**PROJECT BACKGROUND**

The Oleskiw River Valley Park Master Plan will establish a vision and management plan for the next 25 years.

It will build on existing plans, policies and initiatives while identifying public needs and priorities. It will provide direction for environmental management, as well as recommendations for civic, cultural and recreational uses that are appropriate to the park.

**WHAT ARE THE DRIVERS?**

The River Valley Park Renewal Program identifies a long-term strategic approach to renew parks located in the River Valley. The program is initiated by key drivers such as city policies, changing demographics, demand, recreational needs and aging infrastructure.

Park renewal within the River Valley is based on an analysis of the physical condition and functionality of park elements as well as the ability to meet existing (and future) capacity.

Through the Ribbon of Green, areas of Oleskiw River Valley Park have been identified for protection. At the same time, the paved multi-use trail (as part of the West End Trails Project) and the construction of the Terwillegar Park Footbridge pose to increase traffic in the park and improve connectivity in the River Valley.

With the city’s population projected to double by 2050, the Master Plan is an opportunity to support public use of natural spaces and protect the ecological value of the park.

**WHAT IS THE PROCESS?**

The Master Plan is currently in the Concept Phase of the Park and Facility Development Process. City policy, site analysis and public input will inform the process and outcome of the Concept Phase, at the end of which the Master Plan report and concept plan will be submitted to City Council as part of the 2019-2022 budget cycle to seek funding for implementation. The timeline below illustrates how the three inputs work together in the development of the Master Plan.

**PROVIDE YOUR INPUT!**

Review the vision statements and concept options and share your thoughts. Input will be used to develop a preferred concept plan for the Master Plan, which will be presented in Spring 2018.

All activities are also available online: edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan

- **SECTION A**
  - **VISION**
  - What do you think about the vision statements?

- **SECTION B**
  - **CONCEPT OPTIONS & THEMES**
  - What do you think about the two concept options?

- **SECTION C**
  - **COMPARE**
  - Which option best responds to the needs and priorities for this park?

- **SECTION D**
  - **PARK ELEMENTS**
  - What park elements do you prefer?
WHAT WE HEARD SO FAR

This is what we heard from the first and second phases of engagement.

In Phase 1 (August and September 2016), the City of Edmonton asked citizens to share their thoughts on the current state of the Oleksiw River Valley Park.

Themes were developed by grouping similar comments and insights provided by participants during Phase 1 of engagement. All of the comments were analyzed, and major themes emerged that represent prominent issues and opportunities for the Master Plan to address.

In Phase 2 (June and July 2017), Edmontonians were invited to help develop a vision statement and to provide input on desired elements and activities for Oleksiw River Valley Park through an external stakeholder workshop, a public open house, and an online survey.

PHASE 1: INVENTORY & ANALYSIS

How do you currently use the park? What would you like in the future?

PARK USE & AMENITIES
- No off-leash dog walking
- Cycling
- Winter activities (e.g. cross-country skiing)
- Limit development in the park
- Walking / jogging / hiking

ACCESS & CIRCULATION
- Increase trail connectivity
- Keep and develop natural trails
- Create parking inside or adjacent to the park
- Use the footbridges as the main access points
- Do not make vehicular parking inside or near the park

NATURAL ASSET MANAGEMENT
- Keep the park natural
- Preserve natural features
- Do nothing
- Restore ecology
- Create wildlife programming (i.e. bird sanctuary)

SAFETY, MAINTENANCE & ENFORCEMENT
- Trail maintenance to improve safety
- Wayfinding improvements
- Signage and emergency phone for safety
- Increase enforcement of unwanted activity
- Clean up after dogs

PHASE 2: VISION, PRINCIPLES & IDENTITY

What is your vision for the park? What park elements do you prefer? Where would you place different elements in the park?

VISION STATEMENT

Participants were provided the option to either create a vision statement using sample phrases provided or write their own. Most participants used the sample phrases, confirming the shared values that emerged from Phase 1. Input helped craft the vision statements presented today, and informed development of the concept options.

CREATE YOUR OWN PARK

Areas of Major Focus
Clear patterns and game-piece clusters emerged from the results of the "Create your own park" activity. These patterns helped determine overall management and program strategies, while clustering of amenities and programs identified desirable program nodes.

PARK ELEMENTS

Top Park Amenities
Participants were provided with a visual survey of park elements and asked to indicate their preferences. Preferences were slightly different at each engagement session. The two concept options presented today explore some of these differences to gain more insight into public preferences for park elements and ecological preservation.

PUBLIC INPUT:

The What We Heard reports can be found on the resource table tonight and online at edmonton.ca/oleskiwparkmasterplan

The Oleksiw River Valley Park Master Plan incorporates feedback from the Indigenous Engagement occurring through the Ribbon of Green process. See the Ribbon of Green’s Stages of Engagement board for more details on their process.
ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITIES

The environmental sensitivity of an area is defined by the degree to which human impact disrupts its ecological balance.

MANAGEMENT OF SENSITIVITY ZONES:
It is possible to propose activity in any zone, but the trade-offs, or disturbance levels, will be higher in zones of higher sensitivity.

Development in higher sensitivity areas should be restricted for the protection of natural resources. Suggested management practices include the restriction of development, routine maintenance, restricted wildlife control and only emergency safety and security services.

The interaction of natural resources and human activity should be managed in medium sensitivity areas to prevent unnecessary negative environmental impacts. Suggested management practices include development limited to trails, routine garbage pick up and trail edge maintenance, limited wildlife control and some safety and security services.

Lower sensitivity areas have experienced less ecological degradation and therefore are the most suitable for many types of park activities if increased activity is desired. Degraded areas may have the greatest potential for ecological restoration, but may require significant effort.

ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS:
After Phase 1 we continued to explore the ecological functions within and surrounding the park. Our findings helped us define the most environmentally sensitive areas of the park. We used this knowledge and feedback from Phase 2 to develop the Concept Options presented tonight.

The City of Edmonton created sensitivity class categories to describe the sensitivities in River Valley parks. The sensitivity classes outline the types of development that are suitable for the park, help us to understand the trade-offs of development in the River Valley and provide direction for the Master Plan.

FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY:
High sensitivity areas are more susceptible to disturbance and require a higher level of protection. The following factors have the most potential to be disturbed or damaged from human impact.

[Diagram showing various factors like geological, slope, hydrology, vegetation, and human potential with corresponding sensitivity levels]
E.VOLUTION
OF THE
LANDSCAPE

The history of the Oleskiw River Valley Park is intertwined with Edmonton’s history.

The park’s form and function has evolved in response to Edmonton’s urban growth and changing land uses in the River Valley. From the pre-contact uses of the land, through its history as an extension of the Edmonton Country Club and Golf Course, morphing into a farm and back into its current status as a River Valley park, Oleskiw River Valley Park has changed dramatically throughout the years to become a natural destination for Edmontonians to enjoy.

TIMELINE

Land Use

1890
1900
1920
1930
1950
1970
1990
2000

A. 1910
Edmonton Country Club acquires 400 acres of land in its current location.

B. 1913 – 1930
In 1913, the river valley was opened on the southern portion of the Oleskiw River Valley Park and remained there until 1932, when they were moved upland.

C. 2002
Oleskiw River Valley Park acquired by Government of Alberta, which sought to develop the area. Public outcry and a city-wide petitioning development halted the River Valley half the project.

Events & Figures

1876
1895
1930
1970

A. Treaty 8 signed at Fort Carlton and Fort Pitt.

B. Dr. Joseph Oleskiw (1890-1920), a Ukrainian professor, visits Edmonton. He writes and distributes a pamphlet encouraging Ukrainians to immigrate to Canada.

C. Curtis and Muriel Murnane plan Puff Willow Farm and buy 400 acres of land on the current Oleskiw Park acre.

D. Curtis Murnane was born in the U.S. and attended Yale University, served in the U.S. Army during World War I.

Early Heritage

Settlement in the region of present-day Edmonton began about 13,000 years ago, when the North Saskatchewan River started carving through the landscape. The Indigenous Peoples who lived in the area came together in the River Valley for gathering, camping, ceremony, hunting and trade. They hunted bison whose habitat consisted of the unique ecosystem between the northern boreal forest and the great southern plains. The river escarpment allowed the potential to observe wildlife and other people from great heights.

In 1795, Europeans began to settle in the region and set up the most important Hudson Bay Company post west of Winnipeg. First Nations and Métis in the Edmonton area were essential to the success of the western fur trade, as they scouted, hunted, trapped and traded with the European newcomers.

Today

In 1990, council approved the preparation of a Conceptual Plan for the North Saskatchewan River Valley and Ravine System. This conceptual plan, The Ribbon of Green, was expanded into the Ribbon of Green Master Plan, approved in 1992, to include policy guidelines for the long-term development, use and care of the River Valley. Oleskiw River Valley Park is understood as part of a River Valley system that provides ecological, social and health functions, serving all Edmontonians. Neighbouring citizens enjoy the park for its passive recreation opportunities and for the chance to connect to nature.
WHAT WAS OUR DECISION-MAKING PROCESS?

Public input, site analysis and City policy continue to direct Master Plan decisions and concept development.

As the Master Plan is developed, more information is brought forward that helps to develop a comprehensive understanding of how the park functions and the City’s and public preferences for the park. The Master Planning process supports ongoing development and definition of the project requirements:

- City Direction and Priorities (with direction from City policy)
- Environmental Sensitivities (determined through site analysis)
- Public Vision and Values (developed through public and stakeholder input)

These three elements are benchmarks or checkpoints for decision-making for the Oleksiw River Valley Park Master Plan.

1. CITY POLICY

How are the concept options supported and directed by City policies and priorities?

Vehicle Access

- Public Input:
  - Some participants noted that a parking lot in the park boundaries would relieve traffic and parking pressures in surrounding communities. Others were concerned about the environmental impact of construction and the impact a parking lot would have on the park’s natural character.

Site Analysis / City Direction:
  - City is a small portion of the park’s boundaries is adjacent to city-owned land. The creation of a roadway into the park would cause significant environmental disturbance on the River Valley slopes.

Design response:
  - A review of vehicle access was completed and, due to physical constraints and feasibility concerns, vehicle access will not be pursued.

2. SITE ANALYSIS

Are there conflicts with environmental sensitivities in the park? Can they be resolved?

Accessibility

- Public Input:
  - Many participants in the engagement process saw the potential for increased physical accessibility into the park.

Site Analysis / City Direction:
  - The slopes on the west side of the park are highly sensitive. To provide a fully accessible entrance on the west side of the park is not currently feasible.

Design response:
  - While the Master Plan will not include a fully accessible park entrance, opportunities to increase accessibility into the park will be explored.

Invasive Species

- Site Analysis:
  - Invasive plant species are prevalent along the River Valley slopes and the former hay field in the park. A large-scale removal of invasive species would require the implementation of intensive site stabilization, replacement with native grasses, trees and shrubs and a long-term management plan for future stabilization.

Design response:
  - The Master Plan will explore opportunities to introduce native plant species into the park through long-term management strategies.

3. PUBLIC INPUT

How do the concept options align with the common values and vision for the park? What are the conflicting preferences?

CONCEPT DESIGN DECISIONS

Concept development is an iterative process, weighing the pros and cons of public preferences and balancing them with priorities from site analysis and City policy. As recommendations are refined, they are continually measured against the three checkpoints: City policy, site analysis, and public input.

While developing the concept options, some of the priorities conflict. The concept options resolve these conflicts or present alternative recommendations. The table below illustrates some key design decisions and how the background inputs were considered in the concept options.

ALIGNMENT WITH RIBBON OF GREEN

The Project Team for the Oleksiw River Valley Park Master Plan and the Ribbon of Green have worked together to ensure that the proposed features in both concepts are in alignment with Ribbon of Green’s Land Management Classification system.

Vehicle Access

- Public Input:
  - Some participants saw an opportunity for increased river access in Oleksiw River Valley Park.

City Direction:
  - Due to access limitations and environmental sensitivities, the City will provide formal river access points (i.e., boat launch) in the park.

Formalized River Access

- Public Input:
  - Some participants saw an opportunity for increased river access in Oleksiw River Valley Park.

City Direction:
  - Due to access limitations and environmental sensitivities, the City will provide formal river access points (i.e., boat launch) in the park.

Design response:
  - The Master Plan will not include a formal river access point nor will the Master Plan provide formal access to the sand bar.

Emergency Call Boxes

- Public Input:
  - Elements to increase the feeling of safety in the park are desired.

City Direction:
  - The City is reviewing the provision of emergency phones in open spaces to provide better safer, reliable and more cost-effective service to those requiring emergency services.

Design response:
  - Increased signage in the park will provide users a means to give their location to EMS in case of emergency.

Increase Site Servicing

- Public Input:
  - Some participants voiced a desire to see increased servicing in the park, including lighting and amenities such as drinking fountains.

City Direction:
  - Due to access limitations in the park, the City is unable to provide adequate maintenance and utility servicing for amenities such as lighting and access to potable water sources.

Design response:
  - The Master Plan will not recommend elements requiring utility servicing.

Activities Requiring Higher Levels of Maintenance

- Public Input:
  - Some voiced a desire for increased amenities and activities for the park.

Design response:
  - Due to access limitations in the park, the City is unable to provide the appropriate maintenance for certain amenities (including sports fields, playgrounds and sewer connected wastewater).

Activities Requiring Higher Levels of Maintenance

- Public Input:
  - Some voiced a desire for increased amenities and activities for the park.

Design response:
  - Due to access limitations in the park, the City is unable to provide the appropriate maintenance for certain amenities (including sports fields, playgrounds and sewer connected wastewater).

Design response:
  - The Master Plan will recommend amenities that are maintainable within the access limitations, such as informal cross country skiing, nature play and outdoor education.

OFF-LEASH DOG WALKING

- Public Input:
  - Many people did not want an off-leash area or trail in the park.

Site Analysis:
  - Large portions of the park have been identified as having moderate to high sensitivity levels. Areas of low sensitivity in the park have high potential for restoration, which would not be complementary to an off-leash area.

City Direction:
  - Off-leash dog walking may occur along the river in Terraville Park, the largest off-leash dog park in the city.

Design response:
  - Off-leash dog walking will not be supported in the Master Plan.

Activities Requiring Higher Levels of Maintenance

- Public Input:
  - Some voiced a desire for increased amenities and activities for the park.

Design response:
  - Due to access limitations in the park, the City is unable to provide the appropriate maintenance for certain amenities (including sports fields, playgrounds and sewer connected wastewater).

Design response:
  - The Master Plan will recommend amenities that are maintainable within the access limitations, such as informal cross country skiing, nature play and outdoor education.
**HELP NAME THIS PARK!**

The Oleskiw River Valley Park does not currently have an official name. Its name should align with the park vision and identity through the Master Plan.

Please provide your input to help us make a recommendation for a park name, which will be considered in the naming process. Edmonton’s Naming Committee will make the final decision on the park’s official name.

**ENGAGEMENT PHASE 2 RESULTS**

Participants of the last phase of engagement ranked their preference for park name inspiration. The tallied preferences resulted in the following order:

1. Political Figures
2. Historical Heritage
3. Natural Heritage
4. Public Figures

**SHARE YOUR THOUGHTS!**

Think about what you would like to inspire the park name, then place a numbered dot under the corresponding heading. Place 4 under your most preferred option and 1 under your least preferred. Feel free to include comments.

Do you have any park name suggestions or comments on your choice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLITICAL FIGURES</th>
<th>NATURAL HERITAGE</th>
<th>HISTORICAL</th>
<th>INDIGENOUS HERITAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are a number of figures in Edmonton’s history that could be commemorated in the name.</td>
<td>The park is located on a historic floodplain in the North Saskatchewan River. The river is home to fish species, native vegetation and wildlife, which could inspire a name.</td>
<td>During Phase 1 we provided an overview of the park’s history, and Edmontonians that shaped the landscape over the years, such as the Edmonton Country Club land acquired in 1913, or the Wabasca Willow Farm created by Curtis and Edith Munson in 1930.</td>
<td>Edmonton’s River Valley has been a place for Indigenous Peoples to gather for thousands of years. Some archaeological records suggest the presence of historic camping or hunting sites in the park (to be confirmed). Some Indigenous groups have expressed an interest in having the park recognize this Indigenous heritage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VISION STATEMENTS

WHICH VISION STATEMENT REPRESENTS WHAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE IN THE FUTURE FOR THIS PARK?

Place a dot on the scale to indicate your level of support for each vision statement.

Input will be used to craft one vision statement that will guide development of the Oleskiw River Valley Park for the next 25 years.

Comments? Write them on a sticky note!

A VISION FOR CONCEPT 1:

The Oleskiw River Valley Park provides *essential habitat* to a diversity of plants and animals and enhances ecological connectivity in the River Valley.

As a *refuge from the city* for Edmontonians, the park provides a setting where visitors can experience how the landscape changes over time and the *restoration of ecological systems*, enhanced through educational programs and *nature interpretation*.

WHAT IS YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT THE CONCEPT 1 VISION?

Do Not Support  Neutral  Strongly Support

[ ]

A VISION FOR CONCEPT 2:

The Oleskiw River Valley Park provides an immersive experience into the natural landscape while educating visitors on the *natural and cultural heritage of the site* with nature interpretation and ecological learning.

The layered history of the park is celebrated through educational elements and passive recreational opportunities. Surrounded by *habitat for plants and animals*, visitors can learn about the landscape while creating new narratives for Edmonton’s future generations.

WHAT IS YOUR LEVEL OF SUPPORT THE CONCEPT 2 VISION?

Do Not Support  Neutral  Strongly Support

[ ]
CONCEPT 1

MAIN OBJECTIVES:

- Restore native forest habitat, maintaining small portions of the open field.
- Integrate opportunities for visitors to appreciate and enjoy nature.

INCLUDES:

- A picnic, play and gathering area at the south end of the park
- New trail connections with rest stops
- A learning circle at the north end of the park
- A staged restoration plan to expand the existing forest vegetation into the field
CONCEPT 2

MAIN OBJECTIVES:

• Restore native forest and prairie habitat, maintaining larger portions of the open field.

• Integrate opportunities for visitors to learn about the natural and cultural heritage of the site through community activation.

INCLUDES:

• A picnic area at the south end of the park

• New trail connections with rest stops

• A sheltered outdoor classroom and open amphitheatre at the north end of the park

• A restoration plan that incorporates multiple habitat types, east-west ecological connections and educational opportunities
ACCESS & CIRCULATION

Park entrances, trails and directional signs are key components of the access and circulation in the park.

Both concepts aim to make improvements to accessibility and connectivity in the park.

- Amenities in the park become more accessible for people of all abilities. Amenities are placed near the north and south bridge entrances.
- Resting points will also be added at regular intervals along pathways.
- Connections across the park will be improved through the introduction of new trails. Trail loops give visitors different options for distances and use.
- Alternative modes of transportation are encouraged.

PARKING CONSIDERATIONS

A parking management plan will evaluate existing and potential parking locations around the park (including the Terwillegar Park parking lot and Fort Edmonton Footbridge parking on Wannydi Way). The plan will include strategies to mitigate impacts to surrounding communities and monitor levels of park use. The City will also pursue a public education strategy with improved signage to direct vehicles to the most appropriate access points.

CONCEPT 1

- Existing paved multi-use trail and existing natural trails are maintained.
- A new north-south connection is proposed with a granular trail.
- East-west connections are emphasized with new natural surface trails.
- A new natural trail connection is introduced in the forest to help reduce conflicts between trail users (i.e. pedestrians and cyclists).

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 1 BETTER IF...

Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.

CONCEPT 2

- Existing paved multi-use trail and existing natural trails are maintained.
- A new north-south connection is proposed with a granular trail.
- East-west connections are emphasized with new natural surface and granular trails.
- No new trails are proposed within the existing forest.

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 2 BETTER IF...

Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.
Both concepts propose to expand on the existing amenities in Oleskiw River Valley Park. The types of features as well as their placement and scale differ between the concepts.

Elements are proposed to complement the ecological restoration proposed in the park, increase the interpretive and educational opportunities and improve visitor comfort and safety.

These decisions have been made based on input from the public during the first two phases of engagement, an understanding of environmental sensitivities in the park and City priorities for River Valley parks.

CONCEPT 1
• Small, open learning circle / outdoor classroom with interpretive elements to teach visitors about restoration at the north end of the park
• Picnic area, pit washroom and natural play structures located in the south end of the park
• Resting points along natural trails for individuals and groups

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 1 BETTER IF...
Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.

CONCEPT 2
• Sheltered outdoor classroom, small open amphitheatre, small nature play features and pit washroom create an educational area at the north end of the park
• Small sheltered picnic area in the south end of the park

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 2 BETTER IF...
Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.
CONCEPT 1

In Concept 1, the ecological focus is on forest restoration, occurring in stages and supporting various wildlife communities. Concept 1 proposes:

- A long-term strategy to encourage forest growth in the open field
- To maintain and promote increased forest habitat for a variety of plants and animals in stages over many years

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 1 BETTER IF...
Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.

CONCEPT 2

In Concept 2, restoration of a variety of vegetation communities helps to create a variety of habitats throughout the park. Concept 2 proposes:

- A long-term strategy to encourage some forest growth while maintaining large portions of the open field
- The creation of different habitats throughout the park, including forest and prairie
- To restore a small area in the north of the park to native prairie and shrubs

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 2 BETTER IF...
Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.
CONCEPT 1

The focus in Concept 1 is on forest restoration and educational programming related to restoration efforts. Proposed features, such as winter installations and resting areas, are minimal:
- Winding trails through the restored forest invite visitors to explore the park and feel connected to nature.
- Interpretive signs along the trails educate visitors on native plants and animals.
- Small gathering spaces along natural trails provide places for individuals and educational groups to stop and rest.
- Winter installations like warming shelters or temporary art create new ways to experience winter ecologies.

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 1 BETTER IF...
Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.

CONCEPT 2

The focus in Concept 2 is maintaining several habitat types throughout the park while restoring portions of the open field. Concept 2 encourages partnerships with community groups to carry out educational programming in the park:
- Trails lead visitors through various plant communities in the park, including restored areas and the existing open field.
- Interpretive signs along the trails and near the river can teach about the importance of nature and use of the landscape over time, informed by community partnerships.
- Educational programming by community partners is encouraged throughout the park.
- Open space near the north end of the park will focus on native plant restoration, with possible programming and teaching opportunities developed in partnership with a community or partner organization.

I WOULD LIKE CONCEPT 2 BETTER IF...
Use a sticky note to provide your suggestions.
### Maintenance, Safety & Enforcement

Elements to improve the maintenance and feeling of safety in the park are included in both concept options, including:

- Park features that are well maintained and well used tend to discourage vandalism and other unwanted activity.
- Signs along trails will inform of appropriate uses.
- Signs at entrance and exit points in the park will help with safety and wayfinding. They will indicate distances to other entrances and park amenities as well as the slope on the main trails in the park.
- After hours use will be discouraged. Signs will remind the public that parks are officially closed after dusk.
- Locational information on signs will improve wayfinding and allow users to give their location by phone in case of emergencies.
- The proposed washroom will be locked nightly to help avoid unwanted after-hours use.
- Covered waste receptacles will be distributed along trails to help keep the park free of litter.
- The City is reviewing the provision of emergency phones in open spaces to provide better, safer, reliable and more cost-efficient service.

### Concept Level Probable Cost

Costs for the Oleskiw River Valley Park concept options are estimated based on recent park projects of similar size and scope.

The following chart provides a high-level summary estimate of the costs for each concept option.

The figures presented are an opinion of probable costs, not guaranteed cost figures and will be refined as detailed designs are prepared. Each total cost estimate includes a 50% contingency and 20% design and project management fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hardscapes
  Trails and Pathways | $237,895 | $302,054 |
| Site Furnishings
  Amenities, Lighting and Infrastructure | $31,000 | $34,000 |
| Site Furnishings
  Wayfinding and Signage | $190,000 | $212,000 |
| Softscapes (Restoration) | $2,370,711 | $1,824,691 |
| MAJOR NODES
  Picnic and Educational Areas | $959,100 | $1,459,100 |
| TOTAL COST | Includes 50% contingency and 20% design and management fee (including additional studies, as necessary) | $6,440,799 | $6,514,137 |
COMPARE

WHICH CONCEPT RespondS BEST TO THE PREFERRED VISION, NEEDS AND PRIORITIES FOR THIS PARK?

Place a dot to indicate which concept you support. Provide any comments on your decision.

If you think the two concepts should be integrated, write your idea on a sticker and place it in the middle section.

If you chose neither option, place a sticky note below with the reason for your decision.
PARK ELEMENTS

WHAT SPECIFIC PARK ELEMENTS DO YOU PREFER?

Place a dot on the scale to indicate your level of support for each park element.

Consider some of the trade-offs listed to inform your choice.

Your feedback will be used to refine a single concept plan for the park.

ACCESS & CIRCULATION

New Natural Trail
- Create two separate nature trails in existing forest, potentially reducing tree mortality.
- Includes opportunities for environmental education.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Granular Trail Loop
- Outlines boundary of trails and provides a nature education trail.
- Connects visitors across the park for wildlife viewing.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Resting Points
- Provides additional seating, providing opportunities to relax.
- Complemented by interpretative signage.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Granular Trail
- New, longer trail to provide another route with environmental education.
- Allows pedestrians and cyclists to loop through the park.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

PARK USE & AMENITIES

Picnic + Play Area
- Includes picnic tables, play equipment, and nature play elements.
- Provides educational and natural habitat opportunities.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Smaller Picnic Area
- Includes picnic tables and small play area.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Learning Circle
- Includes natural elements and provides opportunities to gather.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Outdoor Education Area
- Enhances outdoor classroom and amphitheatre.
- Suitable for community learning and educational programs.

Do Not Support Neutral Strongly Support

Comments on the elements presented? Place them here:
PARK ELEMENTS

WHAT SPECIFIC PARK ELEMENTS DO YOU PREFER?

Place a dot on the scale to indicate your level of support for each park element.

Consider some of the trade-offs listed to inform your choice.

Your feedback will be used to refine a single concept plan for the park.

NATURAL ASSET MANAGEMENT

Wildlife Lookout
- Small wildlife feature where different ecologies meet
- Allows individuals or groups to view wildlife in the park

Restored Prairie
- Small portion of the field to emphasize our prairie heritage
- Very positive environmental impact for the park

Restored Forest
- Restoration would encourage trees to extend into the existing urban area
- Very positive environmental impact for the park

Open Field
- In Concept 2, the open field is larger than in Concept 1
- The field would continue to be used for winter activities with minimal vegetation, rolling and feeding

ATMOSPHERE & IDENTITY

Winter Installations
- Create winter ways to experience winter ecologies
- Features warming shelters or temporary art

Community Activation
- Focus on native plant restoration near the north end of the park
- Opportunities for community and school involvement in planning and maintenance of park

Gathering Space
- Open space near the educational area could be used by community groups or local organizations

River Lookouts
- Lookout along the river might be considered with minimal vegetation, rolling and feeding

Comments on the elements presented? Place them here: