

1 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

2006 Needs Assessments

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Feedback Results Chart



John Fry Sports Park

Master Plan

Profile gathering and Needs Assessments

Asset Management
Parks Planning & Design

Community Services Department
Access to Recreation & Sport
and
Social & Recreation Services Branch
South Service Area

May 2, 2006

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

CAPITAL CITY SOFTBALL ASSOCIATION

(i) April 3, 2006

i) Background

This group consists of Edmontonians who are interested in promoting the sport of softball for all ages. We host provincial and national championships for minors & adults both male and female. In the past we have hosted the 1992 Juniors Womens Canadian Championship, 1994 Senior Womens Canadian Championship, 1999 Senior Women's Canadian Championship & 2002 Junior Womens Canadian Championship. In 2007 we will be hosting the Midget Girls Canadian Championship. We have also hosted several provincial championships and a Western Canadian Championship.

Most of the time that we use the site is on weekends or towards the end of the softball season when most of the league play has been completed. If there were more diamonds on the site I could foresee us hosting larger provincial championships

Contact information;

Linda Edey, Chairman

lmedey@shaw.ca

Capital City Softball Association

3421 – 37 St.

Edmonton, AB T6L 4Y8

*** Please advise group of future opportunities to participate in this planning process and send out stakeholder information.**

ii) Current likes of the Site

- Diamonds themselves are excellent.
- Diamonds 3 & 4 are small but are usually used as warm up diamonds so are OK
- Very green grass, beautiful flowers and huge trees make the facility very attractive.

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

1. Washrooms are getting very old
2. No concession
3. Would like a facility to be built that would include washrooms, dressing rooms (with showers), office space.
4. Drainage continues to be a problem – when it rains, we know diamond #2 is out for atleast one day.
5. More picnic tables available during an event.

iv) Needs Assessment

1. Do you see this site working for you in the future? Why? Why not? Yes & No.
 - There must be improvements to the site.
 - The washrooms are getting very old and were only put in as a temporary measure 30 years ago.
 - There is no concession.
 - If a facility was built that would include washrooms, dressing rooms (with showers), concession and some type of office space this facility would be as good as any in the country.
2. What are your current spatial requirements?
 - When we host an event we require a minimum of four diamonds for the duration of the event.
 - If the weather does not cooperate with us then we may require more diamond space to make up the games. The largest week long event that we can host with this number of diamonds is 16. When Edmonton hosted the World Master Games in 2005 we used more diamonds in Leduc for fastpitch that we did in Edmonton.
3. Do you have any spatial requirements to a facility?
(i.e. access to washroom, storage space, etc...)
 - When hosting a provincial or Canadian Championship we require washrooms,
 - dressing rooms (with showers),
 - office space, storage space,
 - media area,
 - indoor facility for year round training,
 - concession and "Beer Garden".
 - The present diamonds are not adequate to host an elite men's Canadian or Provincial championship.
 - The fence distances are too short.
4. Are you looking at any infrastructural needs, wants, desires due to future expansion? (e.g. parking, lighting, site furniture, etc...)
 - If additional diamonds were built on the site
 - i. additional parking,
 - ii. lighting,
 - iii. press boxes,
 - iv. picnic tables,
 - v. seating and
 - vi. dugouts would be required.
 - The lack of phone lines has always been an issue.
5. Are you planning any major events requiring larger field, space or administration space use? If so, please provide in detail, including proposed dates.
 - The first week of August in 2007 we will be hosting the Midget Girls Canadian Championship.
 - The two lighted diamonds are of adequate size for this championship.
 - The washrooms and dressing rooms are the "sore point" of the facility. We receive many compliments about how lovely the fields and green space areas look but then they always have to throw in the washrooms.
 - We would also require office space for administrative, statistics, medical & media.
 - Dressing rooms are required for the officials. Currently we would use three of the existing dressing rooms for the officials.
 - For all the other championships that we have hosted we have brought in three 20 by 8 foot trailers and parked them behind the baseball diamond. This is the only location where we can get adequate power and phone hook ups.
6. Are there any concerns or issues that you would like to express about the potential developments/redevelopment on the John Fry Park site? None stated

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

LEPRECHAUN TIGERS RUGBY CLUB

(ii) April 3, 2006

i) Background

Many of our rugby club demographics are outlined in our Program Statement that was submitted to the city in 2003. While the number of our registered players can change from one year to the next, we consist of a mixture of the following:

- Social non-playing members which range in age from 18 to 81
- Senior rugby men and women (generally 18 and over)
- Junior rugby men and women (under 19)

Mini rugby girls and boys (wide range of ages)

Contact information;
Leprechaun Tigers Rugby Club

Current Executive: President - Cam Wilton – cwilton@shaw.ca
Treasurer - Kris Lavoie
VP Mens Rugby - Trevor McGeough
VP Womens Rugby - Jericho Footz
Club Secretary - Taylor Walters
Social Convenor – Andrew Harrison
Junior Development – Craig Husselby
VP Facilities – Scott Goos

Contact information for the executive is available on our website: www.ltrugby.ca

Our membership did have a development committee at one time, but there has been some attrition over time due to a lack of activity. For the time being, I think you could include Norm and myself as contacts.

ii) Current likes of the Site

- The John Fry Park site is ideal for the club. It is reasonable distance from the homes of all their members

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

1. Make improvements to the playing facilities (fields). Due to the extensive use over the years, the fields have become dangerous for contact sports, particularly during the dry summer months. Fill is needed for their fields (*David to look into this)
2. Drainage is an issue
3. Playground site or some type of play for kids
4. Fence in their area as quads, trucks, unofficial BMX riding over their fields
5. Vandalism is a problem – demonstrated on a regular basis and ranges (destruction of property, smashed windows, burned storage shed, vehicle damage to field turf, break ins, theft and dumping. Especially in the winter months when members are not present at the site on a

regular basis. They understand that the nature of the developments in the surrounding area make constant surveillance difficult. There does seem to be constant vehicle traffic in the off-road areas and signs posted to prevent such occurrences seem to have limited effect.

6. Need a storage facility on site. ½ size of soccer centre (cost – David to look into this)
7. Has 10 year lease but one for the club house and one for the field
8. Wants to be in a home base agreement (there may be one for the top half of their field)

iv) Needs Assessments

1. Do you see this site working for you in the future? Why? Why not? Yes
 - a. It is close to members homes
 - b. They have club house on this site.
2. What are your current spatial requirements?
 - They have visiting teams with motor homes
 - Require their current field space
 - When they have 4 teams playing, over 100+ players are on site
 - Parking is not an issue at this time as they use 92 Street however, they can see parking becoming an issue. Purpose parking lot to be expanded
 - Difficult to answer in one question, but based on the large size of our membership, our spatial requirements are considerable.
3. Do you have any spatial requirements to a facility?
(i.e. access to washroom, storage space, etc...)
 - We do have numerous spatial requirements to a facility. Many of which are accommodated by the clubhouse on site.
 - Storage facility
4. Are you looking at any infrastructural needs, wants, desires due to future expansion? (e.g. parking, lighting, site furniture, etc...)
 - We have a number of future plans and infrastructural needs for the site, which are all outlined in the program statement submitted to the city.
5. Are you planning any major events requiring larger field, space or administration space use? If so, please provide in detail, including proposed dates.
 - None at this time.
6. Are there any concerns or issues that you would like to express about the potential developments/redevelopment on the John Fry Park site?

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

SOUTH EDMONTON ELITE BASEBALL ASSOCIATION

(iii) April 3, 2006

i) Background

Our Baseball Association provides an “elite” baseball program to all South Edmonton Youth (south of the river) for ages 12 to 18 years of age.

Our program should be the same in the next few years but we will use this site more if there is another 90 ft baseball diamond available.

Contact information;

Organization: South Edmonton Elite Baseball Association

Contact: Ron Chorney – President

Contact: Rod Scammell – Head Coach

ii) Current likes of the Site

- Diamonds themselves are excellent. We use the Bob White field and we like it a lot.

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

1. Drainage continues to be a problem – when new grading and drainage patterns
2. Field house for indoor practice
3. Another ball field
4. Facility need for - washroom, dressing rooms, equipment storage, facility to have a snack bar, a club house, and a training facility.
5. Want a Home base agreement

iv) Needs Assessment

1. Do you see this site working for you in the future? Why? Why not?

Yes, very much so, and it gives our association a chance to host a National Finals Tournament in the next 2-3 years for Midget Nationals.

2. What are your current spatial requirements?

- Indoor Storage facility for our equipment
- Batting cage (it is over the transportation right away, they use this when they can not have the diamond)
- Another diamond right where the pile of wood chips are (so they do not have to use St. Albert to play on) Currently they host an international tournament. The size of diamond is 330 ft

3. Do you have any spatial requirements to a facility?
(I.e. access to washroom, storage space, etc...)

- A washroom,
- dressing rooms,
- equipment storage,
- facility to have a snack bar,
- a club house, and
- a training facility.
- Home base agreement

4. Are you looking at any infrastructural needs, wants, desires due to future expansion? (e.g. parking, lighting, site furniture, etc...)

See Question No.5

- Parking has not been an issue with the 400 folks even when Softball is playing on diamonds.
5. Are you planning any major events requiring larger field, space or administration space use? If so, please provide in detail, including proposed dates.
- We would like to hold a National Tournament and we would like a Club House and possibly a training facility. 400+ folks attend their current competition.
6. Are there any current issues related to your sport, activity on the John Fry Park site?
- None at this time.

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

EDMONTON LADIES SOFTBALL ASSOCIATION

(iv) April 3, 2006

i) Background

Contact information;
Edmonton, AB T6L 4Y8

ii) Current likes of the Site

-
-

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

iv) Needs Assessment

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

ALBERTA VOLLEYBALL ASSOCIATION

(v) April 3, 2006

i) Background

This group consists of

Contact information;

ii) Current likes of the Site

-
-

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

- 9.
- 10.

iv) Need Assessment

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

CITY OF EDMONTON PARKS OPERATION

(vi) April 13, 2006

i) Background

This group consists of 30 staff on May - October

Contact information; Darrel Malayko (COE staff)

ii) Current likes of the Site

- Central to the park

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

11. Mulch storage site can be moved to another location on this park.
12. Currently the garage holds equipment for grass cutting crews.
13. There are 8 dressing rooms, 2 referee rooms and 2 washrooms, 1 office trailer on site. If there was an amenity building, the garage would need to hold equipment for grass cutting, the office would need to be a good size with a separate washroom for office staff vs. public, kitchen space to hold fridge, microwave. Proper first aid room is also needed. Rollie Mills would be an example of a site building.
14. When major events are held, there is not enough parking. Currently parking for these events are in the overflow, grass, streets and they are short about 100+ stalls.
15. If dressing room trailers are removed, there needs to be washroom plans that holds 2 referee rooms and 8 team rooms as sharing occurs at the moment.
16. A community room would need to serve as a computer room, media room, hosting, storage room during competitions.
17. A concession is needed during big events.
18. Every year there is at least one large event held on this site.
19. Parking is a concern
- 20.

iv) Conclusions

- Keep Parks operation folks in the loop when designing the site.

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

BILLY D'S DRIVING RANGE & GOLF CENTRE INC.

(vii) May 1, 2006

i) Background

- Established in 1983 as Anderson's Longest Yard, the first stand alone Driving Range in the Southside of Edmonton.
- Changed ownership in 1985 and became Billy D's Driving Range and Golf Centre
- A 22 year history of serving South Edmonton's Golf Needs
- Billy D's provides both a practice and learning environment for over 10,000 golfers in South Edmonton, and that number is increasing with the expansion of the South Edmonton corridor.
- Billy D's is the location of Metro Community College Continuing Education for Adults Golf program. Between 400-500 new golfers are introduced or brush up on their golfing skills through our golf instruction programs.
- Billy D's is the location of the University Recreational Golf Instruction program which enlists 300-400 golfers.
- Billy D's provides the perfect learning environment for 2 Jr. and 6 Sr. high schools in the Southside area, approximate 400-500 students per year.
- Is initiating in conjunction with Ross Shepard High school which will provided students with a full 5 credit course in golf. Plans are to expand this program to the major High schools in the city and cultivate golf at the grass roots of the school curriculum.
- Long range plans are to structure University golf Scholarship Program at the University of Alberta. Here graduating high school players can receive a university of Alberta. Here graduating high school players can receive a university degree and develop their golfing talents in Edmonton. Certainly a more affordable alternative to may schools in the United States.
- Currently, Billy D's fits the land usage of this parcel with future LRT plans and gas lines which occupy the north end of the parcel. It is also an excellent outdoor recreational facility that promotes the John Fry Park experience.
- They are a contributor to not only providing hundreds of thousand of dollars to city coffers through lease and taxes. It has also provided an exceptional learning center to cultivate new golfers, who in turn use many of the City of Edmonton Public Golf Courses.
- Billy D's has long been a mainstay in South Edmonton as not only a Driving range, but an excellent learning and recreational centre. Billy D's hopes to continue its long standing service to the public and City of Edmonton.
- Billy D's looks forward to working with the City and The CO centre in making John Fry the best outdoor recreational centre in the city.
- Business is growing . Nearest driving ranges are Bogey Busters (122 Street & Ellerslie Road) and Mill Woods Golf Course. Currently in the first year of a 3 year lease.

Contact information;

Billy D's Driving Range & Golf Centre Inc.
9656 – 28 Ave
Edmonton, AB
(780)461 – 4653

Grey Kellogg (Personal)
1223 Summerside Drive
Edmonton, AB, T6X 1C5
kdaygolf@yahoo.ca

ii) Current likes of the Site

- Good customer exposure – especially within the industrial/commercial area.
- This is a quiet area.

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

- Would like to have additional signage to advertise and direct users to the range
- Vandalism. B & E's.
- Broken windows. Nothing of value left on site.
- Operational alarm system.
- No formal night lighting

iv) Needs Assessment

1. Do you see this site working for you in the future? Why? Why not?

Yes. This is a very good location. There is a 22 year history of a driving range on this site. Current ownership has existed for 13 years. There are 52 stalls.

At the time the Transportation Department is ready to build the LTR rail maintenance yard, the lease with Billy D's will be terminated. At this time, this is not expected to occur for 5-7 years.

2. What are your current spatial requirements?

Access off 28th avenue. Parking. Directional signage off 28th avenue and 91 street would be helpful.

3. Do you have any spatial requirements to a facility? (i.e. access to washroom, storage space, etc...)

Not at this time. However, when the Go Centre is developed on the site to the north, the driving range will need to be re-oriented. Fencing and netting will be required. A berm will likely need to be built at the end of the range, graded and seeded. Scheduling will be an issue. A two year window will be required to sod the range. Financing will be a dependency.

4. Are you looking at any infrastructural needs, wants, desires due to future expansion? (e.g. parking, lighting, site furniture, etc...)

As the park site is developed to the north Billy D's will need to be re-oriented so that it no longer extends out onto Community Services land (parkland). Currently, the lease is with the Transportation Department as 2/3 of the range sits on Transportation land.

5. Are you planning any major events requiring larger field, space or administration space use? If so, please provide in detail, including proposed dates. - No.

6. Are there any concerns or issues that you would like to express about the potential developments/redevelopment on the John Fry Park site?

There will be significant expenses occurred in reconfiguring the driving range when either the Go Centre or the LRT maintenance yard is developed.

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN

GO CENTRE ASSOCIATION

(viii) May 1, 2006

i) Background

See business plan. Once the facility is developed it is expected to be operational 12 months of the year. Are looking forward to being one of the facilities on the John Fry Park Site. Are looking forward to meeting other park stakeholders and sharing information about the proposed Go Community Centre.

Contact information;

Jane Styles

Campaign Director

Go Community Centre

#300, 10328 – 81 Avenue

Edmonton, Alberta T6E 1X2

Phone (780) 439 – 2224

Fax: (780) 413 – 7226

e-mail: jane@gocentre.com

ii) Current likes of the Site

- Good Location

iii) Site Factors/Considerations

- Grade
- Drainage
- Adjacent owners
- Overall users of the site
- Directional signage, sponsorship signage, building signage

iv) Needs Assessment

1. Do you see this site working for you in the future? Why? Why not?

Yes. However, a long strip of land is not as practical as a more rectangular shape. The current proposed drawing is about a year old. This is not necessarily the final design as there are a number of issues to be addressed.

2. What are your current spatial requirements?

- Also looking at 3 outdoor basketball courts.
- Considering different gating options.

- Also want to look at access underneath the Trans Alta Link, especially for parking.
- Are open to looking at alternate access points to the facility (i.e. from the north side).

How does the building support the needs of beach volleyball?

- They have a 3 year lease with 2x1year renewals. Beach volleyball is currently on Transportation Department land. Includes 8 courts and seating room

3. Do you have any spatial requirements to a facility? (i.e. access to washroom, storage space, etc...)

No. Will need to look at a variety of gating options to ensure controlled access to washroom, viewing areas, etc...

4. Are you looking at any infrastructural needs, wants, desires due to future expansion? (e.g. parking, lighting, site furniture, etc...) - No.
5. Are you planning any major events requiring larger field, space or administration space use? If so, please provide in detail, including proposed dates.

These will be contained within the building design.

JOHN FRY SPORTS SITE MASTER PLAN BUSINESS

(ix) April 12, 2006

i) Background

This group consists of local businesses around the John Fry Park

Contact information;

1. Boncor building Products Co.
Lyle Letourneau (Manager)
463 – 1400/984- 7464
* Currently employ 5-6 people, will be expanding over the next years, therefore bringing more people to the park.
2. Powertran Company Ltd
Randy Diamond, General Manager (437 – 6699)
9604 – 31 Ave
Edmonton, AB, T6N 1C4
3. Topco Oilsile Products Ltd.
Bill Klotz (Northern District Manager)
Teresa Lee (Accounting Manager)
* 30 employees

ii) Needs Assessment

1. What are your current likes of John Fry Park site?
 - Driving Range will be utilized by employees
 - Park atmosphere, lessens the blow of industry around it
 - Grassy areas to sit and eat lunch
 - Driving range and volleyball nets nearby to use
2. What is your current dislikes of the John Fry Park site?
 - Wood chips fermenting across from our shop and obstructing the view
 - No thorough road access to 28th ave
 - The number of questionable meetings which take place in the parking lots during daytime and evening hours
 - Not much for the public to use
3. Are there any concerns or issues that you would like to express about the potential developments/redevelopment on the John Fry Park site?
 - To keep the park fee to it, perhaps develop it more for recreational use by neighboring businesses (ie, picnic area for lunch or a walking track)
 - Will there be enough parking on site if this becomes a busy park.

Meeting Notes


Stantec

John Fry Sports Site Master Plan

John Fry / FILE 1161 32072

Date: December 14, 2006
 Place/Time: Stantec / 9:30am
 Next Meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 David Dorward, GO Centre
 Debbie Cashion-Kalinowski, City of Edmonton
 Teresa Miller-Grayston, City of Edmonton
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton

Item:
Action:
1.0 Introductions
2.0 Review of Current GO Centre Model
2.1 General

- GO Centre group is willing to work with John Fry Park design team to maximize on shared site uses Info

2.2 Building Review

- latest design includes a larger building footprint, extending the building into the new triangular piece of land Info
- their current plan shows the volleyball courts remaining in their current location on Transportation land and additional parking in the Altalink ROW Info
- indoor court spaces can accommodate either 30 volleyball or 12 basketball (or combination thereof) Info

- new building footprint is 223,000sq.ft (4.7 acres in size) Info
- they propose a historic display (ie.Edmonton Grads) in building; it would be a joint project w/ City and Provincial Archives Info
- art displays are a possibility (potential for additional 3rd party funding) Info

2.3 Site Review

- parking volumes to be confirmed David
- concessions are planned for the building Info
- berming (or other alternative) requested to provide separation between GO Centre and Transportation land parcel Penny

2.4 GO Centre's proposed timelines Info

- break ground in spring/summer 2008
- begin building construction in 2009

3.0 Discussion of current Go Centre model

3.1 Feedback from City and Stantec (based on site constraints)

- timelines for Transportation property do not allow for long-term planning of volleyball courts in current location Info
- submittal of plan to Altalink to review land uses on utility ROWs Penny/
Felix
- City recommends GO Centre to procure LA services for parking and landscaping David

3.2 Ted updated David by reviewing master plan process Info

3.3 Kevin provided David w/ a copy of the Gantt Chart Info

3.4 Cooperation with other groups:

- Leprechaun Tigers – are they planning to sell clubhouse? Neil

4.0 Additional Action Steps

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------|
| 4.1 | Proceed w/ letters to stakeholders | Penny/
Neil |
| 4.2 | Proceed w/ inquiry to Leprechaun Tigers of future plans | Penny/
Neil |

The meeting adjourned at 10:30am.
The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Meeting Notes


Stantec

John Fry Sports Site Master Plan

John Fry / FILE 1161 32072

Date: February 7, 2007
 Place/Time: Stantec / 9:00am
 Next Meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Darrell Malayko, City of Edmonton
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton

Item:	Action:
1.0 General	
<u>Info Gaps / Questions</u>	
▪ Parks to provide copies (digital) of any additional existing stakeholder agreements and needs assessment information.	Kevin
▪ Parks to confirm stakeholders with Home Base agreements. Darrell confirmed that no Home Base or licensing agreements exist.	Info
▪ Parks to provide lease agreement/boundaries and zoning on parcels.	Kevin
▪ Parks to provide copies of program statements if available.	Kevin
▪ Stantec to update list of provided materials. Neil e-mailed list to City.	Info
▪ John Fry Park is a City Level Park. Development should conform to UPMP.	Info
▪ John Fry Park is an official off-leash area.	Info
▪ Parks Operations has no direct involvement with rugby field or east end of John Fry Park site.	Info
▪ On-site Parks Operations staff regularly maintains west	

side of John Fry Park site (ball diamonds and connecting green spaces). Maintenance includes line painting, watering, cleaning, etc. to Class B standard Info

- **Currently, total maintenance costs for John Fry Park provided entirely by City of Edmonton. Moneys are added as available (ie. conservation funds). Capital plan funds are not currently used, except for future amenity building.** Info

2.0 Physical Site Review

1.1 Grading / Drainage

- Parks has addressed physical grading concerns along east boundary of building at northwest corner of site, but litigation still in progress. South boundary will still need to be addressed. All
- Centre of site does not drain. Drainage issue exists at end of driving range. Info
- Rugby fields currently drain toward property to the north, this issue to be addressed. Fields were not constructed to a high standard and should be fine graded. Info
- "Dirt bike" area in southeast corner to be included in grading review, although it is Transportation land. Info
- Grading and Drainage to be reviewed in detail with Operations at next meeting. Info
- **Overall site drains from southeast to northwest.** Info
- **Diamond #1 has good drainage (built for either '78 Commonwealth or '83 Universiad Games), but the dug-outs in Diamonds #2 and #3 fill with water. Diamond #2 has the worst drainage problems.** Info

1.2 CPTED Review

Stantec to review site for CPTED concerns. Attention to be paid to security lighting and baseball dugouts. Penny

2.0 Concept Plan Review

2.1 Amenity Building

- Ted and Kevin presented a summary of amenity building parameters. Info
- The Rundle Park Family Centre is a similar facility in terms of size and use. Comparable desired level of architecture would be the amenity building at Jackie Parker Park. Size and layout of proposed change rooms would comparable to those at Ted/
Kevin

Rollie Miles Park. Ted / Kevin to provided copy of Rollie Miles floor plans to Penny. Darrell related that space in Rollie Miles is not enough. Goldstick Park facility has good space, but serves a park having less amenities (3 ball diamonds; all built by City).

- Review available space on John Fry Park for amenity building. Info
- **Penny will check w/ architecture group for a probable cost to build amenity building, based on comparisons w/ other City sites (ie. Rundle Park, Jackie Parker, Rollie Miles).** Penny
- **John Fry Park team to bring a proposal for the amenity building to stakeholders meetings.** All
- Level of architectural detail for the amenity building to include a building footprint. Penny to review possibility of providing an illustrative sketch of building. Penny
- **Park Operations currently staffs site with 1-2 people per shift. No staffing increases are planned. Regular City maintenance crews are not stationed on site.** Info
- **Parks Operations indicated need for doubling of current washroom capacity, first aid room, and umpire rooms w/ private washrooms. Require larger garage (more space, higher overhead door).** All

2.2 Utilities

- **Detailed list of pipelines on site provided (in draft report). Penny and Felix to call utility companies re proposed uses on R.O.W.s prior to sending any plans.** Volleyball and basketball areas as shown on Concept Plan may need adjusting, depending on feedback from utility companies. Penny/
Felix

2.2 Drainage solutions:

- Berming along north industrial site. Info
- Sustainable drainage.
- Use marginal material from pile at north end of site for filling the low area and berm construction. It is desirable to use as much material on site as possible.
- Penny proposed new berming concept to contain grading within site and to enhance user interaction (ie. picnic sites, play areas). Concept accepted for further review.

2.3 Access and Parking

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Penny reviewed the road access points shown with an in-house transportation designer, who indicated that they should not be a concern. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To the conceptual parking layout, Penny proposed reducing the amount of formalized (paved) parking and using reinforced grass areas with Grassy Pavers or similar product. Parks was in favour of this approach. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access from 28 Ave into the site not required. A more efficient use of space for a turn around will be reviewed. Existing access from 28 Ave to Billy D's can remain until area turned over to Transportation. Transit will want an emergency access connection through Go Centre land. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parks Operations said current day-to-day parking is good, but main concern is overflow parking (no controls in place). Bollards would help to control scope of parking areas. 	Info
2.4 Go Centre	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Digital copy of new Go Centre plan has not been received. Neil to insert scanned copy into site. 	GO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Go Centre must fit within space provided including required parking and ultimate sand volleyball courts 	Info
2.5 Other	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Winter uses of site briefly discussed. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Problems with fly balls hitting building at northwest corner identified as a field booking concern. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current space for City maintenance and storage area identified as a short-term use for drought tree chipping. Space does not need to be allocated in future plan. Existing bark mulch pile belongs to Forestry, and will be moved to off-site location. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to confirm any existing irrigation. Discuss with Operations at next meeting. Entire zone that's maintained by on-site Park staff is irrigated (main 3 diamonds w/ connecting green space between; other 2 diamonds w/ green space around perimeter. Kevin to check w/ Paul St. Arnaud to locate copy of irrigation plan. Diamonds #1,4,5 have updated irrigations systems, but Diamonds #2 and 3 on old hydraulic (manual) irrigation system. All systems still operational. 	Kevin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parks Operations has 3 classifications for on-site lawn maintenance: no-cut, 10-14 day cut, daily cut. Can be 	Info

visually differentiated either by vegetation shade on air photo or by vegetation color on-site during warm months.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ▪ City to confirm terms of lease with Billy D's Driving range. To reorient the range to a westerly direction, major fencing upgrades would be required for safety. Billy D's was made aware of this, as stated in the Needs Assessment report, but future plan requires clarification. | Kevin |
| ▪ Parks has installed fencing along east side of site. Apparently people are still driving around the fence to access the site through Dirt Guy's access. | Info |
| ▪ Fire hydrants located in adjacent streets. Penny to check with architects re fire safety requirements for Amenity Building | Penny |
| ▪ Parks Operations to email list of desired/required site improvements. | Darrell |
| ▪ Lighting needs consideration – park vs. parking lot vs. amenity/staffing security lighting. | Penny |
| ▪ John Fry Park to have hard surfacing (no shale, gravel, etc.) | Info |

3.0 Stakeholder Input Review

- | | |
|--|-------|
| ▪ Stantec has had contact with all stakeholders. Comments from questionnaire summarized and reviewed. Information placed in simple chart format. Neil provided updated contact information for stakeholder groups to Parks. | Info |
| ▪ Meeting between Parks, Stantec, and Go Centre held in December. Content and schedule for meetings with other stakeholders to be determined at next meeting. Penny provided draft of stakeholder meeting agenda. | Penny |

4.0 Draft Report

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| ▪ Penny provided a draft of the first few sections of the report for review and comment. | Ted / Kevin |
| ▪ Stantec to include budget numbers for field upgrades in report. | Penny |

5.0 Schedule Review

Info

- Penny provided revised schedule charts with one additional week added to the schedule for completion at the end of April.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15am.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Penny Dunford CSLA
Senior Associate
pdunford@stantec.com

Agenda


Stantec

John Fry Sport Site – Stakeholder Meetings

Edmonton Ladies Softball Association

Date: February 21, 2007
 Place / Time: Stantec / 3:00pm
 Next meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Al Schwartz, ELSA
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton

Item:	Action:
1.0 Introductions	
2.0 Review of Current Site	
2.1 Parking	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for normal use, there are no problems w/ parking capacity (two parking lots) gravel parking lot needs curb stops for Nationals, additional parking is used along asphalt path/road (to south) and 31 Avenue (to north); shuttle buses also operate to/from Coast Terrace Inn 	
2.2 Overall Site	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELSA agrees w/ COE Operations' analysis of ball diamonds (re: grading and improvements) ELSA requires minimum of four diamonds for regular use (Monday thru Thursday) Diamond #2, especially around 2nd base, could use crowning of shale first two diamonds to "rain out" are Diamonds #2 and #5 (#2 is the worst drainage) 	

- Diamond #4 has good drainage
- no game play allowed on fields, by COE Operations, until water (irrigation) turned on

3.0 Discussion of Future Plans

3.1 Midget Nationals

Info

- 2007 Midget Nationals to be held July 29-Aug.5
- fence requirements @ 210'

3.2 Proposed Agreements

ELSA/City

- ELSA used to have Home Base agreement @ Clark Field; was relocated, for building of Commonwealth Stadium, to John Fry
- Further discussion required between ELSA and City

4.0 Discussion of Concept Plan

4.1 General

Info

- space allocation required for beer tents

4.2 Temporary Fence

Info

- operational issues of fence – conflicts w/ irrigation; requires additional storage
- ELSA has potential for money grant to supply and install

4.3 Parking

Info

- ELSA approved the proposed parking concept

4.4 Lighting

- diamonds #1,2,3 are currently lit
- one of new (proposed) fields will require lighting; ELSA expressed potentials for sharing cost of lighting w/ City
- City to provide cost of lighting second diamond to ELSA

Info

Info

City

4.5 Ball Diamonds

- small bleachers currently on Diamonds #4,5; bleachers required on new diamonds (P3 and P6), with priority on “P3”; bleachers to be new, but can be of same quality Info
- ELSA requested to leave new diamonds @ 275’, due to potential for additional users (men’s softball from Winterburn) Info
- City to provide cost of proposed dugout revisions to ELSA for potential cost sharing City

4.6 Amenity Building

Info

- ELSA needs year-round access
- temporary storage rooms required (for during tournaments); no other storage area required, except for temporary fencing
- ELSA wants food concession to be present
 1. Ted proposed a volunteer-run concession (shared between user groups)
 2. Al suggested only one group to run concession year-round (ie. private operator; one stakeholder; COE)
- no first aid room required, since ELSA plans to continue supplying their own first aid tent
- small officials’ room required (no separate washrooms needed)
- ELSA currently shares office w/ Alberta Softball (cost - \$350 per month @ 3160-33Ave., contact - Scott @ Alberta Softball); no need to relocate
- more washrooms required
- ELSA’s list of priorities for an amenity building:
 - #1 – washrooms
 - #2 – concession

- #3 – officials room
- #4 – multi-purpose room

5.0 Next Steps

- 5.1 Stantec to advise of next meeting, but likely to be at time of final presentation of John Fry Sports Park Master Plan. Stantec

The meeting adjourned at 3:50pm.
The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Agenda


Stantec

John Fry Sport Site – Stakeholder Meetings South Edmonton Elite Baseball Association

Date: February 21, 2007
 Place / Time: Stantec / 3:50pm
 Next meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Don Chase, SEEBBA
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton

Item:	Action:
1.0 Introductions	
2.0 Review of Current Site	
2.1 Parking – no concerns w/ current parking	Info
2.2 Overall Site	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> would like more warm-up areas need enclosed batting cages and bull-pens (w/ 4 sides and top meshed) baseball field drainage is good bleachers are in good condition baseball field is currently irrigated bleachers, scoreboard and press box were upgraded as part of last round of site improvements; in good condition 	
2.3 Space Requirements	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> overall need for more baseball diamonds no major events currently held, since would require 3-4 diamonds to host tournaments 	

- Midgets use John Fry, but no room presently available for game play by other leagues (ie. Bantam)
- field sizes = PeeWee (12-15yrs old) – up to 230';
Bantam – 275-290'

3.0 Discussion of Future Plans

3.1 Proposed Agreements

SEEBA /
City

- SEEBA would like to have a Home Base agreement; further discussion required

4.0 Discussion of Concept Plan

4.1 Amenity Building

Info

- more washrooms a priority
- two change rooms would be nice, but not priority
- interested in having/sharing office space (SEEBA currently has no office)
- officials room requested
- equipment space needed (currently pay \$2500/yr for approx. 10'x10' space)

4.2 Additional baseball field spaces

Info

- no space on John Fry Park for additional baseball fields
- baseball fields unique from softball in that they require a pitching mound for game play
- cooperative multi-use of fields between softball and baseball discussed (ie. P6)
- multi-use difficult to achieve, since temporary pitching mounds not currently accepted by Baseball Alberta

5.0 Next Steps

- 5.1 Stantec to advise of next meeting, but likely to be at time of final presentation of John Fry Sports Park Master Plan. Stantec

The meeting adjourned at 4:20pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Agenda


Stantec

John Fry Sport Site – Stakeholder Meetings

Capital City Softball Association

Date: February 21, 2007
 Place / Time: Stantec / 4:20pm
 Next meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Linda Edey, CCSA
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton

Item:	Action:
1.0 Introductions	
2.0 Review of Current Site	
2.1 Background Information	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCSA is a group of people primarily focused on promoting game of softball CCSA hosts larger tournaments (in 2007, Midget Nationals – July 29 thru Aug.5) CCSA has access to monetary funds historical note – Diamond #2 was 1st diamond in Edmonton to receive shale 	
2.2 Overall Site	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> diamonds #1,2,3 fenced as one unit; control fencing requires changes (fencing of diamonds vs. entire site) CCSA currently supplies three 20' trailers for event use 	
2.3 Midget Nationals	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCSA requires 4-5 diamonds for tournament 	

3.0 Discussion of Concept Plan

3.1 Amenity Building

Info

- CCSA would need full use of building during events
- concessions wanted
- washrooms required
- two official rooms (men's and women's) w/ washrooms and showers
- common room requested
- 4-6 change rooms requested
- office/storage space requested (need approx. 10'x 20')

4.0 Next Steps

- #### **4.1**
- Stantec to advise of next meeting, but likely to be at time of final presentation of John Fry Sports Park Master Plan.

Stantec

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Agenda


Stantec

John Fry Sport Site – Stakeholder Meetings

Leprechaun Tigers Rugby Club

Date: March 7, 2007
 Place / Time: Stantec / 4:00pm
 Next meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Cam Wilton, LTRC
 Kyley Moisey, LTRC
 Kris Lavoie, LTRC
 Neil Forsyth, LTRC
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec

Item:

Action:

1.0 Introductions

2.0 Review of Current Conditions

2.1 Overall Site

Info

- drainage issues exist between rugby fields and at southeast corners of both fields
- guide wire from power pole (on central east side of east field) is potential safety hazard for athletes
- two catch basins exist in Altalink ROW, south of rugby fields; funds were contributed by LTRC in 1980s ('87 or '88?) to construct
- security issues exist on site (ie. break-ins), primarily on north end of fields
- additional parking required

2.2 Clubhouse

Info

- LTRC outgrowing current size of clubhouse

- shed is required to store equipment (ie.20' x 20'); shed may be erected by LTRC this year

3.0 Discussion of Future Plans

3.1 LTRC's Future Site Development Plans

Info

- LTRC would like a parking lot on Altalink ROW
- 5-7 year plan focuses on fields and posts
- 10+ year plan focuses on clubhouse (increasing to two buildings) and playground/play area (w/ consideration for proximity to clubhouse)
- no lighting of fields required
- bleacher stands not a priority
- LTRC wants to relocate goal posts and upgrade to steel posts; posts currently one meter from edge of ROW
- in coordination w/ field upgrades, LTRC wants to adjust field locations to create more width between fields and allow for more buffer from ROW
 - west field - move ten meters south, one meter west
 - east field - move ten meters south, one meter east

3.2 Proposed Agreements

Info

City/LTRC

- LTRC would like to assist w/ site developments
- Elaine discussed parameters of Home Base agreement:
 - most of site no longer MR designation
 - time and energy commitments would require further negotiation
 - parking lot would be included in lease agreement

4.0 Discussion of Concept Plan

4.1 Feedback from LTRC

Info

- proposed parking is ok (require 50 regular stalls; 4 handicap stalls)
- amenity building not likely to be used by LTRC

5.0 Discussion of Project Timing

5.1 Field upgrades schedule, as proposed by LTRC

Info

- east field can be upgraded at any time; would involve stripping, regrading (keeping relocation in mind), seed or sod, and upgrading of posts
- wait couple of years
- upgrade west field (same process as east field)
- Cam Wilton mentioned cost benefits of upgrading both fields at same time

5.2 Crossing agreements

Info

- LTRC would prefer City to arrange or help w/ crossing agreement process

6.0 Next Steps

6.1 City to provide grading concept of rugby fields to LTRC.

City/
Stantec

6.2 Stantec to advise of next meeting, but likely to be at time of final presentation of John Fry Sports Park Master Plan.

Stantec

The meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Agenda


Stantec

John Fry Sport Site – Stakeholder Meetings

Alberta Volleyball Association

Date: March 12, 2007
 Place / Time: Stantec / 3:00pm
 Next meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Terry Gagnon, AVA
 Ian Allan, AVA
 Absentees: Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec

Item:
Action:
1.0 Introductions
2.0 Review of Current Site
2.1 Background Information

Info

- volleyball demographics show approx 80% of Edmonton adult users are from south side of river
- beach volleyball court layout, as per AVA
 - court size = 8'x16' (for both adult and youth)
 - between courts = 18' (six meter) buffer required from end line to end line; 15' (five meter) buffer required from side line to side line
 - structure = 12-18" ideal depth of sand + landscape fabric + (ideally) gravel w/ weeping tile for area drainage

2.2 Beach Volleyball Courts

Info

- current usage = 5-10pm weekdays; all day on weekends
 = 64 teams/night (2-4 teams)
 = May through August
 = 7-8 weekend events

- currently have three-year lease for present location
- AVA wants courts to remain somewhere on John Fry site
- currently use Sea-can (8'x8'x32') to store equipment, located on site during season

3.0 Discussion of Future Plans

3.1 AVA plans for beach volleyball courts

Info

- develop feature courts w/ seating (either bleachers or berm seating)
- develop staging area w/ potential lighting

3.2 Proposed Agreements

AVA / City

- AVA agreed that permanent storage is required; open to partnering w/ City (ie. funds and energies) for development of amenity building

4.0 Discussion of Concept Plan

4.1 Feedback from AVA

Info

- indoor volleyball courts (along w/ all associated parking, amenities, etc.) currently included in GO Centre plan
- beach v-ball courts were never included in original GO Centre plan
- AVA concerned w/ lower number of beach v-ball courts in concept; for weekend tournaments, ten courts are not enough
- AVA needs at least two feature beach v-ball courts
- no storage area in GO Centre plan for beach v-ball equipment (16 nets, balls, etc.)
- beach v-ball storage area required, since hauling loose equipment over large distances not practical
- beach v-ball sand containment required (ie. wind protection, min. 6" raised edge)

5.0 Next Steps

- 5.1 Stantec to advise of next meeting, but likely to be at time of final presentation of John Fry Sports Park Master Plan. Stantec

The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Meeting Notes


Stantec

John Fry Sports Site Master Plan

John Fry / FILE 1161 32072

Date: April 16, 2007
 Place/Time: CN Tower, 10th Floor / 12:00pm
 Next Meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Paul St. Arnaud, City of Edmonton
 Debi Anderson, City of Edmonton
 Brad Badger, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 James Thompson, City of Edmonton
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton
 Lynn Woywitka, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees

Item:	Action:
1.0 Introductions / Project Introduction	
2.0 General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Penny reviewed John Fry master plan process, providing updates of current schedule status. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Fry team has met with all stakeholders for input. Neil presented a brief summary of the updated stakeholders' feedback. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ted brought up concerns over expansion of the GO Centre (ie.parking). As building footprint increases, amenities (ie.beach v-ball) are being pushed out. Land usage on Altalink ROW remains in question (ie.parking, basketball courts). Concerns agreed with by Directors, and Master Plan will continue to label land parcel as "Proposed GO Centre", but no detail to be shown. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul provided comment, from community/taxpayer groups, for desired balanced usage of green space vs. facilities (in district parks). 	Info

- Directors identified that John Fry is one of Edmonton's premiere baseball/softball parks, and will be treated as such in development/funding considerations. Info
- Due to upcoming 2008 World AAA Youth championships, E1 field will be upgraded (grading, irrigation). For information only, and not in scope of this Master Plan. Info
- Ted discussed zoning of John Fry w/ Peter Alexander. In consolidation process, all John Fry areas will be rezoned as parkland. Info
- Peter confirmed w/ Ted that park boundary, as currently shown, is correct. Land parcel on southwest boundary of John Fry is zoned as AP, but it is not owned by the City. Info
- John Fry Master Plan report will likely require caveat disclaimers and utility notes/contacts. Info
- Directors confirmed that John Fry is classified as a "City Wide Park" Info

3.0 CPTED Review

Stantec to review site for CPTED concerns.

Penny

4.0 Concept Plan Review

4.1 Grading

- Penny reviewed the proposed site grading concept. Info
- Grading concepts indicates need for a couple additional catch basins. Info
- More cut than fill is predicted for John Fry site, therefore removal of material is likely. Info
- Penny raised awareness that two catch basins, key to site drainage in the southwest part of the John Fry site, are included in the proposed land swap with Transportation. Further discussion/negotiation will be required between Parks and Transportation. Ted/
Kevin
- Digital concept grading plan can be made available for John Fry user groups in mid-May. Info

4.2 Parking

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| ▪ Directors indicated that number of planned parking stall should be based on regular usage numbers. | Info |
| ▪ Stantec to provide costing options for permanent parking areas. Options for granular and paved. | Penny/
Neil |
| ▪ Master Plan to provide costs for overflow parking options, but implementation to be determined. | Penny |
| ▪ Redevelopment of LTRC parking lot is enhanced. | Info |

4.3 Amenity Building

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| ▪ Further discussion required on contributions for levels of development and funding (Parks vs. Operations vs. other User Groups). | Info |
| ▪ At stakeholders meeting, John Fry team to present draft of new City standards model for amenity buildings. Potentials available for grandfathering and unique negotiation arrangements. | Parks/
Stantec |
| ▪ Suggestion to invite interested parties, at stakeholders' meeting, to remain afterwards for a focus group meeting on the amenity building. | Info |
| ▪ At stakeholders meeting, show maximum building envelope of amenity building. Explain that envelope may shrink if funding not available for building features. | Parks/
Stantec |
| ▪ Shelley mentioned that attention should be given to health code guidelines (ie.first aid room). | Info |

4.4 Overall

- | | |
|--|------|
| ▪ Stantec presented the proposed Master Plan notes that incorporate the results of stakeholder and John Fry team meeting input to date. The notes include the levels of upgrade/development, as well as levels of funding responsibilities. The Directors provided feedback/clarification on these notes, as well as confirmation of City funding commitments. | Info |
| ▪ Directors indicated that Master Plan should identify the proposed level of upgrade/development, along w/ costing. Future steps, by the City, will be to determine the source for required funding. | Info |

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| ▪ John Fry Master Plan to recommend soil testing/analysis. | Info |
| ▪ Stantec to provide pricing for soil analysis of existing John Fry soils. | Penny/
Neil |
| ▪ Stantec to provide recommendation for LTRC shed location. | Penny |
| ▪ Directors approved inclusion in concept of 3m wide asphalt trail through site. | Info |

5.0 Stakeholder Input Review

- | | |
|--|------|
| ▪ All stakeholder meetings have occurred (ELSA, SEEBA, CCSA, LTRC, AVA). | Info |
| ▪ Neil provided a brief summary of stakeholder feedback. Summarization chart of stakeholders' needs is available upon request. | Info |

5.0 Schedule Review

- | | |
|--|------|
| ▪ Proposed stakeholder meeting/presentation planned for the third week of April. | Info |
| ▪ Master plan completion planned for second week of May. | Info |

The meeting adjourned at 2:15pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka, LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Meeting Notes


Stantec

John Fry Sports Site Master Plan

John Fry / FILE 1161 32072

Date: May 28, 2007
 Place/Time: Stantec / 10:30pm
 Next Meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 David Tymchak, City of Edmonton
 Derek Stuart, AltaLink
 Alan Lucas, AltaLink
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Felix Eisler, Stantec
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Debi Anderson, City of Edmonton
 Elaine Betchinski, City of Edmonton
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton

Item:	Action:
1.0 Introductions / Project Introduction	
2.0 General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Felix noted that Atco is currently doing minor repairs in the southwest corner of the baseball diamond. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Penny reviewed the proposed John Fry master plan. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AltaLink indicated that an adjacent business, located on the northwest corner of John Fry, is looking to expand their building structure to the south. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lines on the John Fry site were designed for previous agricultural use, not roads. All clearances will require review, and relocations or raising of lines may be required. Altalink indicated that they will not incur costs associated with line modifications, due to proposed John Fry development. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AltaLink will require all clearance for roads and parking. If the John Fry team can provide road/surface elevations to AltaLink. AltaLink can provide line height info. 	Info
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No license agreement for John Fry currently exists between AltaLink and City. 	Info

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ▪ Agreements with AltaLink require the City to provide signage (w/ specifics to no 'kite flying'). | Info |
| ▪ AltaLink have not been contacted by the GO Centre group. They are currently looking at alternative sites for the Go Centre and there is a possibility that they will use the land in John Fry Park. | Info |
| ▪ AltaLink owns the E/W corridor through the site including all E/W towers. The N/S connector lines belong to Epcor. | Info |
| ▪ All crossing agreements are good for one year, so it is recommended not to apply until closer to construction. However, they will review plans to provide comment and information on line heights and acceptable development. Neil to forward copy of current plan to Al Lucas. | Kobewka |
| ▪ City is to keep AltaLink updated w/ plans for John Fry, as much as possible, to accommodate long-term planning. | Info |

3.0 Concept Plan Review

3.1 Grading

- | | |
|--|------|
| ▪ The grading plan for the site will address drainage problems on the Altalink ROW. Swales are allowed on the ROW if required. The current drainage patterns will be maintained with cross drainage between the park areas and the Altalink ROW. | Info |
|--|------|

3.2 Parking

- | | |
|---|------|
| ▪ AltaLink has concerns w/ parking lot on R.O.W., because of lower power line clearances. | Info |
| ▪ Height restrictions would be required for the proposed overflow parking areas, using both signage and physical overhead barrier. Access for maintenance/replacements must be maintained for Altalink. | Info |

3.3 Overall

- | | |
|--|------|
| ▪ No basketball courts allowed in AltaLink R.O.W. | Info |
| ▪ AltaLink desires 25m clearance between adjacent buildings and R.O.W. | Info |
| ▪ Beware of line swing-out setback/clearance, especially at midpoint of power line (ie. building height of potential GO Centre). | Info |

- AltaLink will allow trails on R.O.W. License agreement would be required. Info
- Normal below-ground irrigation system is allowed, as long as water is not hitting the lines. AltaLink needs to know location of lines and accessibility, but no specific agreement is required. Info
- AltaLink will require lighting info (ie. light standards for ball diamonds). Info
- Check fence heights, and make sure metal fences are grounded. Info
- Master Plan should show height restriction requirements and RV restrictions. Info
- Master Plan should note that an agreement between Parks and AltaLink is required, for maintenance of AltaLink corridor. Info
- Barriers should be provided to protect towers. Landscape barriers would be acceptable (ie. berm/trees), w/ minimum 10m setback around towers for access. Info
- If Parks wants to develop permanent facilities on the ROW a lease agreement will be required. Purchase of the required land could be considered, but typically Altalink would prefer a lease arrangement. Altalink has considered agreements with Parks in the past whereby the land would be leased to Parks in exchange for maintenance of the ROW. Further meetings with Parks are required to confirm an agreement. Info

5.0 Schedule Review

- Proposed stakeholder meeting/presentation planned for the week of June 18th. Invitations to be sent out asap. Kobewka

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka, LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

Stantec

May 28, 2007

John Fry Sports Site Master Plan

Page 4 of 4

Meeting Notes


Stantec

John Fry Sports Site Master Plan

John Fry / FILE 1161 32072

Date: June 19, 2007
 Place/Time: Stantec / 4:00pm
 Next Meeting: To be announced
 Attendees: Ted Jenkins, City of Edmonton
 Kevin Dieterman, City of Edmonton
 Penny Dunford, Stantec
 Neil Kobewka, Stantec
 Linda Edey, CCSA
 Don Chase, SEEBA
 Jim Plakas, AVA
 Cam Wilton, LTRC
 Kris Lavoie, LTRC
 Kyley Moisey, LTRC
 Neil Forsyth, LTRC
 Absentees: N/A
 Distribution: Meeting attendees
 Shelley Kwong, City of Edmonton

Item:	Action:
1.0 Introductions / Plan Presentation	
2.0 General	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Penny reviewed the proposed John Fry master plan. Differentiate plan labeling between softball and baseball or use generic label of 'ball field'. 	Info Info
3.0 Comments from Stakeholders	
3.1 Grading	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East rugby field - northwest corner of is too low and center of field is crowned too high. Rugby fields can be graded at 1.5%, as long as elevations don't vary too greatly. 	Info Info
3.2 Parking	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	

3.3 Amenity Building

- | | |
|---|------|
| ▪ CCSA - More washroom stalls required (than shower stalls); 6 washrooms recommended. | Info |
| ▪ CCSA - Larger officials' rooms w/ showers required for tournaments. | Info |
| ▪ SEEBBA requires maximum of 2 change rooms; CCSA requires 6 change rooms. | Info |
| ▪ Storage space is good. | Info |
| ▪ Common area is good for meetings. | Info |

3.4 Overall

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ▪ Removable fencing required on P3, P6, and E2 (not E4 and E5). | Info |
| ▪ E4 and E5 have no existing lighting. | Info |
| ▪ LTRC shed to be built on the existing concrete pad. | Info |
| ▪ LTRC season from beginning of May thru end of Sept. | Info |
| ▪ Timing for rugby field construction – sooner the better. | Info |
| ▪ LTRC working on a 10-year irrigation plan for rugby fields. | Info |
| ▪ Rugby fields as-built sizes = 70x120m + end zones. LTRC to provide as-built plans to Stantec. | LTRC |
| ▪ Stantec to provide cost comparison of sod vs. seed for rugby fields. | Stantec |
| ▪ AVA can break beach volleyball into 2 pods. | Info |
| ▪ AVA concerns include court drainage, windbreaks, and storage for equipment. | Info |
| ▪ City to ask GO Centre for official statement of intent. | Parks |
| ▪ Other potential uses for GO Centre site might be baseball. | Info |

4.0 Schedule Review

-

Stantec

June 19, 2007
John Fry Sports Site Master Plan
Page 3 of 4

The meeting adjourned at 7:00pm.

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Neil Kobewka, LAT, AALA
Landscape Architectural Technologist
neil.kobewka@stantec.com

John Fry Sport Site - Feedback Results

	Alberta Volleyball Association	Leprechaun Tigers Rugby Club	Capital City Softball Association	South Edmonton Elite Baseball Association	Edmonton Ladies Softball Association	Edmonton Parks Operation	Go Centre Association*
Has anything changed in your plans which would affect your approval of the current concept plan?	NO	plan not reviewed	NO	Add pitching mound to smaller field	NO	NO	
Do you have an Home Base or lease agreements?	have 3-year lease for current location	no Home Base, but 10-year lease (1 for clubhouse, 1 for field)...duration remaining?	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Do you want a Home Base or lease agreement?	open for partnering w/ COE (funds & energies)	YES		YES	YES	n/a	
Program statement submitted to City		YES					
When and how often group actively uses site.							
Duration of time	May to end of August	field = snowmelt-snowfall clubhouse = all year	July and/or August	April thru September	1st Monday of May thru to 2nd weekend of August	May thru October	all year
How often during the week	full week	full week	daily (only during championships)	2-4 week nights (varies) + weekends	Mon. - Thurs. (Diamonds #2,3,4,5)	full week	full week
Time of day	Mon.-Fri. = 5-10pm weekends = all day	weekdays = 5:30-9:30pm weekends = 10:30-5:30pm clubhouse also weekend evenings	daytime (during championships)	week nights = 5-10pm weekends = days + evenings	6-10pm	7am-11pm	all day
Number of events and when they held	7-8 weekend events (from May thru Aug.)	6-7 larger events per year	one event per year (July & Aug.)	2-3 special events per year	annual = every May long weekend (Fri. evening - Sun. aft); this year = Midget Nationals (July 29-Aug 5)		
Approximate numbers of users							
For a normal use day or evening, typically how many people from your group would be onsite?	130-260	100	special events only	80-100+	150/night (120 players)	1-2 staff per shift	600
Approximately how many vehicles?	100+	50	special events only	40+	100+	1 to 2	150+
Number of people and vehicles on site for special events	Events such as Provincials people = 250+ vehicles = 200+	people = up to 600 vehicles = up to 300	people = 600-1000 vehicles = 400-500	people = 200-400 vehicles = 80-100	May long weekend (500 people, 300 vehicles); Midget Nationals (1000 people, 600-800 vehicles)		people = 2600 vehicles = 650
Desirable uses for Amenity Building.							
If you mentioned storage, of office space as a need for your group, could you provide actual space requirements for these uses.	n/a	amenity building not likely to be used; current clubhouse - additional shower facilities, office space (for 2 desks), additional storage req'd (1/2 size of clubhouse)	need FULL use of bldg during events; concessions; storage req'd = approx. 200sq.ft.; office req'd = approx. 200sq.ft.; 4-6 dressing room (w/ showers); washrooms (priority); 2 officials rooms (M&W) w/ washrooms & showers; common room; media area; phone lines	office space desired (no specified size); 2 dressing rooms (not priority); more washrooms (priority); officials room; equipment storage (10'x10'); snack bar	need year-round access; only temporary storage rooms req'd (during tournaments); no office space req'd; concession (priority); washrooms (priority); no first aid room req'd; small officials room (no separate washrooms req'd); multi-purpose room	double current number of washrooms; storage for grass cutting equipment; office w/ separate staff & public washrooms; kitchen space; first aid room; 2 officials rooms w/ separate washrooms; 8 team rooms; common room w/ media & storage capabilities; concession; larger garage (more space, higher overhead door)	n/a
Preferred method of communication	email	email / phone	email	email / phone	email / phone	email / phone	
Additional Comments		Club size expanding. Would like to buy a property and/or longer lease agreement. Want a Home Base Agreement. More parking required (current use include 92St). Request playground/play area for kids.	Would increase use if more diamonds available. Diamonds #3,4 used as warm-up diamonds. Require minimum of 4-5 fields during event. Currently supply 3 - 20' trailers for event use.	Would like indoor facility (field house/ clubhouse) for expansion of baseball winter training. Need indoor storage facility. Really like using Bob White field. Want a Home Base Agreement. Need space for batting cages and bull-pens (meshed 4 sides & top); batting cage currently on Transportation land.	Require minimum 4 diamonds for regular use (Mon-Thurs).	Parking short by approx 100+ stalls. Garage currently stores grass-cutting equipment.	Will need to look @ gating options to ensure controlled access to washroom, viewing areas, etc. Areas for signage. *The Go Community Centre group was included in stakeholder consultations as the John Fry Park site was an optional location for their facility.

