**Fitch, Abby**

---

I have additional comments regarding Westminster Hills.

My first choice would be to decrease the off-leash area to prevent further damage and better facilitate restoration efforts. How can revegetation efforts be successful unless dogs are prevented from entering certain areas? The same applies to the ditch banks, which show distinct paths and ruts. I have also heard claims that the dogs don't go off trail, but a glance at social media will show otherwise.

Certain statements at the prior city council meeting were troubling. One of the public speakers said that an off-leash dog area is not an inclusive space because it excludes those who do not wish to be around dogs and/or approached by them. I strongly agree with this. However, council statements minimized the speaker's concern and claimed an off-leash space is instead more inclusive. That only holds true for the dog users. Other public speaker statements that people who don't want to be around dogs should, "Go elsewhere," reek of entitlement.

As this area needs a great deal of management, all users should have to pay for it. Otherwise, I believe the management costs, while necessary, will be an excessive sum to spend on a space that primarily serves one user group. Hopefully the city will figure out a system to charge users without pushing them into our neighborhood in search of free parking.

Finally, please recall that prior city council went against popular opinion when it approved the Uplands development. Council voted in consideration of property owner rights despite public opposition. Keeping the extremely large off-leash area at Westminster Hills may be the popular opinion, but that does not make it right.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Hering