survey that was open for input until March 31, 2021. There were 850 people who responded including 222 people living within 1 block of the park. In the April Cincinnati Parks Board of Commissioners meeting they will consider further action on the proposed dog park in Dunore Park; and

Whereas, the survey conducted by the Cincinnati Parks did not ask whether a dog park in/or around Clifton was desired, but rather whether there was interest for a dog park in a specific location at Dunore Park; and

Whereas the Clifton Town Meeting Parks Committee received the survey results on Thursday, April 1 in the afternoon and held community forum that evening to consider the survey results and gather community input. Cincinnati Parks Commissioner Jim Goetz attended that meeting; and

Whereas, survey results concluded that constructing a dog park in Dunore Park is polarizing: total interest in constructing a dog park was slightly more in favor with 54.6% strongly or somewhat in favor and 45.1% strongly or somewhat against in total. Within 1 block that is 27.9% in favor and 72.1% against, within <10 minute walk, 56.6% in favor and 43.4% against and >10 minute walk 80.7% in favor and 19.3% against; and

Whereas, 46.45% of total respondents said they would use it and 53.55% said they would not use it; 62.2% of those >1 block would use it and 37.8% said they would not; 49.3% <10 minute walk indicated they would use it and 50.7% said they would not; within a block 24% said they would use it and 75.8% said they would not; and

Whereas benefits were seen as a community gathering space, improved safety, using an “underutilized space”; the concerns were loss of greenspace, increased noise, lack of parking, increased litter/smell with a dog park that would need to be maintained; and

Whereas 21.2% of people said they would be willing to help fund the construction of a dog park in Dunore Park while 78.7% said they would not; 20.1% said they would be willing to help maintain it while 79.9% indicated they would not be willing to help maintain it; and

Whereas, there is significant community discussion about alternative sites that would not take away greenspace and where it would be easier to maintain.

Resolved, that the Clifton Town Meeting Board of Trustees does not support the construction of a dog park at Dunore Park given how polarizing this location is and with the potential for other locations without the downsides of loss of greenspace and;

Resolved, that the Clifton Town Meeting Board of Trustees believes there is interest in a dog park in and around Clifton that would not replace greenspace and is well maintained.

Resolved, that the Clifton Town Meeting Board of Trustees requests that the Cincinnati Parks explore several alternative locations for a dog park that do not take away greenspace, and partner with CTM on a community engagement process to gather feedback on those potential sites.

Burnet Woods Park Advisory Council
Resolution on Dog Park Concept in Burnet Woods
April 7, 2021

Whereas a proposal to create a dog park in Dunore Park (Clifton) has been put before the Park Board both in early 2020 and again now, in 2021; and

Whereas community discussion of creating a dog park in Clifton or Clifton-near has extended to boundaries beyond Dunore Park, to include Burnet Woods Park; and

Whereas in the Clifton Town Meeting Parks Committee Meeting of April 1, 2021, Park Board Vice President Jim Goetz said that locations in Burnet Woods Park were scoped for a potential dog park; and

Whereas in the Burnet Woods Park Advisory Council Meeting of April 7, 2021, members in attendance unanimously agreed that a dog park in Burnet Woods was not desirable.

Resolved, that the Burnet Woods Park Advisory Council is not in favor of the construction of a dog park in Burnet Woods, and respectfully requests that the Cincinnati Park Board remove Burnet Woods Park from its list of considered locations for a dog park.

Lisa Haglund, 2021 Chair
Burnet Woods Park Advisory Council

[External Email] Dunore Park

Larry Holt

Wed 4/7/2021 10:23 AM

To: Parks, Cincy <Cincy.Parks@cincinnati-oh.gov>; Merz, Rocky <Rocky.Merz@cincinnati-oh.gov>

Cc: Kish, Kara <Kara.Kish@cincinnati-oh.gov>; Bob Rack

Mary Jo Vesper

Margaret Reich

External Email Communication

Greengs Rocky,

We write to advise that the Mt. Storm PAC is sympathetic with the views of those opposing the proposed dog park since it appears to be inconsistent with the mission/vision statement (below) our PAC developed for Dunore Park.

I hope this is helpful.

Larry Holt

Representative of the Mt. Storm Advisory Council

Dunore Park

Mission: To promote maintenance and improvements to enhance Dunore Park as a natural, family-friendly, and child-safe space for residents and as an attractive urban greenspace and visual respite for everyone.

Proposed Activities:

1. Continue to advocate for improved playground equipment.
2. Continue to advocate for new tree planting to replace those recently removed.
3. Request additional contributions to the spring bulb display initiated by daffodil donations from Clifton Community Fund.
4. Support and strengthen trash removal practices.
5. Consider an attractive fence along the Ludlow boundary to increase child safety.

Thanks!

BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Kara Kish, Director *KSK*

Subject: Park Operation & Management Agreement for Lot 23 at Smale Riverfront Park

Background

The design of the extension of Smale Riverfront Park on to Lot 23 was undertaken in conjunction with Music and Event Management, Inc. (MEMI), a subsidiary of the Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, and The Banks design team in anticipation of MEMI hosting musical performances and events in the park. On August 20, 2020, the City, County and MEMI entered into an Entertainment Venue Development Agreement (Venue Development Agreement), which was previously approved by the Board. Under the terms of that agreement, the City was to subsequently develop a management agreement with MEMI, with a number of the material conditions of management agreement specified in the Venue Development Agreement, such as revenue sharing, calendaring, and MEMI paying for the operating costs of Lot 23 up to a certain amount. MEMI also agreed to contribute \$1,450,000 to the Lot 23 park as part of the Venue Development Agreement. The City has been negotiating this agreement for management and revenue sharing for Lot 23 and the agreement has now been finalized. The Board is being asked to approve this agreement.

Description

The agreement recognizes that the site is a public park open to the public but at times the performance lawn will be restricted to ticket holders for concerts and special events. A series of conditions govern how and when the space can be used for events, the responsibilities of both parties, scheduling and revenue sharing, and review and approval requirements. MEMI will be the exclusive manager of the space. The agreement calls for MEMI's production and management of concerts and events in which they cover all expenses and retain 90% of the profits with 10% going to Parks. If events result in a loss, they absorb that loss. For Park Board events, 90% of profits goes to Parks and 10% to MEMI (if MEMI does not manage the event or if it is a fundraising event, then 100% of the net revenues are

Kara S. Kish
Director

Jenny Mobley
Deputy Director

Crystal Courtney
Division Manager

Rocky Merz
Division Manager

Steven L. Schuckman
Division Manager

Craig Sherman
Division Manager

retained by Parks). Third Party events split profits evenly between Parks and MEMI.

Basic park maintenance and capital replacement costs have been predetermined and are depicted in the agreement. MEMI will pay these costs. There are provisions to look at actual costs and then "true-up" payments in which case funds may be due back to MEMI if actual costs are less than estimated in the agreement. Other key provisions are as follows:

- Scheduling - MEMI can place holds on dates for events. At 100 days prior to "hold dates" if the event is not confirmed, the date becomes free for other events. Parks and MEMI are to collaborate on reserving and setting dates. The intent is to have at least one weekend day per month free of scheduled/ticketed events. The concert season is generally May 1st to October 1st and MEMI intends to host up to 15 Bengals events per year.
- Revenue/Payments/Fees - Parks is to provide standard maintenance of the space on non-event days and for the first five years of the agreement the payment to Parks is \$132,565. In year five, projected annual payments are \$139,191. Actual costs will be tracked, and payments adjusted as necessary with caps based on the CPI. MEMI will pay the City admissions tax. They will not have to pay the assessment fee at the Banks if they obtain approval from the Banks property owners.
- Term - Ends on the earliest of (i) MEMI or its affiliate conveying the neighboring venue, (ii) the neighboring venue is no longer commercially useable, or (iii) 40 years.
- Other Provisions - Concerts and events have an 11:00 ending time (and upon receipt of the necessary approvals, in some cases midnight). After concerts/events MEMI has 24 hours to clean up and restore the site. They are also responsible for all stage maintenance. The stage will be open to free public use when it is not being used for concerts/events.
- Default/Remedies - If a default occurs and it is not remedied within the periods specified in the agreement, then the non-defaulting party has the right to terminate the agreement. Parks also has rights to terminate if insolvency proceedings are commenced against MEMI or its affiliates. The foregoing are the only reasons the agreement can be terminated. If there is a change in law or policy that materially limits MEMI's use of Lot 23, then the amount MEMI pays for capital and operations is reduced on a pro rata basis.
- Rights of First Negotiation, Last Refusal - For five years after the expiration of the term (Offer Period), prior to entering into negotiations with a third-party, Parks must first negotiate with MEMI for a 120-day period. If the parties are unable to reach an agreement during that period, only then may Parks negotiate with a third-party. If Parks receives an offer from a third-party during the Offer Period, MEMI has the right to try to match that offer.

Findings

The agreement covers the maintenance, operation and funding of Lot 23 and represents a formal collaboration between the Park Board and MEMI. It will enable both parties to successfully operate this extension of Smale Riverfront Park.

Recommendation

Staff respectfully requests the Board approve the presented Operation & Management Agreement for Lot 23 at Smale.

Attachment A—Park Operation & Management Agreement (The Banks Lot 23)

PARK OPERATION AND MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

(The Banks Lot 23)

THIS PARK OPERATION AND MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT (the “**Agreement**”) is made and entered into on the Effective Date (as defined on the signature page hereof) by and between the **City of Cincinnati**, an Ohio municipal corporation, the address of which is 801 Plum Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 (the “**City**”) and **Music and Event Management, Inc.**, an Ohio nonprofit corporation and wholly-owned subsidiary of Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, the address of which is 409 Broadway Street, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 (“**MEMI**”).

RECITALS

A. The Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio, a political subdivision of the State of Ohio (the “**County**”), previously subdivided Lot 23, as the same is numbered and delineated on the recorded plat thereof, of record in Plat Book ___, Pages ___, Recorder’s Office, Hamilton County, Ohio (“**Lot 23**”), into a ground lot referred to as the “**Lot 23 Ground Lot**”, and an air lot referred to as the “**Eastern Park Lot**”, and will transfer the Eastern Park Lot to the City in accordance with the Development Agreement (as defined below).

B. The County previously subdivided Lot 27, as the same is numbered and delineated on the recorded plat thereof, of record in Plat Book ___, Pages ___, Recorder’s Office, Hamilton County, Ohio (“**Lot 27**”), into a ground lot referred to as the “**Lot 27 Ground Lot**”, and an air lot referred to as the “**Indoor Venue Lot**”, and will transfer the Indoor Venue Lot to Riverbank Real Estate Holding, LLC, an Ohio limited liability company and an affiliate of MEMI (“**Venue Developer**”), in accordance with the Development Agreement.

C. The County currently owns a fee simple interest in Lot 28, as the same is numbered and delineated on the record plat thereof, of record in Plat Book ___, Pages ___, Recorder’s Office, Hamilton County, Ohio (“**Lot 28**”); with an air lot to be subdivided at a later date and conveyed to the City in accordance with the Development Agreement, referred to as the “**Southern Park Lot**”, together with the Eastern Park Lot, the “**Park Lots**”).

D. The City will own a fee simple interest in the Park Lots in accordance with the Development Agreement, as depicted on **Exhibit A** and with the Eastern Park Lot described on **Exhibit B**.

E. Venue Developer will own a fee simple interest in the Indoor Venue Lot in accordance with the Development Agreement, as depicted on **Exhibit A** and described on **Exhibit C**.

F. The City, the County, and Venue Developer entered into a certain *Entertainment Venue Development Agreement* dated August 20, 2020 (the “**Development Agreement**”), for the development of the Eastern Park Lot, as well as other real property. Capitalized terms used but not defined in this Agreement shall have the meanings set out in the Development Agreement. In the event there is any conflict between the terms and conditions of this Agreement and the terms and conditions of the Development Agreement with respect to the operation and

management of the Eastern Park Lot, the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall supersede and control.

G. Under the Development Agreement, the City, the County, and the Venue Developer agreed that the City and the Venue Developer, or an Affiliate of the Venue Developer, would enter into an agreement for the management and operation of the Eastern Park Lot, and upon the election of the City and Venue Developer, the Southern Park Lot.

H. Venue Developer desires to assign its rights and obligations for the management and operation of the Eastern Park Lot under the Development Agreement to its Affiliate, MEMI, and MEMI desires to assume such rights and obligations.

I. Pursuant to Section 8.2 of the Development Agreement, the Venue Developer may assign its rights or delegate its obligations under the Development Agreement, in whole or in part, without the consent of the City and the County and upon five (5) days prior written notice to the City and the County, to one or more of its Affiliates.

J. The Venue Developer notified the City and the County by written notice more than five (5) days prior to the Effective Date, of its intent to assign all of its rights and obligations under Section 3.3.6 of the Development Agreement with respect to the operation and management of the Eastern Park Lot to MEMI.

K. Immediately prior to entering into this Agreement, under the Assignment and Assumption Agreement attached hereto as **Exhibit D**, the Venue Developer assigned all of its rights and obligations under Section 3.3.6 of the Development Agreement with respect to the operation and management of the Eastern Park Lot to MEMI.

L. As an inducement to the parties under the Development Agreement to undertake the development of the Eastern Park Lot, the City and MEMI desire to enter into this Agreement pursuant to which MEMI will manage and operate the Eastern Park Lot.

M. Execution of this Agreement was authorized by City Council by Ordinance No. 451-2019, duly passed on November 20, 2019 and by the Park Board (as defined below) on [____], 2021.

AGREEMENT

NOW THEREFORE, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties hereby agree as follows:

1. **DEFINITIONS.** As used hereinafter, the following terms shall have the following definitions:

“**Base Park**” means the hardscape and landscape to be developed and constructed within the Eastern Park Lot in accordance with the Development Agreement, which may but not necessarily include the following elements, as elected and determined applicable under the Development Agreement and the Specific Declaration: (i) waterproofing

underlayment (including sidewalls); (ii) lightweight soil fill; (iii) irrigation; (iv) steps and railings; (v) hardscape walking surfaces; (vi) planters; (vii) furnishings including benches, trash receptacles and bollards; (viii) electric service and transformer for the Base Park; (ix) transformer service for City Sponsored Event Days and MEMI Events; (x) light poles & bases; (xi) water service; (xii) drainage structures, inlets and drains; (xiii) perimeter guard rails along Mehring Way; (xiv) railings at Race Street extension/plaza; (xv) shade trees (3" to 4" caliper); (xvi) natural and artificial turf; (xvii) elevator headhouse and related elements; and (xviii) any granite pavers and stone cladding, all as more fully described and specified in the Trade Contract TC-09 pertaining to the Eastern Park Lot between and among the City, the County, and Universal Contracting Company, *provided that* (a) any costs in excess of \$6,855,000 (which amount includes the contribution from Venue Developer under the Development Agreement) are subject to future appropriation and in the event that the costs for the Base Park are in excess of the current appropriation, to the extent the City is legally able to obligate itself to do so, the City shall initiate the procedural requirements and take all appropriate steps with respect to such additional funding; and (b) the waterproofing underlayment (including sidewalls) related to the Park Podiums, the steps and hardscape walking surfaces, and the light foundations are Public Party Costs (as defined in the Cooperation Agreement).

"Bengals Team Use Days" means up to 15 days each calendar year that the Eastern Park Lot may be used by the Cincinnati Bengals.

"Cincinnati Bengals" means Cincinnati Bengals, Inc., an Ohio corporation.

"City Sponsored Event Day" means any day on which a Performance Event or other programmed event is held on and within the Eastern Park Lot and as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot, which event is produced, financed, operated and managed by the City (collectively, the **"City Sponsored Event Days"**); provided, however, that MEMI shall operate and manage all concessions for the Eastern Park Lot on all such days and that the City may elect for MEMI to manage and operate such events on such days on its behalf. For the avoidance of doubt, if MEMI manages and operates an event on a City Sponsored Event Day at the City's election, then such day shall still be deemed to be a City Sponsored Event Day.

"Consumer Price Index" means the Consumer Price Index, All Urban Consumers, United States, All Items (1982 – 1984 = 100), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, or its successor, or if such index (or its successor) is not available, such other index as the City and the Venue Developer may agree most closely resembles such index.

"Event Expenses" means direct expenses incurred in connection with the production, operation and management of events held within the Eastern Park Lot, and as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot, including, but not limited to, costs of talent, event staff, stagehands, advertising, catering, security, police, ticket takers, ushers, event liability insurance, maintenance, cleaning, box office management, prorated event

utilities, event-related equipment rental, and similar expenses, but excluding any capital costs related to the Private Improvements.

"Event Revenues" means revenues generated in connection with the production, operation and management of events held within the Eastern Park Lot, and as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot, including, but not limited to, manifested ticket sales, non-manifested ticket sales that are sold on an event-by-event basis, rebates, net food and beverage revenues, facility rental fees, box office fees, net parking revenues, net merchandise revenues, sponsorship revenues (exclusive of any related to the semi-permanent stage), and similar revenues. For the avoidance of doubt, any funds donated to Parks related to the Eastern Park Lot do not constitute Event Revenues.

"Indoor Venue" means an indoor entertainment venue with a stage and capacity of approximately 4,500 people, exclusive of necessary staff, constructed within the Indoor Venue Lot.

"Legal Requirements" means all applicable laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations and requirements of governmental authorities, including, but not limited to, zoning and land use laws, building codes and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

"MEMI Event" means any Performance Event or other programmed event held on the Eastern Park Lot, that is produced by MEMI (collectively, the **"MEMI Events"**).

"MEMI Event Day" means any day on which a Performance Event or other programmed event is held on and within the Eastern Park Lot, which event is produced, financed, operated and managed by MEMI in accordance with this Agreement, including without limitation, the Bengals Team Use Days (collectively, the **"MEMI Event Days"**).

"Net Losses" means, with respect to each event held within the Eastern Park Lot, and as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot, the amount by which the Event Expenses directly related to such event exceed the Event Revenues generated by such event.

"Net Revenues" means the Event Revenues generated by an event held within the Eastern Park Lot, and as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot, less Event Expenses directly related to such event.

"Other Event Day" means any day on which a Performance Event or other programmed event is held on and within the Eastern Park Lot, and, as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot, which event is scheduled and coordinated by MEMI and is produced, operated and managed by MEMI in collaboration with a third-party sponsor (collectively, the **"Other Event Days"**).

"Outdoor Venue" means the Eastern Park Lot designed in accordance with the Development Agreement and the Specific Declaration to accommodate a semi-permanent stage and other necessary elements to facilitate outdoor entertainment events, which MEMI anticipates will have a capacity to accommodate approximately 8,000 individuals, along with necessary supporting infrastructure, as generally depicted in **Exhibit E**, within

the site plan attached as **Exhibit A**, all of which shall be constructed and operated in compliance with the requirements set forth in the Development Agreement and the Specific Declaration.

“**Parks**” as used herein, means collectively, the City Parks Department, in coordination with the Cincinnati Board of Park Commissioners (the “**Park Board**”).

“**Park Improvements**” means all improvements now or hereafter located within the Eastern Park Lot, and, as and if applicable, the Southern Park Lot.

“**Performance Event**” means any show, concert, festival, recital, play, musical or theatrical performance, or similar activity (collectively, “**Performance Events**”).

“**Smale Park Level of Finish Elements**” as used herein means only as funding may permit, that level of finish in design and implementation, comparable to the prior phases of Smale Riverfront Park, which may include, but may not be limited to, granite pavers throughout pedestrian areas, sandstone and/or granite facing on horizontal and vertical surfaces of seating areas, granite stone cladding on all exterior vertical garage surfaces visible within the Park Lots and along City streets, brushed aluminum railings along Park Lot perimeters, brushed aluminum pergolas, elevator headhouses with glass features comparable to other prior phases of Smale Riverfront Park as generally described in the Development Agreement.

2. **TERM.**

(A) The term of this Agreement shall commence on the Effective Date (the “**Commencement Date**”) and shall terminate on the earlier of (i) the date that is 40 years after the Effective Date (the “**40-Year Termination Date**”) or (ii) the first date after the Commencement Date that (a) MEMI, or its permitted successors or assigns hereunder, is not the fee simple owner of the Indoor Venue Lot or, (b) at any time after the construction of the Indoor Venue is completed, if MEMI or its permitted successors or assigns hereunder, remains the fee simple owner of the Indoor Venue Lot but there is not a commercially useable indoor entertainment venue comparable to the Indoor Venue in existence on the Indoor Venue Lot, unless sooner terminated by a mutual written agreement among the parties hereto or as otherwise expressly provided for herein (the “**Expiration Date**”) (the “**Term**”).

(B) Notwithstanding any language to the contrary in this Agreement, the rights and obligations of the City and MEMI pursuant to this Agreement are subject to the satisfaction of the General Contingencies specified in Section 3.1.1 of the Development Agreement.

3. **DUTIES AND OBLIGATIONS.**

(A) **Maintenance and Repairs.**

(i) **General Maintenance.** Subject to MEMI’s payment of the MEMI Funds (defined below), and the City’s annual appropriation, the City shall maintain the general physical condition of the Eastern Park Lot, and once developed, the Southern Park Lot, in a manner consistent with the City’s maintenance of Smale Riverfront Park, in order to provide a safe and clean environment for visitors. The City, through Parks, will perform all ordinary maintenance with respect to the general physical condition of the Park Lots (as each is developed and subject to annual appropriation and MEMI’s payment of the MEMI Funds), including trees, grass, plantings, lighting, etc. consistent with the maintenance provided by the City, through Parks, on adjoining Smale Riverfront Park properties. The City, through Parks, will coordinate such maintenance activities with MEMI on MEMI Event Days and Other Event Days but shall have no other operational responsibilities for the Eastern Park Lot on MEMI Event Days and Other Event Days.

(ii) **Base Park Maintenance.** Subject to the City’s annual appropriation and MEMI’s payment of the MEMI Funds, the City shall maintain the hardscape and landscape within the Park Lots (once developed), including the Base Park, consistent with the City’s maintenance of Smale Riverfront Park and will not make any material changes to the hardscape and landscape, including the Base Park, constructed in accordance with the designs approved under the Development Agreement that would negatively impact MEMI’s operation of the Outdoor Venue or MEMI’s ability to hold MEMI Events on the Eastern Park Lot.

(iii) **Capital Repair.** Subject to MEMI’s payment of the MEMI Funds, the terms and conditions of which are set forth in Section 3(D) herein, and the City’s annual appropriation, the City through Parks, shall be responsible for performing routine capital repair and replacement of the Park Lots, as each is developed.

(iv) **Restoration Following Performance Event.** MEMI will restore the Eastern Park Lot no later than 24 hours after each MEMI Event Day and Other Event Day to its pre-event physical condition, less normal wear and tear, *provided that* in the event of damage to the Eastern Park Lot that cannot be repaired in 24 hours, MEMI shall provide Parks notice of such damage and diligently repair such damage no later than 30 days after the damage was incurred. In the event such damage is not repaired by MEMI, then Parks may invoice MEMI for the costs to restore the Eastern Park Lot to its pre-event condition (such as costs related to grease spills, confetti, tape, stickers, zip ties, chalk drawings, staking and/or driving in the lawn). Parks will restore the Eastern Park Lot no later than 24 hours after each City Sponsored Event Day to its pre-event physical condition, less normal wear and tear, *provided that* in the event of damage to the Eastern Park Lot that cannot be repaired in 24 hours, City shall provide

MEMI notice of such damage and diligently repair such damage no later than 30 days after the damage was incurred.

- (v) **Maintenance of Semi-Permanent Stage.** MEMI is solely responsible for any and all maintenance and maintenance costs related to the semi-permanent stage.
- (B) **Event Management.** Except with respect to certain City Sponsored Event Days, MEMI shall be the exclusive manager and operator of any and all entertainment and programming, including Performance Events, within the Eastern Park Lot. Management and operation of the Eastern Park Lot on MEMI Event Days shall be at the sole cost and expense of MEMI. The Public Parties shall have no liability for any expenses or any losses incurred in connection with the management and operation of any MEMI Event Days or Other Event Days. The City shall coordinate the scheduling of all City Sponsored Event Days with MEMI. At the City's option, the City may elect to manage, produce and operate the Eastern Park Lot on all City Sponsored Event Days.
- (C) **Performance Events.**
 - (i) **Management of Programming, Production and Scheduling.** Except with respect to certain City Sponsored Event Days and subject to the calendaring provisions described below, MEMI shall be the exclusive management entity for all Performance Events on the Eastern Park Lot. MEMI will schedule with the City, through Parks, Performance Events at the Eastern Park Lot subject to the following terms and conditions:
 - (a) **MEMI Event Days Primary Season.** May 1 through October 1 of each calendar year is the primary season for the scheduling of MEMI Event Days (the "**Primary Season**"). Notwithstanding the foregoing, MEMI Event Days may be scheduled and held on dates not during the Primary Season.
 - (b) **Parks "First Hold".** Parks may provide MEMI notice of any desired dates for its activities as far in advance as desired; such dates shall be given "first hold" status by MEMI, with the understanding that until confirmed by Parks, "hold dates" may be rescheduled and potentially replaced by more financially lucrative MEMI Event Days, after discussion and agreement of Parks, which approval will be not unreasonably withheld or delayed.
 - (c) **MEMI "First Hold".** MEMI shall notify Parks of any "hold date" for any potential MEMI Event Day not less than 100 days in advance of such date; if such date is not confirmed as the chosen date within 100 days in advance, such MEMI Event Day shall be released from a "first hold" status.

- (d) **Limit on MEMI Event Days.** MEMI and Parks shall mutually agree in writing on a cap on the number of MEMI Event Days (in addition to the Bengals Team Use Days) during the Primary Season, or some other limitation (by way of example only and not by limitation, at least one Saturday each month shall be free from any MEMI Events), subject to mutual waiver by MEMI and Parks (the "**Number of MEMI Event Days**"). As of the Effective Date, the parties agree that at least one weekend day (specifically, either Saturday or Sunday) each calendar month shall be free from any MEMI Event Days and Other Event Days, unless the parties agree in writing to waive such requirement for a particular month from time to time, in which case such open weekend day shall be reallocated to a future month, no later than six (6) months from such original month, as determined by the parties in writing.
- (e) **Management Fee.** Except for as described in Section 3(C)(ii) below, no other management fee will be charged by MEMI to the City for such Performance Event management services with respect to the Eastern Park Lot.
- (f) **Parks' Use of Indoor Venue.** MEMI, or its affiliate, shall allow Parks to use the Indoor Venue rent-free, with only reimbursement to MEMI, or its affiliate, for MEMI's, or its affiliate's, expenses, for up to four times in any calendar year with such dates subject to MEMI's, or its affiliate's, approval; provided that such use by Parks shall be non-assignable, for Parks' purposes only, and shall not be competitive with MEMI's, or its affiliate's, business. On the days that there are no events in the Eastern Park Lot, the Outdoor Venue, including the semi-permanent stage, will be open to the public as part of the public park on the Eastern Park Lot and MEMI will keep the Outdoor Venue reasonably free from equipment and other items on such days.
- (g) **Annual Calendar and Management Review.** No later than October 31 each year following the Effective Date, MEMI and Parks will meet to discuss (i) the scheduling of events over the prior year, (ii) MEMI's performance as manager pursuant to this Agreement, and (iii) potential improvements to each of the foregoing for the upcoming year.
- (h) **Rose Garden Events.** MEMI acknowledges that Parks, through a third-party, holds outdoor wedding ceremonies in the Rose Garden at Smale Riverfront Park (the "**Rose Garden Events**"). MEMI acknowledges and agrees that if a MEMI Event and a Rose Garden Event occur on the same day, MEMI will collaborate with Parks and make reasonable efforts to minimize the sound emitting from

the Eastern Park Lot from sound checks and set up of a performance during a Rose Garden Event.

- (i) **Timing of Events.** Subject to all Legal Requirements, MEMI and the City agree that all amplified sound occurring in the Eastern Park Lot pursuant to this Agreement will end no later than 11:00 PM, *provided that* in certain circumstances, upon receipt of the necessary City approvals, amplified sound will end no later than midnight. The City and Park Board acknowledge and agree that MEMI's use of the Eastern Park Lot may extend beyond the Park Board's normal hours of operation of the Eastern Park Lot.
- (ii) **Net Revenues.** MEMI and the City shall share Net Revenues from the operation and management of the Eastern Park Lot as follows:
 - (a) **MEMI Event Days.** For all MEMI Event Days, which shall include the Bengals Team Use Days, Net Revenues shall be split as follows: 90% to MEMI and 10% to the City. MEMI shall have the right to share its portion of such Net Revenues with respect to the Bengals Team Use Days with the Cincinnati Bengals. MEMI will absorb any Net Loss from a MEMI Event Day and the City shall not be at risk for any Net Loss.
 - (b) **City Sponsored Event Days.** For all City Sponsored Event Days that MEMI manages and operates, Net Revenues shall be split as follows: 10% to MEMI and 90% to the City; provided, however, if (1) MEMI is not required to provide any staffing or other support in connection with a City Sponsored Event Day, City shall retain 100% of the Net Revenues or (2) a City Sponsored Event Day is a fundraising event for Parks, then MEMI will only be reimbursed its actual costs and will not receive 10% of the Net Revenues from such City Sponsored Event Day. The City will absorb any Net Loss from a City Sponsored Event Day, and MEMI shall not be at risk for any Net Loss.
 - (c) **Other Event Days.** For all Other Event Days and all other Performance Events or other programmed events where MEMI permits a third party to produce such event, Net Revenues shall be split as follows: 50% to MEMI and 50% to City. MEMI and City shall mutually develop and agree to standard rates for such programming based on the nature of the third party (e.g., for-profit or non-profit) and the event, which may be updated from time to time by mutual written agreement between the parties (the "Standard Rates"). The parties will be equitable in applying such rates and will comply with all Legal Requirements. In the event the

Standard Rates are inconsistent with the City's standard rates, the Standard Rates shall supersede and control.

- (d) **Reconciliation of Net Revenues.** MEMI and City, through Parks, shall make reasonable efforts to reconcile and settle the sharing of the Net Revenues for each applicable Performance Event or other programmed event, including making any necessary payments to the other party in connection with such settlement and providing supporting documentation necessary to verify the settlement and the Net Revenues for such period (collectively, the "Settlement"), within ten (10) business days following such event; provided, however, that such Settlement shall be completed at a minimum within thirty (30) calendar days following such event. MEMI and the City shall provide each other with access to all books and records necessary to verify Net Revenues and shall submit annual reports documenting all Net Revenues (including those not captured in the monthly reports) no later than July 30 each year regarding the same.

(D) **Operations and Capital Replacement Funds.**

- (i) **Initial MEMI Funds.** At the beginning of each of the first five fiscal years of the Term of this Agreement (with the first fiscal year beginning on the Effective Date and ending on the first June 30th after the Effective Date and the first five fiscal years of this Agreement being the "Initial Term"), MEMI agrees to pay \$132,565 (such amount is equal to the average annual capital and operation expenses expected to be incurred by Parks for the Eastern Park Lot during the Initial Term) to the City (the "Initial MEMI Funds"). Of the Initial MEMI Funds, \$43,838 is equal to the projected average annual capital and infrastructure replacement reserve and capital repair expenses (the "Initial Capital Funds") and \$88,727 is equal to the projected average annual operating expenses (the "Initial Operating Expense Funds") for the Initial Term. At the end of the third fiscal year of the Initial Term, if the Initial Operating Expense Funds paid by MEMI for such three fiscal year period exceed the actual operating expenses incurred by Parks for the Eastern Park Lot during such period, then MEMI shall be refunded the difference between the Initial Operating Expense Funds paid and such actual operating expenses under the true-up calculation and payment provided in Section 3(D)(v). At the end of the Initial Term, if the Initial Operating Expense Funds paid by MEMI for the fourth and fifth fiscal years of the Initial Term exceed the actual operating expenses incurred by Parks for the Eastern Park Lot during such period, then MEMI shall be refunded the difference between the Initial Operating Expense Funds paid and such actual operating expenses under the true-up calculation and payment provided in Section 3(D)(v). At the end of the Initial Term, if the Initial Capital Funds paid

during the Initial Term exceed the actual capital repairs and capital reserve amounts for the Eastern Park Lot over the Initial Term, then MEMI shall be refunded the difference between the Initial Capital Funds paid for the Initial Term and the actual repairs incurred and the necessary capital and infrastructure replacement reserve, in accordance with the true-up calculation and payment provided in Section 3(D)(v).

- (ii) **Subsequent MEMI Funds.** Immediately prior to each subsequent five-year period during the term of this Agreement (the “**Determination Date**”), Parks will prepare a new projection of the annual capital expenses, including capital and infrastructure replacement reserve, and operating expenses expected to be incurred by Parks for the Eastern Park Lot for each fiscal year during such five-year period (each, the “**Projected Amount**”, and collectively, the “**Projected Amounts**”). The Projected Amounts shall be based upon Parks’ actual capital and operating expenses for the prior five-year period (including a revised projected capital and infrastructure replacement reserve based upon any revisions to the useful life of the improvements to the Eastern Park Lot) for the Eastern Park Lot; *provided, however*, that each Projected Amount shall be capped at the Projected Amount for the immediately preceding fiscal year increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period immediately prior to the Determination Date, with MEMI and City agreeing that the Projected Amount for fiscal-year five of this Agreement shall be \$139,191 (the “**Base Amount**”), which shall serve as the initial Projected Amount in applying this provision. For purposes of clarity and avoidance of doubt, the Projected Amount for the first fiscal year following the initial Determination Date shall be capped at the Base Amount increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period immediately prior to the Determination Date (the “**Initial Projected Amount**”) and the immediately subsequent Projected Amount shall be the Initial Projected Amount increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the 12-month period immediately prior to the Determination Date. The Projected Amounts shall be subject to MEMI’s review and approval, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed. At the beginning of each fiscal year of such subsequent five-year period, MEMI agrees to pay to the City the Projected Amount applicable to such fiscal year for such period (the “**Subsequent MEMI Funds**”). Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the portion of the Subsequent MEMI Funds attributable to operating expenses paid for a given fiscal year exceed the actual operating expenses incurred by Parks for the Eastern Park Lot during such year, then MEMI shall be refunded the difference between the Subsequent MEMI Funds attributable to operating expenses paid and such actual operating expenses under the true-up calculation and payment provided in Section 3(D)(v). At the end of each five fiscal year term, if Subsequent MEMI Funds paid during such five year period for

capital expenses exceed the actual capital repairs and capital and infrastructure replacement reserve amounts necessary for the Eastern Park Lot, then MEMI shall be refunded the difference in accordance with the true-up calculation and payment provided in Section 3(D)(v). The Initial MEMI Funds and the Subsequent MEMI Funds shall each be referred to herein as the “**the MEMI Funds**”.

- (iii) **Payment of the MEMI Funds.** MEMI agrees to submit the MEMI Funds to the City for the purpose of funding Parks’ operating and capital expenses (including a capital and infrastructure replacement reserve) with respect to the Eastern Park Lot no later than July 1 each year for the fiscal year commencing on such July 1, which shall be allocated solely for the capital repair and maintenance of the Eastern Park Lot including but not limited to, the natural and artificial turf and those elements necessary to sustain the production of Performance Events on the Eastern Park Lot. The MEMI Funds for the first year of operations of the Eastern Park Lot shall be prorated based upon the Completion of construction of each Park Lot and the partial year. The MEMI Funds for the last year of operations of the Eastern Park Lot shall be prorated based upon the partial year. MEMI and the City, through Parks, shall collaborate with each other regarding the prioritization and allocation of the MEMI Funds for capital repair and maintenance of the Eastern Park Lot.
- (iv) **Change in Use of Eastern Park Lot.**
- (a) **Change in Law or Policy.** Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Section 3(D), to the extent any change in Legal Requirements or government policy materially limits or impairs MEMI’s use of the Eastern Park Lot as permitted under this Agreement, by way of an example, an ordinance limiting the scheduling, timing, or amount of Performance Events at the Outdoor Venue, MEMI’s liability for capital and operating expenses incurred by the City for the Eastern Park Lot under this Section 3(D) shall be reduced on a pro-rata basis taking into account MEMI’s reduced ability to use the Eastern Park Lot in proportion to the Number of MEMI Event Days, including any additional events agreed to by Parks and MEMI.
- (b) **Eastern Park Lot Unavailable for Use.** Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Section 3(D), in the event the Eastern Park Lot is unavailable for any period of time and that unavailability prevents MEMI from holding a MEMI Event, except as otherwise permitted in this Agreement, MEMI shall not be liable under this Section 3(D) for capital and operating expenses incurred by the City for the Eastern Park Lot during such period and MEMI’s liability under this Section 3(D) shall be reduced

proportionally, *provided, however*, in the event that the unavailability of the Eastern Park Lot is caused by an act or omission of MEMI, MEMI is still liable for all payments under this Section 3(D).

(v) **True-Up; Right to Audit and Inspection.**

- (a) **Operating Expenses True-Up.** Within thirty (30) days after (1) the completion of the third fiscal year of the Initial Term, (2) the completion of the Initial Term, and (3) the completion of each fiscal year thereafter each ending on June 30th or the termination of this Agreement, as the case may be, the City and MEMI shall take the followings actions: (i) the City shall provide MEMI with a detailed reconciliation report setting forth its actual operating expenses incurred with respect to the Eastern Park Lot for such fiscal year(s) (and in the event that the City's records of operating expenses relate to all of Smale Riverfront Park, such amounts will be prorated based upon the amount of square footage of the Eastern Park Lot relative to all of Smale Riverfront Park); and (ii) MEMI and the City shall cooperate in good faith to calculate and reconcile the difference, if any, between (x) the amount of the MEMI Funds actually paid by MEMI to the City for operating expenses for such fiscal year(s) ("**Operating Amounts Paid**"); and (y) the City's actual operating expenses with respect to the Eastern Park Lot for such fiscal year(s) ("**Operating Amounts Owed**") (the "**Operating True-Up Amount**"). In the event the Operating Amounts Paid exceed the Operating Amounts Owed, the City, through Parks, shall promptly pay (within ten (10) business days following each mutual determination of the Operating True-Up Amount) an amount equal to the Operating True-Up Amount to MEMI in immediately available funds (the "**Operating Annual True-Up**"), subject to Section 3(D)(v)(b) below.
- (b) **Capital Repairs and Reserve True-Up.** Notwithstanding Section 3(D)(v)(a), the Operating Annual True-Up shall not include any amount paid by the City, through Parks, related to repairs and replacement reserves for the capital and infrastructure improvements in the Eastern Park Lot (collectively, the "**Capital Improvements**"). On each Determination Date, MEMI and the City shall calculate, reconcile and settle the difference between (1) the repairs of the Capital Improvements projected to be paid by the City, through Parks, for such five year term and the projected replacement reserve for the Capital Improvements and (2) the actual costs of the repairs of the Capital Improvements for such five year term paid by the City, through Parks, for the Eastern Park Lot and the projected replacement reserve for the Capital

Improvements, as revised because of any changes to the projected life-cycle of the Capital Improvements. Within thirty (30) days after each applicable Determination Date, MEMI and the City shall calculate, reconcile, and settle the difference between the amount of the MEMI Funds allocated to the Capital Improvements ("**Capital Payments**"), including (x) if the MEMI Funds received with respect to Capital Improvement repairs exceeded the actual cost of such repairs (the "**Repair True-Up**") and (y) any revisions to the replacement reserve for the Capital Improvement because of changes to the projected life-cycle of the Capital Improvements; *provided that*, if the life-cycle of a Capital Improvement is less than the expected life-cycle of such Capital Improvement at the time of installation, MEMI shall be liable to the City for an amount proportional to the reduced life-cycle of such Capital Improvement, based upon the portion of the Capital Payments attributable to such Capital Improvement, or, if the life-cycle of the a Capital Improvement is greater than the expected life-cycle of such Capital Improvement at the time of installation, the City shall refund to MEMI for the portion of the Capital Payment attributable to the proportional amount of the increased life-cycle of such Capital Improvement (the "**Reserve True-Up**"). The City, through Parks, will pay promptly (within ten (10) business days following the Determination Date) to MEMI an amount equal to the Repair True-Up, if any is owing for such period. The party liable to the other party for the Reserve True-Up shall promptly pay to the owed party (within ten (10) business days following the Determination Date) an amount equal to the Reserve True-Up in immediately available funds. In the event that the City, through Parks, does not have sufficient MEMI Funds on hand at the time of installation of the replacement Capital Improvement to pay for such replacement, then the City, through Parks, may request that MEMI pay within 10 business days after the request, the portion of the future Reserve True-Up necessary to replace the Capital Improvement and such Reserve True-Up will be correspondingly reduced. Notwithstanding the foregoing, while MEMI agrees to be liable for actual capital costs associated with a reduced life-cycle in the Capital Improvements, MEMI shall not be liable for the City's actual capital repair costs for the Capital Improvements that exceed the City's estimated repair costs for the Capital Improvements for the Eastern Park Lot as provided in each of its pro-forma statements. In the event that this Agreement is terminated in the middle of a life-cycle of the Capital Improvements, within thirty (30) days after such termination, the City and MEMI shall apply this provision in the same manner taking into account such reduced period.

- (c) **Right to Audit and Inspection.** MEMI maintains the right to inspect and audit the City's books, records, and receipts pertaining to the Eastern Park Lot, including the City's capital and operating expenses thereof. Upon MEMI's reasonable request, the City shall provide MEMI with access to its books and records and copies of receipts necessary for MEMI to exercise its rights of audit and inspection under this provision, *provided that* in no event is the City obligated to retain such records beyond the applicable City record retention policy.
- (E) **Liquor Permit and Concessions.** MEMI shall apply for, or engage a third party to apply for, a liquor permit for alcohol service and consumption within the area of the Outdoor Venue on MEMI Event Days, City Sponsored Event Days, Other Event Days, and other days. MEMI, or its affiliate or agent, will operate all alcohol and food concessions on the Eastern Park Lot for such days. MEMI shall ensure that such alcohol service and concessions are managed in accordance with all Legal Requirements.
- (F) **Admissions Taxes.** MEMI shall collect and remit to the City Treasurer the Admissions Tax. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this Agreement shall be deemed to limit MEMI's obligations or the City's rights pursuant to Cincinnati Municipal Code Chapter 309.
- (G) **Central Riverfront Park Assessment.** MEMI shall not be required to pay the Assessment (as defined in the General Declaration as such declaration is defined in the Development Agreement). MEMI or its affiliate and the County (pursuant to the Development Agreement) shall collect the signatures of all Banks Property Owners (as defined in the General Declaration) to the necessary amendment of the General Declaration to effectuate such change. Until such time that the General Declaration is amended in accordance with this Section 3(G), MEMI acknowledges and agrees that it will pay the Assessment (as defined in the General Declaration).
- (H) **Third Party Contracts.** MEMI shall have authority to enter into contracts with third parties for all labor, materials and services required in connection with the management and operation of MEMI Event Days, Other Event Days and any City Sponsored Event Days that Parks engages MEMI to manage. Each such contract entered into by MEMI shall (i) be either in the name of MEMI or its designee as agent for MEMI, (ii) require all contractors to provide evidence of sufficient insurance (e.g., worker's compensation, employer's liability covering all persons performing work, and commercial general liability insurance in an amount not less than Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000) per occurrence, combined single limit, or such other requirements as may be specified by the City, naming the City as an additional insured), (iii) provide that such contract shall be assignable to the City, and (iv) provide that all contractors are subject to the applicable terms and conditions of this Agreement. Upon the City's request, MEMI shall provide the

City with copies of fully-executed contracts with third parties so that the City can determine whether the requirements set forth herein have been satisfied. At the end of the Term, MEMI shall, upon the City's request, assign to the City all of MEMI's interests under such contracts or any one or more of them as designated by the City. If the City elects not to assume any one or more of such contracts, MEMI shall be solely responsible for terminating such contracts, including without limitation paying any and all termination fees or penalties associated therewith. Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, MEMI shall not have the authority to enter into any contract in the name of, or to exercise any right or make any decision on behalf of, the City.

- (I) **Reporting Requirements.** MEMI shall collect, maintain, and furnish to the City from time to time such other accounting, financial, business, administrative, operational and other reports, records, statements and information as may be requested by the City pertaining to MEMI or the Eastern Park Lot, including without limitation bank statements, loan statements, income tax returns, and such other reports and information as may be required for compliance with programs and projects funded by the City, Hamilton County, the State of Ohio, or any federal agency (all reports, records, statements and other information furnished by MEMI under this Agreement being referred to herein collectively as "**Records and Reports**"). All Records and Reports compiled by MEMI and furnished to the City shall be in such reasonable form as the City may from time to time require. During the Term, MEMI shall permit the City and its designees and auditors to have access to and to inspect and audit MEMI's Records and Reports. If the City's inspection or audit reveals a material discrepancy with information previously provided by MEMI, MEMI shall reimburse the City for the City's reasonable out-of-pocket costs associated with such inspection or audit, and the parties shall work cooperatively to resolve such discrepancy.
- (J) **Reporting of Accidents and Other Significant Occurrences.** MEMI shall keep the City informed as soon as practicable upon discovery of all reported accidents and other significant, unanticipated occurrences at or otherwise affecting the Eastern Park Lot that involve public health or safety issues or that could lead to negative publicity. MEMI shall notify Parks as soon as discovered but no later than 24 hours of robberies, assaults and other criminal activity. For all incidents for which a police report is filed, MEMI shall promptly obtain a copy of the police report and promptly provide a copy of it to Parks.
- (K) **City's Right to Inspect.** The City shall have the right to inspect the Eastern Park Lot from time to time for any proper purpose.
- (L) **Name of Park.** MEMI shall refer to the Eastern Park Lot by such name as designated by the City through Parks in writing; *provided, however*, that if the City has not designated a name for the Eastern Park Lot in writing, MEMI may refer to the Eastern Park Lot as it may reasonably determine, from time to time.

- (M) **No Interference with Parking Facilities.** In performing its obligations under this Agreement, MEMI shall take reasonable measures not to interfere with the operation of the parking facilities within the Lot 23 Ground Lot.
- (N) **Southern Park Lot.** MEMI and the City may elect to add the Southern Park Lot to this Agreement upon its development and upon mutually agreeable terms and conditions.
- (O) **Real Property Taxes.** As of the Effective Date, the parties do not anticipate any real property taxes accruing on the Eastern Park Lot. In the event that the Eastern Park Lot becomes taxable under applicable law, the parties will collaborate to ensure any real property taxes accruing on the Eastern Park Lot are shared equitably between the parties.
- (P) **Security.** MEMI shall work with the City and other applicable parties (including the County and third-party event permittees) to develop reasonable and appropriate protocols and requirements for the provision of security personnel for MEMI Event Days and Other Event Days, such protocols and requirements to ultimately be determined by MEMI in its reasonable but sole discretion, and update such protocols and requirements from time to time, as necessary. MEMI shall oversee implementation of and compliance with such security protocols and requirements. Notwithstanding the foregoing, permit holders shall be responsible for providing the security required by taking out such permit.

4. **ALTERATIONS; SIGNS; NO LIENS.**

- (A) **Alterations.** During the Term, MEMI shall not make any material alterations, additions or other changes to the Eastern Park Lot. MEMI shall have the right to make temporary minor and cosmetic-type alterations to the Eastern Park Lot without having to obtain the City's prior consent, provided that such modification does not permanently alter the Eastern Park Lot (in which case, the City's prior written consent is required). Notwithstanding the foregoing, MEMI may make alterations to the semi-permanent stage without having to obtain the City's prior consent, so long as MEMI does not change the location of the stage, the footprint of the stage, or replace the stage (in each such case, the City's prior written consent is required). All alterations made by MEMI shall be made in a good and workmanlike manner, in compliance with all Legal Requirements, shall not diminish the value of the Eastern Park Lot, and shall be consistent with the quality, design, functionality, and aesthetic appeal of the Eastern Park Lot. If MEMI installs any trade fixtures, ordinary fixtures or equipment that serve the Eastern Park Lot, not including the semi-permanent stage, MEMI shall not thereafter remove the same and shall surrender the same to the City at the end of the Term.
- (B) **Signs.** MEMI shall be permitted to erect such directional, informational, advertising and other signs within the Eastern Park Lot as MEMI deems

appropriate provided that all such signs are professionally prepared, comply with all Legal Requirements, and comply with all guidelines established by Parks for such signage. MEMI shall, at its expense, keep all signs in good condition and repair.

- (C) **No Liens.** If any mechanics' lien or other similar lien is filed against the Eastern Park Lot as a result of labor or material furnished at MEMI's request, MEMI shall cause the lien to be released or bonded off within thirty (30) days following the filing of such lien.

5. **INSURANCE; INDEMNITY.**

- (A) **Insurance.** Throughout the Term, MEMI shall maintain the following insurance:
 - (i) special peril (formerly known as "all-risk") full replacement cost insurance on the Park Improvements, naming the City and MEMI as their interests may appear;
 - (ii) property insurance on any and all personal property of MEMI from time to time located at the Eastern Park Lot in the amount of the MI replacement cost thereof;
 - (iii) Commercial General Liability insurance covering claims for bodily injury, personal injury or death, and property damage occurring at the Eastern Park Lot in an amount not less than Three Million Dollars (\$3,000,000) per occurrence, combined single limit, or such additional amounts as the City or its insurance advisor may determine from time to time to be commercially reasonable, naming the City as an additional insured; and
 - (iv) workers compensation insurance as required by law.
- (B) **Policy Requirements.** MEMI's insurance policies shall (i) be written in standard form by insurance companies authorized to do business in Ohio and having an A.M. Best rating of A VII or better, (ii) provide that they may not be canceled or modified without at least thirty (30) days prior written notice to the City, and (iii) be primary and non-contributory with respect to insurance maintained by the City. Prior to the Commencement Date, and annually thereafter, MEMI shall provide the City with a certificate of insurance evidencing the insurance required to be maintained by MEMI hereunder.
- (C) **Waiver of Subrogation.** MEMI hereby waives all claims and rights of recovery, and on behalf of MEMI's insurers, rights of subrogation, against the City, its employees, agents, contractors and subcontractors with respect to any and all damage to or loss of property that is covered or that would ordinarily be covered by the insurance required under this Agreement to be maintained by MEMI, even if such loss or damage arises from the negligence of the City, its employees,

agents, contractors or subcontractors; it being the agreement of the parties that MEMI shall at all times protect itself against such loss or damage by maintaining adequate insurance. MEMI shall cause its property insurance policies to include a waiver of subrogation provision consistent with the foregoing waiver.

(D) **Indemnity.**

The City assumes no responsibility for any acts, errors or omissions of MEMI or any employee, agent, representative or any other person acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of MEMI. MEMI shall defend, indemnify and hold the City, its employees, agents, contractors and subcontractors (“**City Indemnified Parties**”) harmless from and against all costs (including without limitation legal costs), losses, claims, demands, actions, suits, judgments, claims for relief, damages and liability suffered or incurred by or asserted against the City Indemnified Parties or any one or more of them as a result of or arising from the acts of MEMI, its agents, employees, licensees, invitees, contractors, subcontractors or anyone else acting at the request of MEMI in connection with MEMI’s activities at or with respect to the Eastern Park Lot or in connection with any breach by MEMI under this Agreement; excluding, however, any of the foregoing caused by the negligence or willful misconduct of the City Indemnified Parties.

6. **CASUALTY; EMINENT DOMAIN.** If the Park Improvements are damaged or destroyed by fire or other casualty, the parties’ respective rights and obligations with respect to the restoration of the Park Improvements shall be as set forth in the Development Agreement and/or herein. If any portion of the Eastern Park Lot is taken by exercise of eminent domain (federal, state or local) that would material frustrate the purposes of this Agreement or otherwise impair any party from substantially fulfilling its duties or obligations hereunder, this Agreement shall terminate immediately.

7. **DEFAULT; REMEDIES.**

- (A) **Default.** Each of the following shall constitute an event of default under this Agreement:

- (i) If MEMI or the City fails to perform or observe any of the covenants, terms or conditions contained in this Agreement (the “**Defaulting Party**”), and such failure continues for longer than thirty (30) days after the Defaulting Party receives written notice thereof from the other party (the “**Non-Defaulting Party**”); provided, however, that if such failure is not reasonably susceptible of being cured within such thirty (30) day period, an event of default shall not be deemed to have occurred if the Defaulting Party commences to cure such failure within such thirty (30) day period and thereafter diligently pursues such cure to completion and, in fact, cures such failure within ninety (90) days after the Defaulting Party receives written notice of the default from the Non-Defaulting

Party. The foregoing notwithstanding, if the failure creates a dangerous condition or otherwise constitutes an emergency as determined by the Non-Defaulting Party, an event of default shall be deemed to have occurred if the Defaulting Party fails to take corrective action immediately upon discovering such dangerous condition or emergency.

- (ii) The commencement of levy, execution or attachment proceedings against MEMI, any principal (which shall be defined as any individual or entity having an ownership interest in MEMI of more than 25%) or partner of MEMI, or any of the assets of MEMI, or the application for or appointment of a liquidator, receiver, custodian, sequester, conservator, trustee, or other similar judicial officer; or the insolvency in the bankruptcy or equity sense, of MEMI or any principal or partner of MEMI; or the assignment for the benefit of creditors, or the admission in writing of an inability to pay debts generally as they become due, or the ordering of the winding-up or liquidation of the affairs of MEMI or any principal or partner of MEMI; or the commencement of a case by or against MEMI or any principal or partner of MEMI under any insolvency, bankruptcy, creditor adjustment, debtor rehabilitation or similar laws, state or federal, or the determination by any of them to request relief under any insolvency, bankruptcy, creditor adjustment, debtor rehabilitation or similar proceeding, state or federal, including, without limitation, the consent by any of them to the appointment of or taking possession by a receiver, liquidator, assignee, trustee, custodian, sequester or similar official for it or for any of its respective property or assets (unless, in the case of involuntary proceedings, the same shall be dismissed within ninety (90) days after institution).

- (B) **Remedies.** Upon the occurrence of an event of default that continues beyond the applicable notice and cure period (if any) provided for in Section 7(A) above, the Non-Defaulting Party shall be entitled to (i) terminate this Agreement by giving the Defaulting Party written notice thereof, (ii) take such actions in the way of “self-help” as the Non-Defaulting Party determines to be reasonably necessary or appropriate to cure or lessen the impact of such default, all at the expense of the Defaulting Party, and (iii) exercise any and all other rights and remedies under this Agreement or available at law or in equity, including without limitation pursuing an action for specific performance; all such rights and remedies being cumulative. The Defaulting Party shall be liable for all costs and damages, including without limitation reasonable attorney’s fees, suffered or incurred by the Non-Defaulting Party as a result of a default of the Defaulting Party under this Agreement or the Non-Defaulting Party’s enforcement or termination of this Agreement. The Defaulting Party shall pay all such costs and damages within thirty (30) days after receiving documentation from the Non-Defaulting Party of the amount due. The failure of the Non-Defaulting Party to insist upon the strict performance of any covenant or duty or to pursue any remedy under this Agreement shall not constitute a waiver of the breach of such covenant or of such

remedy. Nothing contained in this Agreement shall limit or prejudice the right of a party to prove for and obtain as damages incident to a termination of this Agreement in any bankruptcy, reorganization or other court proceedings, the maximum amount allowed by any statute or rule of law in effect when such damages are to be proved.

8. RIGHTS OF FIRST NEGOTIATION AND LAST REFUSAL.

(A) Rights of First Negotiation.

- (i) In the event this Agreement terminates pursuant to Section 2(A)(i), during the period beginning on the 40-Year Termination Date and ending on the date five (5) years immediately after the 40-Year Termination Date (the "**ROFN Period**"), the City and/or Parks shall not, directly or indirectly, enter into negotiations or consummate any transaction relating to the sale, lease, transfer, disposition, or transaction of similar nature or the management and/or operation of the Eastern Park Lot (a "**Transaction**") with any person other than MEMI except in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Section 8.
- (ii) During the ROFN Period, prior to entering into any negotiations relating to a Transaction with any third party, the City shall engage in exclusive good faith negotiations with MEMI to reach agreement on the terms and conditions for such Transaction for a period of one hundred and twenty (120) days ("**ROFN Rights**") (the "**Negotiation Period**"). If the parties are unable to reach agreement by the end of the Negotiation Period, then the City may enter into negotiations with any third party relating to a Transaction. For the avoidance of doubt, MEMI's ROFN rights are null and void upon the end of the first and only Negotiation Period.

(B) **Right of Last Refusal (Matching Right).** If, during the ROFN Period and after satisfying the requirements set forth under Section 8(A)(ii), the City receives a bona fide written offer for a Transaction with a third party that the City desires to accept (each, a "**Third-Party Offer**"), the City shall no later than ten (10) business days following receipt of the Third-Party Offer, notify MEMI in writing (the "**Offer Notice**") of the identity of all proposed parties to such Transaction and the material financial and other terms and conditions of such Third-Party Offer (the "**Material Terms**"). Each Offer Notice constitutes an offer made by the City to enter into an agreement with MEMI on substantially the same Material Terms as such Third-Party Offer (the "**ROLR Offer**"). The period beginning on the 40-Year Termination Date and ending on the date five (5) years immediately after the 40-Year Termination Date shall also be defined as the "**ROLR Period**."

- (i) At any time before the expiration of the twenty (20) calendar day period following MEMI's receipt of the Offer Notice (the "**Exercise Period**"), MEMI may accept the ROLR Offer by delivery to the City of written

notice of acceptance executed by MEMI; provided, however, that MEMI is not required to accept any non-financial terms or conditions contained in any Material Terms that cannot be fulfilled by MEMI as readily as by any other person (e.g., an agreement conditioned upon the services of a particular individual or the supply of a product exclusively under the control of such third-party offeror).

- (ii) If, by the expiration of the Exercise Period, MEMI has not accepted the ROLR Offer, and provided that the City has complied with all of the provisions of this Section, at any time following the expiration of the Exercise Period, the City may consummate the Transaction with the third party identified in the applicable Offer Notice, on material terms that are the same or more favorable to the City as the Material Terms set forth in the Offer Notice, as determined by the City in its sole discretion. If the City does not ultimately consummate the Transaction contained in the Offer Notice, the terms and conditions of this Section will apply to any future proposed Transaction and the City shall not enter into any Transaction with any third party during the ROLR Period without affording MEMI the right of last refusal on the terms and conditions of this Section.
- (iii) For the avoidance of doubt, the terms and conditions of this Section 8(B) apply to each Third-Party Offer received by the City during the ROLR Period.

9. **ASSIGNMENT.** MEMI acknowledges that the City is entering into this Agreement because of the City's confidence that MEMI has the financial backing, business experience and community support that are necessary to properly operate the Eastern Park Lot in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement throughout the entire Term. MEMI acknowledges that the City shall not be expected to consent to a proposed assignment by MEMI of its interests under this Agreement to any person or entity in whom the City does not have similar confidence. *Any attempt by MEMI to assign or otherwise transfer its interests under this Agreement to a third party without the City's prior written consent shall be null and void and shall, at the option of the City, constitute a default of MEMI under this Agreement.* The foregoing notwithstanding, if MEMI assigns its interests under this Agreement (i) to an affiliate or (ii) to a surviving entity in a merger involving MEMI or to a purchaser of all or substantially all of MEMI's assets or ownership interests, such assignment shall not constitute a prohibited assignment for purposes of this section; *provided, however*, that in the case of an assignment in connection with the foregoing (ii), such assignment shall be subject to the City's advance written approval, which shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed. As used in the preceding sentence, an "affiliate" of MEMI means an entity that controls, or is controlled by, or is under common control with, MEMI. For purposes hereof "control" shall mean the power, exercisable jointly or severally, to manage and direct the business and affairs of a party through the ownership of more than fifty percent (50%) of membership or partnership interests, corporate stock and/or voting rights. MEMI shall

not assign its interests under this Agreement pursuant to the preceding three sentences without giving the City at least five (5) days prior written notice thereof. No assignment by MEMI of its rights or obligations under this Agreement to a third party shall relieve MEMI from any liability to the City under this Agreement unless the parties hereto enter into a novation releasing MEMI of its obligations under this Agreement.

10. **SURRENDER.**

- (A) **Surrender.** On the last day of the Term of this Agreement, MEMI shall turn over physical possession of the Eastern Park Lot, including all Park Improvements (which shall not include the semi-permanent stage), to the City, in good condition and repair, reasonable wear and tear excepted, and free and clear of all mortgages and other monetary liens. On or before the last day of the Term of this Agreement, MEMI shall remove all of MEMI's personal property, and any property not so removed shall be deemed abandoned. MEMI shall not remove any signs, trade fixtures, ordinary fixtures or equipment used in connection with the Eastern Park Lot unless the City approves of such removal in writing. MEMI shall promptly repair any and all damage to the Eastern Park Lot, including the Park Improvements, caused by its removal of any items under this paragraph.
- (B) **Documents to be Delivered to City.** At the end of the Term of this Agreement, MEMI shall deliver to the City originals of all books and records, unpaid invoices, operating manuals, contracts with third parties, warranty information, and all other written materials and documents that are in MEMI's possession or under MEMI's control and that are reasonably needed in order for there to be a seamless transition with respect to the operation of the Eastern Park Lot.

11. **NOTICES.** All notices required to be given to any party under this Agreement shall be in writing and (i) personally delivered, (ii) deposited in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, or (iii) delivered by a nationally recognized overnight courier service, to the parties at the following addresses or such other address as either party may specify from time to time by notice to the other. Notices shall be deemed given upon receipt.

To the City:

City of Cincinnati
801 Plum Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Attention: City Manager

With a copy to:

City of Cincinnati
950 Eden Park Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Attention: Director of Parks

To MEMI:

Music and Event Management, Inc.
6295 Kellogg Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Attention: Michael C. Smith

With a copy to:

Graydon Head & Ritchey LLP
312 Walnut Street, Suite 1800
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Attention: Michael A. Hirschfeld, Esq.

{00332247-2}

23

Park Operation and Management Agreement (The Banks Lot 23)
9813868.9

If MEMI sends a notice to the City alleging that the City is in breach of this Agreement, MEMI shall simultaneously send a copy of such notice by U.S. certified mail to: City Solicitor, City of Cincinnati, 801 Plum Street, Room 214, Cincinnati, OH 45202.

12. **GENERAL PROVISIONS.**

- (A) **Entire Agreement.** This Agreement (including the exhibits hereto) contains the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersedes any and all prior discussions, negotiations, representations or agreements, written or oral, between them respecting the subject matter hereof.
- (B) **Amendments.** This Agreement may be amended only by a written amendment signed by the City and MEMI.
- (C) **Compliance with Legal Requirements.** MEMI is responsible for full compliance with all applicable Legal Requirements, including the Park Board Rules, a current copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit F**, as may be modified by the Park Board from time to time (the "**Park Board Rules**"), with respect to this Agreement, operating the Eastern Park Lot, the MEMI Events, and the Other Event Days. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event there is any conflict between the express terms and conditions of this Agreement and the Park Board Rules, the terms and conditions of this Agreement shall supersede and control.
- (D) **Trade Secrets.**
- (i) MEMI acknowledges and agrees that all records, documents, drawings, plans, specifications, and other materials in the City's possession, including materials submitted by MEMI, are subject to the provisions of the Ohio Public Records Act (Ohio Revised Code Section 149.43). To the extent that MEMI considers any information provided to the City to be confidential trade secrets, it shall clearly and prominently mark each and every such page or sheet with "Trade Secret" or "Confidential" as it determines in good faith to be appropriate, *provided, however*, that the City has no obligation to make any independent determination of whether the confidential information is protected from disclosure under Ohio law or to expend any public resources to protect the confidential information from disclosure under Ohio law.
- (ii) If any of the materials submitted by MEMI to the City are clearly and prominently labeled "Trade Secret" or "Confidential" by the City, the City will advise MEMI of public records request applicable to such documents and of the City's intent to release the records to the requestor. MEMI shall have five (5) business days beginning with the date it receives notification to respond to the City by either accommodating the requestor or pursuing legal remedies to stop the release of requested information. This notification shall relieve the City of any further

{00332247-2}

24

Park Operation and Management Agreement (The Banks Lot 23)
9813868.9

obligation under any claim of MEMI or any of its agents or affiliates in any jurisdiction in connection with the disclosure of such records. MEMI and its agents and affiliates shall have the right to pursue legal and/or equitable remedies to stop or limit disclosure at their sole expense.

- (iii) The City shall have no duty to defend the rights of Venue Developer or any of its agents or affiliates in any records requested to be disclosed. Under no circumstances will the City be responsible or liable to MEMI or any other person for the disclosure of any such labeled materials, whether the disclosure is required by law or by court order or occurs through inadvertence, mistake, or negligence on the part of MEMI, except to the extent such disclosure violates a court order of which MEMI has actual knowledge.
- (E) **Governing Law.** This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the City of Cincinnati and the State of Ohio. All actions regarding this Agreement shall be brought in the Hamilton County Court of Common Pleas, and MEMI agrees that venue in such court is proper. The parties hereby waive trial by jury with respect to any and all disputes arising under this Agreement.
- (F) **Binding Effect.** This Agreement shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of and be enforceable by and against the parties and their respective successors and permitted assigns.
- (G) **Captions.** The captions of the various sections and paragraphs of this Agreement are not part of the context hereof and are only guides to assist in locating such sections and paragraphs and shall be ignored in construing this Agreement.
- (H) **Severability.** If any part of this Agreement is held to be void, illegal or unenforceable by a court of law, such part shall be deemed severed from this Agreement, and the balance of this Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.
- (I) **No Recording.** This Agreement shall not be recorded in the Hamilton County Recorder's office.
- (J) **Time.** Time is of the essence with respect to the performance by the parties of their respective obligations under this Agreement.
- (K) **No Third Party Beneficiaries.** The parties hereby agree that no third party beneficiary rights are intended to be created by this Agreement.
- (L) **Interpretation.** The singular of any term, including any defined term, shall include the plural and the plural of any term shall include the singular. The use of any pronoun with respect to gender shall include the neutral, masculine, feminine and plural. The term "person" or "persons"

include(s) a natural person or any corporation, limited liability company, partnership, trust, or other type of entity validly formed.

- (M) **Recitals.** The recitals on the first page of this Agreement are incorporated herein and made a part of hereof with the same force and effect as if same were herein repeated fully and at length.
- (N) **Survival.** The rights and obligations of the parties set forth in Section 5, and any right or obligation of the parties in this Agreement which, by its nature, should survive termination or expiration of this Agreement, shall survive any such termination or expiration of this Agreement.
- (O) **Official Capacity.** All representations, warranties, covenants, agreements and obligations of the City under this Agreement shall be effective to the extent authorized and permitted by applicable law. None of those representations, warranties, covenants, agreements or obligations shall be deemed to be a representation, warranty, covenant, agreement or obligation of any present or future member, officer, agent or employee of the City in other than his or her official capacity. No official executing or approving the City's participation in this Agreement shall be personally liable under this Agreement.
- (P) **Limitation on Liability.** Notwithstanding any provision in this Agreement or under applicable law, each of the parties agrees in accepting this Agreement that it shall have no recourse to any members (individuals or entities), officers or employees of Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, any member (individual or entity) of any committee of Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, or any member (individual or entity) of the Board of Directors of Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra (collectively, the "Constituent Entities"). Each of the parties further agrees that no Constituent Entity shall have any personal liability for any obligation under this Agreement.
- (Q) **Representation as to Authority.** The City and MEMI each represents to the other that it has the power and authority to enter into and perform its obligations under this Agreement without the consent of anyone who is not a party to this Agreement and that the execution and performance of this Agreement have been duly authorized by all necessary actions on the part of the performing party.
- (R) **Authority of the Park Board.** MEMI acknowledges the legal authority of the Park Board (under the City's Charter and Ohio Law) to act with respect to certain matters affecting the Eastern Park Lot and agrees that, in instances under this Agreement when MEMI is required to obtain the City's consent, or the City is required to take action, such decisions and actions will be made by either the City or the Park Board or both, as determined by the City and/or Park Board on case-by-case basis (and in the event such decision or action is taken by the Park Board, MEMI shall be entitled to rely upon the same, unless the City subsequently determines that the Park Board acted beyond the scope of its authority). MEMI

shall not be required to independently determine, in any particular instance under this Agreement, whether the City, the Park Board, or both has legal authority to act.

- (S) **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which is deemed an original, but all of which together are deemed to be one and the same agreement. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in Section 11, a signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, email, or other means of electronic transmission is deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.
- (T) **Exhibits.** The following Exhibits are attached hereto and made a part hereof:
Exhibit A – *Site Plan*
Exhibit B – *Legal Description of Eastern Park Lot*
Exhibit C – *Legal Description of Indoor Venue Lot*
Exhibit D – *Assignment and Assumption Agreement*
Exhibit E – *Rendering of Outdoor Venue*
Exhibit F – *Park Board Rules*

[Signature Page Follows]

This Agreement is executed by the parties on the dates indicated below their respective signatures, effective as of _____, 2021 (the “**Effective Date**”).

CITY OF CINCINNATI

By: _____
Paula Boggs Muething,

**MUSIC AND EVENT MANAGEMENT,
INC.**

{00332247-2}

27

Park Operation and Management Agreement (The Banks Lot 23)
9813868.9

City Manager

Date: _____

By: _____

Printed name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Recommended by:

Kara Kish, Director
Cincinnati Park Board

Approved as to Form by:

Assistant City Solicitor

Certified Date: _____

Fund/Code: _____

Amount: _____

By: _____

Karen Alder, City Finance Director

{00332247-2}

28

Park Operation and Management Agreement (The Banks Lot 23)
9813868.9

BOARD OF PARK**COMMISSIONERS**

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Kara S. Kish
Director

Jenny Mobley
Deputy Director

Crystal Courtney
Division Manager

Rocky Merz
Division Manager

Steven L. Schuckman
Division Manager

Craig Sherman
Division Manager

950 Eden Park Drive
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone (513) 352-2604
Fax (513) 352-4096
www.cincinnatiiparks.com
#cincyparks

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Steven Schuckman, Division Manager

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "KSK", is written next to the name Steven Schuckman.

Subject: Lot 28 Design Services

Background

The extension of Smale Riverfront Park on to Lot 28 requires the design services of a Landscape Architect. Previously, Michael McInturf, an Architect retained by the Bengals, came up with some design concepts for the site. Sasaki Associates, the designers of SRP, also came up with a rough concept, based in part on the McInturf ideas.

A Landscape Architect now needs to be retained to develop the design for Lot 28 through construction documents. An RFP was prepared and sent to the two Landscape Architecture firms with City contracts. The proposals received have been reviewed and the Board is being asked to approve the Selection Committee's recommendation.

Description

Both concepts previously created were intended to break down the scale of Lot 28 that was originally conceived of as a park extension on top of a raised podium. In the alternative, the new concept aims to reduce the wall heights along Elm Street and Mehring Way which would have resulted from the podium plan. The new approach calls for a landscaped and sloped or terraced treatment, while also providing for park storage space beneath a smaller raised podium.

To proceed with the design and expedite the process, the City issued an RFP to the Landscape Architecture firms who already have contracts with the City. Both firms submitted proposals. A selection committee was established and after reviewing the proposals has made a recommendation.

Findings

Proposals were received from Human Nature and MKSK, both firms that have successfully provided design services previously for Parks. The

Selection Committee is recommending MKSK for this project. Their proposed fee is \$202,215. Attached is the Committee's report and the proposed scope of services.

Portions of the fee may be funded by dollars remaining from the Cincinnati Parks Foundation's commitment of up to \$500,000 for the design of both Phase 2 of Lot 23 and for Lot 28 (March). The current estimate for design of Phase 2 is \$400,000 so approximately half of the cost for Lot 28 design could be covered. The exact design costs for the remaining elements of Phase 2 will not be known until a proposal is received. The Board is therefore being asked to approve up to \$202,215 for Lot 28 design, though the amount needed is likely to be around \$100,000.

Funding for the construction of Lot 28 is expected to come from private fundraising.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Board approve the selection of MKSK and fund design services from Fund 329 up to \$202,215.

Attachment A—Selection Committee Report

Attachment B—Design Renderings

Attachment C—Design Proposal



May 12, 2020

TO: Patrick A. Duhaney, City Manager

FROM: Cynthia Witte, Supervising Architect, Evaluation Committee Chairperson

CC: Evaluation Committee Members

SUBJECT: Recommendation of Award to MKSK, Inc. pursuant to RFP #MAC0001071 for the Consultant Services of Smale Park Lot 28 Project

Submitted herewith for your review and concurrence is the award recommendation for the above referenced Request for Proposal (RFP).

HISTORY

On April 3, 2020, the Cincinnati Park Board solicited an RFP for Consultant Services for the Smale Park Lot 28 Project. The objective of the RFP was to contract with the firm(s) that submitted the "Most Advantageous" offer(s) to the City for the requested services. In order to ensure the objective was met, Offerors were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria: Price Proposal, Qualifications of Key Personnel, Similar Projects and Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Utilizations.

A subcontracting goal of 15% SBE applied.

The Proposals were opened on April 17 and, of the two (2) proposals received, both were responsive. The responsive firms are as follows:

- MKSK, Inc.
- Human Nature, Inc.

The Proposals were evaluated by a team which included Jenny Mobley, Casey McCann, and Cynthia Witte from Parks. Additionally, City Purchasing evaluated each Proposal for responsiveness/compliance to the RFP. Based on the above objective, the following Proposal evaluation was prepared.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

All Proposals were first examined to determine whether or not they met all the requirements of the RFP. A point and weight system was then used to evaluate the Proposals by taking the points assigned to a category item and multiplying by the category item's weight (listed below).

Categories	Weight
1. Price Proposal	30%
2. Similar Projects	20%
3. Qualifications of Key Personnel	30%
4. Small Business Utilizations	20%
Total	100%

1. **Price Proposal:** This category dealt with the total overall cost.
2. **Similar Projects:** This category dealt with the prior experience and capabilities of the Respondent in providing the requested services.
3. **Qualifications of Key Personnel:** This category dealt with quality and type of the training materials, as well as, the quality and experience of the Respondent's staff assigned to this project.
4. **Small Business Utilization:** This category dealt with the bidder's ability to meet the M/WBE or SBE requirements. The SBE goal was 15% for this project.

SUBMITTED PROPOSALS

Listed below is a synopsis of each responsive Proposal submitted.

MKSK, Inc.

The highest rated response; excelled in the following areas:

- Excellent Qualifications. MKSK has designed several Parks over parking garages including Dorrian Green Park & Garage in Columbus and Promenade Park in Toledo.
- Excellent overall Scope of Work
- SBE Utilization Goal was not met. Two of the consultants listed as SBE are actually MSD SBE. One of the consultants is a registered WBE.
- Excellent Staff and Deliverables. MKSK included sub consultants including a cost estimator, wayfinding designer, and a civil engineer who have been involved extensively with Banks work,
- Second Highest rated Cost Proposal, the difference between the two proposals was insignificant at about 1%.

Human Nature, Inc.

The second highest rated response; excelled in the following areas:

- Excellent Qualifications. Human Nature has designed several parks over parking garages including Washington Park and Ziegler.
- Excellent overall Scope of Work
- SBE Utilization Goal was met because Human Nature is a registered SBE.
- Excellent Staff and Deliverables. Human Nature included a green roof consultant on their design team which is not something that the committee had considered and allowed for the option of including another landscape architect who had been involved with Smale in the past along with a wayfinding designer. The optional consultants would add cost to the project, however.
- First Highest rated Cost Proposal, without the optional consultants.

RECOMMENDATION

Cincinnati Parks has worked extensively with both MKSK and Human Nature. Both firms are well qualified and would be excellent choices for the Lot 28 Project. After a thorough evaluation by the Evaluation Committee, we recommend an award be made to MKSK, Inc. While the other Respondent also offered a good overall Proposal, MKSK, Inc. can provide the services with a better consultant team at a competitive cost. Based on their Proposal and experience, MKSK's offer is the most advantageous in support of the design consultant needs of the City.

Please indicate your concurrence with the recommendation that the City enters into negotiations with MKSK, Inc. If there are any questions or further information needed, please contact me at 378-0463 or via email.


Reviewed:


Kara Kish, Director of Parks

5/13/20

Date


Approved:


Bobbi Hageman, Chief Procurement Officer

5/18/2020

Date


Approved:


Patrick A. Duhaney, City Manager

5/19/2020


Date





TERRACED GARDEN - PLANTING CHARACTER





PHASE 1: SCHEMATIC DESIGN (2 MONTHS)

Within this initial phase, project administrative functions will be initiated, including the Park Board staff and stakeholders refining and confirming the frequency and format of meetings, confirming the project schedule, and establishing responsibilities, goals, project milestones and deliverables of the work. Also within this phase, we will gather and review site information and applicable data and reports.

Communication

We believe that in addition to experience and creativity, communication is critical to the success of any project, especially an urban riverfront park within a community that is passionate about their riverfront. Although we anticipate involvement of several members of our team, our Project Manager Jack McGlasson will be the day-to-day point of contact, and the familiar face that engages both the city staff and the Park Board. Jack will also lead the schedule and process from our team internally, acting as the link between design and engineering efforts, and the communication and feedback from the Park Board and key stakeholders. We anticipate weekly conference calls or Zoom meetings with staff for updates to schedule and project status. We also anticipate in-person meetings (as needed) every 2-3 weeks.

Workplan

We believe that a comprehensive workplan established at the beginning of the project sets the stage for a more organized and managed process, as well as a better deliverable. We typically establish a set of goals and objectives with the client early in the project, and further describe what steps need to be taken in order to accomplish those goals and objectives. Although goals, objectives, and processes can and do evolve throughout a project, the workplan will serve as the cornerstone that keeps the design and engineering team, client, and stakeholders working together to provide a holistic and comprehensive vision.

Schedule

As part of the initial kick-off to the project, our team will work with you to refine and manage a project calendar that will be shared with the entire project team and client throughout the project. We will indicate milestones, meetings, and deliverables. In order to achieve this task, we promote the use of a dynamic calendar that is graphic in nature and illustrates which tasks are being performed on a weekly basis and who is responsible for those tasks and associated deliverables.

1.1 Project Administration and Coordination

- » Conduct a scoping meeting with Park Board leadership and staff
 - » Review workplan and add any details on process, responsibilities, and deliverables by phase of project
 - » Agree on protocol to approve deviations from the workplan through the process to respond to issues or opportunities that arise
 - » Discuss the invoicing sequence and level of reporting
- » Establish project management protocol
- » Refine project schedule
- » Review of relevant studies, reports, and policies to discuss the results of previous efforts to understand the foundation of input, the meaning and lessons learned
- » Collect base information, mapping, GIS data, and on-site observation of existing conditions

1.2 Understanding – Existing Conditions Analysis and Programming

There’s typically a straightforward method of the inventory and analysis process, but given the importance of this project and site, the diverse users, and adjacent existing and proposed development, as well as the history and culture of the riverfront, this project deserves a more robust analysis of the site and its surroundings. Within this phase, we will synthesize data collected to analyze existing conditions, define opportunities, and establish a program for the types and scales of uses, gatherings, and elements that should be incorporated within the urban riverfront park expansion.

Physical Conditions Analysis

- » Assess existing circulation patterns within the surrounding developments, including automobiles, delivery vehicles, transit buses, pedestrians, bicycles, and scooters
- » Assess drainage infrastructure and possibilities for green infrastructure
- » Assess probable activity during daytime and nighttime on a typical day, during various seasons and for special events
- » Assess existing lighting sources
- » Assess existing and designed surrounding streetscapes, sidewalks, and bicycle routes and facilities

- » Evaluate major pedestrian routes and bikeways near the site, including planned building entrances onto the park, key routes from the parking structure, and various destinations throughout Smale Riverfront Park
- » Discuss access needs for regular maintenance, event setup and post-event cleanup, and snow removal
- » Consider views to the park from the upper floors of the surrounding buildings
- » Identify cultural, historical, and public art assets of significance and opportunities for integration
- » Review site survey provided by Park Board
- » Analyze solar orientation/shadow patterns and prevailing winds
- » Analyze potential events and uses of the site

1.3 Concept Development

Typically, concept plans are visionary with a focus on the long term, but too often these approaches are shelved due to lack of strategy planning for the near and mid-term...and what good is that to a site that is poised for intervention today? We regularly approach design and engineering with an action-oriented methodology that identified prerequisites, priorities, phases, roles and responsibilities to scribe a framework for both short- and long-term wins.

During the concept development process, we will continue our exploration and discovery, challenge assumptions, and motivate the design team, Park Board, and stakeholders to think both inside and outside of the box. For example, it is necessary for the Lot 28 park expansion to function properly as both open space and civic space...culturally, socially, and ecologically. Relationships between programmed spaces and biomes must be understood and tested through an iterative process to ensure the space functions highly at all levels.

As designers we are also highly motivated by the opportunity to extend and promote the identity of Cincinnati's premier urban riverfront, to elevate pragmatics into poetics. It might be enough to simply have an open space that checks all the practical boxes, but how amazing will it be when visitors and residents realize that Lot 28 is a place...an urban park that elevates the community, serves as a destination and a source of inspiration for health and wellness and stewardship of the community, and is a commons for people to interact and enjoy community.

Within the Concept Design task of this phase, we will develop alternatives that respond to feedback provided and collected. We will create at least three concept alternatives that demonstrate varying programmatic mixes and project costs. These studies, informed by the preceding analysis, will be based upon previous experience, emerging practices, and

local acceptance. We will work hand-in-hand with our project engineers B&N to provide input on engineering issues and design refinements that will help progress seamlessly into a final preferred design without losing the important design elements often lost when this level of project collaboration does not occur.

We will graphically communicate our concepts through precedent imagery, plan views, cross-sections, and three-dimensional study models. Based upon feedback, we will prepare a final Schematic Plan and prepare recommendations for project implementations, including preliminary estimate and phasing as needed.

Concept Design and Placemaking Plan

- » Placemaking and Activation Study
- » Green Infrastructure strategies
- » Park branding and identity study (*building upon established vernacular*)
- » Public Art opportunities
- » Event and multipurpose space study
- » Three (3) Concept Design Alternatives
- » Coordinate with structural engineer (THP) on limitations and opportunities for improvements to parking structure deck
- » Refine preferred concept alternative
- » Develop illustrative graphics for preferred concept alternative, including plan rendering, 3D modeling of site, and perspective renderings

Schematic Design Plans

- » Layout and Materials Plan of park, including basic dimensions, detail keys, and materials identification
- » Preliminary Grading Plan, including critical spot elevations and preliminary design of any ADA accessible features
- » Preliminary storm drainage and utility systems strategy/narrative
- » Preliminary design of sustainable stormwater features
- » Preliminary Planting Plan
- » Preliminary Site Lighting Plan
- » Preliminary details, including sections, elevations and enlarged plans as necessary to adequately communicate design intent
- » Preliminary Opinion of Probable Construction cost for preferred Schematic Design Plans

Deliverables for Phase 1: Schematic Design

- » Project Schedule
- » Project Base Mapping
- » Project Goals and Objectives
- » Inventory and Analysis diagrams of existing conditions
- » Programming Summary
- » Branding and Identity Summary
- » Three (3) Concept Design Alternatives
- » Refined Preferred Concept Design
- » Illustrative Plans and Renderings
- » Best Practice/Precedent Summary
- » Schematic Design Package for project coordination, reviews and estimating
- » Preliminary Opinion of Probable Construction Cost

Phase 2: Design Development (3 Months)

Following consensus of the Schematic Design and long-term vision, our team will refine and provide further detail for all design elements/materials, constructability, structural impacts and requirements, and overall impacts to the project budget. Each component of this phase will be developed in a single base model to ensure that coordination is integral to the overall design of the project. We will also develop the draft outline for the Technical Specifications for review by the client and the team.

Our team will also provide graphic exhibits during this phase for the purposes of conveying the overall design intent to the Park Board and City leadership. Graphic exhibits may include a combination of illustrative plans, perspective renderings, or digital models.

2.1 Prepare updated and refined Site Layout and Materials Plans

- » Indicate material selections and provide samples as requested for decision making
- » Indicate refined sections and details for park features, including coordinated sections through the parking garage roof deck for planting beds, pavement, and special features, including handrails, stairs, terrace walls and placemaking elements

2.2 Prepare updated and refined Site Details sheets for each of the following features:

- » Plaza Pavements

- » Tree Pits and Planters
- » Lawn areas and Vegetated Roof Decks
- » Bollards, Railings and Light Fixtures
- » Wayfinding and Placemaking Elements, including integrated naming for donor opportunities
- » Drainage features, including inlets and/or trench drains

2.3 Prepare a refined overall Design Development package

This will be based on review comments from Park Board staff and other stakeholders, and coordinate with subconsultants, including irrigation/plumbing, electrical/lighting engineer, and structural engineers, THP, identified in the RFP.

- » Prepare updated Site Grading Plan, including critical spot elevations and coordinate with B&N for their preparation of a preliminary grading and drainage plan, including stormwater runoff modeling
- » Evaluate site lighting alternatives and prepare preliminary Site Lighting Plan with cut sheets and specifications for recommended fixtures and mounting types and coordinate with electrical engineer for their documentation of electrical services
- » Evaluate potential site furnishings (including movable tables and chairs, trash and recycling containers, bike racks, and drinking fountains) and prepare a preliminary site furnishing plan and schedule with cut sheets and specifications for recommended furnishings and equipment
- » Prepare preliminary Planting Plan showing trees, shrubs, ground covers and seed/sod limits with preliminary listing of plant types proposed
- » Prepare outline of Technical Specifications
- » Update preliminary Opinion of Probable Construction Cost per the Design Development refinements
- » Conduct a Design Development phase review meeting with the Park Board to solicit comments and gain consensus on design and engineering direction

Phase 3: Construction Documentation (3 Months)

Based on authorization from the Park Board to proceed with approved Design Development documents and budget, the MKSK team will prepare Construction Documents, including drawings and specifications in a single bid package for the procurement, permitting, and construction of the project. During the Construction Documentation phase, our team will provide services to assist in securing the permits and approvals necessary for the commencement of construction.

During Phase 3, we propose meeting on a bi-weekly basis via in-person and web-based conference meetings to review progress, provide updates, and discuss any outstanding issues that need to be addressed. We also anticipate technical review meetings with city officials for review of the project as needed for permitting and approval.

3.1 Prepare and Finalize Construction Documents

- » Finalize Site Layout and Materials Plan, including necessary dimensions, detail keys, material identification, and construction and general notes
- » Generate final Grading Plan, including sections and ADA accessibility features
- » Finalize water, sanitary, and storm drainage utility systems drawing and specifications
- » Generate final design of site lighting and site electrical elements, including electrical distribution
- » Finalize planting and soils plan, including locations of plant materials, plant list with genus/species and type of plant, planting details, limits of seed/sod, and construction and general notes
- » Finalize irrigation design layout plan and requirements for controllers and meters
- » Finalize construction level drawings for signage
- » Finalize site construction details, including sections, elevations and enlarged plans as necessary to adequately communicate design intent and construction quality to bidders/contractors
- » Provide a preliminary construction plans to each of the utility service providers. Meet with service providers to review the project and discuss any improvements the service providers may want to install during construction
- » Finalize Opinion of Probable Construction Costs based on Construction Document drawings

Deliverables

- » Materials for project meetings
- » 60% Construction Plans for review
- » 60% Opinion of Probable Cost
- » 60% Preliminary Technical Specifications
- » Bid Quality Construction Documents
- » Final Opinion of Probable Cost
- » Bid Quality Technical Specifications

Phase 4: Bidding & Construction Admin. (6 Months)

Contingent on Park Board review and sign-off, project documents will be submitted to the City for advertising for bidding by potential general contractors. Our team will review and amend from City standard documents on the bidding requirements, forms of agreement and conditions of the contract for construction. Our team will assist in the pre-bid meeting, answer contractor questions during bidding, and assist in the evaluation of bids and bidder reviews.

4.1 Bidding Services

- » Assist the Park Board in preparing the Legal Advertisement
- » Attend the pre-bid meeting
- » Answer technical questions and issue addenda
- » Assist in bid evaluation, bid tabulation and award recommendation
- » Review meeting with the Park Board to solicit comment, coordinate efforts, and secure approval of bidding considerations

4.2 Construction Observation and Administration

This phase of the project is essential to realizing the vision established during the design phases of the project. We will establish a clear line of communication between the design team, the contractor, and the client to ensure that design intent, schedule, and budget are understood. We will schedule a pre-construction meeting between the design team, the Park Board, and the contractor/subcontractors to review construction documents and specifications thoroughly to address questions, concerns, and potential coordination issues that may arise during the construction of the park.

- » Perform a pre-construction meeting with the selected contractor and subcontractors, page turn of the CDs
- » Review and approval of shop drawings and submittals
- » Perform construction observation, including weekly reports of progress
- » Perform weekly progress meetings during construction to confirm progress and compliance with construction documents, specifications and schedule
- » Review and approve pay applications
- » Review contractor claims and issue contract modifications accordingly
- » Final site inspection / punch list development
- » Develop and provide as-built plans
- » Project close-out

6 DESCRIPTION OF COMMITMENT TO THE ECONOMIC INCLUSION AND SUBCONTRACTING PROGRAMS SIMILAR TO THE CITY'S

The Team's commitment to utilize diverse businesses is ongoing. We actively strive to identify and reach out to local diverse A/E's and consultants to develop working relationships. We have developed strategic approaches and methodologies for achieving each client's desired diverse business goals. MKSK supports these programs primarily by working with locally based A/E and subject matter specialist firms as consultants on our projects. As part of these relationships, we negotiate for professional services and often provide mentoring to grow the capabilities of their staff. Our business objective is to develop project teams that provide value to the project, client and community. Helping to mentor and grow these local, small, and disadvantaged businesses directly reinforces that objective.

Our efforts extend far beyond program compliance through meeting a specific percentage of contract dollars. When we begin the process of developing a project team, we do an initial evaluation of the technical needs of the project, assess our internal staff availability and experience, and list opportunities where meaningful and measurable services can be provided by other team members, particularly minority-owned, women-owned or small business firms. Whenever possible, we will break down project scopes into smaller units to achieve greater participation.

Our current proposed Team consists of:

Kolar Design, Inc., a certified **Small Business Enterprise**. Kolar will represent **11% of work** to be performed.

Motz Consulting Engineers, Inc., a certified **Women Business Enterprise**. Motz Engineers will represent **12% of the work**.

Megen Construction Company, Inc., a certified **Minority Business Enterprise**. Megen Construction will represent **6% of the work**.

Our commitment to these firms will ensure that each diverse team member has an opportunity to participate in the Design Services of Smale Park Lot 28. During the life of the project, our team will continue its efforts to identify and work with additional diverse businesses whenever new procurement opportunities arise by utilizing the various approaches.

Kolar Design, Motz Consulting Engineer, and Megen Construction Company's SBE, WBE, and MBE certifications are located in the Forms Section of the submittal.

7 DESCRIPTION OF HOW OFFEROR DETERMINED THEIR FEES AND THE ASSUMPTIONS MADE

Based on the project description in the RFP, our understanding of this specific project, and our experience with similar projects in complexity and scale, we have prepared our fees by outlining the specific tasks in each phase and applying hours to those individual tasks, meetings and deliverables. While we understand the project budget falls between a range of \$2-4M as noted in the addendum, we did not prepare our fees based on a percentage of construction, but rather the time and effort anticipated to complete the project. A complete allocation of team hourly resources by task is available on request for your review.

8 HOURLY FEE FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING POSITIONS:

POSITION	HOURLY FEE	POSITION	HOURLY FEE
MKSK Principal - Andrew Knight	\$210	Motz Engineering MEP Engineer - Chris Wilson	\$160
MKSK Associate Landscape Architect - Kevin Dicke	\$150	Motz Engineering MEP Engineer - Andrew Hemmelgarn	\$160
MKSK Landscape Architect III / Project Manager - Jack McGlasson	\$125	Megen Construction Cost Estimation - Catherine Nwankwo	\$125
MKSK Landscape Architect II - McKenzie Wilhelm	\$115	MKSK Field Inspector - Jack McGlasson	\$125
Burgess & Niple Senior Civil Engineer - Steven Smith	\$212	Kolar Environmental Graphics, Signage & Wayfinding - Kelly Kolar / Nicole Roberts	\$155
Motz Engineering MEP Engineer - Suzie Murdock	\$225		
Motz Engineering MEP Engineer - Brad Motz	\$225		

9 ESTIMATED FEES BROKEN DOWN AS FOLLOWS:

Fees are calculated based on an estimation of the expected time involvement and related production and current hourly rates throughout the duration of the project. Reimbursable Expenses are included in the fee. MKSK has proposed the following fees based on our current understanding of your needs. We look forward to further discussions with you to align our approach and compensation to meet your exact needs, schedule and budget.

PROJECT PHASE	FEE	TIMEFRAME
Schematic Design and Preliminary Cost Estimate	\$37,055	2 months
Design Development and Cost Estimate	\$60,005	3 months
Construction Documentation and Final Cost Estimate	\$75,815	3 months
Bidding / Construction Administration	\$29,340	6 months
TOTAL	\$202,215	14 months

10 REFERENCES AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR PRIOR SIMILAR PROJECTS

Summit Park

City of Blue Ash
 Brian Kruse, Director, Parks & Recreation
 bkruse@blueash.com
 513.745.8442



The Summit Park Master Plan led by MKSK was created to guide the future development and adaptive re-use of 230 acres of former airport lands to foster a new “Central Park.” The plan establishes design and development guidelines for 130 acres of parkland and a 100-acre tract of mixed-use land along the path of the former Blue Ash Airport runway.

Tom Jones Commons

Cincinnati Park Board
 Steve Schuckman, Superintendent
 steven.schuckman@cincinnati-oh.gov
 513.475.9600



Enhancements to Cincinnati’s signature hilltop park will transform Tom Jones Commons into a new destination for activity and a primary gateway into Eden Park. MKSK is providing conceptual design through construction documentation of the first phase of improvements.

Waterfront Park Phase IV

Waterfront Development Corporation
 Deborah Bilitski, President
 deborah.bilitski@louisvilleky.gov
 502.574.3768



MKSK developed a One Riverfront concept plan with the Waterfront Development Corporation that builds on the Hargreaves designed Waterfront Park to include the development of an additional 22 acres of reclaimed industrial riverfront property. The result is a unified and cohesive Riverwalk that connects downtown with surrounding neighborhoods.

BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Kevin Flynn

Linda Lee Thomas

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Cindy France, Principal Architect

KSK

Subject: Design Services for Smale River Edge

Background

A design solution is desired for the edge of Smale Riverfront Park along the river between the Roebling Bridge and the western limits of the park, approximately at the foot of Elm Street. The design needs to solve the erosion and bank stabilization issues while blending seamlessly with the adjacent park. An RFP process has been completed to identify and select a design firm. The Board is being asked to approve entering into a contract with the selected firm to provide schematic design services.

Kara S. Kish
Director

Jenny Mobley
Deputy Director

Crystal Courtney
Division Manager

Rocky Merz
Division Manager

Steven L. Schuckman
Division Manager

Craig Sherman
Division Manager

Description

As a result of a Request for Proposals, two consultants who responded met qualifications. The selection committee rated both proposals and found KZF Design, Inc. was the most advantageous to the City. The scope of services (attached) includes schematic design services including a cost estimate. The cost estimate will be utilized by staff and the U.S. Army Corps to justify and pursue Federal funding for the project. The total cost for schematic design services is \$99,400.

Findings

KZF Design Inc. has put together a highly qualified team which includes Sasaki, the firm that has done all of the landscape design at Smale Park, and Megen Construction for cost estimating services. The design fee should come out of 980 162015, a Capital State Grant fund to be used exclusively to address the stabilization of the riverbank west of the bridge.

Recommendation

Staff respectfully requests the Board approve retaining KZF Design, Inc. to provide schematic design services for this project.

Attachment A—Site Photo

Attachment B—Scope of Services & Cost Proposal

Attachment C—Award Recommendation



Scope of Services



Smale Riverfront Park

“

We have realized significant savings due to KZF Design having most disciplines in-house as compared to retaining numerous consultants for architecture, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, lighting and interior design.

— Dave Prather, Project Manager, Smale Riverfront Park

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

The goal of the proposed project will provide a Schematic/Conceptual Design plan and conceptual budget for the stabilization of the riverbank in Smale Riverfront Park for the purpose of aiding in the identification of potential implementation funding sources.

The area of focus is the rivers edge along the southern portion of Smale Riverfront Park between the Roebling Suspension Bridge and the western limits of the park near Elm Street.

The KZF Team consisting of KZF Design – Project Manager/Civil Engineer, Sasaki Associates – Landscape Architect and Designer, Resource International – Surveyor and Geotechnical Engineering, Megen Construction Company – Cost Estimator and David T Prather – Grant Funding Specialist are excited at the opportunity to continue our collaboration with the Cincinnati Park Board on Smale Riverfront Park.

Since the early 2000's the KZF Team has worked closely with the City, Park Board, a myriad of design professionals and stakeholders to develop a comprehensive and unique experience at Smale Riverfront Park for the community, city, and region. This phase, like the previous, should be carefully considered to expand the park in a way that achieves the goals and design excellence that characterizes Smale Riverfront Park and improves physical, social, and cultural connections to the Ohio River which was a key reason for Cincinnati's founding and growth into the City it is today.

Although this project presents many opportunities, perhaps the most important is to physically connect park users in an accessible way to the river's edge. A connection that does not currently exist at Smale Riverfront Park and is scarce along River. There are opportunities to engineer a green solution into the river's edge that will bolster the ecological function of the park and habitat for riverine inhabitants. Some of which might challenge the way we think about a conventional park. The river's significant fluctuation in water levels and swift currents bringing large debris from upstream must be closely considered in designing an edge that will resist erosion, scouring, and undercutting and be a sustainable long-term solution.

Our team assumes the first phase of work to be 12 weeks long starting at the project kick-off meeting. In preparation for this meeting, the design team will prepare studies, sections, renderings, and presentations completed in the past associated with the design and engineering of the river's edges at Smale Riverfront Park as well as highlight considerations related to the overall park design, such as the extension of Race Street/Castellani esplanade, relationship to previous and future phases, and to Roebling Bridge. The KZF team's nearly 20 years of work along the river have afforded our team a unique understanding of the sites history, its opportunities, and challenges. All of which will be invaluable to the design and engineering, and decision making process.

PROJECT APPROACH

The KZF Team anticipates the below scope in this phase to include the following:

- Participate in a kick-off meeting with the City to discuss project goals, aspirations, agree upon a project schedule to achieve the clients project delivery of 9/1/2021

Scope of Services Continued



Ashland KY Riverfront Boat Dock

- Attend regular project coordination meetings
- Study and development of landscape design to rapidly produce 1-2 design options
- One (1) Concept Design Presentation and one (1) review meeting with client to review and select a preferred design option
- Slope stability analysis and reporting of existing slope to calibrate shear strength parameters, evaluation green (non-structural) remediation options, and structural solution (including slope stability analysis)
- Preferred Design presentation including
 - Preferred Design Plan Rendering
 - Necessary Sections to communicated relationship to the park and river
 - SD level landscape documents – Documents include the following
 - Layout and Materials Plan
 - Grading Plan
 - Preliminary Planting Plan
 - Identifying green infrastructure opportunities
 - Key site sections and typical details
 - Preliminary Cost Estimation of the preferred design options
 - Preliminary conceptual design structural/bank stabilization design
 - Geotechnical engineering input on Conceptual Design based upon current Geotechnical Data
 - Utilization of existing survey data for development of concept.

“

I would recommend their team to act in any design capacity, criteria architect role, or construction management role for any future project the Township performs.

— Eric Reiners, Director of Public Works, Deerfield Township

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

The Cincinnati Park Board may require additional services beyond the above Scope of Services, these additional services will be billed on an hourly basis in accordance with the attached Schedule of Personnel Billing Rates or by fee amendment. The following items will be considered as additional services:

- Diagrams to illustrate design intent
- 3D model studies
- Perspective renderings
- Cost estimating beyond what is described above
- Technical specifications
- Engaging technical subconsultants
- Geotechnical borings located within existing park along the top of the slope failure
- Grant funding specialist services
- Embankment survey to waters edge
- Reimbursable expenses (if necessary)

Scope of Services Continued



City of Blue Ash Summit Park

ASSUMPTIONS

The scope of this work is focused on preliminary design. Additional design work will be required to further refine and implement the project.

NOT INCLUDED IN SCOPE

This proposal does not include survey, geotechnical studies or environmental studies. These items have already been completed for the current location, however, if relocation is deemed feasible, KZF does recommend these items be completed prior to making a final decision. In addition, the following items are not included:

- Hydraulic study, stormwater study, and culvert/sewer design
- Construction administration or inspection
- Structural or bridge engineering services
- Architecture or building design services
- Signage and wayfinding design services and sign plans
- Renderings of proposed improvements
- Lighting and electrical engineering services
- Landscape architecture services
- Underwater survey and mapping

SCHEDULE

We anticipate the following schedule by Phase upon receiving notice to proceed from the City of Cincinnati.

Concept/Schematic Design (12 weeks)

Start 6/1/2021

Complete 9/1/2021



Smale Riverfront Park

Cost

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

- Renderings
- Survey
- Geotechnical borings
- Grant funding specialty
- Reimbursable expenses

Task	Cost
Project Management & Engineering (KZF Design)	\$29,600
Landscape Design (Sasaki)	\$48,900
Cost Estimating (Megen Construction - MBE)	\$7,200
Geotechnical Engineering (Resource International - WBE)	\$13,700
Total Fees	\$99,400

If you have any questions, we would be pleased to answer them at your convenience. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,
KZF Design



Nick Wilkerson PE, PMP
Project Manager

nick.wilkerson@kzf.com • 513.621.6211



Tim Sharp, RA, LEED AP BD+C, Esq.
Chief Strategic Officer

“


The professionals of KZF delivered on their commitments, completing the project on time and under budget. The excellent communication, cooperation, and coordination achieved between team members make this a model of successful project management, design and delivery.

— J. Troy Huff, PE, Highway Management Administrator, ODOT District Nine

Capacity

All key members of the proposed project team are available and their workloads will allow them to dedicate their time to this contract.

KZF has more than 70 additional professional and technical staff available to fulfill project requirements as-needed to meet your project schedule. Our team has sufficient and available staff capacity to provide timely and responsive service. With this strength in number of design professionals, our team has the capability to manage staff availability given the current workload at the time of any assigned task. Throughout our successful track record of term contracts, this systematic approach has allowed our team to meet our client's project time constraints.





April 6, 2021

TO: Paula Boggs Muething, City Manager

FROM: Cindy France *Cindy France* Principal Architect, Evaluation Committee Chairperson

CC: Amanda Soldano, Buyer; Evaluation Committee Members

SUBJECT: Recommendation to Award to KZF Design, Inc. pursuant to MAC0001200 for Engineering Services for the Rivers Edge at Smale Park

Submitted herewith for your review and concurrence is the award recommendation for the above referenced Request for Proposal (RFP).

HISTORY

On February 16, 2021, the Cincinnati Park Board solicited an RFP for Engineering Services for the Rivers Edge at Smale Park. The objective of the RFP was to contract with the firm that submitted the "Most Advantageous" offer(s) to the City for the requested services. In order to ensure the objective was met, Offerors were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria: Price Proposal, Qualifications of Key Personnel, Similar Projects and Economic Inclusion.

A subcontracting goal of 3% MBE and 6% WBE applied.

The Proposals were opened on March 9, 2021 and, of the two proposals received, both were responsive. The responsive firms are as follows:

- KZF Design, Inc.
- Barge Design Solutions, Inc.

The Proposals were evaluated by a cross-departmental team which included Kelly Carr, City Manager's Office, Casey McCann, Parks, Lydgia Sartor, DEI, Rich Pohana, Department of Transportation and Cindy France, Parks. Additionally, City Purchasing evaluated each Proposal for responsiveness/compliance to the RFP. Based on the above objective, the following Proposal evaluation was prepared.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

All Proposals were first examined to determine whether or not they met all the requirements of the RFQ. A point and weight system was then used to evaluate the Proposals by taking the points assigned to a category item and multiplying by the category item's weight (listed below). Each category item was assigned a point range of 0 to 30.

Categories	Weight
1. Price Proposal	30%
2. Qualifications of Key Personnel	30%
3. Similar Projects	20%
4. Economic Inclusion	20%
Total	100%

1. **Price Proposal:** This category dealt with the total overall cost.
2. **Qualifications of Key Personnel:** This category dealt with quality and type of the training materials, as well as, the quality and experience of the Respondent's staff assigned to this project.
3. **Similar Projects:** This category dealt with demonstration of past projects similar in scope as well as the quality and experience of the Respondent's staff assigned to this project.
4. **Economic Inclusion:** This category dealt with the bidder's ability to meet the M/WBE requirements.

The spreadsheet attached hereto as Exhibit No. 1 details the scoring for each Proposal.

SUBMITTED PROPOSALS

Listed below is a synopsis of each responsive Proposal submitted.

KZF Design, Inc.

The highest rated response; excelled in the following areas:

- Excellent Qualifications
- Excellent overall Scope of Work
- Excellent Economic Inclusion, (7.24% MBE/13.78% WBE)
- Second Highest rated Cost Proposal

Barge Design Solutions, Inc.

The second highest rated response; excelled in the following areas:

- Good Qualifications
- Excellent overall Scope of Work
- Excellent Economic Inclusion (3.61% MBE/ 8.67% WBE)
- First Highest rated Cost Proposal


RECOMMENDATION

After a thorough evaluation by the Evaluation Committee, we recommend an award be made to KZF Design, Inc. While the other Respondent offered a good overall Proposal, KZF Design, Inc. can provide the services with a better overall experienced team. The KZF Design, Inc. proposal demonstrates extensive experience tying public spaces to a water's edge. This is the same design solution that the

Cincinnati Park Board is trying to solve at Smale Park. The Barge proposal included several examples of flood mitigation projects rather than erosion control. Additionally, the KZF Design Inc. proposal offered a better understanding of the cost estimate required per the RFP and has experience of working collaboratively with the US Army Corps on funding source identification. Based on their Proposal, KZF Design's offer is the most advantageous in support of the engineering service needs of the City.

Please indicate your concurrence with the recommendation that the City enters into negotiations with KZF Design, Inc. If there are any questions or further information needed, please contact me at 475-9600 or via email.


Reviewed:


Kara Kish, Director of Parks

4/9/21

Date

Approved:


Bobbi Hageman, Chief Procurement Officer

04-14-2021

Date

Approved:


Paula Boggs Muething, City Manager

4/14/21

Date

MAC0001200 - Engineering Services for the River Edge at Smale Park

Scoring Summary

Active Submissions

	Total	A - Responsiveness Review	A-1 - Proposal	A-2 - Inclusion Packet	B - DEI REVIEW	B-1 - Inclusion Packet	C - Evaluation Committee	C-1 - Price Proposal	C-2 - Qualifications of Key Personnel	C-3 - Similar Projects	C-4 - Economic Inclusions
Supplier	/ 100 pts	/ 0 pts	Pass/Fail	Pass/Fail	/ 0 pts	Pass/Fail	/ 100 pts	/ 30 pts	/ 30 pts	/ 20 pts	/ 20 pts
KZF Design	86.4	0	Pass	Pass	0	Pass	86.4	22.2	26.8	19.2	18.2
Barge Design Solutions	76.4	0	Pass	Pass	0	Pass	76.4	23.6	22	14.6	16.2



March 12, 2021

To: Amanda Soldano, Buyer

From: Dionne Cherry, Contract Compliance Specialist

Copies: Jennifer Mackenzie, Interim Director, DEI /JBM
Bobbi Hageman, Chief Procurement Officer

Subject: Reference Number: MAC001200 – Engineering Services for River Edge at Smale Park

The Department of Economic Inclusion (DEI) has made the following determination related to bid reference number MAC001200 advertised as "Engineering Services for River Edge at Smale Park" and the City's Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) and Women Business Enterprise (WBE) Programs. MBE/WBE Contract Participation goals were 3% MBE and 6% WBE. The dollar amount proposed to go to City certified MBEs and WBEs as reported on the Form 2003 was calculated to determine who met, exceeded, or did not meet the participation goals.

See below for result of the bidders' MBE and WBE participation levels.

Company	Total Contract Amount	Total Dollars to MBE's	MBE Participation	Total Dollars to WBE's	WBE Participation
Barge Design Solutions, Inc.	\$69,177.00	\$2,500.00	3.61%	\$6,000.00	8.67%
KZF Design, Inc.	\$99,400.00	\$7,200.00	7.24%	\$13,700.00	13.78%

If you have questions, please contact DEI at dei@cincinnati-oh.gov.



Engineering Services for the River Edge at Smale Park

RFP# MAC001200

City of Cincinnati

Cincinnati, Ohio
March 09, 2021

MBE/WBE INCLUSION PACKET

Form MWP-10
Rev 1/11/2021

MBE AND WBE PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT PACKAGE COVERSHEET

THIS PACKAGE OF MBE AND WBE PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT FORMS, INCLUDING THIS COVERSHEET, FORM 2003, FORM 2004-1 (IF APPLICABLE) FORM MWP-20, & MWP-30 (IF APPLICABLE) MUST BE COMPLETED AND RETURNED WITH THE BID OR PROPOSAL.

Name of Bidder (Proposer): Barge Design Solutions, Inc.

Address: 250 East Fifth Street, Suite 1500, Cincinnati, OH 45202

Contracting Agency: City of Cincinnati

Bid/Proposal Title: Engineering Services for the River Edge at Smale Park Bid/Proposal Number: MAC001200

Indicate what part of the bid this form package is being submitted for:

1. Base Bid/Proposal Only: ☒
2. Base Bid/Proposal with Alternates*: ☐ (List Alternate #s _____)
3. Only Bid/Proposal Items*: ☐ (List Item #s _____)

*If you are only bidding on certain items or alternates on a bid/proposal, indicate the alternates or item #s that correspond to the MBE/WBE participation information you are providing.

The Advertised MBE Goal is 3 % The Advertised WBE Goal is 6 %

THE BIDDER'S PROPOSED MBE AND WBE PARTICIPATION SUBMITTED WITH A WINNING BID, AS VERIFIED BY DEI AFTER BID OPENING AND REFLECTED BELOW, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE CONTRACT AS THE MANDATORY GOALS FOR THE CONTRACT, SUPERCEDING THE ADVERTISED GOALS.

For Department of Economic Inclusion Use Only:

Based on a review of the bidder's submitted MBE and WBE Participation Commitment Forms, DEI has determined that the bidder proposed the following MBE and WBE subcontractor utilization:

MBE Commitment: 3.61 % WBE Commitment: 8.67 %

FOR MORE INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE WITH THESE FORMS CONTACT:

Department of Economic Inclusion
Two Centennial Plaza
805 Central Avenue, Suite 610
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 352-3144

Form MWP-20
Rev 1/11/2021**MBE/WBE PARTICIPATION AFFIDAVIT**

The Undersigned authorized representative of the Contractor does hereby make the following Affidavit: Contractor has read the Bidder Information and Instructions regarding the MBE/WBE Program. Contractor acknowledges the MBE Goal of 3 % and the WBE Goal of 6 % advertised for this contract. Contractor had committed to the following MBE and WBE participation:

Total MBE Subcontract Amount - \$ 2,500 and Total WBE Subcontract Amount of

\$ 6,000 of the total contract bid/proposal amount of \$ 69,177.

My firm has made good faith efforts to meet or exceed the advertised goals for this contract. I understand the Department of Economic Inclusion (DEI), using that portion of the amounts I have identified as the dollar value of my firm's proposed MBE and WBE spend for which DEI has determined credit is permitted under Chapter 324 of the Cincinnati Municipal Code, will calculate the actual inclusion percentages achieved by my firm's bid/proposal.


I understand that, if awarded the contract, ALL OF THE FOLLOWING WILL APPLY:

- I will be required to meet the inclusion percentages calculated by DEI from my bid/proposal not only on the original contract amount, but also on any amendments and/or change orders that, in the aggregate, increase the original contract amount by 10% or more.
- I will be required to submit to DEI copies of subcontract agreements with each of the MBE and WBE firms utilized to achieve the inclusion goals for the contract, and those subcontract agreements must be submitted prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed and before the subcontractor is permitted to perform work under the contract.
- My firm must submit to DEI canceled checks and any other documentation and reports required by DEI to verify payments made to the MBE and WBE firms utilized on the contract.
- If I find I am unable to utilize the MBEs or WBEs identified in my Subcontractor Utilization Plan (Form 2003), I must substitute other certified MBE or WBE firms to meet the participation goals and that I may not make a substitution until after I have submitted a complete Subcontractor Substitution Form (Form 2006) and I have obtained the written approval of DEI for the substitution.
- Authorized representatives of DEI may examine, from time to time, the books, records and files of my firm to the extent such material may be relevant to a determination of whether my firm is complying with the MBE and WBE participation requirements of this contract.

I do solemnly declare and affirm under penalty of perjury that the contents of the foregoing Affidavit are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Company Name: Barge Design Solutions, Inc. Signature: [Signature]
Co. Address: 250 East Fifth Street, Suite 1500 Printed Name and Title: Joseph Sawyer, Vice President

Sworn and subscribed before me this 9th day of March, 2021.



DEI Form 2003
Rev 1/11/2021

MBE/WBE/SBE SUBCONTRACTOR UTILIZATION PLAN (FORM 2003)

(Include all proposed subcontractors, including both certified and non-certified)

Failure to complete the MBE/WBE/SBE Utilization Plan in its entirety could result in your bid being deemed non-responsive

SECTION 1: Bidder/Respondent Information

A. Bid/Proposal Name: Engineering Services for the River Edge at Smale B. Bid/Proposal Reference ID: MAC001200
 C. Bidder/Proposer Name: Barge Design Solutions, Inc. D. Total Bid/Proposal Amount: \$69,177
 E. Primary Contact Name: Jeffery A. Wallace, AICP Phone: 513-504-7688 Email: jeff.wallace@bargedesign.com

SECTION 2: Subcontractor Utilization Information - Attach additional forms if necessary.

Subcontractor Name	SBE, SLBE, ELBE, MBE, WBE or N/A	Federal Tax ID	Detailed description of work to be performed or supplies to be provided	Subcontract Amount	(DEI Use Only) Subcontract % of Total	(For DEI Use Only) DEI Approved?
S&ME	N/A	56-0791580	geotechnical engineering	\$9,900	0.00%	Firm will not count toward the goal
Julie Cromwell & Associates	SBE/WBE		structural engineering	\$6,000	8.67%	Yes
Metric Environmental	SBE/MBE	47-2685192	environmental engineering	\$2,500	3.61%	Yes

SECTION 3: Clarification of Subcontract Amount Listed Above for Suppliers - YOU MUST SELECT ONE OPTION EVEN IF YOU ARE NOT UTILIZING SUPPLIERS

- ☐ The listed amount(s) is/are 100% of the total proposed spend with each identified supplier.
☐ The listed amount(s) is/are only 25% of the total proposed spend with each supplier. Total spend with the supplier(s) will be 4 times greater than shown.
☒ Not Applicable. **No suppliers are listed in Section 2.**

- You must ensure that the firm is certified with the City of Cincinnati to perform the services or provide the supplies that you are proposing in your utilization plan at the time of the bid opening. You can confirm the services and supplies of City Certified firms through the public directory: <https://cincinnati.diversitycompliance.com/FrontEnd/SearchCertifiedDirectory.asp>
- Only 25% of the payment to a certified MBE/WBE supplier that is not a manufacturer may be counted toward an MBE/WBE participation goal (CMC 324-27). **An MBE/WBE contractor that only supplies laborers for use and direction by the prime contractor is considered a supplier and only 25% of that payment can be counted towards the MBE/WBE participation goal.**
- A business enterprise that is certified as both an MBE and WBE (M/WBE) may be counted toward either the MBE contract participation goal or the WBE contract participation goal, but not towards both. The participation of an MWBE also may not be allocated partially to the MBE contract participation goal and partially to the WBE contract participation goal (C.M.C. 324-27(a)). The bidder must select the goal to which the business enterprise is to be counted.



250 EAST FIFTH STREET // SUITE 1500
CINCINNATI // OHIO // 45202
513.504.7688 // PHONE

    // BARGEDESIGN.COM



**City of Cincinnati
Department of Economic Inclusion**

SUBCONTRACTOR INCLUSION BID SUBMISSION CHECKLIST
For use on ITBs, RFPs AND RFQs with MBE and WBE Subcontracting Goals

Please be sure the following items are completed and included in your bid response for a bid with MBE and WBE subcontracting goals. Failure to submit all of the forms required below will result in a bid being deemed "Non-Responsive" by the Department:



here

Form no.	Form Name/Description	Required?	Completed
MWP-10	MBE/WBE Commitment Package Cover Sheet	YES	☒
MWP-20	MBE/WBE Participation Affidavit	YES	☒
2003	Subcontractor Utilization Plan (Complete a separate Form 2003 for each alternate bid. Use additional forms if all subs cannot fit on one form)	YES	☒
2004-1	Statement of Intent to Self-Perform (Complete only if the bidder is a certified MBE or WBE with the City of Cincinnati AND is requesting to count work that it will self-perform towards the applicable subcontracting goal)	If Applicable	☐
MWP-30	MBE/WBE Participation Waiver Request (only if a waiver is being requested) ALL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION MUST BE ATTACHED.	If Applicable	☐

REVIEW THE MBE/WBE INSTRUCTIONS CONTAINED WITHIN THIS PACKET PRIOR TO COMPLETING AND SUBMITTING THE REQUIRED FORMS.

FAILURE TO FULLY AND CORRECTLY COMPLETE AND SUBMIT ALL REQUIRED FORMS MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR BID OR PROPOSAL.

**MBE AND WBE PARTICIPATION
COMMITMENT PACKAGE COVERSHEET**

THIS PACKAGE OF MBE AND WBE PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT FORMS, INCLUDING THIS COVERSHEET, FORM 2003, FORM 2004-1 (IF APPLICABLE) FORM MWP-20, & MWP-30 (IF APPLICABLE) MUST BE COMPLETED AND RETURNED WITH THE BID OR PROPOSAL.

Name of Bidder (Proposer): KZF Design

Address: 700 Broadway Street

Contracting Agency: Cincinnati Park Board

Bid/Proposal Title: Smale Park Engineering Services for River Edge Bid/Proposal Number: MAC001200

Indicate what part of the bid this form package is being submitted for:

1. Base Bid/Proposal Only: ☒
2. Base Bid/Proposal with Alternates*: ☐ (List Alternate #s _____)
3. Only Bid/Proposal Items*: ☐ (List Item #s _____)

*If you are only bidding on certain items or alternates on a bid/proposal, indicate the alternates or item #s that correspond to the MBE/WBE participation information you are providing.

The Advertised MBE Goal is 3 % The Advertised WBE Goal is 6 %

THE BIDDER'S PROPOSED MBE AND WBE PARTICIPATION SUBMITTED WITH A WINNING BID, AS VERIFIED BY DEI AFTER BID OPENING AND REFLECTED BELOW, WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE CONTRACT AS THE MANDATORY GOALS FOR THE CONTRACT, SUPERCEDING THE ADVERTISED GOALS.

For Department of Economic Inclusion Use Only:

Based on a review of the bidder's submitted MBE and WBE Participation Commitment Forms, DEI has determined that the bidder proposed the following MBE and WBE subcontractor utilization:

MBE Commitment: 7.24 % WBE Commitment: 13.78 %

FOR MORE INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE WITH THESE FORMS CONTACT:

Department of Economic Inclusion
Two Centennial Plaza
805 Central Avenue, Suite 610
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 352-3144

MBE/WBE PARTICIPATION AFFIDAVIT

The Undersigned authorized representative of the Contractor does hereby make the following Affidavit: Contractor has read the Bidder Information and Instructions regarding the MBE/WBE Program. Contractor acknowledges the MBE Goal of 3 % and the WBE Goal of 6 % advertised for this contract. Contractor had committed to the following MBE and WBE participation:

Total MBE Subcontract Amount - \$ 7,200 and Total WBE Subcontract Amount of \$ 13,700 of the total contract bid/proposal amount of \$ 99,400.

My firm has made good faith efforts to meet or exceed the advertised goals for this contract. I understand the Department of Economic Inclusion (DEI), using that portion of the amounts I have identified as the dollar value of my firm's proposed MBE and WBE spend for which DEI has determined credit is permitted under Chapter 324 of the Cincinnati Municipal Code, will calculate the actual inclusion percentages achieved by my firm's bid/proposal.

I understand that, if awarded the contract, ALL OF THE FOLLOWING WILL APPLY:

- I will be required to meet the inclusion percentages calculated by DEI from my bid/proposal not only on the original contract amount, but also on any amendments and/or change orders that, in the aggregate, increase the original contract amount by 10% or more.
- I will be required to submit to DEI copies of subcontract agreements with each of the MBE and WBE firms utilized to achieve the inclusion goals for the contract, and those subcontract agreements must be submitted prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed and before the subcontractor is permitted to perform work under the contract.
- My firm must submit to DEI canceled checks and any other documentation and reports required by DEI to verify payments made to the MBE and WBE firms utilized on the contract.
- If I find I am unable to utilize the MBEs or WBEs identified in my Subcontractor Utilization Plan (Form 2003), I must substitute other certified MBE or WBE firms to meet the participation goals and that I may not make a substitution until after I have submitted a complete Subcontractor Substitution Form (Form 2006) and I have obtained the written approval of DEI for the substitution.
- Authorized representatives of DEI may examine, from time to time, the books, records and files of my firm to the extent such material may be relevant to a determination of whether my firm is complying with the MBE and WBE participation requirements of this contract.

I do solemnly declare and affirm under penalty of perjury that the contents of the foregoing Affidavit are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Company Name: KZF Design

Co. Address: 700 Broadway St, Cincinnati OH 4

Signature: [Signature]
Printed Name and Title: Tim Sharp, Chief Strategic Officer

Sworn and subscribed before JENNIFER L. STRAINIC day of March, 2021.



Notary Public, State of Ohio
My Commission Expires 01-20-2024

[Signature]
Notary Public

MBE/WBE/SBE SUBCONTRACTOR UTILIZATION PLAN (FORM 2003)

(Include all proposed subcontractors, including both certified and non-certified)

Failure to complete the MBE/WBE/SBE Utilization Plan in its entirety could result in your bid being deemed non-responsive

SECTION 1: Bidder/Respondent Information

A. Bid/Proposal Name: Smale Park Engineering Services for River Edge B. Bid/Proposal Reference ID: MAC001200
C. Bidder/Proposer Name: KZF Design D. Total Bid/Proposal Amount: 99,400
E. Primary Contact Name: Tim Sharp Phone: 513-621-6211 Email: tim.sharp@kzf.com

SECTION 2: Subcontractor Utilization Information - Attach additional forms if necessary.

Subcontractor Name	SBE, SLBE, ELBE, MBE, WBE or N/A	Federal Tax ID	Detailed description of work to be performed or supplies to be provided	Subcontract Amount	(DEI Use Only) Subcontract % of Total	(For DEI Use Only) DEI Approved?
Resource International, Inc.	WBE	31-0669793	Survey, Geotechnical Engineering	13,700	13.78%	Yes
Megen Construction	MBE	31-1397782	Cost Estimating	7,200	7.24%	Yes

SECTION 3: Clarification of Subcontract Amount Listed Above for Suppliers - YOU MUST SELECT ONE OPTION EVEN IF YOU ARE NOT UTILIZING SUPPLIERS

- ☐ The listed amount(s) is/are 100% of the total proposed spend with each identified supplier.
☐ The listed amount(s) is/are only 25% of the total proposed spend with each supplier. Total spend with the supplier(s) will be 4 times greater than shown.
☐ Not Applicable. **No suppliers are listed in Section 2.**

- You must ensure that the firm is certified with the City of Cincinnati to perform the services or provide the supplies that you are proposing in your utilization plan at the time of the bid opening. You can confirm the services and supplies of City Certified firms through the public directory:
<https://cincinnati.diversitycompliance.com/FrontEnd/SearchCertifiedDirectory.asp>
- Only 25% of the payment to a certified MBE/WBE supplier that is not a manufacturer may be counted toward an MBE/WBE participation goal (CMC 324-27). **An MBE/WBE contractor that only supplies laborers for use and direction by the prime contractor is considered a supplier and only 25% of that payment can be counted towards the MBE/WBE participation goal.**
- A business enterprise that is certified as both an MBE and WBE (M/WBE) may be counted toward either the MBE contract participation goal or the WBE contract participation goal, but not towards both. The participation of an MWBE also may not be allocated partially to the MBE contract participation goal and partially to the WBE contract participation goal (CMC 324-27). The bidder must select the goal to which the business enterprise will be counted.

BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Mary Unterreiner, Executive Assistant

KSK

Subject: Contracts and Agreements for Approval

Background

The Board has established guidelines for items requiring their review, including contracts over \$50,000 or agreements with terms exceeding 12 months.

Contracts over \$50k

Below are projects budgeted within the capital improvement program exceeding \$50k, which are ready to proceed:

- **Rapid Run Play Set - \$137,766.13**
The replacement of the play set in Rapid Run is a FY21 project. The existing play set is 22 years old. Work will be carried out under the City Master Agreement for play set repair and replacement.
- **Administration Building Renovations - \$168,351**
The work includes upgrading the existing restrooms to meet ADA guidelines and to carve a conference room out of an oversized office space. This was bid through the Multiple Award Contract (MAC) process and followed Procurement guidelines.
- **Mt Airy Retaining Wall - \$167,977**
The retaining wall adjacent to the service garage is failing and was noted in poor condition from the Assessment. This was bid through the Multiple Award Contract (MAC) process and followed Procurement guidelines.

Greenspace Agreements Exceeding 12 Months

The Division of Natural Resources staff are working with the City Law Department, Parks Finance, and the clients described below to update all historic and new Greenspace Program landscape maintenance contracts to reflect the current city terms and conditions, and extend the life of the

contracts to minimize annual administration needs. Key contract terms are described below:

- **UC Landscape Maintenance Agreement**

UC desires to engage the City, through its Greenspace program administered by the Board of Park Commissioners, to perform certain landscape maintenance services at various traffic islands and medians along Martin Luther King Drive ("MLK"), near Vine Street and Jefferson Avenue, and along Clifton Avenue between MLK and West McMillan Street. This Agreement shall commence on the Effective Date when signed by the parties and shall continue in full force and effect for a period of three (3) years, until December 31, 2023. The parties may, by mutual consent, renew this Agreement for two (2) additional 12-month periods, through December 31, 2025. UC shall pay the City \$49,299.89, in accordance with the budget mutually agreed upon by the parties. Years 2-5 shall inflate at 2% per year effective January 1st each year.

- **Transdev Landscape Maintenance Agreement**

Transdev desires to engage the City, through its Greenspace program administered by the Board of Park Commissioners, to perform installation and landscape maintenance services at eleven locations along the Streetcar Route in downtown Cincinnati. This Agreement shall commence when signed by the parties and shall continue in full force and effect until August 31, 2021 (the "Term"). The parties may, by mutual consent, renew this Agreement for three additional 12-month periods, through August 31, 2024. Beginning on the effective date of this Agreement for the initial Term hereof, Transdev shall pay the City a Fee of \$5,013.51 for the cost of initial installation, five months of maintenance, and a spring cleanup. For each term thereafter, beginning September 1, 2021, the City shall invoice Transdev the Fee of \$3,737.08 for the annual maintenance, the fall cleanup, and spring cleanup, payable by Transdev on or before the first day of October of each Term. Years 2-5 shall inflate at 2% per year effective September 1st each year.

- **OTR District Management, LLC Liberty Street Landscape Maintenance Agreement**

OTR District Management (OTRDM) is responsible for maintaining certain landscape areas on Liberty Street from Sycamore Street to Central Parkway under a Maintenance Agreement between OTRDM and the City of Cincinnati ("City Agreement"). OTRDM desires to engage the City, through its Greenspace program administered by the Board of Park Commissioners, to perform landscape maintenance that OTRDM assumed under the City Agreement. This Agreement shall commence when signed by the parties and shall continue in full force and effect until December 31, 2021. This Agreement will automatically renew for three successive 12-month periods, through December 31, 2024, unless earlier terminated as allowed under this Agreement. Beginning on the effective date of this Agreement for the initial term hereof, OTRDM shall pay the City \$11,473.68 for 2021 maintenance (approximately 9 months), mowing and a fall cleanup for the first year of the Agreement. The Fee for annual maintenance for the second year of the Agreement (January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2022), if renewed pursuant to Section 2.1 of the Agreement, shall be \$16,673.64. The budget for the Services to be rendered during each successive year of the term hereof, excluding the first year and second years, shall be the Fee paid for the immediately preceding year, increased by 2%.

- **3CDC Landscape Maintenance Agreement**

3CDC desires to engage the City, through its Greenspace program administered by the Board of Park Commissioners, to perform landscape maintenance around three parking lot areas in the Downtown and Over the Rhine neighborhoods, located at 12th Street and Vine Street, 15th Street and Vine Street, and Liberty Street and Race Street. This

Agreement shall commence when signed by the parties and shall continue in full force and effect until December 31, 2021. The parties may, by mutual consent, renew this Agreement for three additional 12-month periods, through December 31, 2024. Beginning on the effective date of this Agreement for the initial term hereof (approximately 9 months ending December 31, 2021), 3CDC shall pay the City a Fee of \$14,321.55 for 2021 maintenance, the spring cleanup, and fall cleanup for the Service Area, and three seasonal displays for the 12th Street and Vine Street Lot. The Fee for the second year of the Agreement (January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2022), if renewed pursuant to Section 2.1 of the Agreement, shall be \$17,566.35 for provision of the Services specified. The budget for the Services to be rendered during each successive year of the term hereof, excluding the first year and second years, shall be the Fee paid for the immediately preceding year, increased by 2%, unless otherwise agreed by the parties in writing.

- **Downtown Cincinnati LLC (DCI) Landscape Maintenance Agreement**

DCI desires to engage the City, through its Greenspace program administered by the Board of Park Commissioners, to perform landscape maintenance at the on-ramp to Interstate 75 located at the intersection of 4th Street and Central Avenue. This Agreement shall commence when signed by the parties and shall continue in full force and effect until December 31, 2021. The parties may, by mutual consent, renew this Agreement for three additional 12-month periods, through December 31, 2024. Beginning on the effective date of this Agreement for the initial term hereof (approximately 9 months ending December 31, 2021), DCI shall pay the City \$1,551.17 for 2021 maintenance, the spring cleanup, and fall cleanup for the Service Area. The Fee for the second year of the Agreement (January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2022), if renewed pursuant to Section 2.1 of the Agreement, shall be \$1,988.85 for provision of the Services specified. The budget for the Services to be rendered during each successive year of the term hereof, excluding the first year and second years, shall be the Fee paid for the immediately preceding year, increased by 2%, unless otherwise agreed by the parties in writing.


Recommendation

Staff respectfully requests the Board approve the presented contracts and agreements.

Attachment A—Rapid Run Play Set Proposal

Attachment B—Administration Building Renovation Proposal

Attachment C—Mt. Airy Retaining Wall Proposal



3662 POOLE ROAD • CINCINNATI, OHIO 45251 • (513) 385-8855 • FAX (513) 741-1928

EMAIL jeffreyallencorp@fuse.net

Complete Lawn & Landscape Service

April 5, 2021

Doug Dornette
Cincinnati Park Board
2625 Reading Rd.
Cincinnati, OH 45206

e. Doug.Dornette@cincinnati-oh.gov

RAPID RUN PARK PROPOSAL

Doug,

The following is our quote for equipment and installation at Rapid Run Park.


- Supply & install Nexus structure, Ten Spin, Standing Steel Slide with Sensory Panels, Accelerator Swing, Hover Net & 3 Piece Rainbow Musical Ensemble.
- Supply & Install 180 yards EWF and 4 x 6 timbers.
- Remove existing A Frame swing and repair area.

Equipment Cost	94,287.50
15% Equipment Markup	14,143.13
Installation of Equipment	27,162.50
8% Subcontractor Markup	2,173.00

TOTAL COST IS \$137,766.13

Thank you for the opportunity to quote this work.

Sincerely,
JEFFREY ALLEN CORPORATION



Jack A. Bresnen Jr.
President

JB/jvn

cc. Cindy France

AGE GROUP:	5-12
ELEVATED PLAY ACTIVITIES - TOTAL:	1
ELEVATED PLAY ACTIVITIES ACCESSIBLE BY TRANSFER:	1
ELEVATED PLAY ACTIVITIES ACCESSIBLE BY RAMP:	0
ELEVATED PLAY ACTIVITIES ACCESSIBLE BY RAMP:	0
GROUND LEVEL ACTIVITY TYPE:	9
GROUND LEVEL ACTIVITY TYPE:	23
GROUND LEVEL QUANTITY:	0

RAPID RUN PARK
CINCINNATI, OH



Playground Equipment Services
3460 Oakmeadow Lane
Cincinnati, OH
PHONE NO: (513) 923-2333
FAX NO: (513) 923-2444
GROUND SPACE: 89'-0" x 67'-0"
PROTECTIVE AREA: 85'-6" x 88'-6"
DRAWN BY: Scott Hill

R0101_44215487729	To promote safe and proper equipment use by children. Miracle recommends the installation of either a Miracle safety sign or other appropriate safety signage near each play/system's main entry point(s) to inform parents and supervisors of the age appropriateness of the playsystem and general rules for safe play.
☒	COMPLIES TO ASTM/CPSC
☒	COMPLIES TO ADA

THE PLAY COMPONENTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS PLAN ARE IPEMA CERTIFIED. THE USE AND LAYOUT OF THESE COMPONENTS CONFORM TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM F1487.
AN ENERGY ABSORBING PROTECTIVE SURFACE IS REQUIRED UNDER & AROUND ALL PLAY SYSTEMS





City of Cincinnati
Administration Building Restroom Reno – MAC0001242
950 Eden Park Dr. Cincinnati, OH 45202
ATTN: Cindy France

03/01/2021

Scope of work: Admin Building Rest Room Reno

- Per plans and specs.
- \$10,000 allowance included

Cost of Above work \$168,351.00

Proposal good for 45 days

Signature _____ Date _____

Thank you for the opportunity to quote this project.

Scott Windish
General Construction Project Manager / Estimator
Cell 513-460-1019
swindish@triton-services-inc.com

8162 Duke Boulevard Mason, Ohio 45040
P: 513-679-6800 f: 513-679-6808 1-866-679-6800 www.triton-services-inc.com
EOE * OH LIC #25648

March 9, 2021

Doug Dornette
City of Cincinnati
Parks/Planning
2625 Reading Rd.
Cincinnati, OH 45206

**Re: City of Cincinnati Parks/Planning
Mt. Airy Maintenance Building Retaining Wall**

Dear Doug,

We propose to furnish all necessary labor, material, and equipment to remove and replace retaining wall per the plans given.


A summary of the cost breakdown is provided below:

Description	Labor	Material	Subcontract
Universal Contracting			\$ 87,499
10% Overhead and Profit (L,M & E)		\$ -	\$ 8,750
Total		\$ -	\$ 96,249
Rod-Techs, Inc.			\$ 8,000
Crete Busters			\$ 25,000
Terracon			\$ 11,501
Security Fence			\$ 20,000
10% overhead and Profit (Subs)			\$ 6,450
Total			\$ 70,951
1.5% Insurance			\$ 333
2% Bond			\$ 444
Grand Total			\$ 167,977

***An approval of this cost proposal will be needed prior to the commencement of work.

Should you have any questions regarding this estimate, please feel free to contact me at the number below or e-mail me at bvogelgesang@unicon.cc

Sincerely,
UNIVERSAL CONTRACTING CORPORATION



Ben Vogelgesang
Project Manager

BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Craig Sherman, CFO *KSK*

Subject: Acceptance of In-Kind Contributions

Background

Board approval is needed to retain in-kind contributions QTR1 2021.

Description

Staff is requesting approval to accept of the QTR1 2021 in-kind contributions:

Kara S. Kish
Director

Jenny Mobley
Deputy Director

Crystal Courtney
Division Manager

Rocky Merz
Division Manager

Steven L. Schuckman
Division Manager

Craig Sherman
Division Manager

Row Labels	Sum of Amount
Park Supplies	\$ 1,793.63
Contract Services	\$ 1,100.00
Grand Total	\$ 2,893.63

Recommendation

Staff respectfully requests the Board approve to accept the in-kind contributions in the amount of \$2,893.63.

Attachment A—Cincinnati Parks Foundation In-Kind Contributions

INDIRECT Donations to Cincinnati Park Board

1st Quarter, 2021

						Attachment - A		
Type	Date	Num	Name	Memo	Account	Class	Amount	
Check	03/10/2021	13241	NATORP LANDSCAPE SUPPLY	Bur tree Eden Park Ken Casey	5710 · Materials & Supplies-Restr	Restricted:Eden Park	163.75	
Check	02/08/2021	13219	MKSK	Design work for Tom Jones Commons	5740 · Contract Services-Restr	Restricted:Eden Park-Commons	600.00	
Check	02/24/2021	13222	Burgess & Niple	Design review for Tom Jones Commons Inv 953653	5740 · Contract Services-Restr	Restricted:Eden Park-Commons	500.00	
General Journal	03/21/2021	126		Amazon-Sawyer Point Park Pickle Ball Courts supplies - Cold Packs	5710 · Materials & Supplies-Restr	Restricted:Sawyer Park - Pickleball	14.89	
General Journal	03/21/2021	126		Amazon-Sawyer Point Park Pickle Ball Courts supplies - First Aid Kit and AA Batteries	5710 · Materials & Supplies-Restr	Restricted:Sawyer Park - Pickleball	63.98	
Check	03/24/2021	13247	Tri-State Visual	transmitter microphone Inv 46052	5710 · Materials & Supplies-Restr	Restricted:Sawyer Park - Pickleball	382.00	
General Journal	01/21/2021	124		Hats and Gloves for kids hiking at Bettman Nature Center	3610 · Misc	Unrestricted:General Operating	55.98	
Check	03/24/2021	13245	E C SHAW COMPANY	plaque Bedell bench Inv #821627	3710 · Materials & Supplies	Unrestricted:General Operating	130.03	
Check	03/24/2021	13248	NATORP LANDSCAPE SUPPLY	Trees French park, eden park Inv 89463	3710 · Materials & Supplies	Unrestricted:General Operating	983.00	

Ideas for Kara Goals - Updated 4/14/21

Complete by 6/30/21

- Prioritize completion of projects
- Identify issues and plan for increased efficiencies with Procurement and DEI to advance projects
- Prioritize a strong relationship between the Park Board of Commissioners and the Parks Foundation through direct personal engagement with the Foundation Director and board leadership, including achieving mutual understanding and adopt processes to implement the terms of the existing MOU
- Complete hiring process for 2 professional positions in Planning & Design
 - Senior Architect - open for City transfer
 - Landscape Architect - open to the public/advertised regionally
- Develop succession plans for Director, Senior staff, and other key positions
- Board Meetings
 - Implemented beginning in May
 - New meeting structure/agenda
 - New Board action item reports
 - New monthly packages from Finance and Planning & Design
- Engage in process to develop 3 year strategic plan
 - Mission and Core Values
 - FY 2022-2024
 - Collaborative process with Commissioner representatives and Senior staff
- Finalize FY22 Performance Agreement with City Manager (items to be complete by 6/30/22)
 - Enhance public feedback and community engagement systems
 - Comprehensive trail signage program - design, location identification, fabrication and installation
 - Mt. Airy Forest revitalization - mountain bike beginner skills area, arboretum, lodges, parking, accessibility
 - Parks ReLeaf program - Double amount of trees distributed (1,700 total)
- Begin 6 month Executive Coaching
- Submit application for Leadership Cincinnati

Complete by 12/31/21

- Complete 3 year strategic plan for Board review/approval
- Collaborate with Cincinnati Parks Foundation to consider fundraising initiative for Krohn Conservatory

Monthly Reports

April 2021

BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Steven Schuckman, Division Manager *KSK*

Subject: Monthly Capital Project Updates

Sawyer Point—Staff is working with a donor on potential improvements to the tennis courts and converting a number of them to pickleball courts.

Johnston Park—The preliminary design and cost estimate for the park was completed.

Recreational Trail Program Grant—ODNR awarded a \$130,000 grant for construction of a bike/multi-use trail in Bramble Park.

Smale Riverfront Park Extension—The Race Street Terrace was completed. The north tree grove was planted, and granite paver installation proceeded, including completion of pavers where the stage will be installed. Also, the base materials were installed to receive the artificial turf. The project is now expected to be substantially complete by mid-May.

Ault Park—Initial site clearing for the portion of the Wasson Way Trail in Ault Park was done and staff conducted a site walk of the Valley trail with APAC members. The purpose was to review stream conditions along the trail and the potential to pave the trail with stimulus dollars, connecting the park to the regional bike/multi-use trail system.

Jones Commons—The shelter was installed, interpretive sign design was completed, and the signs ordered. Lumber for the kiosk was purchased and sitework continued. A June completion is planned.

Boat Dock—The City Manager and Purchasing reviewed the RFQ for design, construction and operation of a dock and had a series of questions. Staff provided responses and is waiting for further comments and/or approval to send out.

SRP River Edge—The RFP process was completed to select an Engineer to design the stabilization of the riverbank west of the Roebling Bridge.

Rapid Run Park—Planning and Operations staff met with CRC park managers on site to explore potential efficiencies in operations. Both Parks and CRC maintain parts of Rapid Run with Parks managing most of the area. The potential is for Parks to take on all management while giving CRC grounds management at another park location where both departments have responsibilities.

Stimulus Funding—Staff prepared lists of major capital improvements and potential transformational projects for consideration.

Gateway to Freedom Park—Staff conferred with the City Administration and Freedom Center representatives on the programming and design of this proposed park and the process involved.

Marian Spencer Statue—The inscriptions on the stone seatwall at the Women's Committee Garden that are part of the statue project will be completed in April followed by the installation of the statues. A dedication event is being scheduled in late June.

Capital Improvement Program—Staff worked on numerous projects to advance toward construction. Work entailed design, securing cost proposals, preparing specifications and work orders, taking projects through the procurement process and certification of funds. Specific capital work included the following:

- Burnet Woods curb and concrete repair work was completed.
- Everybody's Treehouse repairs were completed.
- Staff worked with Purchasing to develop a term masonry contract.

PARK BOARD CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Fund Number	Project Name	Orig. Budget	Expenditures	Encumbrances	Remaining	Completion Date	Comments/ Issues
152015	Lytle Park Improvements	\$ 2,670,178	\$ 257,931	\$ 2,412,247	\$ -		
	Human Nature			\$ 60,795			Construction contract to be awarded once additional funds received from Western-Southern and appeals resolved.
	Prus Construction			\$ 2,351,453			
162016	Yeatman's Cove Walkway Improvements	\$ 850,000	\$ 763,820	\$ 86,180	\$ 0		
	concrete repairs			\$ 28,645		5/21	scheduling work
	concrete repairs			\$ 41,476		5/21	scheduling work
	concrete repairs			\$ 9,209		7/21	scheduling work
162015	Smale Riverfront Park- State of Ohio Capital Funds	\$ 500,000	\$ 7,500	\$ -	\$ 492,500		
	Engineering Consultant Services for River Edge				\$ 99,400		Contract Negotiations after Board Approval
							Grant money restricted to river edge & match to future Federal funds
172001	Smale Riverfront Park	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 201,433	\$ 149,529	\$ 1,149,038		
							Funding for the construction of the Boat Dock.
172010	Ault Park Improvements	\$ 297,000	\$ 285,759	\$ 11,241	\$ -		
	Forevergreen/ cherry trees			\$ 1,345		5/21	scheduling work
	Adleta Concrete			\$ 4,796		5/21	scheduling work
182000	Park Infrastructure Rehabilitation- FY18	\$ 1,666,000	\$ 1,323,589	\$ 342,411	\$ -		
182008	Bellevue Park Improvements	\$ 83,000	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ 23,000		
	Step/ Trail Repair				\$ 23,000	12/21	Masonry Term Contract being developed by Purchasing.
182009	French Park Improvements	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20,000		
	French House- paint exterior				\$ 20,000	7/21	Work Order is being circulated for signatures.
182010	Mt Airy Forest Improvements	\$ 80,000	\$ 34,388	\$ 17,312	\$ 28,300		
	Retaining Wall				\$ 28,300	7/21	Pending Board Approval, circulate Work Order. Use with \$139,677 of fund 202000
182011	System Wide Masonry Improvements	\$ 120,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000		
	Stanbery Pillar Repairs					6/21	Masonry Term Contract being developed by Purchasing.
	French House Wall Repair					6/21	
	California Shelter Floor Repair					6/21	
	Alms Drystack Wall					6/21	
	Eden Park Wall near poolhouse					6/21	
	Seasongood Square Wall					6/21	
	Waterfront Pavers					6/21	
	SRP Pavers					6/21	

PARK BOARD CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

182012	Mt Echo Improvements	\$ 30,000	\$ 13,638	\$ -	\$ 16,362		
	Engineering Services				\$ 11,500	5/21	putting together a work order
	Terrace Repair				\$ 11,362	10/21	Engineering required, use with funds in 212000
182013	Piatt Park Improvements	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,734	\$ 16,044	\$ 80,223		
	Lighting			\$ 13,327		5/21	scheduling work
	Drinking Fountain Replacement				\$ 30,000	8/21	investigating
	Paver Replacement/ Leveling			\$ 6,450		8/21	scheduling work
182014	Hauck Garden Improvements	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000	\$ 20,000		
	Hauck House, paint				\$ 20,000	7/21	circulating work order for signatures
	Concrete Repairs/ Replacement			\$ 30,000		4/21	scheduling work
182015	Lytle Park Improvements	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000		
	Play Set Replacement				\$ 50,000	TBD	This supplements the Lytle Park Budget
182016	Mt Storm Improvements	\$ 26,230	\$ 19,260	\$ 6,970	\$ -		
	concrete work			\$ 6,970		4/21	scheduling work
182017	Drabner Funded Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 250,000	\$ 52,250	\$ 7,796	\$ 189,954		
	Sinton Building Roof Repairs				\$ 20,000	9/21	putting together a work order request, Poor condition per assessment
	Admin Building Painting				\$ 30,000	7/21	circulating work order for signatures
	Bellevue Steps				\$ 5,000	6/21	Masonry contract work, this supplements project 182008
	Mt Echo Comfort Station				\$ 50,000	6/21	Building Renovation. Requires architectural design services.
	Inwood Comfort Station				\$ 40,000	6/21	Building Renovation. Requires architectural design services.
182018	Fleischmann Funded Infrastructure Improvements	\$ 425,000	\$ 301,056	\$ 30,461	\$ 93,484		
	Burnet Woods Disc Golf Tees				\$ 20,000	6/21	Holding for a new concrete term contract for better pricing
	Administration Building Roof				\$ 73,484	12/21	1st bids rejected, put together a work order request for this project
	Inwood Play Set			\$ 123,390		5/21	work underway (partial funding)
182019	Stanbery Park Pavilion- State of Ohio Capital	\$ 352,800	\$ 305,135	\$ 37,326	\$ 10,340		
	Change Order				\$ 10,340		Additional grading and concrete work
	Pavilion Construction			\$ 298,400		-	Completed.
192000	Park Infrastructure Rehabilitation- FY19	\$ 2,077,001	\$ 1,245,659	\$ 822,700	\$ 8,642		
	French Park- Replace Sidewalks			\$ 63,864		5/21	scheduling work, poor condition per assessment
	Friendship Park- Additional Inclinometers and Borings			\$ 31,512		5/22	inclinometer install completed/ readings still scheduled
	Mt Airy Oak Ridge shelter- replace slab			\$ 16,611		5/21	scheduling work
	Mt Airy Area 10 ADA Improvements			\$ 20,432		6/21	Part of ADA plan, scheduling work
	Mt Airy Area 13 ADA Improvements			\$ 20,753		6/21	Part of ADA plan, scheduling work
	Twin Lakes Engineer			\$ 4,970		5/21	work underway
	Mt Storm concrete repairs			\$ 12,878		4/21	schedulig work
	Burnet Woods concrete work			\$ 77,295		4/21	scheduling work
	Gibson House painting consultant			\$ 4,250		6/21	work underway
	Swing Set Replacement FY21 project Oak Ridge			\$ 17,911		6/21	scheduling work
	Alms playset repairs			\$ 5,941		5/21	completed
	Mt Echo play set Replacement			\$ 91,500		12/20	completed

PARK BOARD CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

	Alms curb and concrete repairs			\$	43,124		5/21	scheduling work		
	Replace swing sets (Burnet/Drake/French/Glenway/Mayfield/Dunore/ Area 3)			\$	94,231		12/20	completed		
	Tom Jones pergola lumber and signage			\$	11,690		6/21	scheduling work		
	Kyle Plush Change Order				\$	8,642	4/21	Additional grading and concrete work		
	Inwood- repairs to main stair			\$	21,448		5/21	scheduling work		
	Mt Airy Treehouse Emergency Repairs- consultant work			\$	5,000		5/21	completed		
	Mt Airy Retaining Wall Project special inspections			\$	4,500		11/21	scheduling work		
	Blue Spruce Road Special Inspections			\$	3,683		5/21	scheduling work		
	Tom Jones Commons special inspections			\$	3,742		5/21	work underway		
192007	Inwood Park Improvements	\$	500,000	\$	225,115	\$	244,885	\$	30,000	
	Inwood Benches and Pads					\$	30,000	7/21	certifying funds	
	Inwood playset, lower park area			\$	69,477		5/21	scheduling work		
	Inwood remove concrete table			\$	3,613		5/21	scheduling work		
	Inwood-railing install			\$	6,923		5/21	scheduling work		
	Inwood access road			\$	38,041		5/21	scheduling work		
	Inwood ADA Walks			\$	21,315		5/21	schedulig work		
	Inwood asplalt removal at old play set			\$	7,750		5/21	scheduling work		
202000	Park Infrastructure Rehabilitation	\$	2,009,000	\$	528,557	\$	554,905	\$	925,538	
	Mt Airy Blue Spruce Road restoration			\$	374,705		6/21	Work will begin in April, will take about 4 weeks to replace.		
	Mt Airy Bike Trail Parking Diehl Road			\$	64,411		5/21	scheduling work		
	Mt Airy Parking Lot Shepard Creek			\$	72,922		5/21	scheduling work		
	Mt Airy Retaining Wall Project					\$	139,677	7/21 Pending Board Approval, circulate Work Order, funds combined with \$28,300 in fund 182010. Req to prevent failure.		
	Tom Jones swingsets and play surfaces			\$	42,867		6/21	scheduling work		
	Consuting for Electric Arc Flash Surveys					\$	66,955	2/22	certifying funds	
	Trailside Nature Center- replace condensing units/ heat pump					\$	42,725	7/21	certifying funds, poor condition per assessment	
	Mt Airy Treehouse Emergency Repairs					\$	19,452	3/21	certifying funds.	
	Hauck/Administration/French House Painting					\$	156,397	7/21	circulating work order for signatures	
	Alms Park storm structure repair					\$	10,000	7/21	putting together a proposal	
	Burnet Woods ADA improvements around new play set					\$	20,000	10/21	putting together a scope of work	
	Burnet Woods concrete work around bandstand					\$	11,644	9/21	certifying funds	
	Burnet Woods DGI Repair					\$	1,850	5/21	certifying funds	
	Administration Building Renovation Work					\$	168,351	11/21	Pending Board Approval, circulate Work Order	
	Owls Nest building demo					\$	37,666	7/21	Demo awarded to a Contractor. Scheduling Work.	
	Rapid Run barrier for retaining wall					\$	9,869	9/21	certifying funds	
	Seasongood Pavilion Roof Replacement					\$	50,000	10/21	getting a proposal	
	Mt Echo concrete walk repairs near play set					\$	15,000	7/21	getting a proposal	
	Replace Rapid Run Play Set FY 21 project					\$	137,766	8/21	Pending Board Approval, a certification request will be submitted.	
	Replace swing set in Rapid Run FY 21 project					\$	17,000	8/21	getting a proposal	
	Gibson House Roof and Gutter Repairs					\$	20,000	10/21	getting a proposal	
	Staff Reimbursements for FY21		\$	528,557						

PARK BOARD CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

202004	Burnet Woods Planetarium Projector	\$ 39,030	\$ -	\$ 38,550	\$ 480	
202005	Bramble Park Streambank Restoration	\$ 129,225	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 129,225	
					\$ 129,225	RFQ will be issued for Design/ Build
202006	Sawyer Point Park Gateway	\$ 229,510	\$ 111,329	\$ 118,181	\$ -	
	BN Design Work		\$ 111,329	\$ 118,181		Design work completed.
202008	Smale Riverfront Park Extension	\$ 6,975,000	\$ -	\$ 6,312,800	\$ 662,200	
202011	Sawyer Point Fishing Pier	\$ 773,000	\$ 587,000	\$ 185,000	\$ 1,000	
	Prus Construction		\$ 587,000	\$ 185,000		7/21 Construction suspended due to high water. Work will commence 6/21.
202005	Bramble Park Streambank Restoration	\$ 129,225			\$ 129,225	
	Streambank Project Renovation					8/21 RFP package is CM approval for public advertisement
202008	Smale Riverfront Park Extension	\$ 6,975,000			\$ 662,200	
						5/21 under construction
212000	Park Infrastructure Rehabilitation	\$ 2,001,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,001,000	
	Comfort Stations General Repairs				\$ 5,000	
	Emergency Repairs/ Vandalism				\$ 15,000	
	Greenhouse Repairs				\$ 5,000	Repairs as Needed
	Roads/ Parking/ Trails/ Steps				\$ 35,000	Minimal funds needed for repairs
	Structures				\$ 5,000	Held for emergency repairs.
	Playset repairs				\$ 5,000	Held for emergency repairs.
	Utilities/ Storm Water Emergency Repairs				\$ 75,000	Held for emergency repairs.
	Various Fencing/Benches/ Signage				\$ 11,000	As needed
	Rapid Run pond caulking				\$ 50,000	9/21 reviewing scope. The caulking was noted in poor condition from the assessment
	Rapid Run Pavilion Gutter Repairs				\$ 15,000	10/21 getting a proposal
	Victory Parkway Roof Repairs				\$ 30,000	10/21 getting a proposal
	Eden Park ADA improvements at upper overlook picnic				\$ 20,000	12/21 getting a proposal
	Eden Park Fulton Steps repair landings				\$ 20,000	12/21 getting a proposal
	Drake Park trip hazards				\$ 15,000	12/21 getting a proposal
	Maple Ridge Garage Roof Replacement				\$ 20,000	10/21 getting a proposal
	Hauck House Roof Repairs				\$ 20,000	12/21 putting together a scope of work
	Twin Lakes replace pond pumps				\$ 50,000	11/21 putting together a work order request
	Sinton Service Building/ Infrastructure Renovations				\$ 200,000	12/21 Renovation and code compliance. Architect being retained.
	Mt Echo Terrace Repairs				\$ 75,000	10/21 Engineering required, to subsidize 182018
	Administration Building retaining wall repair				\$ 40,000	6/22 masonry term contract work
	Administration Building Roof				\$ 10,000	12/21 Use with fund 182018
	Rapid Run walk replacement				\$ 120,000	12/21 putting together a scope of work
	Gibson House exterior painting and carpentry				\$ 150,000	10/21 Consultant needs to develop specs for bidding this project
	Gibson House- exterior painting and carpentry phase 2				\$ 100,000	6/22
	IWF Pump and motor repairs				\$ 50,000	6/21 If Required for Summer Season

PARK BOARD CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Lighting and Electric Repairs				\$	22,000	TBD	placeholder for any repairs that need to be made per the Arc-Flash assessment		
ADA Improvements				\$	50,000	6/22	Poor condition per assessment		
Drake/Alms/Fechheimer- replace DF with an ADA fixture				\$	24,000	6/22	Poor condition per assessment		
La Boiteaux- LED lights, road and parkng repair				\$	40,000	6/22	Poor condition per assessment		
Kennedy- ADA walk repairs, stair repairs				\$	30,000	6/22	Putting together a proposal, Poor condition per assessment		
Alms road resurface				\$	111,000	12/21	putting together a proposal, Poor condition per assessment		
Alms resurface play areas				\$	48,000	8/21	poor condition per assessment		
Sinton Building Roof Replacement				\$	125,000	9/21	putting together a work order request, Poor condition per assessment		
Staff Reimbursements for FY 21				\$	355,000	As needed to cover staff costs.			
Design/ Engineering/ Consulting Services				\$	55,000				
Parks Operations Center	\$	57,750		\$	57,750				
KZF Design				\$	57,750	certifying funds			

Cincinnati Park Board

Financial Presentation – April 2021

BOARD OF PARK COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner - *PRESIDENT* **James Goetz** - *VICE PRESIDENT*
Susan F Castellini **Molly North** **Linda Lee Thomas**

Kara Kish - *DIRECTOR*
Jenny Mobley - *Deputy Director* **Steven Schuckman** - *DIVISION MANAGER* **Rocky Merz** - *DIVISION MANAGER*
Crystal Courtney - *DIVISION MANAGER* **Craig Sherman** - *CFO*



Table of Contents



YTD BUDGET VS.
EXPENSES



FUND BALANCES



ENDOWMENT
FUND SUMMARY



YTD REVENUE

YTD Budget vs. Expenses

As of March 31, 2021

FUND	Fund Name	COMMITTED Expenses	All Funds Budget	VARIANCE
050	General Fund	\$ 6,993,734	\$ 8,263,254	\$ 1,269,520
107	Stormwater Fund	\$ 1,260,543	\$ 1,934,860	\$ 674,317
301	Hwy Greenspace (Street Construction Management)	\$ 169,202	\$ 395,240	\$ 226,038
302	Infrastructure Fund (Income Tax-Infrastructure)	\$ 1,253,971	\$ 1,602,580	\$ 348,609
318	Sawyer Point	\$ 305,358	\$ 1,490,820	\$ 1,185,462
326	Park Donations and Special Activity	\$ 516,177	\$ 805,880	\$ 289,703
327	W.M. Ampt Fund (Free Concerts)	\$ 4,850	\$ 16,000	\$ 11,150
328	Groesbeck Fund (endowment)	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ 16,000
329	Cincinnati Riverfront Park	\$ 706,341	\$ 997,840	\$ 291,499
330	Park Lodge / Pavilion Deposits	\$ 59,996	\$ 292,660	\$ 232,664
332	Krohn Conservatory	\$ 629,270	\$ 1,190,890	\$ 561,620
428	Urban Forestry	\$ 34,166	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,834
430	Private Endowment	\$ 1,156,420	\$ 2,028,644	\$ 872,224
759	Income Tax Transit Fund	\$ -	\$ 31,300	\$ 31,300
792	Forestry Assessment	\$ 2,290,629	\$ 2,215,340	\$ (75,289)
Grand Total		\$ 15,380,657	\$ 21,321,308	\$ 5,940,651



FY Year over Year Expense Review

As of March 31, 2021

Sum of AMOUNT		Column Labels			
Row Labels		2019	2020	2021	Notes
050 - General	\$	6,875,008	\$ 7,865,394	\$ 6,636,827	Salaries are driving the decrease - Down 22 headcount versus 2020 (7 FT and 15 PT)
107 - Stormwater	\$	601,369	\$ 1,494,991	\$ 1,257,853	
301 - St Const	\$	199,006	\$ 257,177	\$ 143,117	Supplies decrease of \$20K and down 1 FTE
302 - Infrastruct	\$	1,271,938	\$ 1,381,106	\$ 1,253,971	
318 - Sawyer Pnt	\$	729,009	\$ 378,958	\$ 221,559	Decrease in salary reimbursements
326 - Park Misc Rev	\$	358,734	\$ 401,952	\$ 310,130	
327 - W.M. Ampt	\$	5,700	\$ 13,152	\$ 4,850	
328 - Groesbeck	\$	6,910	\$ 5,871		
329 - Riverfront Park	\$	250,158	\$ 492,703	\$ 629,174	Increase in salary reimbursements
330 - Park Lodge	\$	15,404	\$ 15,300	\$ 36,746	
332 - Krohn	\$	622,848	\$ 869,904	\$ 602,367	
428 - Urban Forest	\$	82,478	\$ 965	\$ 5,020	
430 - Parks Priv Endo	\$	186,421	\$ 520,965	\$ 463,770	
752 - Park PIF			\$ 87,000	\$ 256,500	Infrastructure Study and District 5 Design Services
759 - Cit Transit	\$	23,875			
792 - Forestry Asm	\$	1,198,261	\$ 1,403,611	\$ 1,541,441	
Grand Total	\$	12,427,118	\$ 15,189,048	\$ 13,363,326	

Fund Balances

Fund Name	Account Balance as of 11/06/2020	Account Balance as of 12/04/2020	Account Balance as of 01/07/2021	Account Balance as of 02/08/2021	Account Balance as of 03/08/2021	Account Balance as of 04/06/2021
318 Sawyer Point	\$ 1,350,919	\$ 1,347,342	\$ 1,332,665	\$ 1,326,090	\$ 1,328,104	\$ 1,315,060
326 Park Misc Revenue & Special Activity	\$ 1,262,398	\$ 1,246,937	\$ 1,209,586	\$ 1,192,516	\$ 1,186,553	\$ 1,118,110
327 WM Ampt Free Concerts	\$ 44,465	\$ 44,465	\$ 42,765	\$ 42,765	\$ 42,765	\$ 42,765
328 Groesbeck Endowment	\$ 145,586	\$ 145,586	\$ 145,586	\$ 145,586	\$ 145,586	\$ 145,586
329 Cincinnati Riverfront Park	\$ 3,748,560	\$ 3,734,632	\$ 3,779,382	\$ 3,789,826	\$ 3,366,211	\$ 3,302,963
330 Park Lodge/Pavilion Deposits	\$ 1,175,544	\$ 1,168,161	\$ 1,167,571	\$ 1,171,626	\$ 1,171,626	\$ 1,158,026
332 Krohn Conservatory	\$ 742,650	\$ 715,811	\$ 674,833	\$ 582,046	\$ 540,269	\$ 491,313
334 Columbia Parkway Greenway	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 502	\$ 502	\$ 502
403 Yeatman's Cove Park Trust	\$ 702,654	\$ 702,654	\$ 702,654	\$ 705,059	\$ 705,059	\$ 705,059
428 Urban Forestry	\$ 202,064	\$ 202,064	\$ 207,114	\$ 207,114	\$ 207,114	\$ 207,184
430 Parks Private Endowment	\$ 570,469	\$ 565,724	\$ 485,949	\$ 377,963	\$ 895,372	\$ 835,058
706 Ampt Trust	\$ 132,897	\$ 134,162	\$ 134,879	\$ 135,336	\$ 136,601	\$ 137,318
707 Groesbeck Trust	\$ 42,474	\$ 42,551	\$ 45,904	\$ 46,618	\$ 46,618	\$ 50,481
708 Schmidlapp Music	\$ 51,451	\$ 51,451	\$ 51,453	\$ 51,634	\$ 51,634	\$ 51,641
752 Permanent Capital Improvement	\$ 2,471,096	\$ 2,349,055	\$ 2,326,940	\$ 2,322,116	\$ 2,264,824	\$ 2,274,723
792 Forestry Assessment	\$ 1,495,525	\$ 1,306,727	\$ 1,045,867	\$ 882,558	\$ 1,399,484	\$ 1,209,782

Account Number	Account Balance as of 10/31/2020	Account Balance as of 11/30/2020	Account Balance as of 12/31/2020	Account Balance as of 01/31/2021	Account Balance as of 02/28/2021	Account Balance as of 03/31/2021
PNC 6022/6081	\$ 2,123,287	\$ 2,609,413	\$ 2,895,832	\$ 3,203,575	\$ 2,605,625	\$ 2,651,653
PNC 4573	\$ 3,552,975	\$ 3,838,519	\$ 3,950,672	\$ 3,923,817	\$ 3,972,199	\$ 4,029,484




Endowment Fund Summary

Fund Name	Sep-20 Balance	Oct-20 Balance	Nov-20 Balance	Dec-20 Balance	Jan-21 Balance	Feb-21 Balance	Mar-21 Balance
<u>Trustee</u>							
Bettman	\$ 2,248,360	\$ 2,215,564	\$ 2,360,234	\$ 2,435,611	\$ 2,419,497	\$ 2,452,298	\$ 2,498,695
Drabner	\$ 1,112,219	\$ 1,097,765	\$ 1,199,444	\$ 1,241,917	\$ 1,220,193	\$ 1,244,366	\$ 1,265,722
Fleischmann	\$ 767,735	\$ 757,845	\$ 805,657	\$ 834,088	\$ 818,760	\$ 835,943	\$ 850,658
Fleischmann	\$ 2,614,674	\$ 2,581,169	\$ 2,818,583	\$ 2,920,200	\$ 2,869,134	\$ 2,934,472	\$ 2,987,625
Geier	\$ 1,646,301	\$ 1,625,001	\$ 1,776,185	\$ 1,839,844	\$ 1,813,322	\$ 1,851,072	\$ 1,883,587
Miles-Edwards	\$ 3,411,310	\$ 3,339,062	\$ 3,585,381	\$ 3,687,245	\$ 3,619,567	\$ 3,699,596	\$ 3,892,704
Levy	\$ 32,784	\$ 31,706	\$ 34,376	\$ 35,473	\$ 35,209	\$ 35,865	\$ 37,097
Sub-total	\$11,833,381	\$11,648,112	\$12,579,860	\$12,994,377	\$12,795,682	\$13,053,612	\$13,416,089
<u>Beneficiary Only</u>							
Hauck- Sooty Acres	\$ 529,019	\$ 522,190	\$ 566,123	\$ 586,093	\$ 587,097	\$ 599,351	\$ 611,247
Hauck - Fountain Sq	\$ 1,652,660	\$ 1,631,637	\$ 1,611,595	\$ 1,668,556	\$ 1,671,336	\$ 1,706,114	\$ 1,739,775
Meyer	\$ 4,934,622	\$ 4,871,859	\$ 5,073,885	\$ 5,250,126	\$ 5,258,642	\$ 5,367,509	\$ 5,473,036
Sub-total	\$ 7,116,301	\$ 7,025,686	\$ 7,251,603	\$ 7,504,775	\$ 7,517,075	\$ 7,672,974	\$ 7,824,059
Endowment Total	\$18,949,682	\$18,673,798	\$19,831,464	\$20,499,151	\$20,312,756	\$20,726,586	\$21,240,148
Commissioners' Fund	\$ 3,612,761	\$ 3,552,975	\$ 3,838,519	\$ 3,950,672	\$ 3,923,817	\$ 3,972,199	\$ 4,029,484
Invested Total	\$22,562,443	\$22,226,772	\$23,669,982	\$24,449,824	\$24,236,573	\$24,698,785	\$25,269,632



Revenue



FUND_DESC	FY20	FY21
318 - Sawyer Pnt	\$764,119	\$232,673
326 - Park Misc Rev	\$625,845	(\$99)
329 - Riverfront Park	\$814,295	\$193,756
330 - Park Lodge	\$304,508	\$6,759
332 - Krohn	\$612,807	\$134,347
428 - Urban Forest	\$15,878	\$14,990
752 - Park PIF	\$135,410	\$176,492
792 - Forestry Asm	\$661,739	\$724,692
Grand Total	\$3,934,601	\$1,483,610

- Event rentals decrease versus FY20 – **(\$1,260,370)**
- Admission decrease versus FY20 – **(\$486,571)**
- Programming – **(\$326,448)**
- Parking decrease versus FY20 – **(\$339,352)**

Revenue

FY20 Net Revenue Losses due to COVID19 (March-June)

- Krohn Fund 332 and Gift Shop – (\$780K)
- Riverfront Park Fund 329 – (\$142K)
- Sawyer Point Fund 318 – (\$157K)
- Rentals and Explore Nature Fund 326 – (\$195K)
 - Includes refund of (\$68K) that occurred in FY21
- Total Net Revenue Loss (\$1.27M)

FY21 Net Revenue Losses due to COVID19 (FY21)

**FY2021 Revenue versus FY2020 and FY2019 average)

- Krohn Fund 332– (\$377K)
 - *Butterfly Show Postponed until May 2021*
- Riverfront Park Fund 329 – (\$457K)
- Sawyer Point Fund 318 – (\$432K)
- Pavilions and Lodges Fund 330 – (\$216)
- Rentals and Explore Nature Fund 326 – (\$532K)
- Total Net Revenue Loss (\$2.0M)

Cincinnati Park Board

FY21 Budget versus FY21 Expenses

Location (Multiple Items)

Row Labels	FY 2021 Budget	FY2021 Expenses	Remaining Budget
Admin Overhead	\$ 130,000	\$ 12,023	\$ 117,978
Ault Park	\$ 20,700	\$ -	\$ 20,700
Ault Park - Drackett	\$ 35,000	\$ 2,177	\$ 32,823
Avon Woods	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bettman	\$ 16,340	\$ 2,000	\$ 14,340
Bettman Operating	\$ 15,000	\$ 5,755	\$ 9,245
California Woods	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Carousel Gift Shop	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
City Gard Cent Pky	\$ 18,978	\$ 6,428	\$ 12,550
City Gard Fort Wash	\$ 12,690	\$ 9,398	\$ 3,292
City Gard Torr Pky	\$ 5,500	\$ -	\$ 5,500
Comisar Overlook Alms	\$ 914	\$ -	\$ 914
Dasiy Jones Garden	\$ 475	\$ -	\$ 475
Diggs Foundation Burnet Woods	\$ 26,250	\$ -	\$ 26,250
Dornette	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Dornette - Mt Airy Hiking	\$ 25,000	\$ 1,283	\$ 23,718
Drabner	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ 30,000
Eden	\$ 10,000	\$ 5,212	\$ 4,788
Fleischmann	\$ 68,000	\$ 42,809	\$ 25,191
Fount Sq-Hauck	\$ 54,000	\$ 44,879	\$ 9,121
French Park	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Geier	\$ 19,953	\$ 9,953	\$ 10,000
Gift Shop - Krohn	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000
Greeno	\$ 15,000	\$ 3,388	\$ 11,612
Greenspace	\$ 113,100	\$ 12,341	\$ 100,759
Jacobs Hyde park Fountain Fund	\$ 500	\$ 1,850	\$ (1,350)
Kapela	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Krohn	\$ 221,000	\$ 79,346	\$ 141,654
Krohn Adm	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Lazarus	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ 1,000
Lytle Park	\$ 0	\$ 1,744	\$ (1,744)
Meyer	\$ 165,643	\$ 84,513	\$ 81,130
Miles-Edwards	\$ 238,734	\$ 168,854	\$ 69,880
Nature Next Door	\$ 38,500	\$ -	\$ 38,500
Parks Foundation	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 40,000
PBV Gardens	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ 12,000
Piatt Park	\$ 105,788	\$ 5,581	\$ 100,207
Releaf	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Ruth Wagner / Stewards of Burnet Woods	\$ 319,072	\$ 309,572	\$ 9,500
Schriber	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Show Sponsors	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Sooty Acres	\$ 47,144	\$ 4,506	\$ 42,638
Vasey	\$ 5,700	\$ -	\$ 5,700
Waterfront Parks	\$ 147,000	\$ 32,536	\$ 114,464
Wilson Wildflower fund	\$ 475	\$ -	\$ 475
Smale Riverfront Park	\$ 43,084	\$ 32,718	\$ 10,366
Grand Total	\$ 2,042,540	\$ 878,866	\$ 1,163,674

FY2021
Commissioners Fund Budget Tracking Statement

202-1000 Operations Administration										
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	Funding Number	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Travel/Training	Admin Overhead (1001)	1001	12150	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 2,023	\$ 10,000	\$ 12,023	\$	12,978
Playground Mulch	Miles-Edwards (5160)	5160	12151	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 18,156	\$ 44	\$ 18,200	\$	11,800
Wi-Fi for Nature Centers and Krohn	Admin Overhead - Paid out of Fund 473	1001	12155	\$ -	\$ 122,145	\$ 72,338	\$ 49,807	\$ 122,145	\$	-
Liberty Gardens Annual Planting	Admin Overhead (1001)	1001	12157	\$ -	\$ 5,482	0	0	\$ -	\$	5,482
MT Echo Steps	Admin Overhead (1001)	1001	12153	\$ -	\$ 21,300	0	0	\$ -	\$	21,300
COROA Design Services	Admin Overhead (1001)	1001	12156	\$ -	\$ 6,500	\$ -	\$ 6,500	\$ 6,500	\$	-
Carousel Payment	Admin Overhead (1001)	1001	12160	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	0	0	\$ -	\$	100,000
Total 202 - 1000				\$ 155,000	\$ 310,427	\$ 92,517	\$ 66,351	\$ 158,867	\$	151,560
202-2000 Waterfront Parks										
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE		LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Sawyer Point P&G Pavilion	Waterfront Parks (2082)	2082	12250	\$ 67,000	\$ 67,000	\$ -	\$ 19,407	\$ 19,407	\$	47,593
Sawyer -Maint/Supplies	Waterfront Parks (2082)	2082	12251	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$	35,000
Total 202 - 2000				\$ 107,000	\$ 107,000	\$ -	\$ 24,407	\$ 24,407	\$	82,593
202-3000 Operations East										
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE		LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Ault Park Maint/Supplies	Ault Park (3007)	3007	12350	\$ 5,700	\$ 5,700	0	0	\$ -	\$	5,700
Plant Material	Ault Park (3007)	3007	12351	\$ 0	\$ 0	0	0	\$ -	\$	0
Torr Pkwy Supplies	City Gard Torr Pky (3017)	3017	12352	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,500	0	0	\$ -	\$	4,500
Fleischmann Maintenance	Fleischmann (3033)	3033	12353	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 25,209	\$ 12,600	\$ 37,809	\$	12,191
Beautification Contractual	French Park (3035)	3035	12354	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	\$ -	\$	-
Geier Espionage Maintenance	Geier (3036)	3036	12355	\$ 5,000	\$ 14,953	\$ 9,953	\$ -	\$ 9,953	\$	5,000
Hort Supplies	Meyer (3159)	3159	12356	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	0	0	\$ -	\$	3,000
Hort Supplies	Admin (1001)	1001	12368	\$ -	\$ 14,550	0	0	\$ -	\$	14,550
Hort Supplies	Lazarus (3055)	3055	12358	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	0	0	\$ -	\$	1,000
Hort Supplies	Comisar Overlook Alms	1061	12357	\$ 914	\$ 914	0	0	\$ -	\$	914
Hort Supplies	Jacobs Hyde park Fountain Fund	1063	12359	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 1,747	\$ 103	\$ 1,850	\$	(1,350)
Hort Supplies	Ault Park - Drackett	3007	12360	\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	0	\$ 2,177	\$ 2,177	\$	22,823
Total 202 - 3000				\$ 95,614	\$ 120,117	\$ 36,909	\$ 14,880	\$ 51,789	\$	68,328

FY2021
Commissioners Fund Budget Tracking Statement

202-3100 Operations Krohn and Warder									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Floral Shows Contingency	Geier (3036)	3136	I2371	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Krohn Gift Shop Purchases	Krohn (3137)	3137	I2372	\$ 150,000	\$ 119,999	\$ 24,553	\$ 8,374	\$ 32,927	\$ 87,072
Krohn Gift Shop Sales Tax	Krohn (3137)	3137	I2373	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 2,480	\$ -	\$ 2,480	\$ 18,520
Butterfly Support	Krohn (3137)	3137	I2381	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 64	\$ 10,608	\$ 10,672	\$ 39,328
Foral Support	Krohn (3137)	3137	I2382		\$ 30,001	\$ 19,443	\$ 13,823	\$ 33,266	\$ (3,265)
Hort Supplies - Warder Money	Meyer (3159)	1036	I2455	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,448	\$ 21,186	\$ 22,634	\$ (2,634)
Park Supplies - Warder Money	Meyer (1059)	1036	I2158	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,154	\$ 18,431	\$ 19,585	\$ 415
Contractual Labor	Kapela (3149)	3149	I2374	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Floral Shows Contingency	Meyer (3159)	3159	I2376	\$ 9,000	\$ 9,000	\$ -	\$ 9,640	\$ 9,640	\$ (640)
Educational Programs	Miles-Edwards (5160)	3168	I2377	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Educational Programs	Krohn Adm (3151)	3151	I2378	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Krohn Support	Schriber (3173)	3173	I2379	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
Floral Shows	Show Sponsors (3175)	3175	I2380	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0
						\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -
Total 202 - 3100				\$ 275,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 49,143	\$ 82,062	\$ 131,205	\$ 143,795
202-3200 Operations Central									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Beautification Central Pkwy	City Gard Cent Pky (3214)	3214	I2390	\$ 13,078	\$ 13,078	\$ -	\$ 6,428	\$ 6,428	\$ 6,650
Lytle Park Hort Supplies	Lytle Park (3257)	3257	I2392	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,744	\$ -	\$ 1,744	\$ (1,744)
Maintenance Contract	Piatt Park (3267)	3267	I2393	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 2,000
Hort Supplies	Piatt Park (3267)	3267	I2394	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,500	\$ 2,786	\$ 2,795	\$ 5,581	\$ 4,919
Sooty Acres	Sooty Acres (3276)	3276	I2395	\$ 77,144	\$ 47,144	\$ 3,652	\$ 854	\$ 4,506	\$ 42,638
Levy Clock Supplies	Fleischmann (1033)	1033	I2396	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 3,000
Operational Support/Hort Supplies	Meyer (1059)	1059	I2252	\$ 18,500	\$ 18,500	\$ 5,828	\$ 13,084	\$ 18,912	\$ (412)
Beautification Eden Park	Eden (1030)	1030	I2253	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,212	\$ 5,212	\$ (212)
Beautification Eden Park Roundabout	Eden (1030)	1030	I2254	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Total 202 - 3200				\$ 124,222	\$ 104,222	\$ 14,010	\$ 28,374	\$ 42,384	\$ 61,838

FY2021
Commissioners Fund Budget Tracking Statement

202-4000 Operations West									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Mt Airy Aboretum Hort Supplies	Vasey (4080)	4080	12451 \$ 2,850	\$ 2,850	0	0	\$ -	\$ 2,850	
Hinkle Garden Hort Supplies	Meyer (1059)	1059	13447 \$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	0	0	\$ -	\$ 3,500	
Hort Supplies	Greeno (1040)	1040	13448 \$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 5,000	
Hort Supplies	Wilson Wildflower fund	1062	13449 \$ 475	\$ 475	0	0	\$ -	\$ 475	
Hort Supplies	Daisy Jones Garden	4032	13450 \$ 475	\$ 475	0	0	\$ -	\$ 475	
Supplies	Diggs Foundation Burnet Woods	1011	13453 \$ 1,750	\$ 1,750	0	0	\$ -	\$ 1,750	
Mt Storm Project	Parks Foundation	1062	13454 \$ -	\$ 40,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 40,000	
Burnet Woods Lake Mgmt	Meyer (1059)	1059	13452 \$ 6,500	\$ 6,500	0	0	\$ -	\$ 6,500	
Total 202 - 4000			\$ 20,550	\$ 60,550	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,550	

202-5100 Land Management									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Wildflower Seeds & Plants	Meyer (5159)	5159	12550 \$ 300	\$ 300	-	515	\$ 515	\$ (215)	
Mt Airy Invasive Species Removal	Domette - Mt Airy Hiking	3126	13455 \$ -	\$ 24,500	0	0	\$ -	\$ 24,500	
Trail Improvements	Meyer (5159)	5159	12552 \$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,019	-	\$ 1,019	\$ 3,981	
Land Management Supplies	Miles-Edwards (5160)	5160	12553 \$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 1,000	
Trail Crew Materials	Domette - Mt Airy Hiking	3126	12556 \$ 25,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 141	\$ 1,141	\$ 1,283	\$ 23,718	
Trail Crew Materials	Greeno (1040)	1040	13158 \$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 2,646	\$ 743	\$ 3,388	\$ 6,612	
Trail Crew Equipment	Miles-Edwards (1060)	1060	13159 \$ 2,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,959	-	\$ 1,959	\$ 541	
Releaf Program	Releaf (5177)	5177	12554 \$ -	\$ -	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	
Emergency Tree Removal	Meyer (5159)	5159	12555 \$ -	\$ -	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	
Burnet Wds	Ruth Wagner (Burnet Wds -1071)	1071	13168 \$ 250,000	\$ 319,072	\$ 75,262	\$ 234,311	\$ 309,572	\$ 9,500	
Total 202 - 5100			\$ 293,800	\$ 387,372	\$ 81,027	\$ 236,710	\$ 317,737	\$ 69,635	

202-5200 Interstate Greenspace									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Hort Supplies	Fount Sq-Hauck (3234)	3234	12391 \$ 40,000	\$ 54,000	\$ 23,360	\$ 21,519	\$ 44,879	\$ 9,121	
Ft. Washington Way Bridge Planters	City Gard Fort Wash (3215)	3215	12398 \$ 10,690	\$ 10,690	\$ -	\$ 9,398	\$ 9,398	\$ 1,292	
Hort Supplies	Greenspace (2041)	2041	12403 \$ -	\$ 20,100	\$ -	\$ 12,341	\$ 12,341	\$ 7,759	
Total 202 - 5100			\$ 50,690	\$ 84,790	\$ 23,360	\$ 43,258	\$ 66,618	\$ 18,172	

202-8000 Smale Riverfront Park									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Hort Supplies	Women's Committee- Smale Riverfront	8047	12401 \$ 19,194	\$ 19,194	\$ 3,239	\$ 5,588	\$ 8,828	\$ 10,366	
Beautification Anniversary Garden	Parks Foundation	8047	12402 \$ -	\$ 23,890	\$ 21,340	\$ 2,550	\$ 23,890	\$ -	
Gift Shop Purchases	Carousel Gift Shop (8013)		12880		0	0	\$ -	\$ -	
Sales taxes	Carousel Gift Shop (8013)		12881 \$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Total 202 - 8000			\$ 19,194	\$ 43,084	\$ 24,579	\$ 8,138	\$ 32,718	\$ 10,366	

Total 202			\$ 1,141,070	\$ 1,492,562	\$ 321,544	\$ 504,180	\$ 825,724	\$ 666,838	
Overall Total			\$ 1,662,548	\$ 2,042,540	\$ 348,376	\$ 530,490	\$ 878,866	\$ 1,163,674	

FY2021
Commissioners Fund Budget Tracking Statement

203-1000 Admin									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	Funding Number	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance
Travel/Training	Admin Overhead (1001)	1001	13150	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 5,000
						0	0		
Total 203-1000				\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000

203-2000 Financial Services									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE		LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance
Staff Reimbursement	Bettman Operating (2009)	2009	13253	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 755	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,755	\$ 9,245
Staff Reimbursement	Ault Park - Drackett	3007	13254	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 10,000
Staff Reimbursement	PBV Gardens (2066)	2066	13261	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	0	0	\$ -	\$ 8,500
Staff Reimbursement	Piatt Park (2067)	2067	13262	\$ 18,288	\$ 18,288	0	0	\$ -	\$ 18,288
Staff Reimbursement	Vasey (2080)	2080	13263	\$ 2,850	\$ 2,850	0	0	\$ -	\$ 2,850
Staff Reimbursement	Gift Shop - Krohn (2037)	2037	13264	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 40,000
Staff Reimbursement	Greenspace (2041)	2041	13265	\$ 93,000	\$ 93,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 93,000
Staff Reimbursement	Fleischmann (1033)	1027	12161	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ -
Staff Reimbursement	City Gard Torr Pky (2017)	2017	124023	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 1,000
Staff Reimbursement	City Gard Cent Pky (3214)	3214	124011	\$ 5,900	\$ 5,900	0	0	\$ -	\$ 5,900
Staff Reimbursement	City Gard Fort Wash (3215)	3215	124022	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 2,000
IT Software & Equipment	Miles-Edwards (2060)	2060	13271	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 20,000
Office Supplies	Miles-Edwards (1060)	2001	13250	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Hazardous Waste Removal	Meyer (2059)	2059	13252	\$ -	\$ 8,707	\$ -	\$ 8,707	\$ 8,707	\$ (0)
Total 203-2000				\$ 226,538	\$ 235,245	\$ 755	\$ 18,707	\$ 19,462	\$ 215,783

203-6000 Business Services									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE		LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance
Public Relations/Sponsorships	Miles-Edwards (2060)	2060	13266	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 2,243	\$ -	\$ 2,243	\$ 2,757
Marketing/Media	Meyer (2059)	2059	13267	\$ 6,500	\$ 6,500	\$ 12,208	\$ -	\$ 12,208	\$ (5,708)
Marketing of Inner City	Fleischmann (2033)	2033	13268	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Website & Marketing	Miles-Edwards (2060)	2060	13270	\$ 9,100	\$ 9,100	\$ 3,500	\$ 5,600	\$ 9,100	\$ -
Volunteer Supplies	Miles-Edwards (1060)	1027	12154	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 2,000
Operational Support/Volunteer	Fleischmann (1033)	1033	12152	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Volunteer Support	Meyer (2059)	2059	12159	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 11,000
Total 203-4000				\$ 43,600	\$ 43,600	\$ 17,951	\$ 5,600	\$ 23,551	\$ 20,049

FY2021
Commissioners Fund Budget Tracking Statement

203-5000 Planning & Design									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Park Improvements	Piatt Park (1067)	1067	13153	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 75,000
General Capital Improvements	Waterfront Parks (1082)	1082	13155	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 8,127	\$ 3	\$ 8,129	\$ 31,871
Benches/Picnic Tables	Meyer (2059)	1033	13161	\$ 30,000	\$ 21,293	0	0	\$ -	\$ 21,293
Supplies	Drabner (1027)	1027	13169	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 30,000
Supplies	Meyer (2059)	2059	13170	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 30,000
Brumm Arbor Replacement	Ault Park (3007)	3007	13171	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000	0	0	\$ -	\$ 15,000
Total 203-4000				\$ 220,000	\$ 211,293	\$ 8,127	\$ 3	\$ 8,129	\$ 203,164
203-4000 Nature Education									
DESCRIPTION	FUNDING SOURCE	LINE	2021 Budget	Adjusted Budget	2021 Expense	2021 Encum	Total Expense and Encum	Variance	
Sundry Materials & Supplies	Bettman (4009)	4009	13451	\$ 16,340	\$ 16,340	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 14,340
Program Supplies	Nature Next Door	4100	13452	\$ 10,000	\$ 38,500	0	0	\$ -	\$ 38,500
Materials & Supplies	Avon Woods (4008)	4008	13453	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	\$ -	\$ -
Materials & Supplies	California Woods (4012)	4012	13454	\$ -	\$ -	0	0	\$ -	\$ -
Total 203-4000				\$ 26,340	\$ 54,840	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 52,840
Total 203				\$ 521,478	\$ 549,978	\$ 26,833	\$ 26,310	\$ 53,142	\$ 496,835

BOARD OF PARK

COMMISSIONERS

Brad Lindner
President

James Goetz
Vice President

Susan F. Castellini

Linda Lee Thomas

Molly North

Date: April 15, 2021

To: Board of Park Commissioners

From: Kara Kish, Director

KSK

Subject: Personnel Actions – April 2021

Kara S. Kish
Director

Jenny Mobley
Deputy Director

Crystal Courtney
Division Manager

Rocky Merz
Division Manager

Steven L. Schuckman
Division Manager

Craig Sherman
Division Manager

Name	Title	Division	Action
Rachel Brucato	Florist	Waterfront	Filled a Full-time open position – worked part time as a Recreation Specialist since 2018
Garrett Dienno	Parks/ Recreation Maintenance Crew Leader	Natural Resources	Promoted to Parks/Recreation Maintenance Crew Leader from Florist – Started with Parks in 2015
Jacob Edwards	Urban Forestry Specialist	Natural Resources	Filled a Full-time open position
Nick Griggs	Florist	East Region	Filled a Full-time open position
Jackson Hamann	Florist	West Region	Filled a Full-time open position – worked part time as a Recreation Specialist since 2020
Jonathan Hnatiuk	Florist	Natural Resources	Promoted to a Florist from a Tree Maintenance Worker– Started with Parks in 2019
Lynn Lorio	Florist	West Region	Filled a Full-time open position
Brittany Stephenson	Florist	Krohn/Warder	Started Full time – worked part time as a Recreation Specialist since 2016
Greg Torres	Florist	Natural Resources	Filled a Full-time open position

2021 SPECIAL EVENTS & PROGRAMS

Date	Description	Time		Location
4/1-4/30	Storywalk at California Woods	anytime		California Woods
Every Fri. - 4/23	Free Hike Fridays - April Edition!	1:00 PM	2:30 PM	California Woods
4/15, 4/22, & 4/29	Habitat Hunt	10:00 AM	11:30 AM	California Woods
4/1 & 4/8	Contemporary Art Center Thursday Art Play	10:30 AM	11:30 AM	Eden Park Twin Lakes
4/1 - 5/27	Mom and Me - Thursday Stroller Hikes	10:00 AM	11:00 AM	Location Varies Weekly. Check www.cincinnatiiparks.com for schedule
4/3	Spring Wildflowers	10:30 AM	Noon	Trailside Nature Center
4/5	Art & Nature Spring Break Mini Camp	12:30 PM	3:00 PM	LaBoiteaux Woods Nature Preserve
4/5	Outdoor Survival Spring Break Camp	9:30 AM	12:00 PM	Caldwell Nature Center
Every Mon. 4/1 - 5/27	Active Adults - Hike Series	2:30 PM	4:00 PM	Location Varies. Check www.cincinnatiiparks.com for a weekly location.
Every Tues. 4/6 - 4/27	Nature Tots	9:30 AM	11:00 AM	LaBoiteaux Woods Nature Preserve
Every Tues. 4/6 - 5/25	Lunch & Learn with CincyParks	Noon	1:00 PM	Location Varies. Check www.cincinnatiiparks.com for a weekly location.

#cincyparks

www.cincinnatiiparks.com



Cincinnati Parks is committed to providing a quality experience at all parks and facilities by providing reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities upon request, call 5133572604. Visitors may be recorded by Cincinnati Park Board for educational and promotional uses.

2021 SPECIAL EVENTS & PROGRAMS

Date	Description	Time		Location
Every Wed. 4/7 - 5/26	Library Nature Encounters (in collaboration with Cincinnati Public Library)	10:30 AM	11:30 AM	Location Varies. Check www.cincinnatiiparks.com for a weekly location.
4/17	Wildflower Walk	10:00 AM	11:30 AM	LaBoiteaux Woods Nature Preserve
4/17	Green Up Volunteer Day	1:00 PM	3:00 PM	LaBoiteaux Woods Nature Preserve
4/17	Northside Greenspace - Invasive Removal Projects & Program Events	10:00 AM	12:00 PM	Parker Woods
4/22	Earth Day Wildflower Walk	1:00 PM	3:00 PM	Caldwell Nature Preserve
4/17 & 5/1	Talk to a Naturalist: Learn iNaturalist	1:00 PM	3:00 PM	California Woods Nature Preserve
4/24	GreenUP Volunteer Day	9:00 AM	12:00 PM	California Woods Nature Preserve
4/24	Wildflower Walk	1:30 PM	3:00 PM	California Woods Nature Preserve
4/24	Alms Park Allies - Invasive Removal Work Days	9:00 AM	12:00 PM	Alms Park
4/25	National Audubon Day Bird Bingo Challenge	12:00 PM	2:00 PM	Parkers Woods
4/25	Mt. Airy Trail Runners - Trail Work Days	9:00 AM	12:00 PM	Mt. Airy Forest
4/27 & 4/30	Discovery Days - Ecology	9:30 AM 1:00 PM	11:30 AM 3:00 PM	Caldwell Nature Preserve
4/30 - 5/3	iNaturalist City Nature Challenge	All Day		All Cincinnati Parks & Great Parks of Hamilton County
4/30	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	10:00 AM 11:00 AM 1:00 PM		California Woods Nature Preserve
4/30	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	12:00 PM	2:00 PM	Trailside Nature Center
4/30	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	9:00 AM	4:00 PM	Avon Woods Nature Preserve
5/1	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	10:00 AM 12:30 PM	11:00 AM 1:30 PM	LaBoiteaux Woods Nature Preserve

#cincyparks

www.cincinnatiiparks.com



Cincinnati Parks is committed to providing a quality experience at all parks and facilities by providing reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities upon request, call 5133572604. Visitors may be recorded by Cincinnati Park Board for educational and promotional uses.

2021 SPECIAL EVENTS & PROGRAMS

Date	Description	Time		Location
5/1	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	1:00 PM	3:00 PM	Trailside Nature Center
5/2	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	1:00 PM	3:00 PM	Caldwell Nature Center
5/3	iNaturalist BioBlitz - Naturalist Led Hike	10:00 AM	1:00 PM	Bettman Nature Preserve
5/8-9/6	Butterflies of Bali at Krohn Conservatory Daily	10:00 AM	5:00 PM	Krohn Conservatory
Every Thurs. - 5/27	May Habitat Hunts	10:00 AM	11:30 AM	California Woods Nature Preserve
5/4 & 5/7	Discovery Days - Fossils	9:30 AM 1:00 PM	11:30 AM 3:00 PM	Caldwell Nature Preserve
5/6 & 5/13	Contemporary Arts Center Thursdays Art Play	10:30 AM	11:30 AM	Burnet Woods Bandstand
5/7, 5/14, 5/21, & 5/28	Cicada Walks	Noon	1:30 PM	Trailside Nature Center
5/15	National Kids to Parks Day! (NKTPD)			
	NKTPD: Fossil Fun	10:00 AM	12:00 PM	French Park
	NKTPD: Gardening, Compost, and Worms	10:00 AM	2:00 PM	LaBoiteaux Woods Nature Preserve
	NKTPD: Nature Play & Hike	10:00 AM	2:00 PM	California Woods Nature Preserve
	NKTPD: Insects	11:00 AM	1:00 PM	Smale Riverfront Park
	NKTPD: Cicada Celebration and Hikes	10:30 AM	3:00 PM	Trailside Nature Center
5/15	Northside Greenspace - Invasive Removal Projects & Program Events	10:00 AM	12:00 PM	Buttercup Valley
5/18 & 5/21	Discovery Days - Fossils & Rocks	9:30 AM 1:00 PM	11:30 AM 3:00 PM	Caldwell Nature Preserve
5/20	World Bee Day & DIY Bee House Build!	6:00 PM	7:30 PM	Bettman Natural Resource Center
5/20	Rockin' on the Roebling	6:00 PM	10:00 PM	Smale Riverfront Park

#cincyparks

www.cincinnatiiparks.com



Cincinnati Parks is committed to providing a quality experience at all parks and facilities by providing reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities upon request, call 5133572604. Visitors may be recorded by Cincinnati Park Board for educational and promotional uses.

2021 SPECIAL EVENTS & PROGRAMS

Date	Description	Time		Location
5/22	Cicada Celebration	10:30 AM	Noon	Trailside Nature Center
5/24	Music at the Esplanade	5:00 PM	7:00 PM	Castellini Esplanade at Smale Riverfront Park
5/27	Rocking' on the Roebling	6:00 PM	10:00 PM	Smale Riverfront Park
5/29	Sawyer Point Summer Concert Series	2:00 PM	10:00 PM	Sawyer Point
Every Tues. * Thurs. 6/1 - 8/31	Acoustic Lunch at Piatt	11:30 AM	1:30 PM	Piatt Park
Every Wed. 6/2 - 8/11	Wednesdays n the Woods	6:00 PM	9:00 PM	Burnett Woods
Every Wed. 6/2 - 9/29	Smale Mind and Body (Embra Yoga)	6:00 PM	7:00 PM	Smale Schmidlapp Event Lawn
Every Thurs. 5/20 - 9/2	Rockin' on the Roebling	6:00 PM	10:00 PM	Smale Schmidlapp Event Lawn
6/4	Pickleball Mixer	7:00 PM	9:00 PM	Schott Amphitheatre at Sawyer Point
6/5	Music at the Esplanade	5:00 PM	7:00 PM	Castellini Esplanade at Smale Riverfront Park
6/17	Summer Music Festival	6:00 PM	10:00 PM	Ault Park
6/19	Music at thte Esplanade	5:00 PM	7:00 PM	Castellini Esplanade at Smale Riverfront Park
6/26	Pickleball Mixer	6:00 PM	8:00 PM	Schott Amphitheatre at Sawyer Point

#cincyparks

www.cincinnatiiparks.com



Cincinnati Parks is committed to providing a quality experience at all parks and facilities by providing reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities upon request, call 5133572604. Visitors may be recorded by Cincinnati Park Board for educational and promotional uses.

2021 SPECIAL EVENTS & PROGRAMS

	Virtual Recognitions planned or completed in conjunction with any in-person events.		Details
4/22	"Path of Life" at Mt. Echo with LifeCenter	9:30 AM	Mt. Echo
6/5	Kyle Plush Pavilion in Stanberry Park		Stanberry Park (Invite Forthcoming)
6/27	Marian Spencer Statue in Smale Riverfront Park	5 PM	Anticipated dedication - April/May
t.b.d.	Tom Jones Commons in Eden Park with Tom Jones and the Parks Foundation		Anticipated completion - June/July
t.b.d.	Smale Riverfront Park Expansion with the City, County, the Banks Partnership, the Parks Foundation, Icon Music Center		Anticipated completion - June/July
10/9	Inwood Park Playground		Anticipated completion - July
t.b.d.	Ezzard Charles Statue in Laurel Park		Anticipated dedication - October
	Hyde Park Square, Mt. Echo and Burnet Woods Playground, Stanberry and Marian Spencer		Virtual Recognitions planned or completed in conjunction with any in-person events.

#cincyparks

www.cincinnatiiparks.com



Cincinnati Parks is committed to providing a quality experience at all parks and facilities by providing reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities upon request, call 5133572604. Visitors may be recorded by Cincinnati Park Board for educational and promotional uses.