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1 INTRODUCTION

The City currently operates eleven off-leash dog areas (OLAs) within the City’s parks system, and two additional OLAs are currently in-development or being modified. In recent years, dog ownership has increased in Winnipeg, and so has public interest and inquiries about OLAs.

In 2012, the Guidelines for Off Leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg was developed. Resulting from public demand, in 2014, the City’s Executive Policy Committee recommended that further research be conducted into OLAs, supported by a more robust public engagement process.

WSP Canada Group Limited (WSP) was retained by the City to undertake the development of the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan (OLAMP), which will build on the City’s previously prepared Guidelines, and incorporate additional research and recommendations informed by a comprehensive engagement process.

The objectives of the OLAMP are to:

- Engage with key stakeholders and the general public on the current challenges and opportunities for OLAs in Winnipeg;
- Develop site selection criteria and metrics for determining how OLAs are selected;
- Develop an implementation strategy for OLAs;
- Identify gaps and problems to help form the basis for an OLA policy;
- Develop policies to address conflicts and maintenance issues; and
- Identify potential partnerships and funding opportunities.

What the OLAMP will not do is:

- Select specific locations in Winnipeg for future OLAs;
- Create a timeline/development schedule for future municipal OLAs;
- Develop detail designs and cost estimates for specific OLAs; or
- Develop a list of deficiencies/required improvements for existing OLAs in Winnipeg.

As mentioned above, the development of the OLAMP was supported by a comprehensive engagement process. The goal of the OLAMP’s engagement process was to:

- Provide information about the study to the public;
- Collect feedback pertaining to the current issues and potential opportunities associated with the City’s current OLAs, shared parks, recreational spaces, seasonal sites, and underutilized locations; and
- Gather input for criteria and policies to address current and future demand for OLAs.

Within the following sections of this Engagement Report, each component in the OLAMP’s engagement process is described and the results are summarized.
1. **SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES**

OLAMP engagement activities occurred through April 2017 to December 2017, with the intent of project promotion and collecting feedback and background information that will be used to inform the development of the OLAMP. Following the completion of the draft OLAMP, the project’s engagement process will conclude with an online survey, which will seek input and feedback from stakeholders and the public on the draft OLAMP.

Engagement activities included a City staff workshop, two community stakeholder workshops, a Council seminar, three project pop-up information booths, and an online survey and mapping tool, which were made available on the project’s webpage.

**Table 1: Engagement Activity Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>NO. OF ATTENDEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Staff Workshop</td>
<td>April 19, 2017</td>
<td>9 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg, 65 Garry St., Winnipeg</td>
<td>20 individuals attended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshop (#1)</td>
<td>May 31, 2017</td>
<td>6 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>South Winnipeg Community Centre, 1885 Chancellor Dr., Winnipeg</td>
<td>22 stakeholders attended. A direct email invite sent to 75 individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshop (#2)</td>
<td>June 1, 2017</td>
<td>6 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>East Elmwood Community Centre, 490 Keenleyside St., Winnipeg</td>
<td>14 stakeholders attended. A direct email invite was sent to 70 individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Seminar</td>
<td>November 3, 2017</td>
<td>11 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
<td>City Hall, 510 Main St., Winnipeg</td>
<td>All Councillors were invited, six attended along with approximately 20 members of the City of Winnipeg administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#1)</td>
<td>November 25, 2017</td>
<td>11 a.m. – 1 p.m.</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg Animal Services during their annual Photos with Santa event, 1057 Logan Ave., Winnipeg</td>
<td>Approximately 65 individuals participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#2)</td>
<td>December 2, 2017</td>
<td>10 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
<td>Kilcona Park Off-Leash Area, 1229 Springfield Rd., Winnipeg</td>
<td>Approximately 75 individuals participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#3)</td>
<td>December 7, 2017</td>
<td>6 p.m. – 8 p.m.</td>
<td>Cindy Klassen Recreational Complex, 999 Sargent Ave., Winnipeg</td>
<td>Approximately 50 individuals participated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Survey</td>
<td>Available online from November 3, 2017 – December 21, 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>winnipeg.ca/offleashareas</td>
<td>2,190 survey responses collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Tool</td>
<td>Available online from November 3, 2017 – December 21, 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>winnipeg.ca/offleashareas</td>
<td>250 individuals provided feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 PROMOTION

Various methods of promotion were used to advertise and promote the various OLAMP’s engagement activities. Below is a summary of those methods used to promote each engagement event.

Table 2: Engagement Promotion Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>METHOD OF PROMOTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Staff Workshop</td>
<td>April 19, 2017</td>
<td>Direct email invite to select City of Winnipeg staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshop (#1)</td>
<td>May 31, 2017</td>
<td>Direct email invite sent to 75 individual stakeholders or groups on May 18, 2017. A follow-up reminder email was sent on May 24, 2017. Bilingual services were offered to those invited to the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshop (#2)</td>
<td>June 1, 2017</td>
<td>Direct email invite to select individual stakeholder and groups on May 18, 2017. The invite was sent to 70 individuals. A follow-up reminder email was sent on May 24, 2017. Bilingual services were offered to those invited to the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Seminar</td>
<td>November 3, 2017</td>
<td>City of Winnipeg administration sent direct email invites to City of Winnipeg Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Online Survey             | Available online from November 3, 2017 – December 21, 2017 | The project and its online engagement tools were promoted using the following methods:  
  - The project webpage: [winnipeg.ca/offleashareas](http://winnipeg.ca/offleashareas);  
  - A news release published by the City on November 3, 2017;  
  - Direct emails sent to project stakeholders on November 8, 2017 to 157 email addresses;  
  - Project postcards handed out at the Bonnycastle OLA grand opening on November 16, 2017;  
  - A Facebook advertisement targeting Winnipeg sports and outdoor enthusiasts from November 22 – December 7, 2017;  
  - Print advertisement posted in the Metro on November 24, 2017;  
  - At the three project pop-up information booths (see below);  
  - Project information boards displayed at the Winnipeg Humane Society from December 8 – December 22, 2017; and  
  - Additional in-kind event promotion was provided by various project stakeholder groups.  

Both English and French versions of the online survey and mapping tool were available.  

Online Survey

| Mapping Tool               | Available online from November 3, 2017 – December 21, 2017 | The project pop-up information booths were advertised/promoted using the following methods:  
  - The project webpage: [winnipeg.ca/offleashareas](http://winnipeg.ca/offleashareas);  
  - Multiple posts on the City’s Facebook page and Twitter, and within the City’s Public Engagement Newsletter;  
  - The City’s Animal Services Facebook page;  
  - Direct emails to project stakeholders on November 22, 2017. Sent to 157 email addresses;  
  - Print advertisement posted in the Metro on November 24, 2017; and  
  - Additional in-kind event promotion was provided by various project stakeholder groups.  

Both English and French versions of the pop-up information boards were available.  

Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#1)  
  | Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#2) | November 2, 2017 |  
  | Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#3) | December 12, 2017 |  
  | Pop-up Information Booth Board Display | December 8 – December 22, 2017 | The pop-up information booth boards were displayed in the lobby of the Winnipeg Humane Society. |

Examples of the project’s promotional items can be found in Appendix A
4 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

During the OLAMP’s engagement process, the study team engaged with City staff, project stakeholders, City of Winnipeg Council and administration, and the general public, in-person and online, to promote the project and:

- Collect feedback pertaining to the current issues and potential opportunities associated with the City’s current OLAs, shared parks, recreational spaces, seasonal sites, and underutilized locations.
- Gather input for criteria and policies to address current and future demand for OLAs.

Information and feedback collected during the engagement activities will be used to help advise the development of the final OLAMP.

A description of each of the engagement events and a summary of the input received are included in the following sections.

4.1 MASTER PLAN WORKSHOPS

4.1.1 CITY STAFF WORKSHOP

On April 19, 2017, a workshop with City staff was held to discuss the OLAMP. The objective of the City staff workshop was to collect and confirm feedback in regards to the current issues experienced by various City departments pertaining to the City’s OLAs. The information collected was used to advise and confirm the study’s public engagement process, and provide the project team with an in-depth understanding of the issues associated with municipal OLAs, as well as dog-related issues in other City parks/greenspaces.

Representatives from various departments were invited in order to provide different perspectives regarding OLA issues and opportunities. Representatives from the following City departments participated in the workshop: Animal Services, Community Services, Urban Design, Urban Planning, Parks and Open Space, Risk Management, Water and Waste, and the Office of Public Engagement. A representative from the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres also participated in the workshop.

The workshop was held over a three-hour period and began with a brief presentation that provided a description and intent of the project. This presentation was followed by a variety of activities. A workbook was prepared, which guided the workshops activities. A number of activities were facilitated to develop a vision and key values for the OLAMP, to identify issues and inform potential location criteria to be included in the OLAMP, and to evaluate some of the potential criteria as identified by workshop participants. Twenty individuals attended the workshop.

A copy of the City Staff Workshop workbook can be found in Appendix B.

The following information summarizes the feedback obtained at the workshop.

**ACTIVITY #1: VISIONING & KEY VALUES**

Participants were asked, as a group, to brainstorm a set of ‘key values’ or principles they hoped to see the OLAMP represent. The following are some key values, as identified by workshop participants:

- Education: on use of care for animals, enforcement, boundaries;
- Clear guidelines: consistency with rules and enforcement;
- Accessibility: for dog owners residing in all parts of the City (i.e., accessible via walking, biking, driving), to safe/clean water, throughout the year, for varying abilities (i.e., wheelchair accessible);
- Wildlife protection;
- Amenities: for both small and large dogs;
— Allow special interest groups to enhance;
— Supporting recreation, active lifestyles, community connections, and community health and well-being. Fostering relationships between dog owners and non-dog owners;
— Safety: responsible dog ownership, and limiting conflicts between OLA and park users; and
— OLAs should be a ‘core’ park provision.

Using the identified key values, participants were asked to develop a vision statement, which represents the vision for OLAs in Winnipeg. The following is a statement as created by one of the workshop groups:

*The City of Winnipeg strives to create and maintain accessible, safe, sustainable OLAs that complement the communities in which they are located for all users.*

Other ideas to be included in a potential vision statement included:

— Healthy communities;
— Responsible pet ownership;
— Dog parks as a core amenity;
— Improving the health of people and dogs;
— Providing local opportunities;
— Supporting the benefits that dogs bring to communities; and
— Changing the world one dog park at a time.

**ACTIVITY #2: IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES TO INFORM POTENTIAL LOCATION CRITERIA**

The workshop groups were asked to brainstorm a series of criteria that would be important when selecting future locations for OLAs in Winnipeg. Participants were asked to identify criteria that would work to mitigate the issues that are currently experienced in/around Winnipeg’s OLAs.

Draft criteria identified included:

— Set back from car traffic – a liability issue;
— Clear delineation of areas adjacent to OLAs;
— Compatible adjacent uses;
— Logistics of multi-use areas;
— Should not interrupt neighbourhood connectivity of path networks;
— Should consider forested areas, as well as open spaces; forested areas could act as a buffer and enhance the OLA experience;
— Re-purpose sports fields that are underutilized;
— Hours of operation. Potential for shared use areas at different times of day, (i.e., OLA before 8 a.m., after 7 p.m);
— Should consider City owned properties other than parks: closed landfills, right-of-way’s, brownfield sites;
— Areas selected should have proper drainage;
— Separation from schools/playgrounds. Buffer zones between streets, residential, playgrounds;
— Accessibility in terms of walkability. Well-maintained access routes;
— Cost;
— Need to consult with direct/adjacent community. Ongoing engagement should occur with the selection and management of OLAs;
— No new OLAs near retention ponds;
— Priority areas near a higher density of licensed dogs or population density;
— Review of ‘informal’ OLAs;
— Avoid wildlife protected areas;
— Should consider minimum standards of amenities, (i.e., fencing, lighting, access to drinking water, ease of waste collection);
— Refine conditions for working with community centres;
— Availability of parking and safe access to parking;
— Potential of land acquisition; and
— Lessons learned from other jurisdictions.

**ACTIVITY #3: OLA CRITERIA EVALUATION**

The purpose of Activity #3 was to apply the criteria developed in Activity #2 to select municipal OLAs (as case studies) to determine if the draft criteria identified was useful and applicable, and if there were any obvious criteria gaps not identified during the previous activity.

The workshop groups were assigned a ‘regional’ OLA and a ‘community’ or ‘neighbourhood’ OLA and asked to determine whether the criteria as identified in Activity #2 aligns with the OLA’s configuration and its location. Groups were also asked to identify any additional criteria that should be considered to mitigate any existing issues that are experienced in the OLAs that they were assigned. Below is a summary of the issues experienced in some of the City’s current OLAs, and the potential criteria that could mitigate these issues.

**Maple Grove Park OLA:**
— Inadequate parking. The OLA does not have enough designated parking spots for the amount of traffic it generates;
— Riverbank instability, a safety concern. Improved signage could warn users of this;
— The adjacent river could be a safety concern for some users. Additional fencing could mitigate this concern;
— Lack of maintenance in the winter; and
— Vehicle access off of St. Mary’s Road is difficult.

**Kilcona Park OLA:**
— No fencing, unclear delineation of the OLA. Include better signage and potentially fencing or other physical barrier, particularly between other park uses such as soccer and tobogganing. This will mitigate off-leash dogs from encroaching on other parts of the park, as well as mitigate other park users from entering the OLA unknowingly (which is permitted, however, they should be aware);
— Better signage, re: enforcement, to mitigate dog owners from releasing their dogs within the Park’s parking lot, which is a danger to dogs and other park users; and
— No specific areas for small/large dogs = potential conflicts.

**Charleswood Dog Park:**
— No parking on-site, this may limit/discourage use; and
— OLA not fenced on all sides. Fencing on all sides may prevent conflict with traffic and nearby uses such as with students from the nearby school and community centre users.

**King’s Park OLA:**
— The OLA is adjacent to a park pathway, potential conflict may occur here between cyclists and dogs.
— A buffer/physical barrier around the park’s OLA could minimize the need for enforcement.
— The OLA in King’s Park is not connected to the park’s parking area, perhaps better connections could be made (with signage) to increase the use of the OLA, and ensure users maintain their dogs on-leash in all areas of the park other than the OLA.

**Mazenod Park:**
— No fencing, potential conflict with adjacent streets;
— Located in an area that is adjacent to light industrial land uses, not located within or nearby to a residential neighbourhood;
— No safe connection of this park from the active transportation pathway that is located on the west side of Mazenod Road;
— Park lacking pathways and other amenities; and
— A retention pond is located within the centre of the OLA, the water in this pond may be hazardous; dogs may be inclined to swim/drink this water due to its location within the OLA.

Bourkevale Park:
— Lack of physical barriers around OLA. Adjacent to an active transportation path; potential conflict between users of the path and dogs;
— The OLA is located across a pathway from the Bourkevale Community Centre, which includes a lawn bowling facility and multi-use fields. The Community Centre’s field is located adjacent to a school sports field and track. Because there are no physical barriers around the OLA, some off-leash dogs have encroached on the Community Centre and school fields causing conflict. Better enforcement, communications, signage, and buffers required; and
— The parking lot adjacent to the OLA is for the Bourkevale Community Centre, parking conflicts have occurred between Community Centre users and OLA users.

![Bourkevale Park Map](image)

**Figure 1: Sample of City Staff Workshop Activity #3 Map**
### 4.1.2 Stakeholder Workshop

Two stakeholder workshops were held with representatives from various stakeholder groups during the early summer 2017. The project team worked together to develop a comprehensive stakeholder list which included representation from a wide variety of park users, not just OLA users/dog-owners. Stakeholder groups that were invited to the workshops included organizations such as:

- OLA/dog park organizations/clubs such as WinDog, the Kilcona Dog Park Club, Little Mountain Dog Club, Maple Grove Dog Park Club, etc;
- Resident associations such as North Pont Douglas Residents Committee, South Osborne Residents’ Group, Sage Creek Residents Association, Old St. Boniface Residents Association, the Glenelm Neighbourhood Association, Residents of the Exchange District, etc;
- Community Club District Boards;
- School Divisions;
- Dog rescue associations and groups such as the Winnipeg Humane Society, Earth Dog, CAARE, the Winnipeg Pet Rescue Shelter, etc;
- Recreational/sports organizations/park specific recreational/sports groups such as the YM-YWCA of Winnipeg, the Perfect Circle Flying Club, Sport Manitoba, Softball Manitoba, WRHA Active Transportation Advisory Committee, The Running Room, Bonivital Soccer, Manitoba Organization of Disc Sports, Trails Manitoba, Bike Winnipeg, etc; and
- Other miscellaneous organizations such as Take Pride Winnipeg, the Green Action Centre, CNIB, Manitoba Hydro, and Save Our Seine.

Two stakeholder workshops were facilitated. The first was held in south Winnipeg on May 31, 2017, at the South Winnipeg Community Centre and the second was held on June 1, 2017, in north Winnipeg at the East Elmwood Community Centre. 75 groups were invited to the May 31 workshop, and 22 individuals attended. 75 were invited to attend the June 1 workshop, and 14 individuals attended.

The following is a description of the various stakeholder groups who attended the workshop events:

**Table 3: Groups Represented at Stakeholder Workshops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>May 31 Workshop</th>
<th>June 1 Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLA/Local Dog Park Organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Club District Boards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational/Health Organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog rescue associations/organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Associations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Division</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both workshops were held over a two and a half hour period, and began with a brief presentation about the project, its intent and purpose. The presentation also included some background information and best practices of other municipality’s OLAs/dog parks. The presentation was following by a variety of group activities. A workbook was prepared that guided the workshop exercises, and included the brainstorming of key values and a vision for the OLAMP, the identification of issues associated with current OLAs, and the identification of potential OLA selection criteria.

A copy of the Stakeholder Workshop workbook can be found in Appendix B.

The following information summarizes the feedback obtained at the workshop.

**ACTIVITY #1: VISIONING & KEY VALUES**

Participants were asked as a group, to brainstorm a set of ‘key values’ or principles they hoped to see the OLAMP represent. The following are some key values, as identified by workshop participants:

- Community engagement;
- A place for dogs and owners to socialize and be active;
- Safe and clean, including safe water sources. A safe environment for dogs and owners;
- Visually identifiable;
- Respectfully shared space;
- Sense of community. Space for building community;
- Amenity to support tourism;
- Adaptation of underutilized spaces;
- Local access;
- Responsible pet ownership;
- Compatibility for all park users;
- Fitness, greenspace, active lifestyle;
- Education for all users, including City staff, 311 and Animal Services;
- Single use;
- Located in areas of need;
- Improved enforcement of rules;
- Decent levels of service: garbage, recycling, amenities, etc; and
- Preservation of natural indigenous flora and fauna.

Using the identified key values, participants were asked to develop a vision statement, which represents the vision for OLAs in Winnipeg. The following are some vision statements created by the workshop groups:

*The City of Winnipeg will provide safe, sustainable off-leash opportunities to citizens, which will enhance the well-being of people and dogs.*

*In recognition of the need for OLAs and that these OLAs enhance the health and wellness of its residents, while also strengthening neighbourhoods and building communities, the City of Winnipeg will provide year-round services with universal and equitable access to OLAs in partnership with local dog park groups.*

Other ideas to be included in a potential vision statement included:

- An OLA is more than just a dog park - it can promote safety (eyes on the park) and can create stronger networks within communities. OLAs are a contributor to the City as a whole, decreasing illegal off-leash occurrences in other parks and greenspaces;
- Continuous consultation and feedback;
- Comfort of dogs and owners;
- Must incorporate the idea that off-leash areas should be a dedicated land use to enhance a community, rather than 'take away' from a community; and
— Balance the interests of all park users.

**ACTIVITY #2: IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES WITH CURRENT OLAS**

The workshop groups were asked to identify the issues that their organization (or themselves as an individual) currently experience within Winnipeg’s existing OLAs or other parks and greenspaces within Winnipeg.

The common issues identified are as follows:

— Safety for dogs and owners. Adjacent road speeds a significant hazard;
— Signage within OLAs should be improved;
— Influx of traffic into neighbourhoods;
— Aggressive dogs: communication of rules/education, need for dog owner education and park user education;
— Clean up/maintenance;
— Inadequate water supply;
— Current catchment area size, the ‘catchment areas’ as outlined in the Guidelines report are too large, and consider ‘driving’ distances, rather than ‘walking’ distances – not everyone has access to a vehicle;
— Inaccessibility: Need for more OLAs that are more evenly dispersed throughout the City (for daily use), rather than large parks for weekly outings. Current OLAs not located for easy access. Integrate OLAs into existing neighbourhoods;
— Lack of defined areas in OLA for large dogs and small dogs;
— OLAs lacking amenities, (i.e., water, shade, shelter. Lack of standards for amenities);
— Lack of parking, should require some dedicated parking if OLA is located within a multi-use park;
— Dog owners treated as second-class citizens;
— Conflicting uses need to be better defined;
— Sanitation/maintenance, dog owners not picking up waste;
— City budget implications;
— Overuse/over capacity of existing OLAs;
— Existing OLA spaces have at times been reduced/adjusted by the City;
— Current process to request the creation of a new OLA is unclear. A simplified public process/application should be developed; and
— Developers should be forced to include OLAs in new developments.
Participants were provided with three ‘dot’ stickers and asked to place a sticker on the issues that were the most important/significant to them. Issues that received the most stickers are as follows:

- Current non-OLAs being used as OLAs (seven votes);
- Better maintenance (12 votes);
- Inadequate water supply (10 votes);
- Need for stewardship groups to support the OLAs, the City should assist in their formation. Current cooperation with City is inconsistent (eight votes);
- Conflicting uses. OLAs within parks need to be better defined (five votes);
- The wording in Section 27.1 of By-law 2443/79 is ambiguous, should be revised to be clearer (10 votes);
- Community centres – a public misconception that they can be used as OLAs (four votes);
- Lack of OLAs within Winnipeg. The City should develop smaller sized OLAs throughout existing neighbourhoods (15 votes);
- Adjacent road speeds (11 votes);
- Overuse/over capacity of existing OLAs (10 votes);
- Current process to request the creation of a new OLA is unclear. A simplified public process/application should be developed (five votes); and
- Lack of standards for OLA amenities (11 votes).
**ACTIVITY #3: OLA SELECTION CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT**

The workshop groups were asked to brainstorm a series of criteria that would be important when selecting future locations for OLAs in Winnipeg. Participants were asked to identify criteria that would work to mitigate the issues that are currently experienced in/around Winnipeg’s OLAs.

Draft criteria identified included:

- Do not locate next to a school, playground, or daycare unless the OLA is fenced;
- Consider OLA placement by intersections, retention ponds, and bike paths, and ensure proper barriers are established if located near these things;
- Allow for sponsorship/funding opportunities for small, urban OLAs;
- Consider areas for small and large dogs if size and space allows;
- Consider the creation of temporary OLAs where not a lot of amenities are required (only a chain-link fence);
- Develop a standard for separation from housing and roads;
- Areas of OLA need could be determined through residential density or dog license data;
- Underutilized City-owned lands should be considered for future OLAs, not just existing park space;
- Accessibility: universal design, is park accessibility safe, adequate parking;
- Should not be established on harmful property, (i.e., toxic lands);
- Should look for areas where a single-use OLAs can be developed;
- All neighbourhood parks should be established with fencing;
- A consultation/engagement process must be required in establishing new OLAs. During this process, educate the community and create awareness of the positive benefits of OLAs;
- OLA identification should start with where the locations of ‘unofficial’ OLAs currently exist;
- All ‘single-use’ OLAs need to be fenced;
- Community Centre boards need to be consulted each year;
- A clear process needs to be established for developing new OLAs;
- ‘Single-use’ and ‘neighbourhood’ OLAs should be walkable, connected to a residential community; and
- Each ‘quadrant’ of the City should have a ‘regional’ park.

Other comments obtained during this exercise:

- Site selection criteria may be different in different parts of the City, core vs. suburban; and
- The ‘neighbourhood’ OLA catchment area is currently too large.

---

**4.2 COUNCIL BRIEF**

A council brief was held on November 3, 2017. The purpose of this brief was to inform City Council on the project’s process to date and of the engagement activities that were being facilitated during late 2017.

The brief described:

- The purpose and scope of the OLAMP;
- Winnipeg’s current OLA inventory and OLA-related policy;
- A summary of feedback obtained from the stakeholder workshops;
- A summary of OLA user-counts; and
- Project next steps, such as the description of engagement activities, and a demonstration of the online mapping tool.

The brief lasted approximately 25 minutes, and was followed by a question and answer period.
4.3 POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTHS

Three pop-up information booths were facilitated to promote the project, promote its online survey and mapping tool, and obtain comments and feedback from the general public in regards to issues, concerns, and potential opportunities for Winnipeg’s current and future OLAs.

The pop-up information booths were facilitated at three different locations within Winnipeg. The first pop-up was held at the City’s Animal Services building on November 25, 2017, during the annual pet photos with Santa; the second pop-up was held at the Kilcona Park OLA on December 2, 2017; and the third was held in the lobby of the Cindy Klassen Recreational Complex on December 7, 2017. These pop-up locations were chosen to allow the project team to engage a wide variety of residents, from OLA users, to dog owners, to members of the general public who do not have a vested interest in dogs or OLAs, but who utilize Winnipeg’s greenspaces and recreational facilities.

![Image of pop-up information booth](image_url)

**Figure 3: Pop-up Information Booth at Kilcona Park, December 2, 2017**

The pop-up booths consisted of a series of storyboards, which presented project background information, and members of the project team were available to discuss the project with the public, answer questions, and collect feedback. Project postcards were handed out, which included the project webpage’s URL.

Tablets were available at the pop-up booths, so participants could fill out the online survey and mapping tool. Paper surveys were also available. In total, only 10 paper surveys were collected for the three pop-ups, however, the public and stakeholders were highly encouraged to utilize the online engagement tools (2,190 individuals filled out the online survey). The results of the paper surveys have been compiled with the online survey results. Please see Section 4.4 of this report for more details). In total, the project team engaged approximately 190 individuals at the pop-up information booths.
Following the December 7, 2017, pop-up event, the information boards were displayed at the Winnipeg Humane Society from December 8 to December 22, 2017.

The pop-up information booth storyboards were posted on the project’s webpage and are included in Appendix C.
Below is a summary of some general comments noted from conversations with members of the public who visited the pop-up information booths:

- OLAs should not be located near parks geared towards children’s recreational activities;
- A membership system with a ‘swipe card’ could be developed to access Winnipeg’s OLAs. This could help pay for the development and maintenance of OLAs, mitigate ‘irresponsible’ users, and help ensure the dogs brought to OLAs are licensed and vaccinated;
- Animal Services should more closely monitor/police the prohibition of ‘restricted’ breeds within municipal boundaries, (i.e., pitbulls);
- The City’s existing ‘regional’ OLAs require more maintenance, especially after the spring melt;
- A potable water source should be available at all OLAs;
- OLAs should not be multi-use;
- The City should think about the allowance of ‘seasonal’ OLAs – (i.e., on the river in winter, and in golf courses);
- The OLAMP should include clear implementation policies, (i.e., to allow citizens to propose the establishment of OLAs in Winnipeg);
- A ‘regional’ OLA should be established in the City’s south-west quadrant to replace the Brenda Leipsic OLA, as it has been decreased in size; and
- The establishment of fences around OLAs and ‘single-use’ OLAs would be able to mitigate most of the issues experienced within/around OLAs.

4.4 SURVEY

A survey was developed to obtain feedback from the public to advise the development of the OLAMP. Specifically, the survey was designed to obtain information pertaining to:

- Issues currently experienced in parks and greenspaces in Winnipeg (including off-leash and non-off-leash areas);
- Which of the City’s OLAs are commonly visited, which are not, and the reasons why;
- Opportunities and trends related to dog use in parks and greenspaces in Winnipeg (including OLAs and non-OLAs); and
- The OLAMP vision and key values.

The surveys were created in two forms: paper and online. The paper survey was available at the pop-up information booths, and the online survey was available on the project webpage from November 3, 2017, to December 21, 2017. A significant amount of feedback and data was obtained from these online tools. In total, 2,196 responses were collected from the survey.

The following is a summary of the feedback obtained from the survey. A sample of the paper survey can be found in Appendix D.
4.4.1 Question 1: Dog Ownership

The online survey asked if respondents owned a dog or not. 2,197 respondents answered this question.
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**Figure 6: Survey Q1 - Do you own a dog?**

4.4.2 Question 2: Do You Visit the City’s OLAs?

The second survey question asked whether survey respondents visited Winnipeg’s current OLAs; 2,188 respondents answered this question; 1,929 of those respondents are dog owners and 259 of the respondents do not own a dog. If the survey participants noted that they do not visit the City’s OLAs, they were automatically directed to Question 13 of the survey.

![Pie chart showing OLAs visitation](image)

**Figure 7: Survey Q2 - Do you visit the City's OLAs?**
4.4.3 Question 3: OLA Visitation, Dates & Times

The third survey question asked which times and days users frequently visit the City’s OLAs, participants were asked to check off all answers that applied. A total of 6,976 answers were received by 1,658 survey respondents; 1,575 of those respondents are dog owners and 83 of the respondents do not own a dog. Based on the question’s responses. Weekend afternoons (from approximately 1 p.m. – 4 p.m.) is the most popular time to visit an OLA (67.8% of survey responses), with the second and third most popular OLA visitation times being weekend mornings (from approximately 9 a.m. – 12 p.m.) at 55.63% and weekdays after 6 p.m. and during noon hour at 49.39%.

Figure 8: Survey Q3 - What times and days do you typically visit OLAs?

4.4.4 Question 4: Why OLAs Are Used/Visited

Question 4 of the online survey asked respondents why they visit the City’s OLAs. This was an open-ended question that received 1,666 responses; 1,555 of those responses came from dog owners and 111 of the responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. Because this was an open-ended question, the responses were coded in order to determine the major themes which came from the respondents’ answers. The majority of answers contained multiples themes, in total 3,632 codes where applied to the 1,666 responses.
The following tables outline the major themes and sub-themes as to why respondents take their dogs to the City’s OLAs.

**Table 4: Survey Q4 Summary – Please explain why you visit the City’s OLAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses that Contained this Major Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical wellbeing/health of dog</strong></td>
<td>1 For exercise. 2 An area where my dog can run freely and explore. 3 OLAs are the only option to exercise certain breeds (large dogs, dogs with high-energy). 4 An easy way to exercise my dog, reducing the owners’ stress and saves time (especially for those with large and/or multiple dogs). 5 An easy way to ensure my dog is getting enough exercise as I am physically unable to provide them with the amount they need on-leash.</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunity to socialize (dogs and owners)</strong></td>
<td>1 For my dog to play with other dogs. 2 For myself to socialize with other dog owners and other people visiting the OLA. 3 To improve my dog’s socialization and behaviour. 4 To build trust/a relationship between myself and my dog. 5 A way for my dog and my children to interact as a family; a recreational outing. 6 The potential to meet other dog owners/dog walking groups</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensures fair treatment of dogs</strong></td>
<td>1 OLAs respect the freedom of dogs by giving them the chance to explore and run freely. 2 Give priority to dogs’ happiness and well-being, enables ‘dogs to be dogs’.</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dog-friendly environment</strong></td>
<td>1 Those who visit OLAs like being around dogs and enjoy watching them have fun. 2 OLAs prevent complaints from private property owners/people who don’t like dogs. 3 Less restriction regarding on-leash rules for dogs. 4 Less distractions/disruptions; owners do not have to worry about their dogs disturbing other park users such as cyclists/soccer players/etc. 5 OLAs provide ample space to run and are well-maintained.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>1 Safer than slippery sidewalks in the winter. 2 For those OLAs that are enclosed/partially enclosed/incorporate physical barriers: very safe places for dogs to run and play.</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of other options</strong></td>
<td>1 Only place in the city that allows my dog to be off-leash. 2 I don’t have any of my own space/property to exercise my dog (live in apartment, townhouse, downtown, have a small yard). 3 Stringent City by-laws, to avoid any fines.</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enjoyable experience</strong></td>
<td>1 Provide a new experience for dogs. 2 Allows dog and owner to enjoy the outdoors. 3 A great outdoor activity for both dog and owner.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can’t be categorized</strong></td>
<td>1 Visited OLA only because it was in my neighbourhood.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.5 Question 5: Why OLAs Are Not Used/Visited

Question 5 of the online survey asked respondents why they do not visit the City’s OLAs. Only those respondents that answered ‘no’ for Question 2 of the survey were provided with the opportunity to answer this question. As a result, only 426 respondents answered this open-ended question; 302 of those responses came from dog owners and 124 of the responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. Similar to Question 4, the responses were coded in order to determine major themes. The majority of answers contained multiples themes, in total 598 codes where applied to the 426 responses.

The following list describes the major themes and sub-themes as to why survey participants do not take their dogs to the City’s OLAs.

Table 5: Online Survey Q5 Summary – Please explain why you do not visit the City’s OLAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses that Contained this Major Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns</td>
<td>1 Have either witnessed or heard of dogs being attacked by aggressive dogs in OLAs.</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Used to go, but stopped after my dog was attacked.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Too many other poorly trained dogs (jumping onto other people/dogs at the OLA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 My dog has health issues (very old, poor vision, behavioural issues).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Fear of large dogs attacking the small dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Theme</td>
<td>Sub-Themes</td>
<td>No. of Responses that Contained this Major Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No OLA in the locality</td>
<td>Proximity/distance is an issue:</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Don’t have a car; 2. Owner has health issues; 3. Cannot afford the cost of fuel to drive to an OLA; and 4. My dog dislikes being in the car.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not own dogs</td>
<td>1. Not a dog owner.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate fencing</td>
<td>Inadequate fencing leads to potential dangers for dogs:</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Running into traffic; and 2. Running away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of comfort and amenities</td>
<td>1. OLAs unclean, dog excrement not picked up by owners. 2. Overcrowding (more potential for dog fights). 3. Dog is not comfortable going to OLAs. 4. Unpleaseant experience with irresponsible dog owners.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns untrained dog/tiny dog</td>
<td>1. My dog is too small and needs more training. 2. My dog is unfriendly and may create problems for others’ and their dogs.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are not in favor of OLAs</td>
<td>1. Worried about dog infections (not all dogs may be vaccinated). 2. Prefer a calm place to walk. 3. Scared of dogs, prefer going to parks where dog entry is prohibited. 4. Disagree with the idea of bringing strange dogs together, could potentially lead to dog fights. 5. OLAs do not offer anything different that the dog will enjoy. 6. OLAs are a waste of space, the natural environment, and money.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested, may visit in the future</td>
<td>1. I used to go, but no longer have a dog. 2. I was not aware of the City’s OLAs, but plan to visit in the future.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>1. No time. 2. Health conditions restricting the owner from taking dogs for a walk. 3. Do not want to take my kids to OLAs. 4. Do not see the need to take my dog to OLAs. 5. I have other options to exercise my dog (on-leash walks, my backyard).</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate information</td>
<td>1. Hearing about OLAs for the first time. 2. Have heard of OLAs, but do not know where they are located.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t be categorized</td>
<td>Answers included responses such as 1. ‘No particular reason’. 2. ‘I don’t know’. 3. ‘No use’.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.6 Question 6: Which of the City’s OLAs Are Most Visited

Question 6 of the online survey asked respondents which of the City’s OLAs they visit. Only those that answered ‘yes’ for Question 2 were able to answer this question. In total, 1,658 respondents answered this question; 1,555 of those responses came from dog owners and 111 of the responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. Respondents were permitted to provide multiple responses; as a result, 3,758 responses were received. Overall, Maple Grove (758 responses), Kilcona (698 responses), Charleswood Dog Park (674), and Little Mountain Park (599) are the City’s OLAs that are the most visited according to the responses received from this survey question.
4.4.7 Question 7: Site Specific Reasons Why OLAs Are Visited

Question 7 asked survey participants to provide feedback pertaining to the reasons why they specifically visit certain OLAs over others (i.e., this could include features such as proximity to home, ample parking, secure fencing, etc.). In total, 1,596 participants answered this question, and 3,739 answers were received; 1500 of those responses came from dog owners, and 96 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.

The following list describes the ‘major themes’ of why survey participants take their dogs to specific OLAs:

**Table 6: Survey Q7 Summary – Please explain the reasons why you visit certain OLAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLA</th>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Responses per OLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove Park</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 OLA more enclosed, feels safer. 3 Lots of variety/amenities: trails, puppy pen, forested area. 4 Access to water. 5 Nice large size.</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilcona Park</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 Large size. 3 Lots of amenities/path/trail system/topography. 4 Ample parking. 5 Meet friends there. 6 Far from home, but a nice change in scenery.</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleswood Dog Park</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 Lots of parking. 3 Fenced. 4 Pooling water/drainage not an issue. 5 Nice large size.</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mountain Park</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 Paths/trails. 3 Quieter setting. 4 Ample parking. 5 Large size.</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Park</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 Beautiful park. 3 Trees shade in the summer. 4 Lots of open space. 5 Ample parking. 6 Nice topography. 7 Opportunity for dogs to swim.</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 Forested and trails. 3 Nice size. 4 Feels like you aren’t in the city.</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourkevale Park</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home. 2 Parking. 3 Well lit after dark. 4 Near Assiniboine Park. 5 Can walk to in the winter over the river.</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.4.8 Question 8: Which OLAs Users Tend To Not Visit

Question 8 of the online survey asked respondents which of the City’s OLAs they tend to not visit. Only those that answered ‘yes’ for Question 2 were able to answer this question. In total, 1,231 respondents answered this question and 8,243 responses were received; 1,145 of those responses came from dog owners, and 86 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.

Overall, Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue (942 responses), Woodsworth Park (942 responses), Mazenod Park (935), and Westview Park (858) received the most responses to this question.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLA</th>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Responses per OLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Westview Park                    | 1 Close to home.  
                                     2 Great topography.  
                                     3 Great central location.  
                                     4 Great view of city.          | 152               |
| Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue OLA | 1 Proximity to home.  
                                     2 Close to friends.             | 90                |
| Mazenod Park                     | 1 Close to home.  
                                     2 Quiet.  
                                     3 More isolated.  
                                     4 Less dogs than other OLAs.    | 76                |
| Woodsworth Park                  | 1 Proximity to home.  
                                     2 Very quiet.  
                                     3 Nice pond with wildlife.      | 46                |

Figure 12: Survey Q8 – Which of the City’s OLAs do you tend not to visit
4.4.9 Question 9: OLA Improvements

Question 9 asked survey participants to provide feedback pertaining to potential upgrades to the City’s existing OLAs, which would encourage them to visit more often. Only those that answered ‘yes’ for Question 2 were able to answer this question. In total, 1,109 participants answered this question, and 6,825 answers were received; 1,054 of those responses came from dog owners, and 55 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.

The following list describes the ‘major themes’ describing the improvements that could be made to the City’s existing OLAs that would encourage visitation.

Table 7: Survey Q9 Summary – Please describe some improvements that could be made to the City’s existing OLAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLA</th>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Responses per OLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourkevale Park</td>
<td>1 Define boundary of OLA - Needs fencing.</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Increase size, currently too crowded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Develop barrier to protect from river.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Develop barrier to protect from bike path/community centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Road &amp; Silver Avenue OLA</td>
<td>1 Needs fencing (separate from traffic and wildlife).</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest</td>
<td>1 Needs fencing.</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Too wet/muddy – improve drainage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Increase parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Develop barrier to protect from rail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazenod Park</td>
<td>1 Develop barrier around retention pond (a health risk for dogs).</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Improve parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Improve barriers around park, too close to trucking route.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Incorporate more shelter from elements and more trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodsworth Park</td>
<td>1 Fence in OLA, protect from retention pond.</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Improve maintenance, i.e., garbage pickup.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westview Park</td>
<td>1 Improve maintenance, lots of glass and garbage on trails, lots of gopher holes.</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Fence-in OLA, conflicts between dogs and runners/cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Incorporate more garbage receptacles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Improve lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Incorporate shelter from elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Park</td>
<td>1 Improve by-law enforcement.</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Fence in OLA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Provide more direct access to OLA from parking lot, perhaps some off-leash paths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Improve signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLA</td>
<td>Major Themes</td>
<td>Responses per OLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilcona</td>
<td>1. Too busy. 2. Improve fencing. 3. Improve water quality issues/retention ponds. 4. Better separation from other park uses. <em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.</em></td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mountain Park</td>
<td>1. Improve by-law enforcement. 2. Incorporate off-leash trails. 3. Incorporate water source. 4. More garbage receptacles. 5. Improve parking area. 6. Improve signage. 7. Incorporate fenced in area for small dogs/puppies. <em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.</em></td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleswood Dog Park</td>
<td>1. Fence all sides of OLA – too close to sports fields and heavy traffic. 2. Incorporate water source. 3. Provide more garbage receptacles. 4. Improve lighting. 5. Improve by-law enforcement. <em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.</em></td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove Park</td>
<td>1. Incorporate more benches. 2. Incorporate water source. 3. More wood shavings/gravel to mitigate mud. 4. Improve signage. 5. All-season washrooms for humans. 6. Improve parking. 7. Increase size of OLA. <em>Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.</em></td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4.10 Question 10: Other Parks/Open Spaces in the City That People Enjoy Taking Their Dog(s)

Question 10 asked survey participants if there are other parks and/or open spaces in the city that they enjoy taking their dog. Only those that answered ‘yes’ for Question 2 were able to answer this question. In total, 1,512 participants answered this question; 1,421 of those responses came from dog owners, and 91 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.
4.4.11 Question 11: The Other Parks/Open Spaces That People Take Their Dogs in Winnipeg and Why

Question 11 asked survey participants where in the city they enjoy taking their dogs (other than the existing OLAs) and the reasons why. Only those that answered ‘yes’ for Question 2 were able to answer this question. In total, 1,057 participants answered this question; 1,019 of those responses came from dog owners, and 38 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. As this was a long-answer question, participants’ responses were coded by their major themes; in total, 2,216 codes were assigned to the 1,057 responses.

Some of the most common parks/open spaces (outside of the City’s existing OLAs) that survey respondents take their dogs include:

- A variety of community centres that allow dogs in their hockey pens in the summer months;
- Along the Red River in North Point Douglas;
- Assiniboine Forest;
- Assiniboine Park;
- Beaudry Park;
- Biroreserve in Transcona;
- Birds Hill Park;
- Bois Des Esprits;
- Canoe Club Golf Course;
- Churchill Park;
- Cindy Klassen Recreational Complex field;
- Crescentwood Community Club;
- Duff Roblin Trail;
- Fisher Park;
- Fraser’s Grove Park;
- Garden Drive Park;
- Harte Trail;
- Henteleff Park;
- Issac Brock Community Centre;
- Joe Malone Park;
- Kavanagh Park;
- Kildonan Park;
- Kildonan Park;
- La Barriere Park;
- Lagimodiere Park;
- Leicester Square Playground;
- Munson Park;
- Omands Creek;
- Open fields;
- Rosehill Park;
- Sage Creek Trails;
- Seine River Greenway Trails;
— St. Johns Park;
— St. Vital Park;
— The Floodway;
— The Forks;
— Transcona Trail;
— University of Manitoba;

— Various school yards in Winnipeg, a number of respondents specified they go very early in the day, or late when the yards are not occupied by students/sport teams;
— Vimy Ridge Park;
— Wellington Crescent pathway; and
— Whittier Park.

The second part of the question inquired why respondents take their dogs to the locations specified, the major themes and sub-themes were as follows:

Table 8: Survey Q11 Summary – Explain why you enjoy taking your dog to these locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
<th>Responses per Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>1 Convenient location (accessible by either car or foot).</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Availability of adequate parking options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>1 Proximity to home.</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 In the same neighbourhood where I live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Within walking distance from my home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort &amp; Amenities</td>
<td>1 Well-maintained space.</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Walkable area (trails/paths).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Not crowded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Open and good visibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Protected from cold winds in winter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Washroom facilities available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Recreation options for both children and dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Beautiful landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be categorized</td>
<td>1 Have not mentioned reasons.</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Do not want to disclose details of where they take their dog.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural beauty</td>
<td>1 Attractive, natural environment.</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Diversity in environment: river banks, wooded area, trails through forest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog-friendly environment</td>
<td>1 Opportunities to allow dogs off-leash (although illegal).</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— in winter/late evenings/off-school times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— in areas where no one complains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Many other dogs and dog-owners, opportunities to socialize and exercise dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large, open area</td>
<td>1 Enough space to allow dogs to run free/walk around without being bored.</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety reasons</td>
<td>1 Located away from traffic.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Dogs that visit the park/area are trained and have responsible owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Very few (or almost absence) of cyclists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Fenced park, no worry of dogs running into traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 No fear of dog-attacks, the park/area is visited by very few people/dogs (i.e., school grounds, hockey rinks, river banks).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>1 Take dogs where the rest of the family goes for an outing (whether an OLA or not).</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.12 Question 12: Reasons Why Respondents Do Not Take Their Dogs to Other Parks/Open Spaces in Winnipeg

Question 12 asked survey respondents to explain why they do not take their dogs to other parks and open spaces in the City outside of the City’s current OLAs. Only those that answered ‘yes’ for Question 2 were able to answer this question. In total, 441 respondents provided an answer to this question; 387 of those responses came from dog owners, and 54 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. The responses received were coded and categorized into major themes and sub-themes. In total, 578 codes were assigned to the 441 responses.

The major themes and sub-themes are as follows.

Table 9: Survey Q12 Summary – Explain why you do not take your dog to other parks and open spaces in Winnipeg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Responses per Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No dog-friendly options</td>
<td>Alternative options are not good for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  Cannot allow the dog to be off-leash, owners do not want to be penalized; and</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2  Dogs are not treated well everywhere, i.e., restricted entry, many people do not like dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less convenient</td>
<td>1  All other options are less convenient compared to the existing one (existing OLA is within locality of resident).</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2  Do not want to drive far/spend money on fuel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3  Dog-friendly options too far from home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low comfort and amenities</td>
<td>1  Unclean (dog excrement rarely picked up by owners).</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2  Poorly maintained in winter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3  Other options are not as comfortable as the location they currently take their dog(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--- Overcrowded/unnecessary arguments with other people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--- Cannot really enjoy due to additional street created (other users getting panicked by dogs or worry about dog’s safety).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4  Lack of scenery/natural beauty around.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>1  Lack of time to go with dogs.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2  Only the current option matches with tight work schedule.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3  Don’t want to go to other places (respondent likes the specific park they go to, unwilling to change).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4  Respondent would never think to take their dog to a new park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5  Respondent doesn’t want to go to an unfamiliar area (has established a relationship with people and dogs to come to the same park).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Major Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Responses per Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot be categorized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lives outside the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does not own a dog(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Location close to heavy traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Poorly trained, aggressive dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Irresponsible dog owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No separate area for smaller and larger dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dogs have poor recall and run away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate fencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only partially fenced/no fencing, leading to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dogs running into traffic; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fear of dogs running away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Did not know of any other OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10: Survey Q13 Summary – Explain your top three (3) concerns associated with Winnipeg’s existing OLAs**

**Major Themes**
- Overcrowding.
- Lack of fencing.
- Aggressive dogs.
- Safety for dogs/owners/non-dog owners.
- Traffic concerns.
- Conflicts between dog park users and other park users (sport teams, children playing, etc.).
- Lack of fresh water supply.
- Irresponsible dog owners/owners’ not properly monitoring their dogs.
- Conflicts between dogs and/or their owners.
- Lack of cleanliness/waste pickup.
- Conflicts between large and small dogs.
- Lack of enforcement.
- Lack of lighting and other amenities, (i.e., trails).
- Incompatible adjacent land uses.
- OLA accessibility – not accessible to all those who want to use them.
- Parking.
4.4.14 Question 14: Concerns in Dogs in Parks and Open Spaces

Question 14 asked whether participants had ever experienced any concerns regarding dogs in Winnipeg’s parks and open spaces. All survey participants were able to respond to this question, and in total, 1,830 responses were received; 1,630 of those responses came from dog owners, and 200 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.

![Figure 14: Survey Q14 – Have you experienced any concerns regarding dogs in Winnipeg's parks and open spaces?](image)

4.4.15 Question 15: Dog-Related Concerns Typically Experienced in Winnipeg

Question 15 asked survey participants to describe the dog-related concerns they have experienced in Winnipeg’s parks and open spaces. Only those respondents who answered ‘yes’ for question 14 where able to answer this question. As a result, 828 responses were received; 705 of those responses came from dog owners, and 123 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. The responses were coded into major themes and sub-themes. In total, 1,586 codes were applied to the 828 responses received.
### Table 11: Survey Q15 Summary – Please describe the concerns experienced regarding dogs in Winnipeg’s parks and open spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses per Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible Owners</td>
<td>1. No regard for other park users.</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Owners thinking that their dog is trained, but unable to control dog.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Owners consider aggressive behaviour as ‘playful’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Do not pick up after their dog.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Owners too busy socializing and not watching their dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Dogs left off-leash in OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Owners leaving dogs off-leash near the entrance of parks/parking areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Owners bringing large dogs to small parks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Owners bringing food items to parks for their dogs/children which could lead to dog fights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive Dogs</td>
<td>1. Dogs attacking other dogs and people.</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict- Between Various Users</td>
<td>1. Many park users do not like dogs.</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parents bringing children to OLAs and not supervising their children properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cyclists passing through OLAs to avoid longer routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dogs escaping the OLA areas into leashed areas due to lack of fencing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People BBQing near OLA areas, eating food where dogs play.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Off-leash dogs in non-OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dogs chasing kids/adults in non-OLA areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scared to go to certain areas because there are too many dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Some dog owners do not want their dog to mingle with other dogs or people (even inside OLAs).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Big breed dog owners vs. small breed dog owners (these conflicts are more evident in smaller places, or areas that are not fenced).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Trained Dogs</td>
<td>1. Inadequately trained/unruly dogs.</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dogs approach/jump onto people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Dogs chasing joggers and children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate Fencing</td>
<td>1. Dogs running into traffic.</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dogs with poor recall running away.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. No separation with parking areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Risk of dogs drowning (in close proximity to open fast moving water).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Comfort and Amenities</td>
<td>1. Inadequate dog-friendly options.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Existing parks and open spaces have several limitations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No clean drinking water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overcrowding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Too small to run freely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No washrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.16 Question 16: Key Values That Should Be Reflected in the City’s OLAMP

Question 16 presented survey participants with a series of key values that were identified by City staff and project stakeholders during the workshops held in the spring 2017 (see Sections 4.1.1 of 4.1.2 of this report for further details).

Survey participants were asked to rank these key values from most important to least important. All survey participants were able to provide answers to this question; in total 1,643 respondents provided an answer; 1,456 of those responses came from dog owners, and 187 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.

Key values, ranked from highest to lowest is as follows:

1. Accessibility;
2. Security – for dogs, their owners, and the general public/park users;
3. Sociability and training, for the dog;
4. Preservation of natural habitat;
5. Clarity of rules/education of users and non-users;
6. Management that reflects a balance of needs of all users;
7. Sociability, for the dog owner; and
8. Fiscal sustainability.
The following is a summary of the result of this question:

**Figure 15: Survey Q16 – Please rank ‘key’ values from most important to least important**

### 4.4.17 Question 17: Additional ‘Key Values’

Question 17 asked survey participants if they could provide any additional ‘key values’ that should be represented by Winnipeg’s OLAs; 349 survey participants provided answers to this question; 299 of those responses came from dog owners, and 50 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. The responses received for this question were coded and categorized into four major themes, which are described by various sub-categories.

**Table 12: Survey Q17 Summary – Additional key values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Additional’ Key Value</th>
<th>Important Points Raised/Additional Sub-themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses per Key Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dog friendly regulations/facilities      | 1. Giving priority to dogs in OLAs.  
<p>|                                          |   — OLAs should be a place for dogs and owners to have fun.                                                  | 75                            |
|                                          | 2. No aggressive animal enforcement.                                                                        |                               |
|                                          | 3. More options for OLAs and more amenities for dog recreation and safety.                                   |                               |
|                                          | 4. Relaxation of existing regulations to encourage dogownership.                                             |                               |
|                                          |   — Create a dog friendly environment to encourage the adoption of sheltered dogs.                           |                               |
|                                          | 5. Single-use parks for dogs (good for safety and better maintenance).                                       |                               |
|                                          | 6. Need for off-leash hours in certain greenspaces that are currently on-leash areas.                        |                               |
|                                          | 7. Educating people, making the public more aware of the rules and conduct of OLAs.                          |                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Additional' Key Value</th>
<th>Important Points Raised/Additional Sub-themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses per Key Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better OLA planning</td>
<td>Better planning of OLA location.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— More accessible OLAs (OLAs should accommodate needs of all categories of dog owners, include those who do not drive).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Locating OLAs in urban areas/established neighbourhoods may reduce urban sprawl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— OLAs should be connected by pedestrian routes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Planning for dogs’ safety from traffic (planning OLAs away from busy streets).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— OLAs should be functional in all seasons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Separate dog-friendly places from crowded locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Locate OLAs near greenspaces/water to enhance overall experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Locating OLAs away from trails and natural areas where others’ also would like to go vs. locating OLAs near greenspace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Locate OLAs away from residential areas or no-pet parks/away from traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Develop more small-size OLAs vs. large-size OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Better OLA planning to reduce conflict of interest between various users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Options to minimize conflict of interest between dog-owners’ while opening new OLAs (compatibility of OLAs to adjacent uses).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Do not convert well-used public spaces to OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Options such as division between spaces for small and large dogs (based on weight).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Include off-leash options downtown or inside the City, vs. interests of non-dog owners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Dog-owners vs. other OLA users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Dog-owners vs. neighbouring communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Single-use vs. multi-use spaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ensure information availability for better OLA management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Programs to train/educate dogs and their owners (for better handling of animals).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‏— Ensuring information is available to all visitors (on rules and regulation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional Key Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Additional' Key Value</th>
<th>Important Points Raised/Additonal Sub-themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses per Key Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High quality spaces</strong></td>
<td>Provide support to ensure OLAs are high-quality, interesting places to visit in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Measures to ensure comfort and amenities of all users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Biodegradable doggie bags.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Access to drinking water for dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— More exercise options for dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Well-maintained ponds and pools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Adequate lighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Waste and water solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Availability of bathroom facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Adequate landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved dog owner responsibility</strong></td>
<td>1 Initiatives to encourage good ownership: owners attend training programs for better handling of their pets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Encourage single-use OLAs so that owners are held to their responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Dog owners/OLA users must respect the interest of the communities where OLAs are located.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many participants included valuable feedback which could be categorized into the existing ‘key values’ as presented in Question 16. The table below identifies some of the important sub-themes that were raised by survey participants, tying them into the pre-existing key values.
### Table 13: Survey Q17 Summary – Other feedback received applicable to OLAMP’s existing key values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Existing’ Key Value (as presented in Question 16)</th>
<th>Important Points Raised/Additional Sub-themes</th>
<th>No. of Responses per Key Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>1 Safety of dogs.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Fenced and protected from traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Safety of dogs from possible dog fights (separate small and large breeds).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Safety of other people around.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management that reflects a balance of needs of all users</strong></td>
<td>1 OLAs should be designed to fit the needs of all park users.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 OLAs are a place for socialization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Planning OLAs as multi-use areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Respect the interests of all park users/residents when planning OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 OLAs encourage people to exercise and remain healthy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Communities that are adjacent to OLAs should have more say when it comes to OLA planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of Rules/Education of users and non-users</strong> (perhaps also include ‘Efficient Enforcement’)</td>
<td>7 Strict action against those who violate rules.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Compulsory registration of all park users to identify offenders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Restrict BBQing in OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Post rules and regulations in parks (i.e., signage such as ‘use at your own risk’).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 No unattended children in OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 No untrained dogs in OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Presence of enforcement personnel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of natural habitat</strong></td>
<td>1 Support of OLAs:</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— OLAs can be a way to strengthen human-nature connection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Dog parks can encourage environmental conservation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Against OLAs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Need to use and preserve the City’s limited greenspace efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— OLAs should be located away from trails and natural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— OLAs are likely to spoil natural greenspace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal sustainability</strong></td>
<td>1 Charge an annual fee for all users.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Collect funds from private companies to construct OLA facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Increase dog-licenses costs to cover the costs of OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Non-OLA users/non-dog owners should not have to pay for OLAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 4.4.18 Question 18: OLAMP Vision Statement

Question 18 presented a draft vision statement that was created based on feedback obtained during the City staff workshop and stakeholder workshop engagement events. This draft vision statement was presented as follows:
The Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan will guide the future location of off-leash dog areas in Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg envisions that future off-leash dog areas will provide safe, secure areas for dogs and their owners to enjoy, while ensuring that off-leash dog areas are located in parks and open spaces that protect, enhance, and balance the recreational needs of all park users in Winnipeg.

Survey participants were asked to provide their thoughts and/or adjustments to the draft vision statement as presented; 1,597 survey participants provided comments; 1,426 of those responses came from dog owners, and 173 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog.

Many respondents noted that the draft ‘vision’ was good and fair and provided no suggestion for it to be changed. The following is a summary of the comments obtained which suggested alterations to the draft statement:

- The use of language and emphasis on “safe and secure” tends to imply the use of barriers and fences with little or no emphasis on natural settings. The OLAs in Winnipeg are already very limited and I would not be in favour of limiting them any further. Other park users in Winnipeg have major parks solely dedicated to their use (St. Vital Park, Assiniboine Park) with no opportunity for off-leash pets;
- Why is there nothing in that "vision" to protect those afraid of dogs who also use parks?
- Maintaining access for all park users is of prime importance;
- Include the concepts that there should be a lot of them, spaced out for access to all;
- More emphasis on the responsibility of dog owners;
- There needs to be something put in place to "police" people that don't follow the rules of the OLAs;
- This should include a long term plan that is sustainable both financially and environmentally;
- The statement should emphasize that these parks should be a neighbourhood amenity (i.e., walkable, local), not just a small number of citywide "destinations" you have to drive to;
- The vision statement should recognize the need for city pet owners to have accessible locations to exercise their pets, and the positive impact this could have on instances of animals bring surrendered because they can't get enough exercise to behave properly in a home;
- Some parks should be off-leash just for dogs. No kids, no toboggans, no sports. Dogs are not just an add-on; and
- OLAs should be single user parks which will "provide safe, secure areas for dogs and their owners to enjoy".

### 4.5 ONLINE MAPPING TOOL

Along with the opportunity to allow stakeholders and the public to provide feedback about the OLAMP through the online survey, an online, interactive mapping tool was also developed to allow stakeholders and members of the public to identify: Locations in the city where an OLA is desired; locations where an OLA is not desired; and the locations of OLAs and other greenspaces dog owners are taking their dogs in comparison to where they reside.

Specifically, mapping tool participants were asked to locate the following on a map of Winnipeg:

- ‘Where I live’;
- ‘OLAs I walk to’;
- ‘OLAs I drive to’;
- ‘Other outdoor spaces where I take my dog(s)’;
- ‘Areas in the city where I would like to see an OLA’; and
- ‘Areas in the city where I would not like to see an OLA’.

The mapping tool was available on the project webpage from November 3, 2017 to December 21, 2017. In total, 250 individuals provided feedback through the mapping tool, leaving a total of 2,401 points. Participants were also encouraged to provide comments associated with the points they left on the maps.

Using the data collected from the online mapping tool, a series of four maps were created that present respondents’ data:

- Map 1 includes the data points of: ‘where I live’, ‘OLAs I walk to’ and ‘OLAs I drive to’ (Figure 16);
- Map 2 includes the data points which illustrate ‘areas in the city where I would like to see an OLA’ (Figure 17);
Map 3 includes the data points which illustrate ‘areas in the city where I would not like to see an OLA’ (Figure 18); and Map 4 includes the data points which illustrate ‘other outdoor spaces where I take my dog(s)’ (Figure 19).

The following summaries include general observations pertaining to the data points and comments that respondents left on the mapping tool.

### 4.5.1 Map 1: Where I Live & OLAs I Walk and Drive To

In total, this map includes 482 points; 185 points were left indicating where respondents live, 32 points indicate the OLAs that respondents walk to, and 265 points indicate OLAs that respondents drive to.

The ‘where I live’ data points, which are illustrated in dark blue on Map 1, appear to be well dispersed throughout Winnipeg, with the highest concentration appearing to be in the River Heights/Fort Rouge/Charleswood/Riverview areas. The lowest concentration of data points seem to appear in the North Kildonan and Lindenwoods/Whyte Ridge areas of the city, however, the data points left seem to indicate survey respondents have come from most, if not all, areas of Winnipeg.

The ‘OLAs I walk to’ data points, illustrated in light blue, are located on/near the following locations:

- Bonnycastle OLA;
- Bourkevale Park;
- Brenda Leipsic Park; and
- Westview Park.

A number of ‘OLAs I walk to’ data points were left on existing parks and greenspaces within Winnipeg that are not considered OLAs:

- Happyland Park;
- Jae Eadie Park;
- Open fields near Waverley West;
- St. John’s Park; and
- The Forks/Steven Juba Park.

The ‘OLAs I drive to’ data points are illustrated in purple on map one. These points were located on/near the following locations:

- Bourkevale Park OLA;
- Brenda Leipsic Park;
- Charleswood Dog Park;
- Kilcona Park OLA;
- King’s Park OLA;
- Little Mountain Park OLA;
- Maple Grove Park OLA;
- Mazenod Park; and
- Woodsworth Park.

A number of ‘OLAs I drive to’ data points were left on existing parks and greenspaces within Winnipeg that are not considered OLAs:

- Assiniboine Park;
- Crescent Drive Park;
- Open space behind Kildonan Place;
- The Floodway; and
- Transcona Bioreserve.
Additional feedback of note that was included with the data points on this map:

- Would be nice to have some fenced in OLAs;
- There is plenty of greenspace nearby along Tache, south of La Verendrye used by people for recreation. This greenspace is used less often, and is a little more out of the way, perfect for an OLA right across from numerous existing and planned condominium developments; and
- School fields could be used as OLAs during the summer months.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- Most OLA users access the OLAs by driving to them, rather than walking to them.
- The OLAs that are accessed most frequently by pedestrians are the ‘neighborhood’ and ‘community’ OLAs, and the City’s only ‘single-use’ OLA (Bonnycastle).
- Many dog owners are taking their dogs on ‘off-leash’ walks in non-designated areas, which could indicate that the current OLAs are too overcrowded, not convenient/accessible in relation to where they live, or unpleasant.

4.5.2 Map 2: Areas Where I Would Like To See an OLA

In total, this map included 719 data points. Overall, data points were evenly dispersed throughout the city, many of which were left on/nearby existing greenspaces, including: Assiniboine Park and many of the City’s parks located along the Red River, such as La Barriére Park, the Trappist Monastery Provincial Heritage Park, St. Vital Park, Henteleff Park, Crescent Drive Park, Churchill Drive Park, Lyndale Drive Park, Whittier Park, Steven Juba Park, St. John’s Park and Kildonan Park.

Dividing the City up into quadrants, other common locations of these data points included:

**North-west:**
- Various neighbourhood parks dispersed through the quadrant;
- Sturgeon Creek Park;
- Rod’s Football Field;
- Cindy Klassen Recreational Complex Field;
- Vimy Ridge Park;
- Central Park;
- Old Exhibition Grounds;
- Various community centre fields; and
- Open space adjacent to Amber Trails/West Kildonan Industrial area.

**North-east:**
- Various neighbourhood parks dispersed through the quadrant;
- Chalmers Park;
- Keenleyside Park;
- Civic Park; and
- Various community centre fields.

**South-west:**
- Assiniboine Forest;
- Marj Edy Park;
- Frederick Heubach Park (Park Boulevard);
— Munson Park;
— Fort Rouge Park; and
— Various neighbourhood parks dispersed through the quadrant.

**South-east:**
— Various small parks and greenspaces along the Seine River;
— St. Boniface Golf Club;
— King George Park;
— Bois des-esprits;
— Dakota Park;
— Various small parks dispersed through the quadrant; and
— Various community centres.

Additional feedback of note that was included with the data points on this map:
— Fenced OLAs are preferred;
— OLAs should not be located nearby children’s play areas/athletic fields;
— Part of the winter river walk could become an OLA; and
— OLAs could be included on golf courses in the winter.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**
— Respondents desire to have a number of small OLAs well-dispersed throughout the city’s existing/established neighbourhoods.
— The location of data points on major greenspaces (such as Assiniboine Park, Assiniboine Forest, and Kildonan Park), as well as small parks/greenspaces in the city, such as neighbourhood parks, indicate that OLA users would like to have a diverse variety of OLAs to visit, rather than just large/regional OLAs or small/neighbourhood/community OLAs.

---

**4.5.3 Map 3: Areas Where I Do Not Want To See an OLA**

In total, this map included 840 data points. Overall, the data points, similar to Map 2, were evenly dispersed throughout the city, many of which were left on/nearby existing greenspaces. Comparing Maps 2 and Maps 3, the data points that indicate where respondents would like to see an OLA, there are data points marking the same locations that denote the locations of where other respondents do not want to see an OLA.

This indicates that although there is tremendous support for the development or more OLAs in Winnipeg of varying kinds, there is also a fair amount of opposition and apprehension for the development of more OLAs in the Winnipeg.

**GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**
General comments/feedback of note that were included with these data points are as follows:
— Parks that are highly used by families during all seasons are at capacity already, and should not include an OLA;
— OLAs should not be located near family picnic areas;
— OLAs should not be located in areas where they could disturb wildlife/natural habitats;
— Garbage pickup/uncleanliness is a general concern as to why some respondents do not want more OLAs in the city;
— Many respondents want to be able to use parks without the risk of a dog running up to them – they want to be able to recreate in parks with a certain level of comfort; and
Many respondents are afraid of additional parking/traffic congestion associated with the development of new OLAs.

4.5.4 Map 4: Other Outdoor Spaces I Take My Dog(s)

In total, Map 4 included 360 data points. Overall, data points were evenly dispersed throughout the city, many of which were left on/nearby existing greenspaces, including: Assiniboine Park and many of the City’s parks located along the Red River, such as La Barriere Park, the Trappist Monastery Provincial Heritage Park, St. Vital Park, Henteleff Park, Crescent Drive Park, Churchill Drive Park, Lyndale Drive Park, Whittier Park, Steven Juba Park, St. John’s Park and Kildonan Park.

The data points participants left on Map 2 and Map 4 are very similar; survey respondents are taking their dogs to the majority of parks and greenspaces in Winnipeg, particularly those that are located along rivers and creeks, providing the dog and owner with the opportunity to enjoy Winnipeg’s naturalized areas.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Owners are willing to drive to a location to take their dogs for a walk if the destination provides some additional benefit, (i.e., enjoyment of naturalized areas, trails, diverse terrain, etc).

General comments/feedback of note that were included with these data points are as follows:

- A number of respondents left data points on ‘underutilized park spaces’ and noted that the development of an OLA in this space could help increase comfort and decrease crime in the area;
- Areas in the city with greater residential density, (i.e., Waterfront Drive, Downtown, Osborne area should have more enclosed OLAs);
- Respondents desire to have more OLA-trails in OLAs throughout the city; and
- OLAs could be developed in other underutilized greenspace in the City (that couldn’t be used by children/sports teams), such as riverbanks.
5 CONCLUSION

The feedback collected from City staff, project stakeholders, and members of the public throughout the engagement phase of the OLAMP provides valuable insight into the OLAMP study. This OLAMP Engagement Summary will be used as a reference tool to guide the development of the policies which will form the OLAMP final document.

Once the OLAMP is drafted, it will be available for stakeholder and public review. An online survey will be created to allow stakeholders and the public to provide the project team with feedback regarding the draft Plan. This public and stakeholder feedback will be considered when making adjustments to the final OLAMP, which will be formally adopted by Council.
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PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS
The City of Winnipeg is developing an **Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan** to address and respond to, the growing interest and demand for off-leash dog areas in Winnipeg. The plan will address the needs of all park users and, develop a vision and implementation strategy for off-leash dog areas throughout Winnipeg.

**For more information visit winnipeg.ca/OffLeashAreas**

**Project contact:**
Brittany Shewchuk, Public Engagement Lead
Phone: 204-943-3178    Email: brittany.shewchuk@wsp.com
La Ville de Winnipeg est en train de mettre sur pied un **plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté afin** de répondre à l’intérêt et à la demande grandissants pour de tels espaces à Winnipeg. Le plan répondra aux besoins de tous les usagers et usagères des parcs et présentera une vision et une stratégie de mise en application visant les terrains pour chiens en liberté de Winnipeg.

Pour plus de renseignements, rendez-vous sur **www.winnipeg.ca/francais/ppd/PublicEngagement/OffLeashAreas/**

Project contact:
Brittany Shewchuk, Public Engagement Lead
Phone: 204-943-3178   Email: brittany.shewchuk@wsp.com
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

The City of Winnipeg invites you to the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan Pop-Up Information Booth. The Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan is being developed to address and respond to the growing interest and demand for off-leash dog areas in Winnipeg. The Plan will address the needs of all park and public open space users, and will include a vision and implementation strategy for off-leash dog areas throughout Winnipeg.

Please visit the Pop-Up Information Booth to learn more about the project!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, November 25, 2017</td>
<td>11 a.m. – 1 p.m.</td>
<td>Animal Services, photos with Santa Event, 1057 Logan Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, December 2, 2017</td>
<td>10 a.m. – 12 p.m.</td>
<td>Kilcona Off-Leash Dog Park, parking lot off McIvor Ave., 1229 Springfield Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, December 7, 2017</td>
<td>4 p.m. – 6 p.m.</td>
<td>Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex, front hall, 999 Sargent Ave.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information about the project and to take our online survey, visit us at: [winnipeg.ca/offleashareas](http://winnipeg.ca/offleashareas)

For those who require alternate formats or ASL interpretation in order to participate, please contact [Brittany.Shewchuk@wsp.com](mailto:Brittany.Shewchuk@wsp.com).
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CITY AND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP WORKBOOKS
Name: 
Group: 

Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan 
City Staff Workshop Guide 
April 19th, 2017
Purpose of the Workshop

The purpose of the City Staff Workshop is to obtain feedback on current off leash facilities in Winnipeg, the issues that are currently being experienced with existing off-leash sites, and the identification of potential off-leash site selection criteria.

Workshop Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Activity &amp; Details</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:45 – 9:00</td>
<td>Project Introduction Presentation</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:35</td>
<td>Activity 1: Visioning &amp; Key Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Task A</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Task B</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Report Back</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35 – 10:15</td>
<td>Activity 2: Identification of Issues to Inform Potential Location Criteria</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Task A</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Report Back</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 - 10:30</td>
<td>Refreshment Break</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:30</td>
<td>Activity 3: Off-Leash Areas Criteria Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Task A</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Task B</td>
<td>25 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Report Back</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 11:55</td>
<td>Activity 4: Identification of Informal Off-Leash Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Task A</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Report Back</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:55 – 12:00</td>
<td>Workshop Wrap Up</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Instructions

Welcome to the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan City Staff Workshop. This workbook outlines the activities that will be facilitated in today’s workshop in order to gather important information for the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan.

Each activity will be facilitated in groups; each group shall select a recorder, and each will be assigned a facilitator who is a member of the project team.

Facilitators Role:

- Lead the group introductions at your table.
- Lead the group activities, ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to speak and share their opinions.
- Encourage individuals who may not be as vocal to share their thoughts and ideas.
- Review the content included in the workshop booklet with your group.
- Encourage everyone to document their ideas on the large maps provided where applicable.

Recorders Role:
- Record your group’s ideas on the flip chart provided.
- Encourage everyone to document their ideas on the large maps provided where applicable.
- Present a summary of your group’s discussions back to the larger group at the end of each activity.

Expectations/obligations of Participants:
- Speak one at a time – avoid side conversations.
- Listen to understand.
- Allow everyone a chance to speak.
- Be respectful of everyone’s comments.
- Share ideas and ask questions – no idea or question is too ‘basic’.
- Stay within the scheduled activity timelines.
- Balance what is important to you with consideration of what is important to others.
- Set technology to ‘silent mode’.
Activity 1: Visioning & Key Values (35 mins)

Task A (15 mins):
As a group, brainstorm a set of ‘key values’ or principles you would like to see the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan study represent? Please think about what you hope this study will accomplish.
Record your answers on the flip chart provided.

Task B (10 mins):
Considering the ‘key values’ or principles as identified in Activity 1, Task A, as a group, please develop a concise vision statement for the Master Plan.
This vision statement should represent your vision for off-leash areas in Winnipeg.
Your group’s vision statement could capture how off-leash areas should fit into/work within existing City parks and open spaces, and how these off-leash area users shall cooperate with other various park and open space recreational users.
Record your answers on the flip chart provided.

Report Back (10 mins):
Please have the group recorder share a summary of your group’s responses for Activity 1.
Activity 2: Identification of Issues to Inform Potential Location Criteria

Task A (30 mins):

A component of the final Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan will be the identification and evaluation of off-leash area location selection criteria that will be used by the City of Winnipeg to determine the future locations of off-leash areas.

Location selection criteria may consider:

- Parking requirements
- Adjacent land uses
- Street frontage
- Population density
- Dog license/registration density
- Existing parks & open spaces
- Publicly owned or leased lands (other than parks or public reserve)
- Existing locations of ‘informal’ off-leash areas
- Terrain/topography
- Waterbodies
- Noise
- Conflicts with shared park uses/adjacent land uses
- Mitigation of other issues currently being experience in off-leash dog areas

As a group, identify criteria that will be important to consider when selecting future locations for off-leash dog areas in Winnipeg. The selection criteria identified should work to mitigate the issues that are currently experienced in/around Winnipeg’s off-leash areas.

When completing this task, please consider the off-leash dog area hierarchy as outlined in Spearman’s Report (regional, community, neighbourhood, and single-use). Criteria for each of these types of off-leash dog areas may differ.

Record your ideas and thoughts on the flip chart provided.

Report Back (10 mins):

Please have the group recorder share a summary of your group’s responses for Activity 2.

Refreshment Break (15 mins)
Activity 3: Off-Leash Area Criteria Evaluation

Task A (25 mins):

Your group will be assigned a ‘regional’ off-leash dog area.

Please determine if this ‘regional’ off-leash dog area meets the criteria your group identified in Activity 2, Task A.

Please note:

- Does your criteria align with the ‘regional’ dog park location and its configuration?
  - If not, what’s missing?
- Are there issues that need to be mitigated pertaining to this ‘regional’ off-leash dog area that the criteria did not capture, but should?
  - What criteria should be included to capture these issues?

Please record your answers on the flip chart, and utilize the aerial photos and maps provided to illustrate any areas of conflict/issue within this ‘regional’ off-leash area.

Task B (25 mins):

Your group will be assigned a ‘community’ or ‘neighbourhood’ off-leash area.

Please determine if this ‘community’ or ‘neighbourhood’ off-leash dog area meets the criteria your group identified in Activity 2, Task A.

Please note:

- Does your criteria align with the ‘community’ or ‘neighbourhood’ dog park location and its configuration?
  - If not, what’s missing?
- Are there issues that need to be mitigated pertaining to this ‘community’ or ‘neighbourhood’ off-leash dog area that the criteria did not capture, but should?
  - What criteria should be included to capture these issues?

Please record your answers on the flip chart, and utilize the aerial photos and maps provided to illustrate any areas of conflict/issue within this ‘community’ or ‘neighbourhood’ off-leash area.

Report Back (10 mins):

Please have the group recorder share a summary of your group’s responses for Activity 3.
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan
Stakeholder Workshop Guide
June 1, 2017
Purpose of the Workshop

The purpose of the Stakeholder Workshop is to develop a vision and key values for the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan, obtain feedback on the current issues being experienced in Winnipeg pertaining to off-leash dog use, and obtain input for the development of off-leash site area selection criteria for the location of future off-leash dog areas.

Workshop Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Activity &amp; Details</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 – 6:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Workshop Introduction &amp; Presentation</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15 – 6:20 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 1 – Visioning &amp; Key Values: Presentation</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20 – 6:40 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 1 – Visioning &amp; Key Values: Group Work</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40 – 6:55 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 1 – Visioning &amp; Key Values: Report Back</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:55 – 7:10 p.m.</td>
<td>Refreshment Break</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 – 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 2 - Identification of Issues: Group Work</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 – 7:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 2 - Identification of Issues: Report Back</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45 – 7:55 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 3 – Site Selection Criteria: Presentation</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:55 – 8:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 3 – Site Selection Criteria: Group Work</td>
<td>20 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15 – 8:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Activity 3 – Site Selection Criteria: Report Back</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Instructions

Welcome to the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan Stakeholder Workshop. This workbook outlines the activities that will be facilitated in today’s workshop in order to gather important background information for the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan.

Each activity will be facilitated in groups; each group shall select a recorder, and each will be assigned a facilitator who is a member of the project team.

Facilitators Role:

- Lead the group introductions at your table.
- Lead the group activities, ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to speak and share their opinions.
- Encourage individuals who may not be as vocal to share their thoughts and ideas.
- Review the content included in the workshop booklet with your group.
- Encourage everyone to document their ideas on the large maps provided where applicable.

Recorders Role:

- Record your group’s ideas on the flip chart provided.
- Encourage everyone to document their ideas on the large maps provided where applicable.
Present a summary of your group’s discussions back to the larger group at the end of each activity if comfortable doing so, otherwise the facilitator can present.

Expectations/obligations of participants:

- Speak one at a time – avoid side conversations.
- Listen to understand.
- Allow everyone a chance to speak.
- Be respectful of everyone’s comments.
- Share ideas and ask questions – no idea or question is too ‘basic’.
- Stay within the scheduled activity timelines.
- Balance what is important to you with consideration of what is important to others.
- Set technology to ‘silent mode’.

Please review the questions carefully and answer them as a group. All participants are encouraged to mark-up the table maps as provided.
Activity 1: Visioning & Key Values (40 mins)

Visioning & Key Values Presentation (5 mins)

Task A (10 mins):
As a group, please brainstorm a set of ‘key values’ or principles you would like to see the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan represent? In determining the set of ‘key values’, please think about what you hope this study will accomplish.

Record your answers on the flip chart provided.

Task B (10 mins):
Referencing the sample Vision statements as presented, and considering the ‘key values’ your group determined in Task A, please develop a concise vision statement for Winnipeg’s off-leash areas to be included in the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan.

Your group’s vision statement could capture how off-leash areas should fit into/work within existing City parks and open spaces, and how these off-leash area users shall cooperate with other various park and open space recreational users.

Record your answers on the flip chart provided.

Report Back (15 mins):
Please have the group recorder read a summary of your group’s responses for Activity 1.

Refreshment Break (15 mins)
**Activity 2: Identification of Issues Associated with Current Off-Leash Areas (35 mins)**

A component of the final Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan will be the identification and evaluation of off-leash area location selection criteria that will be used by the City of Winnipeg to determine the future locations of off-leash areas.

In order to develop well-informed site selection criteria, it is important to understand the issues currently associated with off-leash dog use in parks and other open spaces within Winnipeg.

**Task A (15 mins):**

As a group, please identify all of the issues that you/your organization experiences that are associated with off-leash dogs in parks and other open space areas within Winnipeg.

Using the map provided, identify the locations of where these issues occur/are most prevalent. Describe the issues on the flip chart provided.

These issues could be associated with:

- Noise
- Odour
- Incompatible adjacent uses, i.e.: daycares, residential areas, high traffic volumes
- Parking
- Other park users, such as sports/recreational groups
- Safety

**Task B (5 mins):**

Each member of your group has been provided with three (3) dot stickers. Please place a dot next to the issues that are most important/most significant to you. Please place each of the three dots on separate issues.

Once all of the dots have been placed, please have the table recorder tabulate the total number of dots next to each issue.

On the flip chart, please list the top three (3) issues that received the most dots.

**Report Back (15 mins):**

Please have the group recorder read a summary of your group’s responses for Activity 2.
Activity 3: Off-Leash Area Selection Criteria Development (45 mins)

Site Selection Criteria Presentation (10 mins)

Task A (20 mins):
Referencing the example criteria as presented, and the issues your group outlined in Activity 2, please develop a series of site selection criteria that pertains to the type of off leash area your group has been assigned (regional, community, neighbourhood, single-use).

Please ensure that the site selection criteria you develop will help select future off-leash areas that mitigate the conflicts/issues that were identified in Activity 2.

Record your ideas on the flip chart. If you think that some of your criteria may apply to a variety, or specific, off-leash area types (regional, community, neighbourhood, single-use), please note this on the flip chart.

Report Back (15 mins):
Please have the group recorder read a summary of your group’s responses for Activity 3.
APPENDIX
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POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH STORY BOARDS
The City of Winnipeg is developing an **Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan** to address, and respond to, the growing interest and demand for off-leash dog areas (OLAs) in Winnipeg.

This plan will address the needs of all park users, and will develop a vision, site location criteria, and an implementation strategy for OLAs around Winnipeg.

**The plan will:**

- Define a vision, goals, and objectives for OLAs in Winnipeg.
- Confirm site sizing and location criteria as defined in the City’s existing *Guidelines for Off Leash Dog Parks In the City of Winnipeg (2012)*.
- Develop additional OLA criteria pertaining to site selection, shared-use facilities, implementation, maintenance, etc.
- Identify policy constraints and make recommendations for change.

**History of OLAs in Winnipeg:**

In 2012, a *Guidelines for Off Leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg* report was developed. In 2014, the Public Service recommended further research be conducted into OLAs, supported by a comprehensive public engagement process.

The plan will build on the City’s 2012 report, and incorporate additional research and recommendations informed by a comprehensive public engagement process.
The Guidelines for Off Leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg report determined four types of OLAs:

**Regional OLA:**
- At least 8 ha in size
- 7.5 km catchment area (~20 min drive)
- On-site parking
- Site amenities should include, information booth, site furnishings, signage, potentially a water source
- Pathway extensions, trails, open grassed area

**Community OLA:**
- 2 to 8 ha in size, to be located where a ‘regional’ area is unfeasible
- 3.75 km catchment area (~10 min drive)
- On-site parking
- Site amenities should include signage, information booth, site furnishings, and waste receptacles
- Pathway extensions and/or open grassed area

**Neighbourhood OLA:**
- 0.5 to 1 ha in size
- 1 km catchment area (~5 min drive/20 min walk)
- Parking not a requirement
- Limited amenities such as site furnishings, signage and waste receptacles
- Open grassed area

**Single Use Site OLA:**
- 0.25 to 0.75 ha in size
- Frequented by pedestrian users
- Parking not a requirement
- Very few amenities: signage, waste receptacles
- Fenced in open area, much like a ‘dog run’
The City of Winnipeg currently operates 10 OLAs within the City of Winnipeg Parks system.

### Regional Facilities (>8 ha)
- Kilcona Park: 48.78 ha
- Maple Grove Park: 12.92 ha
- Charleswood Dog Park: 8.22 ha
- Little Mountain Park: 8.42 ha

### Community Facilities (1 – 8 ha)
- Mazenod Park: 6 ha
- King’s Park: 4.41 ha
- Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue: 4.03 ha
- Westview Park: 4 ha
- Brenda Leipsic Park (Temporary Location): 17 ha

### Neighbourhood Facilities (< 1 ha)
- Woodsworth Park: 0.83 ha
- Bourkevale Park: 0.28 ha
- Bonnycastle Park: in development
- Devonshire Park: in development

The City’s 2012 report determines catchment areas for three types of OLAs that currently exist within Winnipeg. Currently there are no ‘single-use’ OLAs in Winnipeg.

### Catchment Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities Type</th>
<th>Radius</th>
<th>Drive Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Facilities</td>
<td>7.5 km</td>
<td>20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>3.75 km</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Facilities</td>
<td>1 km</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT DO YOU THINK?**

» Using a sticky note, please comment on the catchment areas of the City’s current OLAs.

Would you walk 20 minutes to a neighbourhood OLA?  
Would you drive 10 minutes to a community OLA and/or 20 minutes to a regional OLA?  
Do these catchment areas meet your expectations? Are they too large or too small?

Place sticky notes here.
Existing OLA Catchment Areas

Legend:
OLA-Catchment Area
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Proposed Neighbourhood Site

Map Features:
- Kilcona Park
- Maple Grove Park
- Charleswood Dog Park
- Little Mountain Park
- Macdonald Park
- King’s Park
- Sturgeon Road
- Westview Park
- Brenda Langton Park (Temporary Location)
- Woodsworth Park
- Bourkevale Park
- Bonnycastle Park (In Development)
- Devonshire Park (In Development)
- Dufferin Park
- Existing OLA Catchment Areas
Common issues that have been identified for OLAs include:

- Parks only accessible by car
- Nearby elementary/high schools
- Over-use
- Limited sightlines
- Conflicts with other park users, i.e. cyclists, sports
- Environmental issues, i.e.: standing water, contamination
- Noise
- Odour
- Traffic
- Proximity to athletic fields and playgrounds

The following are some best practices for OLAs from other cities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>Denver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>» OLAs should accommodate multi-use functions in public parks</td>
<td>» Must be a minimum of 100 ft. from a children’s playground/children’s facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Include OLAs as a key consideration in park planning for established and new communities</td>
<td>» No arterial streets within 200 ft. unless fully fenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Must be at least 0.5 ha in size</td>
<td>» Location must be informed by a comprehensive public engagement strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» Location must be informed by a comprehensive public engagement strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrey</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>» OLAs located to sites commonly adjacent to people engaged in sport/active recreational uses will be fully enclosed with a 1.2 m fence and double entry gates to minimize conflict</td>
<td>» Preferred adjacent land uses: commercial, municipal facilities, employment zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>» ‘Neighborhood’ OLAs do not require parking</td>
<td>» Preferred land use types: open space, transportation/infrastructure/utility ROWs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>» Comprehensive public engagement undertaken for each new OLAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>» Winter OLA considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>» The site cannot be a designated natural area or wildlife habitat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT DO YOU THINK?**

» Using a sticky note, please comment on the following question.

What are some criteria or standards that you think are important to consider when locating OLAs? Place sticky notes here.
PLAN DIRECTEUR SUR LES TERRAINS POUR CHIENS EN LIBERTÉ

ÉVÉNEMENT SPONTANÉ

www.winnipeg.ca/francais/ppd/PublicEngagement/OffLeashAreas
La Ville de Winnipeg est en train de mettre sur pied un plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté (TCL) afin de répondre à l’intérêt et à la demande grandissants pour de tels espaces à Winnipeg.

Le plan directeur répondra aux besoins de tous les usagers et usagères des parcs et présentera une vision, des critères d'emplacement et une stratégie de mise en application visant les TCL à Winnipeg.

**Le plan:**
- définira une vision et des objectifs pour les TCL à Winnipeg;
- confirmera les critères de taille et d'emplacement conformément aux lignes directrices existantes sur les Parcs pour chiens en liberté de la Ville de Winnipeg (2012);
- déterminera des critères supplémentaires pour les TCL en ce qui concerne le choix de l'emplacement, les installations à utilisation partagée, la mise en œuvre, l'entretien, etc.;
- identifiera les contraintes relatives aux politiques et émettra des recommandations de changement.

**Histoire des TCL à Winnipeg:**
En 2012, un rapport intitulé Guidelines for Off-Leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg (lignes directrices sur les parcs pour chiens en liberté de la Ville de Winnipeg) a été rédigé. En 2014, l'administration municipale a recommandé de poursuivre les recherches dans le domaine des TCL en s'appuyant sur un processus de participation publique complet.

Le plan s’appuiera sur le rapport rédigé par la Ville en 2012 et inclura d’autres recherches et recommandations fondées sur un processus de participation publique complet.

**Calendrier du projet**
- **Février 2017**: Début du projet
- **Mai 2017**: Ateliers communautaires
- **Été/Automne 2017**: Participation publique : guichets de renseignements, sondage en ligne et outil de cartographie
- **Été/Automne 2017**: Élaboration du plan et des politiques
- **Automne - Hiver 2017**: Partage des ébauches du plan et des politiques
- **Été/Automne 2017**: Collecte de renseignements
- **De février à avril**: Participation publique : guichets de renseignements, sondage en ligne et outil de cartographie
- **Été/Automne 2017**: Élaboration du plan et des politiques
- **Début 2018**: Soumission du plan final
Le rapport Guidelines for Off-Leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg a identifié quatre types de TCL :

**TCL régionaux :**
- Superficie : au moins 8 ha
- Zone desservie : 7,5 km (environ 20 min en voiture)
- Stationnement sur place
- Les installations sur place doivent inclure un guichet de renseignements, du mobilier sur place, de la signalisation et éventuellement un point d’eau.
- Sentiers et zone ouverte gazonnée

**TCL communautaires :**
- Superficie : de 2 à 8 ha, dans des emplacements où il est impossible d’avoir un terrain régional.
- Zone desservie : 3,75 km (environ 10 min en voiture)
- Stationnement sur place
- Les installations sur place devraient inclure de la signalisation, un guichet de renseignements, de l’ameublement sur place et des poubelles
- Sentiers ou zone ouverte gazonnée

**TCL de quartier :**
- Superficie : de 0,5 à 1 ha
- Zone desservie : 1 km (environ 5 min en voiture ou 20 min à pied)
- Stationnement non requis
- Peu de mobilier sur place, de signalisation et de poubelles
- Zone ouverte gazonnée

**TCL sur site à usage unique :**
- Superficie : de 0,25 à 0,75 ha
- Fréquenté par les piétons
- Stationnement non requis
- Très peu d’installations : signalisation et poubelles
- Terrain ouvert clôturé, très semblable à un parcours pour chien
À l’heure actuelle, la Ville de Winnipeg exploite 10 TCL au sein de son réseau de parcs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrains régionaux (&gt;8 ha)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilcona Park</td>
<td>48,78 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Grove Park</td>
<td>12,92 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleswood Dog Park</td>
<td>8,22 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mountain Park</td>
<td>8,42 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrains communaux (1 à 8 ha)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mazenod Park</td>
<td>6 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Park</td>
<td>4,41 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Road et Silver Avenue</td>
<td>4,03 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westview Park</td>
<td>4 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Leipsic Park (emplacement temporaire)</td>
<td>17 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrains de quartier (&lt; 1 ha)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodsworth Park</td>
<td>0,83 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourkevale Park</td>
<td>0,28 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnycastle Park</td>
<td>en construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire Park</td>
<td>en construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Le rapport de la Ville, datant de 2012, détermine les zones desservies de trois types de TCL existant à l’heure actuelle à Winnipeg. Il n’y a pour le moment pas de TCL « à usage unique » à Winnipeg.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones desservies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrains régionaux</td>
<td>7,5 km radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrains communaux</td>
<td>3,75 km radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrains de quartier</td>
<td>1 km de rayon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QU’EN PENSEZ-VOUS?**

» Si vous avez des commentaires à faire sur les zones desservies des TCL actuels de la Ville, veuillez nous en faire part à l’aide d’un feuillette adhésif.

Marcheriez-vous pendant 20 minutes pour vous rendre à un TCL de quartier?  
Conduiriez-vous 10 minutes pour vous rendre à un TCL communautaire ou 20 minutes pour vous rendre à un TCL régional?  
Ces zones desservies répondent-elles à vos attentes? Sont-elles trop grandes ou trop petites?

Collez les feuillets adhésifs ici.
Les problèmes communs ayant été identifiés pour les TCL comprennent :

- Les parcs uniquement accessibles en automobile
- La proximité d’écoles élémentaires ou secondaires
- La fréquentation excessive
- Les lignes de visibilité réduites
- Les conflits avec les autres personnes qui fréquentent les parcs, comme les cyclistes et autres sportifs
- Les questions environnementales, comme les eaux stagnantes et la contamination
- Le bruit
- Les odeurs
- La circulation
- La proximité de terrains de sports et de jeux

Voici certaines pratiques exemplaires d’autres villes en matière de TCL :

**Calgary**
- Les TCL doivent respecter les utilisations multifonctionnelles des parcs publics.
- Les TCL doivent faire partie des considérations de base lors de la planification de parcs dans les collectivités établies et les nouvelles collectivités.
- Les TCL doivent avoir une superficie d’au moins 0,5 hectare.
- Le choix de l’emplacement doit être guidé par une stratégie de participation publique complète.

**Surrey**
- Les TCL situés à des emplacements adjacents à des lieux où l’on fait habituellement du sport ou l’on s’adonne à des activités de loisirs actives doivent être clôturés avec une barrière de 1,20 m de hauteur et disposer de deux portails d’entrée pour minimiser les risques de conflits.
- Les TCL de quartier n’ont pas besoin de stationnement.

**Edmonton**
- Usages préférés pour les terrains adjacents : usage commercial, installations municipales, zones d’emploi.
- Usages préférés pour les terrains : espaces ouverts, emprise pour les transports, l’infrastructure et les services.
- Participation publique complète pour chaque nouveau TCL.
- Considérations pour des TCL d’hiver.
- Le site ne doit pas être une zone naturelle désignée ou un habitat faunique.

**QU’EN PENSEZ-VOUS?**
- Répondez à la question suivante sur un feuillet adhésif.

À votre avis, de quels critères ou normes est-il important de tenir compte lors du choix de l’emplacement d’un TCL ?

Collez les feuillets adhésifs ici.

Winnipeg
City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Thank you for taking a few minutes to participate in this survey.

The Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan is being developed to address and respond to the growing interest and demand for off-leash dog areas in Winnipeg. The Plan will include a vision and implementation strategy for off-leash dog areas throughout Winnipeg, and identify criteria which will be used by the City of Winnipeg to inform the future locations of off-leash areas in Winnipeg.

This survey has been designed to collect feedback from both off-leash area users and general park users. We want to hear from everyone, not just those who own dogs and/or currently use the City’s off-leash dog areas. Your answers to these survey questions will help us understand the issues and opportunities related to current off-leash areas and other parks and open spaces in Winnipeg.

If you would rather complete this survey online, please visit:

www.surveymonkey.com/r/winnipegoffleash

1. Do you own a dog?
   ☐ Yes, one dog
   ☐ Yes, multiple dogs
   ☐ No
   ☐ No, but I foster/frequently take care of others’ dogs

2. Do you visit Winnipeg’s off-leash dog areas (the City of Winnipeg’s designated dog parks)?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

   a) If yes, please explain why you visit these off-leash dog areas?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

   b) If no, please explain why you do not visit these off-leash dog areas?

   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

3. If applicable, please tell us which of Winnipeg’s off-leash areas you visit? Also, please indicate the reasons why you like to visit these specific off-leash areas. These could include features such as: proximity to home, ample parking, secure fencing, a path/trail system, water, etc.

   ☐ Bourkevale Park:
   ☐ Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest (to be re-established):
   ☐ Charleswood Dog Park:
   ☐ Kilcona Park:
   ☐ King’s Park:
   ☐ ________________________________
   ☐ ________________________________
   ☐ ________________________________
   ☐ ________________________________
   ☐ ________________________________
4. If applicable, what times and days do you typically visit OLAs? Please check all that apply.

Weekdays:
- Before 9:00 a.m.
- 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
- 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
- 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
- 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
- After 6:00 p.m.

Weekends:
- Before 9:00 a.m.
- 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
- 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
- 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
- 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
- After 6:00 p.m.

5. If applicable, do you avoid any of Winnipeg’s off-leash areas? Why?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________

________________________________________________

a) Which of Winnipeg’s off-leash areas do you avoid? Please indicate the reason(s) why you avoid these specific off-leash areas? These could be reasons such as: overcrowding, irresponsible dog owners, lack of maintenance, safety, proximity to homes, proximity to heavy traffic, etc.

☐ Bourkevale Park: ________________________________________________________________
☐ Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest (to be re-established): _________________________________
☐ Charleswood Dog Park: _________________________________________________________
☐ Kilcona Park: _________________________________________________________________
☐ King’s Park: _________________________________________________________________
☐ Little Mountain Park: _________________________________________________________
☐ Maple Grove Park: _____________________________________________________________
☐ Mazenod Park: _______________________________________________________________
☐ Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue Off-Leash Area: ________________________________
☐ Westview Park: ______________________________________________________________
☐ Woodsworth Park: _____________________________________________________________
6. If applicable, are there other parks/open spaces in Winnipeg you enjoy taking your dog? If yes, please identify these parks/open spaces and tell us why you enjoy taking your dog here. These could be reasons such as convenience, amenities, location, accessibility, etc.
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________
___________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
7. Whether you visit Winnipeg’s off-leash areas or not, what are your top three concerns that are associated with existing off-leash dog areas in Winnipeg? These could include concerns such as: parking, noise, odours, overcrowding, conflicts with other park users (i.e. sport teams, recreational groups), safety to children, safety to dogs, incompatible adjacent land uses (i.e. day cares, residential areas, high traffic volumes), etc.

Issue #1: _______________________________________________________________________________
Issue #2: _______________________________________________________________________________
Issue #3: _______________________________________________________________________________

8. Whether you own a dog or not, have you experienced any issues regarding dogs in Winnipeg’s parks and open spaces? If yes, please describe these issues and where they typically occur.
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________

9. In May 2017, two workshops were held with community and off-leash area user representatives. Participants were asked to develop a series of ‘key values’ for OLAs in Winnipeg. The following were some of the ‘key values’ stakeholders suggested.

Please rank the ‘key values’ below from most important to least important, where one (1) is most important.
☐ Accessibility  ☐ Security  ☐ Preservation of natural habitat  ☐ Fiscal sustainability  ☐ Clarity of rules/education of users & non-users  ☐ Management that reflects a balance of needs of all users  ☐ Sociability, for the dog owner  ☐ Sociability and training, for the dog

Please note any additional ‘key values’ that you think off-leash areas in Winnipeg should represent:
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________

10. In May 2017, community and off-leash area user representatives were also tasked with developing a draft vision statement for the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan.
Summarizing the stakeholder feedback, the draft vision statement for the Plan was created:

The Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan will guide the future location of off-leash areas in Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg envisions that future off-leash dog areas will provide safe, secure areas for dogs and their owners to enjoy, while ensuring that off-leash areas are located in parks and open spaces that protect, enhance, and balance the recreational needs of all park users in Winnipeg.

Please provide us with your thoughts or adjustments of the draft vision statement below:

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

11. Please tell us your postal code: ____________________________________________

12. If you would like to be contacted with project updates, please provide you email address below:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the online survey!
Your feedback is very important for this project.

For project information and future public engagement activities associated with the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan, please visit

winnipeg.ca/offleashareas

Your personal information is being collected under the authority of 36(1)(b) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. This information will be used to help advise the development of the City of Winnipeg Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan and help inform the project’s public engagement process. This information will not be used or disclosed for any other purposes, except as authorized by law. The information you have included on this survey will be summarized used to advise the development of the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan, your personal information will not be published. If you have any questions about the collection or use of this information, contact the Corporate FIPPA Coordinator by mail to City Clerk’s Department, Administration Building, 510 Main Street, Winnipeg MB, R3B 1B9, or by telephone at 311.
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Merci de prendre quelques minutes pour participer à ce sondage en ligne.

Le Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté (TCL) vise à répondre à l’intérêt et à la demande grandissants pour de tels espaces à Winnipeg. Le plan présentera une vision et une stratégie de mise en application visant les TCL de Winnipeg, et identifiera les critères qui seront utilisés par la Ville pour décider de l’emplacement des futurs TCL de Winnipeg.

Ce sondage a été conçu pour recueillir les rétroactions des personnes qui fréquentent les terrains pour chiens en liberté et les gens qui fréquentent les parcs de la ville. Vos réponses nous aideront à comprendre les problématiques et les possibilités relatives aux TCL existants ainsi qu’aux autres parcs et aux espaces en plein air de Winnipeg.

Si vous préférez remplir ce sondage en ligne, veuillez visiter:

https://fr.surveymonkey.com/r/winnipegTCL

1. Avez-vous des chiens?
   ☐ Oui, un chien
   ☐ Oui, plusieurs chiens
   ☐ Non
   ☐ Non, mais il arrive que mon foyer serve de famille d’accueil pour chiens, ou que j’en garde souvent

2. Fréquentez-vous les TCL de la ville?
   ☐ Oui
   ☐ Non
   a) Veuillez expliquer pourquoi vous fréquentez les TCL de la Ville :
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   b) Veuillez expliquer pourquoi vous ne fréquentez pas les TCL de la Ville :
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

3. Quels TCL de la Ville fréquentez-vous? Veuillez expliquer pourquoi vous fréquentez chacun des TCL indiqués : Cela peut comprendre des raisons comme la proximités de votre résidence; la capacité de la zone de stationnement; la présence de barrières sécuritaires, d’un réseau de sentiers, d’un point d’eau, etc.
   ☐ Bourkevale Park: ____________________________________________________________
   ☐ Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest (to be re-established): ____________________________
   ☐ Charleswood Dog Park: ____________________________________________________
   ☐ Kilcona Park: ______________________________________________________________
   ☐ King’s Park: ________________________________________________________________
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☐ Little Mountain Park: ______________________________________________________
☐ Maple Grove Park: ______________________________________________________
☐ Mazenod Park: _________________________________________________________
☐ Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue Off-Leash Area: __________________________
☐ Westview Park: _________________________________________________________
☐ Woodsworth Park: ______________________________________________________

4. À quelles heures et quels jours est-ce que vous vous rendez habituellement dans les terrains pour chiens en liberté? Veuillez cocher toutes les réponses qui s’appliquent.

En semaine:
☐ Avant 9 h
☐ De 9 h à midi
☐ De midi à 13 h
☐ De 13 h à 16 h
☐ De 16 h à 18 h
☐ Après 18 h

En fin de semaine:
☐ Avant 9 h
☐ De 9 h à midi
☐ De midi à 13 h
☐ De 13 h à 16 h
☐ De 16 h à 18 h
☐ Après 18 h

5. En tant que personne qui fréquente les TCL, évitez-vous certains TCL de Winnipeg?

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

a) Veuillez nommer les TCL que vous évitez. Veuillez expliquer pourquoi vous évitez chacun des TCL indiqués dans la question précédente. Les raisons pourraient être les suivantes : trop de fréquentation, propriétaires de chiens irresponsables, manque d’entretien, sécurité, proximité de maisons, proximité de circulation dense, etc.

☐ Bourkevale Park: _______________________________________________________
☐ Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest (to be re-established): _______________________
☐ Charleswood Dog Park: ________________________________________________
☐ Kilcona Park: _________________________________________________________
☐ King’s Park: __________________________________________________________
☐ Little Mountain Park: _________________________________________________
☐ Maple Grove Park: ____________________________________________________
☐ Mazenod Park: ________________________________________________________
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☐ Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue Off-Leash Area: ____________________________________________
☐ Westview Park: ________________________________________________________________
☐ Woodsworth Park: _____________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

7. Que vous visitez les TCL de Winnipeg ou non, quelles sont les trois principales inquiétudes associées aux TCL qui vous concernent le plus?
Ceci pourrait comprendre : le stationnement, le bruit, les odeurs, le fait qu’il y ait trop de monde, les conflits avec d’autres personnes qui fréquentent ces parcs (comme les équipes sportives et les groupes de loisirs), la sécurité des enfants, la sécurité des chiens, l’incompatibilité des terrains adjacents (comme les garderies, les zones résidentielles, les zones à circulation dense, etc.).

Inquiétude no 1 : ________________________________________________________________
Inquiétude no 2 : ________________________________________________________________
Inquiétude no 3 : ________________________________________________________________

8. Avez-vous rencontré des problèmes relatifs aux chiens dans les parcs et les espaces en plein air de Winnipeg? Veuillez décrire ces problèmes et où ils ont habituellement lieu :
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

9. En mai 2017, la communauté et les représentants des personnes qui fréquentent les TCL ont été invités à des ateliers. Nous avons demandé aux participants de réfléchir à une série de « valeurs essentielles » ou de principes que devraient représenter les TCL de Winnipeg. Les « valeurs essentielles » ou principes identifiés comprenaient :

Veuillez classer les « valeurs essentielles » ci-dessous de la plus importante à la moins importante :
☐ L’accessibilité;
☐ La sécurité;
☐ La préservation des habitats naturels;
☐ La viabilité budgétaire;
☐ La clarté des règles et l’éducation du public;
☐ La gestion équilibrée des besoins des différentes personnes qui fréquentent les TCL;
☐ La sociabilité des propriétaires de chiens;
☐ La sociabilité et le dressage des chiens.
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Veuillez indiquer toute autre « valeur essentielle » qui devrait être représentée dans les TCL de Winnipeg :

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

10. En mai 2017, la collectivité et les représentants des personnes fréquentant les TCL ont également été chargés de l’élaboration d’une ébauche de déclaration de vision pour le Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté.

La déclaration de vision relative au Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté, résumant les rétroactions des parties prenantes, a ainsi été créée. La voici :

Le Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté déterminera l’emplacement des futurs terrains pour chiens en liberté de Winnipeg. La Ville envisage un futur dans lequel les terrains pour chiens en liberté seront des espaces sécuritaires dont les chiens et leurs propriétaires pourront profiter, tout en faisant en sorte qu’ils soient situés dans des parcs et des espaces en plein air qui protégeront, amélioreront et équilibreront les besoins en loisirs de toutes les personnes fréquentant les parcs de Winnipeg.

Veuillez nous faire part de vos pensées ou des modifications que vous voudriez apporter à l’ébauche de déclaration de vision :

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

11. Veuillez indiquer votre code postal :

__________________________________________________________________________________

12. Si vous voulez que nous vous communiquions les mises à jour concernant le projet, veuillez indiquer votre adresse courriel ci-dessous :

__________________________________________________________________________________

Merci d’avoir pris le temps de remplir le sondage en ligne! Votre rétroaction quant à ce projet est très importante à nos yeux.

Pour des renseignements sur le projet et pour être informé des activités de participation publique à venir associées au Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté, rendez-vous sur winnipeg.ca/francais/PPD/PublicEngagement/OffLeashAreas/default.stm.