

CITY OF WINNIPEG

OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS MASTER PLAN

MAY 2018

Winnipeg

wsp



OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS MASTER PLAN

CITY OF WINNIPEG

PROJECT NO.: 17M-00378-00
DATE: MAY 2018

WSP
111-93 LOMBARD AVENUE
WINNIPEG, MB, R3B 3B1

TEL: +1-204-943-3178
FAX: +1-204-943-4948
WSP.COM



The project team would like to thank the five dog models for generously donating their time to act as the muses for the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan, inspiring the creation of this study's logo. Without them, the logo would have been arguably less cute. From L – R: Artichoke, Matilda, Gideon, Berg, & Milkshake.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Across North America, dog ownership is increasing; the Canadian Animal Health Institute recently reported that dog ownership in Canada has risen from 6.4 million in 2014 to 7.6 million in 2016.[1] This increase in dog ownership may be due to the commonly acknowledged benefits dogs provide to people, such as companionship, increased physical activity, and the enhancement of social connections.

In fact, North American households now have more pets than children[2], which has had a profound impact on the composition of our households, our spending patterns, and particularly, on the landscape and development of our cities. Increasing dog ownership has led to a growing demand for municipalities to accommodate residents and their dogs in public spaces. Across Canada, a significant number of urban municipalities have developed policy and action plans that address the development, management, and maintenance of off-leash areas (OLAs), recognizing that they should be considered a legitimate park use.

Dog ownership trends exhibited across North America are likewise occurring here in Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg (the City) has reported an increase in dog ownership in recent years based on a notable rise in the number of licensed dogs, as well as an increase in public interest and inquiries about the City's existing OLAs. The City recognizes the values and benefits that dog ownership and OLAs can provide for individuals and for the community, and understands that they must address the demand for more off-leash opportunities.

The City currently has a number of OLAs of various sizes throughout Winnipeg; however, there is no overall plan providing clear direction as to where new OLAs should be directed or how they should be established. In past years, the City designated a portion of lands held for long-term infrastructure as temporary OLAs. As these infrastructure projects come to fruition, the temporary OLAs are reduced or adjusted, and have led to the misconception that the City does not support OLAs as a legitimate park use, nor the future development of additional OLAs. This plan will illustrate that this is not the case.

The Off-leash Dog Areas Master Plan (OLAMP), through research and a robust community and stakeholder engagement process, outlines the City's vision, goals, guiding values, and objectives for the future establishment of OLAs in Winnipeg, as well as policies and standards for the development and design of safe, accessible, and sustainable OLAs. The OLAMP builds upon a report published in 2012 entitled *Guidelines for Off-leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg*, while responding to the growing interest and demand for OLAs throughout the city. The OLAMP aligns with the City of Winnipeg's *OurWinnipeg Development Plan*, *Our Winnipeg's Complete Communities Direction Strategy*, *Recreation and Parks Masterplan* and the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy* by emphasising the establishment of OLAs that are accessible, walkable, safe, sustainable, and satisfy the needs of OLA users, while also balancing the needs and interests of the broader community.

The OLAMP is a helpful planning tool for the City's politicians and administration, as well as the public. The plan will act as a reference guide for the City and the public, providing clear policies and standards for the siting, design, management, and establishment of new OLAs and the enhancement of existing OLAs.

The following items identify and summarize the intent, direction, and content of the OLAMP.

The Vision for OLAs in Winnipeg as outlined in the OLAMP

- In recognition of the need for off-leash areas in Winnipeg that enhance the health and wellness of its residents, while strengthening neighbourhoods and building communities, the City of Winnipeg will strive to create and maintain accessible, safe and sustainable off-leash areas that complement the communities in which they are located.

Goals of the OLAMP

- **GOAL 1**: To describe the local demand for OLAs, identify opportunities and constraints to serve that demand, and define a strategic direction for achieving appropriate access to OLAs across the city.

---

[1] Canadian Animal Health Institute (2017) Latest Canadian Pet Population Figures Released. Obtained from https://www.canadianveterinarians.net/documents/canadian-pet-population-figures-cahi-2017 on February 6, 2018.
[2] CBC Radio (2017). Bringing up furbaby: The evolution from family pet to pet family. Obtained from http://www.cbc.ca/radio/ideas/bringing-up-furbaby-the-evolution-from-family-pet-to-pet-family-1.4136659 on February 1, 2018.

- **GOAL 2**: To provide clear standards and processes for identifying/selecting/designating OLAs in City owned parks and open spaces to meet the needs of all park users.

Guiding Values of the OLAMP

- To provide transparency in the OLA site selection process.
- To streamline the process for establishing an OLA for the public and City administration.
- To provide standards and guidelines for designing safe, accessible, and sustainable OLAs.
- To consider the interests of the various park and open space users including adjacent land uses, ecologically sensitive areas, and the surrounding community when siting and designing an OLA.
- To mitigate safety issues and concerns in and around OLAs through siting, design, and management considerations.
- To provide OLA opportunities that will improve the health and well-being of citizens.
- To review the development of OLAs in accordance to a classification system based on typology, amenities, service levels, and distribution.

Objectives of the OLAMP

- To develop policies and standards for the establishment and management of OLAs in Winnipeg, based on public and stakeholder feedback, research, and review of best practices implemented in other jurisdictions, and a review of the *Guidelines for Off-leash Parks in Winnipeg* (2012).
- To identify a method which considers appropriate OLA distribution for the City based on demand and existing policies.

OLAMP Policy Considerations and Standards

The OLAMP includes policies and standards that will be used by the public service to site, design, and manage future OLAs and to enhance existing OLAs in Winnipeg. These policies and standards also provide direction for how to meet the local demand for OLAs in a logical and sustainable manner, in alignment with *OurWinnipeg*, *Complete Communities*, the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*, and the *Recreation and Parks Master Plan*.

The policies and standards included in the OLAMP reflect recommendations from the previous *Guidelines for Off-leash Parks in Winnipeg*, stakeholder and community feedback, observations gathered from local OLA site visits and user-counts, and OLA best practices implemented by a variety of municipalities from across North America.

The OLAMP's policies considerations are as follows:

1. The Off-leash Area (OLA) Policies and Standards must align with *OurWinnipeg*, the *Recreation and Parks Master Plan*, and the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*.
2. The City will establish a budget line item to support capital investment in the establishment and enhancement of OLAs based on the most current siting and design standards, as outlined in the OLAMP, and will establish additional operating budget resources for the management of OLAs, as per the most current management (service level) standards described in the OLAMP.
3. The City shall consider opportunities for OLAs through the land development process.
4. The City shall establish permanent OLAs in accordance with the most current siting standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
5. The City shall establish temporary OLAs in accordance with the most current siting standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
6. Design of OLAs shall comply with the most current design standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
7. Management of OLAs shall comply with the most current management (or service level) standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.

The OLAMP includes a series of standards, which will be used by the City for the future planning and enhancement of OLAs. These standards are divided into four (4) sections:

- General;
- Siting;
- Design; and
- Management.

The standards within each of these sections will assist the public service in achieving the intent of the policy considerations. The OLA design standards define four (4) OLA classifications as follows:

- Regional OLA;
- Community OLA;
- Neighbourhood OLA; and
- Seasonal Adaptive OLA.

Each of these classifications were developed to fit the varying needs and desires of OLA users in Winnipeg. The OLA classifications vary in their size, distribution, amenities, and service levels. To establish these OLAs, the OLAMP includes two (2) processes that guide how future OLAs are to be established.

DEFINITIONS

Community OLA – The second largest type of OLA within Winnipeg, ranging in size from 0.5 to 8 hectares.

Community OLA Association – An OLA association that represents the interests of one or a limited number of local OLAs. For example, in Winnipeg, associations such as the Maple Grove Dog Owners' Association and the Kilcona Park Dog Club Inc. are considered community OLA associations, as they represent and advocate for the Maple Grove OLA and the Kilcona Park OLA respectively.

Double-gated entry/exit – Will be installed in all OLAs containing 'secure' boundaries such as fencing. A double-gated entry consists of two fence doors, creating a vestibule between the doors to prevent a dog from easily exiting an OLA.

Multi-use OLA – A designated OLA where other general recreational park uses are permitted. Currently, many of Winnipeg's OLAs permit other general recreational park uses, and are considered 'multi-use'. Ideally, as public opinion has requested, current 'multi-use' OLAs could be designated as 'single-use' OLAs if barriers or fencing are installed as boundaries.

Municipal OLA – An OLA that is located on City owned land.

Neighbourhood OLA – The smallest type of permanent OLA within Winnipeg. This OLA is divided into two subsets, a 'large' Neighbourhood OLA, ranging in size from 0.1 to 0.5 hectares, and a 'small' Neighbourhood OLA, ranging in size from 0.04 to 0.1 hectares.

OLA – Off-leash area; a land-use that permits off-leash dogs.

OLA Association – An association made up of a group of volunteers that assists the City in the operation and management of OLAs.

OLA Classification – An OLA type as defined by this plan. There are four (4) OLA classifications defined in this Plan; Regional OLA, a Community OLA, a Neighbourhood OLA, and a Seasonal Adaptive OLA. These OLA classifications vary in size, and have varying standards for as per their design requirements, siting, and amenities.

Permanent OLA – An OLA that has been designated by the City to exist as a long-term use.

Permeable Boundary – A type of OLA boundary that delineates the limits of the OLA; however, it is not secure. A permeable boundary could be landscaping, berms, posts, bollards, etc.

Regional OLA – The largest type of OLA in Winnipeg, exceeding 8 hectares in size.

Regional OLA Association – A recognized OLA advocacy group that represents the interests of a network of community OLA associations, for example, in Winnipeg, Windog serves as the city's Regional OLA Association.

Screening Checklist/Selection Criteria – A checklist used to assist the City in the evaluation of potential locations for future OLAs.

Seasonal Adaptive OLA – A type of OLA that is temporary in nature, and located in public spaces only for part of the year.

Secure Boundary – A type of OLA boundary that delineates the limits of the OLA that is secure and cannot be penetrated, such as a fence.

Single-use OLA – A designated OLA where all other activities are prohibited except those associated with off-leash dogs.

Temporary OLA - An area that the City has designated as an OLA, but only for a limited period of time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 PURPOSE 1

1.2 VISION 1

1.3 GOALS 1

1.4 GUIDING VALUES 1

1.5 OBJECTIVES 2

1.6 OLAMP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OVERVIEW 2

1.6.1 OLA POLICY & RELATED DOCUMENT REVIEW 2

1.6.2 BEST PRACTICE PRECEDENT REVIEW 4

1.6.3 BACKGROUND MAPS 4

1.6.4 CITY STAFF & COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS 5

1.6.5 OLA USER-COUNTS 5

1.6.6 ENGAGEMENT 5

1.7 ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW 6

2 BACKGROUND 7

2.1 NORTH AMERICAN TRENDS IN DOG-OWNERSHIP AND WHAT THIS MEANS FOR CITIES 7

2.2 TRENDS IN ACCOMMODATING OLAS IN NORTH AMERICAN CITIES 8

2.3 OLAS IN WINNIPEG 9

2.3.1 STAKEHOLDER AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK 9

2.3.2 THE INTEGRATION OF THE GUIDELINES FOR OFF-LEASH DOG PARKS IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG (2012) INTO THE OLAMP 11

2.3.3 THE INTEGRATION OF WINNIPEG OLA OBSERVATIONS & FEEDBACK INTO THE OLAMP 12

2.3.4 NEXT STEPS 21

3 PLANNING POLICIES & STANDARDS FOR OLAS 22

3.1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR OLA PLANNING 23



3.1.1 General OLAMP Policy Considerations 23
3.1.2 General OLA Standards 23
3.2 OLA SITING 25
3.2.1 OLA CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY 25
3.2.2 OLAMP SITING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS 28
3.2.3 OLA SITING STANDARDS 28
3.3 OLA DESIGN 31
3.3.1 OLAMP POLICY CONSIDERATIONS 32
3.3.2 REGIONAL OLA DESIGN STANDARDS 32
3.3.3 COMMUNITY OLA DESIGN STANDARDS 33
3.3.4 NEIGHBOURHOOD OLA DESIGN STANDARDS 34
3.3.5 SEASONAL ADAPTIVE OLA STANDARDS 36
3.4 OLA MANAGEMENT 37
3.4.1 OLAMP MANAGEMENT POLICY CONSIDERATIONS 37
3.4.2 OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS 37
3.4.3 OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: SIGNAGE 37
3.4.4 OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: education 38
3.4.5 OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: COMPLIANCE 38
4 OLA ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS 39
4.1 ESTABLISHING A PERMANENT OLA 39
4.2 ESTABLISHING A SEASONAL ADAPTIVE OLA (TEMPORARY) 40
4.3 OLA ESTABLISHMENT CONSIDERATIONS 41



FIGURES

Figure 1: OLAMP Project Timeline 6
Figure 2: Current Off-leash Dog Areas and Community and Regional Catchment Areas 14
Figure 3: Current Off-leash Dog Areas and Neighbourhood Catchment Areas 15
Figure 4: Areas in the City Where I Would Like to See and OLA 16
Figure 5: Areas in the City Where I Would Not Like to See and OLA 17
Figure 6: Current Off-leash Dog Areas and Neighbourhood Catchment Areas 18
Figure 7: Illustration of Double Gated Entry/Exit 24
Figure 8: Illustrative Example of Regional OLA 32
Figure 9: Illustrative Example of Community OLA 33
Figure 10: Illustrative Example of a 'Large' Neighbourhood OLA 35
Figure 11: Illustrative Example of a 'Small' Neighbourhood OLA 36
Figure 12: Illustrative Example of a Seasonal Adaptive OLA 36
Figure 13: Permanent OLA Establishment Flowchart 40
Figure 14: Temporary OLA Establishment Flowchart 41

TABLES

Table 1: OLA Classification Summary Table 25
Table 2: OLA Screening Checklist 30
Table 3: OLA Public Engagement Radius Standards 39

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Current Policy
Appendix B: Precedent Review
Appendix C: OLA Background Review Maps
Appendix D: Off-Leash Dog Areas Engagement Report
Appendix E: OLA User Counts
Appendix F: Potential Funding Opportunities and Partnerships



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

The City of Winnipeg (the City) developed the Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan (OLAMP) to respond to the growing interest and demand for off-leash areas (OLAs) in Winnipeg. The OLAMP considers the interests of various parks and open space users while establishing an overarching vision, goals, guiding values, and objectives for the establishment of OLAs throughout the city. The OLAMP provides clear direction for the evaluation of existing OLAs, and policies and standards to guide the siting, maintenance, compliance, management, and design of future OLAs.

1.2 VISION

The OLAMP's vision statement was developed in collaboration with City staff, project stakeholders, and members of the public through a robust engagement process. The vision statement helps to communicate the overarching purpose of the OLAMP and guides its goals, objectives, and policies.

> *In recognition of the need for off-leash areas in Winnipeg that enhance the health and wellness of its residents, while strengthening neighbourhoods and building communities, the City of Winnipeg will strive to create and maintain accessible, safe and sustainable off-leash areas that complement the communities in which they are located.*

1.3 GOALS

In alignment with the vision statement, the following goals establish the long-term aims of the OLAMP:

- **GOAL 1**: To describe the local demand for OLAs, identify opportunities and constraints to serve that demand, and define a strategic direction for achieving appropriate access to OLAs across the city.
- **GOAL 2**: To provide clear standards and processes for identifying/selecting/designating OLAs in City owned parks and open spaces to meet the needs of all park users.

1.4 GUIDING VALUES

In alignment with the vision statement and the OLAMP's goals, a set of guiding values were created that advised the content and direction of the OLAMP. These guiding values were also developed in collaboration with City staff, project stakeholders, and members of the public.

- To provide transparency in the OLA site selection process.
- To streamline the process for establishing an OLA for the public and City administration.
- To provide standards and guidelines for designing safe, accessible, and sustainable OLAs.
- To consider the interests of the various park and open space users including adjacent land uses, ecologically sensitive areas, and the surrounding community when siting and designing an OLA.
- To mitigate safety issues and concerns in and around OLAs through siting, design and management considerations.
- To provide OLA opportunities that will improve the health and well-being of citizens.
- To review the development of OLAs in accordance to a classification system based on typology, amenities, service levels and distribution.



1.5 OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the OLAMP are as follows:

- To develop policies and standards for the establishment and management of OLAs in Winnipeg, based on public and stakeholder feedback, research and review of best practices implemented in other jurisdictions, and a review of the *Guidelines for Off-leash Parks in Winnipeg* (2012).
- To identify a method which considers appropriate OLA distribution for the City based on demand and existing policies.

The following items were outside of the OLAMP's project scope and the OLA Masterplan Charter:

- To select specific locations for future OLAs.
- To create a specific timeline/development schedule for future OLAs.
- To develop detailed designs and cost estimates for specific OLAs.
- To develop a list of deficiencies/required improvements for existing OLAs.

1.6 OLAMP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS OVERVIEW

A number of components were facilitated to develop the OLAMP, including background research, best practice research, OLA site visits, OLA user-counts, engagement with stakeholders, and engagement with the community. The information collected through each of these project components informed the policies and considerations included in the OLAMP.

The following paragraphs provide a summary of the OLAMP's components, and describe how each of these components were integral to the formation of the plan. These components are ordered chronologically based on their order of completion.

Section 2 details how the information derived from the following project components, such as public engagement and the precedent review, was integrated into the OLAMP.

1.6.1 *OLA POLICY & RELATED DOCUMENT REVIEW*

A review of City policies and OLA-related documents was completed to understand how the establishment, management and operations of OLAs currently occur in Winnipeg, and how the direction presented in the City's over-arching policy documents should guide the creation and direction of the OLAMP. *OurWinnipeg*, the City's Development Plan provides direction for the planning of parks, recreational spaces, and municipal services. The objectives and direction of future OLA planning must tie into the direction and principles within *OurWinnipeg*. The City's Responsible Pet Ownership By-law regulates the use of OLAs. The City also has other documents which provide direction to the operations and management of OLAs such as the OLA *Code of Ethics* and the *Guidelines for Off-leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg* (2012) (the *Guidelines)*. Each of these policies/documents are explored below.

OurWinnipeg is the City of Winnipeg's municipal development outlines a vision and policies that influence the delivery of City services, how people move through the city, and outlines how the city should grow. *OurWinnipeg* presents a 25-year vision for the entire city and positions Winnipeg for sustainable growth, which is key to Winnipeg's future competitiveness.



OurWinnipeg's chapter on 'Quality of Life' includes policies and provisions to ensure that municipal services are delivered in a safe, clean, healthy environment, and that access to opportunity, the maintenance of vital, healthy neighbourhoods, and being a creative city with vibrant arts and culture are critical to the overall well-being of the city. The City is committed to applying the direction presented in this chapter when planning for and delivering a variety of municipal services, which include the planning and establishment of OLAs:

> *The City of Winnipeg is committed to creating an inclusive urban environment. Design that allows all people, regardless of age or ability, to participate in society is critical to our city's social, environmental and economic sustainability. An inclusive community promotes healthy living and independence and is the foundation for social and economic stability. Building environments that are accommodating and comfortable to a diverse range of people is central to the concept of complete communities.*

Furthermore, the following sections of *OurWinnipeg* apply to the establishment of future OLA facilities:

Section 03-1: Opportunity

> ***Direction 1****: Strive to use mandated municipal services areas, such as libraries and recreation, as opportunities to foster strong cross-cultural relations that contribute to healthy communities.*
>
> ***Direction 2:*** *Provide equitable access to municipal programs, services and facilities.*

Section 03-2: Vitality

> ***Direction 2:*** *Deliver a coordinated, integrated, and seamless service response to address community needs and priorities that contribute to building healthy communities.*
>
> ***Direction 4:*** *Maintain the health and safety of neighborhoods by enforcing animal control by-laws and promoting responsible pet ownership.*

The Complete Communities Direction Strategy is part of *OurWinnipeg*, and provides land-use direction for the growth of the City. The *Parks, Places and Open Spaces* chapter of *Complete Communities* outlines a number of directions that will be applied to the operation and establishment of OLAs:

> ***Direction 2:*** *Ensure that parks support economic development and are managed in a financially sustainable, innovative manner.*
>
> ***Direction 4:*** *Promote active mobility and pedestrian connectivity.*
>
> ***Direction 5:*** *Maintain relevant standards and guidelines for open space development and management.*

In summary, guided by *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities*, the City will establish OLAs that are accessible, walkable, safe, sustainable, and satisfy the needs of OLA users, while also balancing the other interests in the community.

The City's Responsible Pet Ownership By-law No. 92/2013 includes rules for dog-owners when using an OLA, as outlined below:

Section 4(5) When the dog is in an off-leash area, the owner of a dog must:

- *(a) Be present and have the dog within view at all times;*
- *(b) Ensure that the dog is not in heat and that it does not act in a dangerous or aggressive manner towards humans or other dogs;*
- *(c) Remove the dog from the off-leash area immediately if the dog is in heat or acts in a dangerous or aggressive manner towards humans or other dogs;*
- *(d) Ensure that the dog comes when called;*
- *(e) Have a leash available to restrain the dog if needed;*
- *(f) Remedy any harm caused by the dog, including filling in holes dug by the dog; and*
- *(g) Immediately remove and property dispose of any excrement left by the dog.*

This By-law also restricts dogs from certain areas in the City, and includes policies regarding dog licensing, prohibited dog breeds, impoundment of dogs (stray, diseased, dangerous), cat ownership, and excess animals. The by-law does not include policies to guide the planning for future OLAs, OLA siting/distribution, site design, or OLA establishment. It will be



important for the OLAMP to address OLA siting/distribution, site design, and OLA establishment, as this is a current gap in City policy. The Responsible Pet Ownership By-law is included in **Appendix A**.

The *Guidelines*, a report written in 2012, includes recommendations for OLA site design, OLA implementation considerations, and an OLA inventory; however, the *Guidelines* were not officially adopted by the City, and thus, is not an officially recognized document. The content included in the *Guidelines* document assisted in the development of the OLAMP. Its content was updated and adjusted based on best practice research and stakeholder and community feedback. A description of what was taken from the *Guidelines* and integrated into the OLAMP is explained in **Section 2.3.2**. It is the intent that the OLAMP replace the *Guidelines.*

The City has also established an OLA *Code of Ethics* for all dog owners in OLAs, as follows:

- Stoop & Scoop - Please use plastic bags to pick up after your dog;
- Train Your Dog - Please train your dog to respond to commands, whether on or off-leash;
- Respect other users of the park - Walkers, joggers, cyclists, skiers, and other dog owners have a right to enjoy; and
- Proper Licensing is required - Please ensure your pet is properly licensed.

This Code is presented on the City's webpage and clarifies the City's expectations of dog owners who utilize OLAs.

1.6.2 *BEST PRACTICE PRECEDENT REVIEW*

A precedent review of OLA/dog park master plans from other urban municipalities was completed. This review provided guidance as to how OLAs are established, managed and maintained in other municipalities. This review also provided insight into the standard content that is typically included in an OLA/dog park plan. **Section 2.2** summarizes how OLAs planning, management and operations of OLAs is done in other cities, and **Appendix B** includes the full precedent review summary.

1.6.3 *BACKGROUND MAPS*

A series of background maps were developed to guide discussions during the OLAMP's city staff workshop and community stakeholder workshop. The background maps (see **Appendix C**) illustrate the following items to view these maps:

- The City's OLA inventory;
- The OLA catchment areas as defined by the *Guidelines*; and
- A geographical review of dog license density data obtained from the City's Animal Services Division.

These maps were created to provide information for stakeholders and the public about the location of current OLAs, to illustrate the OLA catchment areas as outlined by the *Guidelines*, and illustrate of the disbursement of dog ownership in the city.

The OLA catchment area map (reflecting the catchment area as defined by the *Guidelines*) illustrates that the majority of Winnipeg is located within a catchment area for an OLA. It was noted by workshop participants that although Winnipeg looks like it is well-serviced with OLAs based on these catchment areas, most of the existing OLAs are not within walking distance of people's homes. The general consensus at the workshops was that the City should focus on the establishment of OLAs that are more accessible, or 'walkable' from people's homes.

The dog license density map illustrates that the highest concentration of licensed dogs are located in the northern and eastern parts of Winnipeg, however, Animal Services estimates that only approximately 30% of dogs are licensed in Winnipeg, therefore this map may not accurately illustrate 'dog density' in Winnipeg.

In other jurisdictions, dog license density data is used by municipalities to prioritize areas for the establishment of future OLAs. The OLAMP suggests that dog license density data is one component that will be considered by the City when siting future OLAs.

1.6.4 *CITY STAFF & COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS*

A City staff workshop was facilitated to understand challenges, issues, and opportunities associated with Winnipeg's existing and future OLAs. The City staff who participated in the workshop represented a wide variety of departments, providing different perspectives regarding the management and operations of OLAs.

Two community stakeholder workshops were facilitated to understand current challenges, issues, and opportunities associated with Winnipeg's OLAs from a wide variety of stakeholder groups, including OLA user groups, recreational organizations, and other special interest groups.

The varying perspectives collected from each of these workshops uncovered a number of themes that the OLAMP should address outlined in **Section 2.3.1**. **Sections 2.3.2** and **2.3.3** describe how the feedback obtained at these workshops advised certain components of the OLAMP.

A detailed record of the process and feedback of these workshops can be found in the project's public engagement report in **Appendix D**.

1.6.5 *OLA USER-COUNTS*

OLA user-counts were conducted in three of Winnipeg's OLAs: Maple Grove (a Regional OLA), King's Park and Westview Park (Community OLA). The purpose of these counts, was to provide the City with a baseline understanding of:

- Who is using the OLAs;
- How the OLAs are being used (i.e., individuals with multiple dogs, families with a single dog, etc.); and
- When the OLAs are being used (i.e., times of day and days of the week).

The following are some general observations that were drawn from the OLA user-counts. A detailed description of the count process, and more specific observations can be found in **Appendix E**.

- The majority of users drove a vehicle, rather than arriving at the OLA via walking/biking;
- Peak visitation times were generally during weeknight evenings and on the weekends;
- The Regional Park (Maple Grove) seems to be a 'destination' OLA for many users, providing recreational activities for families and their dogs; and
- In the 'multi-use' park (Westview) it appears that the number of off-leash dogs decreased as the number of runners and cyclists increased in the park, this could be due to a conscious effort made by dog owners to mitigate potential conflicts in the park, or vice versa.

Some of the observations made during these counts assisted in the formation of certain OLA design standards, such as the suggestion to designate certain areas of 'multi-use' OLAs as 'single-use', and the standard to identify select periods of time within 'multi-use' OLAs where recreational activities are restricted except for off-leash dog use. These suggestions are articulated in **Section 2.3.3**.

1.6.6 *ENGAGEMENT*

In-person and online community and stakeholder engagement was facilitated to provide information to the public about the project and to collect feedback regarding current OLA related issues and opportunities. Public feedback was collected through the facilitation of an online survey and mapping tool, and through three project information pop-up booths. A detailed summary of this feedback can be found in the project's engagement report in **Appendix D**.

Public feedback helped the project team develop an understanding of the varying public and stakeholder needs and desires regarding OLA planning, which assisted in the formation of policy and standards guiding OLA siting and distribution and OLA establishment. A number of themes were compiled based on the feedback collected during the public engagement

process, which provided guidance as to what the OLAMP should address. These themes are outlined in **Section 2.3.1,** and **Sections** 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 describe how the feedback obtained from the public advised certain components of the OLAMP.

A final online survey was created to obtain feedback from the public and stakeholders on the final draft of the OLAMP. The feedback collected from this final survey, and how the OLAMP was adjusted as a result of this feedback is outlined in **Section 2.3.1**.

Figure 1 illustrates the OLAMP engagement process within the project timeline.



Figure 1: OLAMP Project Timeline

1.7 ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW

A robust engagement process assisted in the development of the OLAMP. The objectives of the OLAMP'S engagement process were:

- To provide key stakeholders, City Council, and the public with information about the study;
- To collect feedback pertaining to issues and potential opportunities associated with the City's current OLAs, parks, recreational spaces, seasonal sites and underutilized locations; and
- To gather input for criteria and policies to address current and future demand for OLAs.

A description of the engagement process, including a summary of the feedback obtained, is available in the projects engagement report, which can be found in **Appendix D**.

2 BACKGROUND

The background section provides an overview of current trends in dog ownership and OLA establishment in North America, and compares these to local OLA trends occurring in Winnipeg. Information pertaining to dog ownership and OLA development trends, and OLA best practices were gathered through a best practice precedent review of OLA plans from a variety of municipalities across North America. Local trends and observations were gathered from site visits and user-counts, a catchment area analysis of Winnipeg's existing OLAs, and through stakeholder and community feedback.

Integrated into this section is a narrative of how the information gathered through some of the OLAMP's project components (public feedback, best practices, OLA user-counts) informed the development of the policies and standards included in the OLAMP.

2.1 NORTH AMERICAN TRENDS IN DOG-OWNERSHIP AND WHAT THIS MEANS FOR CITIES

Across North America, dog ownership is increasing; the Canadian Animal Health Institute recently reported that dog ownership in Canada has risen from 6.4 million in 2014 to 7.6 million in 2016.[3] These increases in dog ownership may be due to the commonly acknowledged benefits dogs provide to people, such as companionship, increased physical activity, and the enhancement of social connections.

North American households now have more pets than children[4], and this increase in pet ownership has had an impact on the composition of our households, our spending patterns, and particularly, on the landscape and development of our cities. The U.S. based *Trust for Public Land* reported that OLAs lead the charge in the development of new urban parks in the U.S., with a growth of 4% between 2015 and 2016 and 89% since 2007.[5]

These increases in dog ownership has led to a growing demand for municipalities to accommodate residents and their dogs in public spaces, and many municipalities have been working towards meeting this demand. Across Canada, a significant number of urban municipalities have developed policy and action plans that address the development, management, and maintenance of OLAs, recognizing that they should be considered a legitimate park use.

Overall, accommodating OLAs within cities has been seen as beneficial, not only for dog owners, but to entire communities. According to the Humane Society of the United States, OLAs provide opportunities for companionship with other dogs and humans, improve the physical health of dogs and humans, and improve the mental health of dogs and humans while also creating and strengthening community bonds, deterring criminal behaviour by encouraging additional 'eyes on the park', and preventing dogs in certain public areas, so they are separated from those individuals who prefer not to interact with them.[6]

Dog ownership trends exhibited across North America is likely occurring here in Winnipeg. The City has reported that dog ownership has increased in recent years based on dog license data; the number of licensed dogs in Winnipeg has increase from 15,297 to 51,665 from the years 2000 to 2017. Although this data may not indicate that the number of dogs in Winnipeg has more than tripled as the City has been encouraging more dog owners to license their pets, it may indicate that domestic dog ownership is increasing. The City reports that public interest and inquiries about the City's OLAs and the process to establish new OLAs, has increased.

[3] Canadian Animal Health Institute (2017) Latest Canadian Pet Population Figures Released. Obtained from https://www.canadianveterinarians.net/documents/canadian-pet-population-figures-cahi-2017 on February 6, 2018.
[4] CBC Radio (2017). Bringing up furbaby: The evolution from family pet to pet family. Obtained from http://www.cbc.ca/radio/ideas/bringing-up-furbaby-the-evolution-from-family-pet-to-pet-family-1.4136659 on February 1, 2018.
[5] The Trust for Public Land (2016). Dog Parks Lead Growth in Urban Parks. Obtained from https://www.tpl.org/media-room/dog-parks-lead-growth-urban-parks#sm.0001uu8vh5e4tfl2x421d1mmaw0wu, on December 15, 2017.
[6] Humane Society of the United States (2008). Dog Park and Their Benefits, The Humane Society of the United States. Obtained from http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/pets/dog_parks.pdf on February 1, 2018.



The City recognizes the values and benefits dog ownership and OLAs can provide for individuals and for the community, and as a result, the City understands that they must address the demand for more off-leash opportunities.

2.2 TRENDS IN ACCOMMODATING OLAS IN NORTH AMERICAN CITIES

More and more cities in North America are supporting and facilitating the establishment of OLAs. By and large, OLAs are located on municipally owned land, within existing parks and greenspaces. However, there are some special cases where OLAs are located on non-municipal lands, which could be managed by other levels of government, or by private property owners.

Typically, the establishment of OLAs within cities is led by the municipality. Generally, it is the municipality that selects future OLA locations as part of a comprehensive OLA planning process. However, in other cases, the municipality allows members of the public, OLA associations, or other groups to submit proposals indicating a preferred OLA location, which is then evaluated by the municipality.

OLA development is also generally completed and funded by the municipality, however many municipalities partner with OLA associations to assist with the design, operations, and management of OLAs. These OLA associations may provide significant capital and operating costs through fundraising which is dedicated to the management and operations of OLAs. Some municipalities also require the commitment of an OLA association to assist with an OLA's management and operations prior to the OLAs establishment. Some municipalities have allowed OLA associations to establish 'private' OLAs on public lands requiring a lease and operating agreement with the municipality. Membership fees are charged to those who utilize the OLA.

Overall, a number of other North American municipalities who are active in OLA establishment/development rely on OLA associations to varying degrees to help assist with the management and operations of OLAs. Presently, the City does not have any formal leases or partnerships with OLA associations or any other community groups, or a formalized way of recognizing OLA associations.

Many municipalities have developed a series of policies/standards/guidelines to be applied to the siting and establishment of future OLAs. These polices/standards/guidelines are used to ensure that future OLA locations are safe for its users, are not disruptive to existing uses on adjacent lands, are accessible, and are likely to be supported by stakeholders and the public. Some municipalities have also developed guidelines pertaining to the distribution of future OLAs within cities. For example, some municipalities commit to establishing OLAs based on population and/or dog density, geography, municipal growth, and local demand. These distribution standards are generally anecdotal, and not based on a 'hard' metric.

Municipalities will often develop classifications for a variety of OLA types. OLA classifications are primarily based on the OLA size and the amenities each contain. It is generally intended that each OLA type will suit a different OLA 'need', (i.e., 'a place I can take my large dog to run far' vs. a 'place where I can take my dog to walk off-leash next to my downtown condominium'). Typically, these OLA classifications have defined 'catchment areas' that assist in their distribution within the municipality. These 'catchment areas' are typically defined by driving or walking distances.

Many municipalities typically have three (3) OLA classifications. The first tends to be a 'regional', 'district', or 'destination' OLA that is designed to serve a large portion of the municipality. This OLA is considered the largest, its catchment area is generally based on driving distances, and it will likely contain the most amenities, such as paths, trails, and small-dog enclosures. The second classification is typically a 'community' or 'suburban' OLA. These are still considered 'destination' OLAs, but generally smaller and better integrated through residential areas in the municipality. The third classification is generally a 'neighborhood' OLA, which is the smallest classification, and is typically incorporated into locations that are within walking distance from its users and offer the fewest amenities.

The trend to establish more OLAs in cities also generally aligns with overarching municipal planning documents. For example, Edmonton's *Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy* was developed to be consistent with the directions outlined in the City of Edmonton's *The Way We Grow: Edmonton's Municipal Development Plan*, *The Way We Green: Edmonton's Environmental Strategic Plan, the Urban Parks Management Plan*, and the *WinterCity Strategy*. The goals, key values,



objectives, policies, and overall direction of the OLAMP has been drafted to be consistent with the City's *OurWinnipeg Development Plan*, *Complete Communities Direction Strategy*, and will be consistent with the policies and direction of the *Recreation and Parks Masterplan* and the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*.

Overall, many North American cities support the establishment of OLAs, and see the benefits of these OLAs not only extending to dog-owners, but to all community members. OLAs are recognized to prevent illicit off-leash dog use in other public parks and greenspaces, and encourage residents to get outside and meet their neighbours. OLAs are one of the many recreational uses a municipality can offer that promotes the health and well-being of its residents. As dog ownership increases, and a greater portion of a municipality's population become dog-owners, a greater demand exists for OLAs. This need is recognized through municipal actions, such as the development of OLAs plans, leading to the establishment of more OLAs. Please see **Appendix B** for a detailed best practice precedent review summary.

2.3 OLAS IN WINNIPEG

Here in Winnipeg, the City currently operates eleven (11) OLAs within the City's parks system, with an additional OLA currently under construction and another receiving modification, see **Figure 2** for the locations of Winnipeg's existing OLAs.

The City recognizes that residents are increasingly more interested in the management, operations, and development of municipal OLAs, and that OLAs are not only a community resource for dogs and their owners, but they can also contribute to a community's social and physical health and well-being, improve safety and security by encouraging more 'eyes in the park', and mitigate potential dog-related conflicts in public spaces.

2.3.1 *STAKEHOLDER AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FEEDBACK*

In 2017, the City initiated the development the OLAMP, which included a robust engagement process, including two (2) community stakeholder workshops, three (3) project pop-up information booths, and an online survey and mapping tool, all facilitated to collect background information and feedback regarding Winnipeg's current OLAs, ideas/opportunities that could be incorporated into the future establishment of OLAs in Winnipeg, and to confirm the direction of the previously prepared *Guidelines*.

Over 450 individuals were engaged at the in-person workshop and pop-up booths, and 2,190 individuals participated in the project's online survey. Every effort was made to involve a wide variety of stakeholders and the public, such as OLA-users, non-OLA users, non-dog owners, general park users, etc., however the reality was that the majority of individuals who participated in the engagement process were dog owners and OLA-users. A detailed description of this engagement process and the feedback collected can be found in **Appendix D**. The information collected during these engagement events was considered when compiling the draft version of the OLAMP.

The following themes emerged from the feedback gathered through this engagement process:

- Participants noted that the City is lacking a clear vision, goals, and objectives that will guide the future establishment of OLAs within Winnipeg;
- There is a desire for more OLAs to be established throughout Winnipeg, particularly those that are within walking distances from residents' homes;
- There is a strong desire for more OLAs to have secure boundaries, such as fencing. This would provide an increased level of comfort and safety for both OLA users and non-OLA users;
- Participants noted that OLA planning should be integrated into the City's parks/greenspace planning process;
- A number of participants noted that the establishment of future OLAs should not impede upon existing parks and greenspaces that are highly used by the City's residents;
- Participants would like the City to outline a clear process for the establishment of future OLAs;
- Participants noted that there is a need for a community engagement process when establishing new OLAs;
- Many OLA users noted that future OLAs should be considered 'single-use', (i.e., would only permit activities associated with off-leash dog use);



- Participants noted that OLAs should not be located adjacent to, or at minimum, maintain adequate separation distances from schools and playgrounds. Specifically, the OLAMP should include these separation distances; and
- Participants noted that communication and enforcement must be improved in order to mitigate safety concerns in and around OLAs. Participants believe that if the public had a better understanding of the City's rules and 'Code of Ethics' pertaining to OLAs, conflicts surrounding OLA use and off-leash dogs would be mitigated. Participants also noted that increased enforcement of OLA rules would help mitigate safety concerns as well as related by-law infractions.

Through the collection of feedback which informed the above themes, it is clear that in general the public desires more OLAs with upgraded amenities and design features to be distributed throughout Winnipeg. The OLAMP works to address these themes by providing direction of how the City can establish new OLAs which will help mitigate illicit off-leash activity, conflicts between OLA users, conflicts between other park users, and potential land-use conflicts.

Following the facilitation of the OLAMP's community and stakeholder engagement events, a draft version of the OLAMP was prepared, and in May of 2018, this draft document was posted on the OLAMP's project website along with a project summary and an online survey, which allowed the community and stakeholders to review the Plan (or its summary) and provide comments and feedback on the draft OLAMP. In total, 267 individuals completed the online survey, and another 634 individuals partially completed the online survey.

The following are the major themes that emerged from the feedback gathered through the OLAMP's final online engagement process:

- Many participants expressed that secure fencing should be a mandatory feature surrounding all of the City's OLAs in order to mitigate potential conflicts from occurring around OLAs;
- In addition to the establishment of secure fencing around OLAs, it was suggested that there is a strong desire for the establishment of 'single-use' OLAs in order to mitigate conflicts between park users that currently occur within 'multi-use' OLAs;
- A number of participants noted that the establishment of Seasonal Adaptive (temporary) OLAs in community centre hockey pens should be initiated by the City rather than the individual community centres themselves (or by a community organization or member of the general public); and
- A number of participants expressed concern that the OLAMP was written to reflect the 'balanced' interests of Winnipeg's park users, and that it should have been written to only reflect the needs and desires of OLA users.

This feedback provided from the community and stakeholders via the online survey was reviewed and considered by the project team. The following paragraphs explore how these themes were considered in this final iteration of the OLAMP.

The City supports the development of 'single-use' OLAs, and has committed to advocate for the establishment of 'single-use' OLAs over the establishment of 'multi-use' OLAs (see **Standard 3.1.2.4**). However, increased municipal resources are required to establish 'single-use' OLAs, (i.e., for fencing and additional maintenance). As a result, municipal budgets, site specific conditions, user-driven demand, and the standards outlined in the OLAMP, will determine if and where the City can establish 'single-use' OLAs. The City understands the benefits, and the user-demand for 'single-use' OLAs, and will work to establish and designate OLAs as 'single-use' where possible.

In addition, the City also supports the establishment of secure fencing around OLAs to promote safety and mitigate potential conflicts, however, the establishment of secure fencing requires increased municipal resources. The establishment of secure fencing around Winnipeg's current and future OLAs will be a matter of municipal budgets, site specific conditions, and the fiscal demands/prioritization of other City park planning and/or improvement projects. Although the establishment of secure, 'single-use' OLAs is a priority of the City, the establishment of these types of OLAs must retain a balance with the demands of other City projects/initiatives that require increased resources to facilitate.

A number of the OLAMP's standards were adjusted to reflect the City's support for the establishment of fenced, 'single-use' OLAs. **Table 1** (the OLA Classification Table) outlines that the City will consider designating any type of OLA (Regional, Community, or Neighbourhood) as 'single-use', however, this will be determined by the City on a case-by-case basis; **Standards 3.3.2.4**, **3.3.3.6**, and **3.3.4.6** were also adjusted to reflect this intent. However, if the City does not have the resources to establish fenced, 'single-use' OLAs, the City will make every effort to design and manage 'multi-use' OLAs that



maximize safety and minimize potential conflicts between general park users and OLA-users (see **Standard 3.1.2.3**, **3.1.2.5**, and **3.1.2.12**).

The **Seasonal Adaptive OLA** component of **Section 2.3.3** clarifies the relationship and management structure between the City, the City's community centres, and the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC), and establishes why the City cannot initiate the development of temporary (Seasonal Adaptive) OLAs in community centre hockey pens as per the current policies outlined in the GCWCC's Constitution. In order to change this management structure, the GCWCC and the City would need to agree to change the provisions outlined in the GCWCC's Constitution. This is something that the City is willing to explore with the GCWCC.

Lastly, the OLAMP was drafted to reflect the 'balanced' needs of Winnipeg's park users, which includes OLA-users, as well as other park users. The City supports the establishment and responsible management of OLAs in its parks and greenspaces, however, the City must also support and consider the interests of the City's other parks and greenspace users. As suggested in **Policy Consideration #1** in **Section 3**, the OLAMP must align with *OurWinnipeg*, the *Recreation and Parks Master Plan*, and the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*. In order to align with these documents, and to develop a responsible and implementable planning document, the OLAMP must establish policies and standards that not only consider the users of OLAs, but also the priorities of the other users of the City's parks system.

2.3.2 THE INTEGRATION OF THE GUIDELINES FOR OFF-LEASH DOG PARKS IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG (2012) INTO THE OLAMP

In 2012, a *Guidelines for Off-Leash Dog Parks in the City of Winnipeg* report was developed. Resulting from public demand in 2014, the City's Executive Policy Committee recommended further OLA research be conducted, supported by a comprehensive public engagement process. The OLAMP builds on the City's previously prepared *Guidelines* report while incorporating additional research and recommendations informed by stakeholders and the public. Below is an explanation of how the *Guidelines* were used when developing the OLAMP.

Part of the project's scope was to confirm content included in the *Guidelines* through the OLAMP's engagement process, and make adjustments where required. For example, the *Guidelines* outlines four (4) OLA classifications: Regional sites, Community sites, Neighbourhood sites, and Single-use sites. The *Guidelines* assigned each of these OLA classifications with a general size and a 'catchment' area, and recommendations for a standard set of amenities.

These OLA classifications were presented to stakeholders and the public during the OLAMP's engagement process, and were adjusted based on the feedback collected. Regional OLA standards were not changed as per the *Guidelines* report, however the minimum size of a Community OLA was decreased. This decrease in minimum size was due to one of Winnipeg's existing OLAs, the Woodsworth OLA, which was considered a 'neighbourhood' OLA as per the *Guidelines*, but better fit the characteristics of a Community OLA, based on its location, being surrounded by busy roads, adjacent industrial uses, and lack of integration into its adjacent residential neighbourhood.

The OLAMP also adjusted the Neighbourhood site and Single-use site classifications, combining them into one single classification: the Neighbourhood OLA. This adjustment was based on public feedback. The intent of the Neighbourhood OLA is to satisfy the need for smaller, more accessible neighbourhood OLAs that are located within walking distance of residents' homes. Size adjustments were made to this OLA classification from what was noted in the *Guidelines*; the OLAMP recommends that a Neighbourhood OLA range in size from 0.04 to 0.5 hectares (as opposed to what was suggested in the *Guidelines* being 0.25 to 1.0 hectares in size), and creates two Neighbourhood OLA subsets: a 'large' Neighbourhood OLA (to range in size from 0.1 to 0.5 hectares), and a 'small' Neighbourhood OLA (to range in size from 0.04 to 0.1 hectares). To provide some context to this size range, a standard sized community basketball court is 0.04 hectares in area, and Winnipeg's Bourkevale OLA is 0.28 hectares in area.

This range in size was based on public feedback; the public expressed two (2) types of OLAs that they would like to see established in locations that are 'walkable' from where they reside. The first being a small, fenced OLA similar to a 'dog run'. This was an OLA-type that many residents who live in multi-family, high-density neighbourhoods desired, particularly those that do not have access to private outdoor space. The second being an OLA that is 'walkable' from their home, but



provides enough area for a large dog to run. To accommodate these desires, the OLAMP design standards establish standards for a 'small' Neighborhood OLA (similar to a 'dog run') and a 'large' Neighborhood OLA, see **Section 3.3.4**.

As suggested above, public engagement expressed a significant emphasis on the establishment of more OLAs that are within 'walkable' distances of residents' homes, thus the catchment area for the Neighborhood OLA was adjusted to 1.2 km, which equates to an approximate 15 minute walk (or less) for those who reside within the OLA's catchment. This desire expressed by the public is also consistent with the directions emphasized in *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities* for the promotion of active mobility, pedestrian connectivity, and to provide municipal services that are equitable and accessible to all residents.

The label 'single-use' was removed from the 'Neighbourhood (single-use)' OLA name as presented in the *Guidelines*, as the term 'single-use' caused a significant amount of confusion for the public and stakeholders. A 'single-use' OLA suggests that only activities associated with off-leash dog activities will be permitted in the area. Therefore the OLAs that do not have 'single-use' in the title imply that they are all 'multi-use', meaning that all activities permitted in the park can occur in the designated OLA area.

Although the OLAMP standards suggests only the 'small' Neighbourhood OLAs are always 'single-use', the OLAMP also recommends that 'single-use' areas are designated by the City within each of the other OLA classifications, as this is something users greatly desire. Therefore, a Neighbourhood OLA can be a small, single-use, dog-run like OLA; a small or large un-fenced, multi-use OLA; a large, multi-use OLA with a designated 'single-use' area; or a large, fenced, single-use OLA. How each new Neighbourhood OLAs will be designed will be determined by the City, and based on a number of factors including demand, land availability, adjacent land-uses, capital budgets, etc.

The *Guidelines* report contains a brief distribution analysis of the City's OLAs, which was replaced through **Figures 2** and **3**. These Figures clearly illustrate the areas in Winnipeg that are not located within an OLA's catchment area, and makes suggestion as to how the City should begin to prioritize these 'underserved' OLA areas, through the establishment of new OLAs.

The *Guidelines* also included 'level of service' guidelines for the different OLA facilities. These were confirmed and adjusted based on stakeholder and public feedback, and are incorporated into the OLAMP as design standards. Adjustments were made to be more specific, such as the incorporation of specific setback distances between an OLA and certain land-uses, and established other specific mitigation measures, (i.e., the requirement of fencing of 1.5 metres in height). These standards also increased the number of land-uses that are considered to be 'incompatible' when adjacent to OLAs, which was also based on engagement feedback, as the public expressed concerns regarding the placement of OLAs next to certain land-uses, particularly those which commonly have children.

The OLAMP also includes two processes for the establishment of future OLAs, one for the establishment of permanent OLAs, and one for temporary (Seasonal Adaptive) OLAs. These processes replace and clarify the process outlined in *Appendix A* of the *Guidelines* as per feedback received through public engagement and through the public service.

2.3.3 THE INTEGRATION OF WINNIPEG OLA OBSERVATIONS & FEEDBACK INTO THE OLAMP

As per the public feedback collected through this plan's engagement process, the City is not meeting the current demand for the development of OLAs. Referencing the results from the engagement processes' online mapping tool, it was suggested by resident's that they would like to see OLAs established in most parks and greenspaces across the City. This makes sense, as dog ownership is also dispersed across the city. On the other hand, many members of the public expressed that they do not want OLAs within their parks and greenspaces. **Figure 4** and **5** illustrate where the public would like to see OLAs, and where they do not want to see OLAs (these figures are also included in **Appendix D**). There is a significant amount of overlap in this feedback, therefore, it will be the City's job to balance the distribution of future OLAs carefully, and ensure that their establishment is considerate of the public's concern and adjacent land-uses.

The following additional observations were compiled from information and ideas obtained from a variety of sources, such as public and stakeholder feedback, OLA site visits and user-counts, a catchment area analysis of Winnipeg's existing OLAs, and a best practices precedent review. These apply specifically to the Regional, Community, Neighbourhood, and Seasonal Adaptive Neighbourhood OLAs.

REGIONAL & COMMUNITY OLAS

Confirmed through the OLAMP's engagement process, the catchment area for a Regional OLA is 7.5 km (an approximate 20 minute drive), and the catchment area for a Community OLA is 3.75 km (an approximate 10 minute drive). Winnipeg currently has four (4) regional OLAs, and five (5) community OLAs. **Figure 2** illustrates the catchment areas for a Regional OLA and Community OLA. The purpose of these catchment areas is to provide context to the current location of Winnipeg's Regional and Community OLAs and assist with the siting and distribution of future OLAs in Winnipeg. **Figure 2** indicates that 98% of Winnipeg is currently located within a Regional OLA catchment area, and 50% of Winnipeg is located within a Community OLA catchment area.

Public feedback confirmed that the Regional OLAs are all widely used (and desired) by their users, and draw from a larger base of users outside their 'catchment areas'. Community OLAs are also very popular, however, are not used to the extent that the Regional OLAs are used. OLA observations, public feedback, and site visits noted that Community OLAs are not as popular due to their locations (some are not conveniently located adjacent to/within residential areas), and unsafe conditions (poor maintenance, adjacent to busy roads, lack of protection from adjacent land-uses). Thus, the City should focus on improving the deficiencies of existing Community OLAs prior to establishing new facilities, such as providing better boundaries, like fencing to improve the safety of OLAs.

Overall, engagement feedback did not indicate that there are a lack of Regional or Community OLAs in Winnipeg. However, they suggested that future Community OLAs should be better integrated into neighbourhoods. The public expressed concerns that a gap in service would occur if the City removed or reduced existing Regional and/or Community OLAs.

As a result of the observations and feedback, ideally all of Winnipeg should be served by either a Regional OLA or Community OLA catchment area (see **Standard 3.2.3.2**), and if the City is required to remove or reduce an existing Regional or Community OLA, the City will establish an OLA of similar size within that general area of the city. If adequate land is not available, the City may establish municipal OLAs in that general area to compensate for the original OLA that was removed (see **Standard 3.1.2.16**).

Based on public feedback and the directions presented in *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities* which encourages the establishment of walkable, accessible parks and greenspaces, this Plan emphasises the development of more small and large Neighbourhood OLAs over the development of additional Regional and Community OLAs.

During the engagement process, participants expressed the desire for 'single-use' OLAs. The City supports and will advocate for the establishment of 'single-use' OLAs, and on a case-by-case basis, will explore the option of establishing 'single-use' Regional or Community OLAs, or the conversion of areas within these larger OLAs as 'single-use', however, this will be based on municipal budget considerations, site-specific considerations, and user-driven demand. The City may also consider the establishment of OLAs that are designated as 'singe-use' *during restricted times*. This could be done in 'multi-use' OLAs that are heavily used by other recreational users, for example, mountain bikers and runners. To promote safety and mitigate risk and conflict between users, the City could explore the option of limiting off-leash use to only certain times of day (i.e., 9 a.m. – 11 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.). Outside of these specific times, off-leash use could be restricted.







City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

Off-Leash Dog Area Catchment Distance

- Community Catchment Area (3.75 km)
- Regional Catchment Area (7.5 km)

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1.2 km, 15 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: City of Winnipeg, MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: March 16, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 2

Current Off-Leash Dog Areas and Community and Regional Catchment Areas

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\CatchmentArea_CommRegDogPark_Bsize_20180316.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

Off-Leash Dog Area Catchment Distance

- Neighbourhood Catchment Area (1.2 km)

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site
- Community Site
- Regional Site
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: City of Winnipeg, MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: March 16, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 3

Current Off-Leash Dog Areas and Neighbourhood Catchment Areas

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-003780-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\CatchmentArea_LargeScaleDogPark_Bsize_20180316.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

- Would like to see off-leash areas

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Community Centre
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: February 08, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 4

Areas in the city where I would like to see an OLA

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\PublicEngagementMaps\MAP2_WouldLikeToSeeOffLeashArea_Bsize_20180208.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

- Would not like to see off-leash areas

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Community Centre
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: February 08, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 5

Areas in the city where I would not like to see an OLA

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\PublicEngagementMaps\MAP3_WouldNotLikeToSeeOffLeashArea_Baize_20180208.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

Dog Park Catchment Area Distance

- Neighbourhood Catchment Area (1.2 km)
- Other Catchment Areas (1.2 km)

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site
- Community Site
- Regional Site
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: City of Winnipeg, MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: April 12, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 6

Current Off-Leash Dog Areas and Neighbourhood Catchment Areas

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\CatchmentArea_1.2kmDogPark_Bsize_20180412.mxd

NEIGHBOURHOOD OLAS

As per engagement feedback, there is a high demand for 'neighbourhood' OLAs that are dispersed through residential neighbourhoods and can be easily accessed within a short walk from residents' homes. This desire is consistent with certain directions presented within *OurWinnnipeg* and *Complete Communities* as described in the previous sections. As such, the catchment area for the Neighbourhood OLA is 1.2 km, which represents an approximate fifteen (15) minute walk.

Presently, Winnipeg has four (4) OLAs which fall into the 'large' Neighbourhood OLA classification, see **Figure 3**. Winnipeg does not have any OLAs currently that would be considered 'small' Neighbourhood OLAs. Currently only 4.61% of Winnipeg is covered by the Neighbourhood OLA catchment area, however, **Figure 6** illustrates that if all of Winnipeg's OLAs were assigned a 1.2 km catchment area, 10.23% of Winnipeg can generally access an OLA within a 15 minute walk (or less).

To meet the demands of the public, the City must begin to move forward in the establishment of additional Neighbourhood OLAs. Public feedback, as well as information derived from the project's best practice review, suggested that the City could prioritize areas to establish a neighbourhood OLA based on a variety of criteria, such as: areas of Winnipeg that are considered 'underserved', population density, dog license density, sites that can be developed 'sustainably', and land availability. The OLA Siting Standards were informed by the above suggestions, which are described in **Section 3.2.3**.

It was suggested that the City should consider 'underserved' areas, as those areas that do not fall within the 'neighbourhood' OLA catchment area, therefore the parts of the city that do not appear within a catchment area in **Figure 4** would be considered 'underserved' by neighbourhood OLAs.

Like other municipalities, it was suggested that the City examine population density and dog license density (based on the number of dog licenses per household and the address of the household with the dog license) to further prioritize where neighbourhood OLAs should go. Once the City establishes where its 'underserved' areas are, they should then select areas of priority based the areas of the City that have the highest population density and the highest concentration of dog licenses.

In order to establish neighborhood OLAs that are safe, successful, and sustainable in the long-term (i.e., compatible with adjacent land-uses, safe for users, can be included within the City's capital and operations budgets, etc.), the City should then utilize the OLA siting criteria/checklist, as is done in other municipalities.

SEASONAL ADAPTIVE OLAS

Public feedback suggested that the City should permit the establishment of 'seasonal' OLAs in locations that may not be widely used during certain seasons/the 'off-season'. Seasonal OLAs are temporary in nature and can be a cost effective way of fulfilling a neighbourhood's need for an OLA. Winnipeg has a number on non-sanctioned Seasonal Adaptive OLAs, however, the City is interested in endorsing the establishment of this type of OLA facility.

Two types of 'seasonal' OLAs were cited by the public during the engagement process, these were the establishment of a temporary OLA in community centre hockey pen (during the summer), and on a frozen river. Tennis courts (during the winter) could potentially be another option for a Seasonal Adaptive OLA. Opportunities and constraints for these options were explored, and are described as follows:

Hockey Pens/Tennis Courts

The public community centre model in Winnipeg is unique from other Canadian cities; although community centres are owned by the City, they are not managed and operated by the City. Rather, community centres are governed by a group of volunteers with a community-elected Board of Directors. The City provides an annual operating grant to the community centre to cover basic maintenance and utilities while each individual community centre is responsible for all other costs, such as staffing, programming, capital improvements, and equipment.

In addition to the City's ownership and funding role for Winnipeg's community centres, the Greater Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) is an organization that provides leadership and direction for Winnipeg's community centres, reviews and develops policy statements on issues related to community centres, as well as acts as an effective communication link between City Council, the public service, and Winnipeg's community centres.



This organizational mandate is outlined in **Article 2** of the *GCWCC Constitution*, as follows:

> ***Article 2 – Objectives:***
>
> *2.1* *To provide leadership and direction to all City of Winnipeg Neighbourhood Clubs and Community Recreation and Leisure Centre herein and after called "Community Centres" which are members of the GCWCC, in cooperation with the District Community Centre Boards and the City of Winnipeg.*
>
> *2.2* *To review and develop policy statements, documents and manuals on issues of common interests for Community Centres and District Boards.*
>
> *2.3* *To encourage cooperation and unity of purpose in all matters associated with Community recreation and leisure activities.*
>
> *2.4* *To provide a central organization to support and speak on behalf of its members on all matters of common interest.*
>
> *2.5* *To provide an effective communication link between City Council, all Departments of the City and Community Centres.*

There are currently sixty-three (63) community centres with outdoor hockey pens in Winnipeg. In the summer months, some of these hockey pens are used for recreational activities, such as ball hockey, box lacrosse, mini soccer, and bike polo; however, many are unused. In municipalities, such as the City of Regina and the City of Eden Prairie, Minnesota, hockey pens are used as temporary seasonal OLAs in the summer months (i.e., from May to September). These municipalities manage and maintain the seasonal OLAs. In Winnipeg, because community centres are governed by their individual Board of Directors, it would be up to each individual community centre Board to determine whether they would permit their hockey pens to be used as Seasonal Adaptive OLAs.

Due to the City's management structure with its community centres and the GCWCC, as per the GCWCC's Constitution, it is suggested that a proposal to establish a Seasonal Adaptive OLA within a community centre's hockey-pen should be initiated by an OLA association, Community Centre Board of Directors, an established community organization, or a member of the public. The City and the GCWCC will support the Community Centre's use of hockey pens as Seasonal Adaptive OLAs, but this use must be evaluated and approved by the Community Centre Board on an annual basis. If a temporary OLA is established within a hockey pen, and it is well utilized, the City could consider establishing a permanent Neighbourhood OLA near this location if land is available. The process to establish a Seasonal Adaptive OLA is outlined in **Section 4.2**.

Establishing a Seasonal Adaptive OLA in a tennis court during the winter would require similar approvals to establishing a Seasonal Adaptive OLA in a hockey pen. There are thirty-seven (37) locations around Winnipeg with public outdoor tennis courts, eighteen (18) of those under the jurisdiction of a community centre. The establishment of a Seasonal Adaptive OLA in a tennis court would either require the approval of a Community Centre Board of Directors or the City.

Winter River Trail

In Winnipeg during the winter months, the river trail is a popular destination for cold-weather recreational activities. The trail is used for walking, skating, skiing, and sledding, and is located on parts of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. The trail is generally open between January and March, depending on weather conditions. An OLA association, other private organization, or community centre could sponsor a seasonal temporary OLA at a location along the winter river trail. This option would have to be reviewed and approved by the City, and all necessary precautions to ensure public safety must be considered and implemented.

The design standards for Seasonal Adaptive OLAs within **Section 3.3.5** were informed by the information noted above. The City will support the development of Seasonal Adaptive OLAs. If established, capital and operational funding will be required to support the development/facilitation of signage, communications, additional garbage pick-up, snow clearing, and fencing (potentially); the party responsible for the initiation and development of this OLA will be responsible for these costs.

2.3.4 *NEXT STEPS*

The following three (3) sections of the OLAMP contain design standards which are to be applied to the establishment of new OLAs, and the evaluation of current OLAs. These standards provide direction for the siting, design and management of OLAs.

The development of these standards were informed through the compilation of best practices, stakeholder feedback, public feedback and recommended policies. Some of the standards were taken from the *Guidelines* and adjusted based on the feedback retained from the project's engagement process. It is the goal that these standards will meet the demands of the public while using a balanced approach when establishing future OLAs in Winnipeg.

The City understands that the OLAMP is an 'evolving document', and it will be reviewed every five (5) years to ensure that it is continuing to meet its goals and objectives.



3 PLANNING POLICIES & STANDARDS FOR OLAS

Planning is an essential part of the enhancement of existing and establishment of future OLAs throughout Winnipeg. In order to effectively plan for OLAs, the following section outlines the overarching policies and specific standards that will assist in the siting, design, and management of these desired areas. The policies and standards provide direction for how to meet the local demand for OLAs in a logical and sustainable manner, in alignment with *OurWinnipeg*, the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*, and will also align with the *Recreation and Parks Master Plan*.

The policies and standards included herein reflect recommendations from the previous *Guidelines*, stakeholder and community feedback received during the public engagement process, observations gathered from local OLA site visits and user-counts, and OLA best practices implemented by a variety of municipalities from across North America.

The following chapter is divided into four sub-sections, including:

- General Considerations for OLA planning
- OLA Siting
- OLA Design
- OLA Management

Each section begins with the applicable overarching OLAMP policies, followed by a series of OLAMP standards that will assist the public service and its partners in achieving the intent of these policies.

The City of Winnipeg's OLAMP includes seven (7) overarching policies to guide the siting, design, and management of OLAs; these policies are as follows:

Off-leash Area Master Plan (OLAMP) Policy Considerations:

1. The Off-leash Area (OLA) Policies and Standards must align with *OurWinnipeg*, the *Recreation and Parks Master Plan*, and the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*.
2. The City will establish a budget line item to support capital investment in the establishment and enhancement of OLAs based on the most current siting and design standards, as outlined in the OLAMP, and will establish additional operating budget resources for the management of OLAs, as per the most current management (service level) standards described in the OLAMP.
3. The City shall consider opportunities for OLAs through the land development process.
4. The City shall establish permanent OLAs in accordance with the most current siting standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
5. The City shall establish temporary OLAs in accordance with the most current siting standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
6. Design of OLAs shall comply with the most current design standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
7. Management of OLAs shall comply with the most current management (or service level) standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.



3.1 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR OLA PLANNING

The policies and standards included in **General Considerations for OLA Planning** apply to all OLAs, and do not vary depending on the particular OLA Classification.

3.1.1 *GENERAL OLAMP POLICY CONSIDERATIONS*

1. The OLA Policies and Standards must align with *OurWinnipeg*, the *Recreation and Parks Master Plan*, and the *Regional Parks Investment Strategy*.
2. The City will establish a budget line item to support capital investment in the establishment and enhancement of OLAs based on the most current siting and design standards, as outlined in the OLAMP, and will establish additional operating budget resources for the management of OLAs, as per the most current management (service level) standards described in the OLAMP.
3. The City shall consider opportunities for OLAs through the land development process.

3.1.2 *GENERAL OLA STANDARDS*

3.1.2.1 The City will evaluate the need for new OLAs and determine how best to achieve the variety and coverage required based on Policy and within the context of the OLA Classifications.

3.1.2.2 The City will ensure all new OLAs comply with Universal Design Standards and will identify resources to adapt existing OLAs to better meet Universal Design Standards.

3.1.2.3 The City will design, ideally with fencing or other barriers to define clear boundaries, and manage OLAs to maximize safety and mitigate potential conflicts between general park users and OLAs in multi-use parks.

3.1.2.4 The City will advocate for 'single-use' OLAs over current 'multi-use' OLAs. A single-use OLA will provide for exclusive use of activities associated with off-leash dogs. 'Multi-use' OLAs, which are currently located within multi-use parks are not exclusive to off-leash activities. Wherever possible, on a case-by-case basis, the City will designate and design OLAs as 'single-use' based on municipal budget considerations, site-specific considerations, and user-driven demand.

3.1.2.5 The City will incorporate mitigation features when redeveloping or planning 'multi-use' OLAs in order to minimize potential conflicts between dogs, their owners, and other park users. This could include design interventions, public awareness campaigns, additional signage, and additional enforcement.

3.1.2.6 Where possible, the City's OLAs will include amenities in accordance with their appropriate OLA Classification.

3.1.2.7 Permanent OLAs should include a standard level of site amenities including signage, open areas for running and playing, waste receptacles, clearly marked boundaries, and seating, in accordance with their appropriate OLA Classification.

3.1.2.8 The City will explore the provision of additional amenities in permanent OLAs on a case-by-case basis subject to existing site servicing, municipal budgets, and potential partnerships with OLA associations.

3.1.2.9 The City may consider additional OLA amenities in partnership with OLA associations and/or with private entities. These amenities and their management will be determined on a case-by-case basis in collaboration with the City's Parks and Open Space Division, but could include agility courses, additional waste or bag receptacles, dog enclosures, additional lighting, trails, water access, drinking fountains, etc.

3.1.2.10 The City and an OLA association/private entity must establish management and service levels to ensure that the ongoing maintenance costs and management of additional OLA amenities are considered and resources are available.

3.1.2.11 OLAs that have secure boundaries (fully enclosed fencing) must have double-gated entries and exits (see **Figure 7**).



3.1.2.12 The City will clearly mark and communicate the boundaries of OLAs to minimize potential confusion and conflict. Visible boundaries may include signage and secure and/or permeable boundary features such as berms, fencing, existing landscape features, or a combination thereof. However, the City will aim to establish secure boundaries (fencing) around its OLAs based on municipal budget considerations and site-specific conditions.



Figure 7: Illustration of Double Gated Entry/Exit

3.1.2.13 OLA design shall provide access into the site by service/maintenance vehicles.

3.1.2.14 The City will site and design OLAs to minimize capital and operating demands.

3.1.2.15 Site drainage within OLAs will be managed so that surface water does not cause any negative impacts to the environment, adjacent properties, or adjacent waterbodies.

3.1.2.16 Should an existing OLA be adjusted, removed, or reduced by the City, the City will establish a new OLA of similar size within that general area of the city. If a similar sized OLA is not feasible, the City may establish multiple OLAs in that general area to compensate for the original OLA that was removed within the context of the appropriate OLA Classification and **Siting Standards** and **Design Standards** must be considered.

3.1.2.17 The City will consider the incorporation of OLA land-uses in the same manner that the City considers the incorporation of other activities, land-uses, and interests in the parks planning process for both established and new communities.

3.1.2.18 The City will consider the incorporation of OLA planning into its City's parks and greenspace planning efforts for New Communities and Secondary Plans/Precinct Plans, in the same way the City considers the incorporation of other activities, land-uses, and interests for New Communities and Secondary Plans/Precinct Plans.

3.2 OLA SITING

The policies and standards included in **OLA Siting** provide direction for identifying the logical and appropriate location for future OLAs within the City as a whole, within a particular neighbourhood, as well as an OLA's specific location and orientation on a site.

To assist with the siting and design of the various types of OLAs in Winnipeg, the City will utilize an OLA Classification system, which categorizes OLAs into one of five Classifications, including:

- Regional OLA;
- Community OLA;
- Neighborhood OLA; and
- Seasonal Adaptive OLA.

3.2.1 *OLA CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY*

In order to relate the size of the various OLA Classifications, the following standard field sizes may be used for comparison:

- Six Par Golf Course = ~8 ha;
- Two standard sized soccer fields = ~1.2 ha.
- Canadian Football League field = ~0.8 ha;
- Standard softball field = ~0.4 ha;
- Standard sized basketball court = ~0.04 ha; and
- Standard sized hockey pen = ~0.02 ha.

- Regional OLA = 8 ha +;
- Community OLA = 0.5 – 8 ha; and
- Neighbourhood OLA = 0.04 – 0.5 ha.

The following Table 1: OLA Classification Summary Table should be used in conjunction with both the OLA Siting Standards, as well as the OLA Design Standards.

Table 1: OLA Classification Summary Table

OLA Classification	Regional	Community	Neighbourhood	Seasonal Adaptive
Approximate Size	8 ha or above	0.5 to 8 ha	0.04 to 0.5 ha	Will vary depending on site
Catchment Area	7.5 km catchment area (~20 minute drive)	3.75 km catchment area (~10 minute drive)	1.2 km catchment (~15 minute walk)	n/a
Distribution	All of Winnipeg to be covered either by the Regional or Community OLA catchment area.		Priority to establish a Neighbourhood OLA will be based on: - Underserved areas of Winnipeg; - Population density; - Density of dog licenses;	On a case-by-case basis as initiated by interested parties (see Section 4.2)



OLA Classification	Regional	Community	Neighbourhood	Seasonal Adaptive
			- Sites where OLAs can be developed in a 'sustainable' manner, (i.e., comply with the OLAMP's policies and standards); and - Land availability. See **Standard 3.2.3.4** for a more detail on the aforementioned criteria.	
Single-Use vs. Multi-Use	The City will designate the OLA as 'single-use' on a case-by-case basis. If the entire OLA is not designated 'single-use', a 'single-use' dog enclosure is recommended within the 'multi-use' OLA.	The City will designate the OLA as 'single-use' on a case-by-case basis. If the entire OLA is not designated 'single-use', a 'single-use' dog enclosure is recommended within the 'multi-use' OLA.	The City will designate the OLA as 'single-use' on a case-by-case basis, however all 'small' Neighbourhood OLAs are to be designated as 'single-use'.	Single-use
Setback Distances	Where feasible, a 50-metre setback distance from all residential uses to mitigate noise concerns, and Where applicable, a 50-metre setback distance from the following uses is required, unless separated by a secure fence of at least 1.5 metres in height is recommended: - Elementary schools; - Playgrounds; - Daycares; - Family picnic areas; - Any other uses commonly occupied by children; - Ecological areas of sensitivity; - Community gardens; - Children's wading pools & splash pads; - Sports fields and other high-intensity park uses; - Busy roads; and - Multi-use trails/pathways.			n/a
Public Engagement	√	√	√	√	n/a



OLA Classification	Regional	Community	Neighbourhood		Seasonal Adaptive
Process Required for Development					
Standard Amenities					
Waste Receptacles	√	√	√	√	√
Signage	√	√	√	√	√ (Temporary)
By-law/ Enforcement Information Posted at OLA	√	√	√		√ (Temporary)
Secure Boundaries (Fencing)	As needed	As needed	As needed		Will vary depending on site
Permeable Boundaries (Landscaping, Berms)	√ (May require fencing in certain locations, depending on site)	√ (May require fencing in certain locations, depending on site)	√ (May require fencing in certain locations, depending on site)		Will vary based on location of OLA
On-site Parking	√	√	n/a		n/a
Seating	√	√	√		n/a
Open Area	√	√	√		√
Internal Trails/Pathways	√	√ (where feasible)	n/a		n/a
Enclosed Small Dog/Puppy Pen	√	√	n/a		n/a
Separated Areas for Large/Small Dogs	√ (Where feasible)	√ (Where feasible)	√ (Where feasible)		n/a
Enhanced Amenities, Must be Financed/Managed/Maintained by OLA Association					



OLA Classification	Regional	Community	Neighbourhood	Seasonal Adaptive
Waste Bag Dispensers	Optional			n/a
Notice Board	Optional			n/a
Agility Equipment	Optional			n/a
Potable Water Source	√ (Where servicing is available/feasible)			n/a
Other Enhancements proposed by OLA Associations	√			n/a

3.2.2 *OLAMP SITING POLICY CONSIDERATIONS*

1. The City shall designate permanent OLAs in accordance with the most current siting standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.
2. The City shall designate Seasonal Adaptive OLAs in accordance with the most current siting standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.

3.2.3 *OLA SITING STANDARDS*

3.2.3.1 The site selection process for new OLAs will be guided by the **OLA Siting Criteria**, policies, and standards included within the OLAMP, in conjunction with a comprehensive public engagement process.

3.2.3.2 All of Winnipeg should be served by a Regional OLA or Community OLA catchment area.

3.2.3.3 Neighbourhood OLAs should be established throughout Winnipeg.

3.2.3.4 Priority to establish new permanent OLAs should consider and evaluate the following **OLA Siting Criteria**:

a. Underserved areas of the city; underserved areas of the city are considered areas that are not located within an OLAs catchment area pertaining to its OLA Classification. The future siting of a Regional or Community OLA will consider the location of these existing OLAs together. The future siting of a Neighbourhood OLA will not require the consideration of the Regional or Community OLA catchment areas. **Figure 2** illustrates the areas that are 'underserved' by a Regional or Community OLA, and **Figure 6** illustrates the areas that are 'underserved' by Neighbourhood OLAs.

b. Population density; areas of the city that have a higher population density.

c. Dog license density; areas of the city that have a higher density of dog licenses based on number of dog licenses per household address;

d. Sites where OLAs can be developed 'sustainably'; these sites would be considered places where an OLA that can be established that is safe, successful, and sustainable in the long-term, (i.e., compatible with adjacent land-uses), safe for users, can be accommodated into the City's capital and operations budgets, and complies with the standards of the OLAMP; and

e. Land availability; available municipal land in existing parks and greenspaces that is not significantly utilized by the public currently for recreational activities.



3.2.3.5 Temporary OLA (Seasonal Adaptive OLAs) will not require the consideration of the **OLA Siting Criteria** as outlined in **Standard 3.2.3.4** or the **OLA Screening Checklist**.

3.2.3.6 Once a potential future OLA location has been identified in accordance with the **OLA Siting Criteria**, the **OLA Screening Checklist** should be used to help evaluate the viability of the specific site (see **Table 2**).



Table 2: OLA Screening Checklist

OLA Screening Checklist		
Question	**Yes / No / NA**	**Comments / Mitigation**
Is the identified site on City land or is there an opportunity to lease or acquire the land?		
Does the identified site fill an OLA service level gap?		
Is the identified site at least .04 ha in size?		
If the site is located within an existing multi-use site, can strategies be implemented to mitigate conflict and safety issues? (peripheral location as opposed to central, clear boundary delineations)		
Is the identified site safe for people and dogs? (buffers from conflicting uses, away from major roadways)		
Does the site have adequate drainage?		
Is there adequate space to accommodate parking? (Neighbourhood and Seasonal Adaptive OLAs are exempt)		
Is stakeholder support likely?		
Is resident support likely?		
Is the identified site easily accessible by the public?		
Is the identified site easily accessible for service vehicles?		
Is the topography and terrain suitable and not subject to stability issues?		
Is the identified site not expected to be developed in the next 15-20 years?		
Can impacts to natural areas be mitigated?		
Is the cost of implementation and maintenance reasonable?		



3.2.3.7 Future OLAs shall not not eliminate highly utilized recreational land-uses, such as playgrounds, tot lots, school grounds, and athletic fields as determined by the City's Responsible Pet Ownership By-Law 92/2013 Section 49 6 (2) (a) and (b). Within established neighbourhoods, it is a priority to establish OLAs within underutilized greenspaces and potentially within areas currently used as unofficial or temporary OLAs.

3.2.3.8 When assessing locations for a new OLA, a review of adjacent land uses is required to mitigate potential land-use conflicts.

3.2.3.9 Compatible OLA uses include:

a. Passive parks/greenspaces; and

b. Greenspaces with low ecological/environmental sensitivity.

3.2.3.10 When located adjacent to an OLA, the following uses are considered incompatible, and will either require a mitigation measure or prohibit OLA development:

a. Elementary schools;
b. Playgrounds;
c. Daycares;
d. Family picnic areas;
e. Any other uses commonly occupied by children;
f. Ecological areas of sensitivity;
g. Community gardens;
h. Children's wading pools and splash pads;
i. Sports fields and other high-intensity park uses;
j. Busy roads; and
k. Multi-use trails/pathways.

3.2.3.11 The City will make every effort to establish new OLAs next to 'compatible' uses; however, if an OLA is located adjacent to a land-use that is considered 'incompatible', the following mitigation measures may be incorporated into the design of the OLA, specifically:

a. The OLA's entrance could be located away from the incompatible use;
b. A secure boundary (a fence) of at least 1.5 metres (5 feet) in height could be established around the OLA; or
c. A minimum separation distance of 50 metres could be established around the OLA, as well as other boundary features such as landscaping and berms.

3.2.3.12 Where feasible, OLAs adjacent to residential areas should maintain a minimum setback distance of 50 metres to mitigate noise. The requirement for visual screening will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

3.2.3.13 Future OLAs shall be located in areas that minimize impacts on the natural environment.

3.2.3.14 OLA designs shall incorporate clear sightlines to promote site safety.

3.2.3.15 OLAs should maintain direct access from their designated parking areas or the street to reduce safety concerns of off-leash dogs outside the OLA.

3.3 OLA DESIGN

The policies and standards included in **OLA Design** provide direction for the design of OLAs, in accordance with their applicable OLA Classification. As mentioned above, the OLA Classifications are as follows:

- Regional OLA;
- Community OLA;
- Neighborhood OLA; and
- Seasonal Adaptive OLA.



3.3.1 *OLAMP POLICY CONSIDERATIONS*

1. Design of OLAs shall comply with the most current design standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.

3.3.2 *REGIONAL OLA DESIGN STANDARDS*

Regional OLAs are the largest of the City's OLAs and can offer a variety of amenities. These OLAs tend to attract a greater number of visitors during peak times, particularly on weekday evenings and weekends. It is likely that OLA users who live in close proximity to a Regional OLA may visit multiple times per week. Regional OLAs also attract a number of visitors who visit less frequently, potentially only for an occasional weekend recreational outing. Regional OLAs are generally located far apart from one another and only accessible to the majority of users by motor vehicle. As a result, these OLAs require significant parking facilities.



Figure 8: Illustrative Example of Regional OLA

3.3.2.1 Regional OLAs should be over 8 hectares in size.

3.3.2.2 Regional OLAs should maintain a catchment area of 7.5 kilometres. This generally translates to an approximate 20-minute drive or less for those residents who live within the catchment area.

3.3.2.3 Regional OLAs do not require secure fencing; however, clearly defined boundaries are recommended using a combination of secure and permeable boundaries such as landscaping, berms, trees/shrubs, partial fencing, or other boundary features. Where necessary, the installation of partial fencing may be required to maintain and enhance the safety of all users, or to protect adjacent land-uses.

3.3.2.4 The City may designate an area within a Regional OLA as a 'single-use' or designate the entire Regional OLA as 'single-use', and as such, secure boundaries should be established around the 'single-use' area, however, this will be based on municipal budget considerations, site-specific conditions, and user-driven demand. Only activities associated with off-leash dog use will be permitted within the single-use area of an OLA.

3.3.2.5 The City will determine if and where the single-use area of the OLA will be located. This area will be clearly identified by on-site signage.

3.3.2.6 Regional OLAs should include the following amenities:

a. Waste receptacles;

b. Signage;

c. Open space;
d. Trees;
e. Trails/pathways;
f. Seating; and
g. Single-use fenced enclosure (for puppies, training, or other specific needs).

3.3.2.7 Regional OLAs must have designated on-site parking.

3.3.2.8 Regional OLAs are typically located adjacent to collector or arterial roads. The City may consider the traffic impacts of the Regional OLA on adjacent neighbourhoods through the completion of a traffic impact study prior to its establishment.

3.3.2.9 The City should prioritize enhancing existing Regional OLAs prior to establishing new Regional OLAs.

3.3.3 *COMMUNITY OLA DESIGN STANDARDS*

Community OLAs are the second largest type of OLA in Winnipeg and offer a significant amount of space. Where feasible, a Community OLA should offer the same standard amenities as a Regional OLA. Most users consider the Community OLAs as "destinations', as the majority of these OLAs are located outside of residential neighbourhoods, and therefore, are not widely accessed by pedestrian traffic. In the future, Community OLAs should be better integrated into existing residential areas, while maintaining appropriate setbacks, so that they can be easily accessed by potential users.



Figure 9: Illustrative Example of Community OLA

3.3.3.1 Community OLAs should be approximately 0.5 to 8 hectares in size.

3.3.3.2 Community OLAs should maintain a catchment area of approximately 3.75 kilometres. This generally translates to an approximate 10-minute drive or less for those residents who live within the catchment area.

3.3.3.3 The City shall prioritize future Community OLAs in areas that are adjacent to or easily accessible to residential neighbourhoods, rather than locating them within industrial or commercial areas.

3.3.3.4 Community OLAs do not require secure fencing; however, clearly defined boundaries are recommended using a combination of secure and permeable boundaries such as landscaping, berms, trees/shrubs, partial fencing or other boundary features. Where necessary, the installation of partial fencing may be required to maintain and enhance the safety of all users, or to protect adjacent land-uses.

3.3.3.5 The City should prioritize the enhancement of existing Community OLAs prior to establishing new Community OLAs.

3.3.3.6 The City may designate an area within a Community OLA as 'single-use' or designate the entire Community OLA as 'single-use', and as such, secure boundaries should be established around the 'single-use' area, however, this will be based on municipal budget considerations, site-specific conditions, and user-driven demand. Only activities associated with off-leash dog use will be permitted within the single-use area of an OLA.

3.3.3.7 Community OLAs should connect to pedestrian routes, where possible.

3.3.3.8 Community OLAs should include the following amenities:

a. Waste receptacles;
b. Signage;
c. Open space;
d. Trees;
e. Trails/pathways (where feasible);
f. Seating; and
g. Consideration for a single-use fenced enclosure (for small/elderly dogs, puppies, training, or other specific needs).

3.3.3.9 Community OLAs should have on-site parking, as well as access to on-street parking.

3.3.3.10 Community OLAs should have access from collector or arterial roads. The City must consider the traffic impacts of the OLA on adjacent neighbourhoods and may consider the facilitation of a traffic impact study.

3.3.3.11 Time restrictions for Community OLAs may be considered for 'multi-use' sites, (i.e., restricting off-leash dog use to only certain times of the day to avoid conflict during athletic field play times or daycare/school use of site).

3.3.4 *NEIGHBOURHOOD OLA DESIGN STANDARDS*

Neighbourhood OLAs should be considered for Winnipeg's parks and greenspaces and within new and established residential neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood OLAs should be approximately 0.04 to 0.5 hectares in size.

The following standards are divided into two Neighbourhood OLA 'subsets', and apply to what is considered a 'large' Neighbourhood OLA, and a 'small' Neighbourhood OLA. 'Small' Neighbourhood OLAs will be 'single-use'; the City will determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether a 'large' Neighbourhood OLA will be 'single-use' or 'multi-use'. Secure fencing may be integrated into the design, wherever possible.

As noted in **Section 2.3.2**, the intent of the 'large' Neighbourhood OLA is to provide users with an OLA that is 'walkable' from their home that provides enough area for a large dog to run, whereas the intent of the 'small' Neighbourhood OLA is to be similar to a 'dog run', serving residents who live in multi-family, high-density neighbourhoods.

3.3.4.1 Neighbourhood OLAs should maintain a catchment area of approximately 1.2 kilometres. This generally translates to an approximate 15-minute walk or less for those residents who live within the catchment area.

3.3.4.2 Neighbourhood OLAs should be located within or adjacent to residential areas and connect to pedestrian routes.

3.3.4.3 Neighbourhood OLAs should include the following amenities:

a. Waste receptacles;
b. Signage;
c. Seating; and
d. Open space.

3.3.4.4 Neighbourhood OLAs should have access to on-street parking.





Figure 10: Illustrative Example of a 'Large' Neighbourhood OLA

3.3.4.5 Large Neighbourhood OLAs should be approximately 0.1 to 0.5 hectares in size.

3.3.4.6 The City may designate an area within a Large Neighbourhood OLA as 'single-use' or designate the entire Large Neighbourhood OLA as 'single-use', and as such, secure boundaries should be established around the 'single-use' area, however, this will be based on municipal budget considerations, site-specific conditions, and user-driven demand. Only activities associated with off-leash dog use will be permitted within the single-use area of an OLA.

3.3.4.7 Small Neighbourhood OLAs should be approximately 0.04 to 0.1 hectares in size.

3.3.4.8 Small Neighbourhood OLAs shall be completely enclosed with a minimum 1.5-metre (5 foot) fence, a double-gated entry, and be designated as 'single-use'.

3.3.4.9 The establishment of small Neighbourhood OLAs should be focused in Winnipeg's high-density urban neighbourhoods.

3.3.4.10 The City will encourage multi-family residential developers to establish private small Neighbourhood OLA facilities within their development sites.



Figure 11: Illustrative Example of a 'Small' Neighbourhood OLA

3.3.5 *SEASONAL ADAPTIVE OLA STANDARDS*

Seasonal Adaptive OLAs are intended to be located in areas that are underutilized during various times of the year (off-season for the intended use). Seasonal Adaptive OLAs could potentially be located within outdoor hockey pens (summer) or along sections of Winnipeg's frozen network of rivers (winter).



Figure 12: Illustrative Example of a Seasonal Adaptive OLA

3.3.5.1 The establishment of Seasonal Adaptive OLAs may be initiated by an OLA or Community Association, a Community Centre Board of Directors, or a member of the public.

3.3.5.2 The establishment of a Seasonal Adaptive OLA must be approved by the City in cooperation with the applicable site manager.

3.3.5.3 The City will support the establishment of an approved Seasonal Adaptive OLA; however, the capital or operating funding for the on-going operations must be secured each season.

3.3.5.4 The design of a Seasonal Adaptive OLA must meet the **General OLA Standards** applicable to all OLA Classifications.

3.3.5.5 Seasonal Adaptive OLAs shall only be permitted in areas where they do not have a negative impact on adjacent land-uses or the environment.

3.3.5.6 The specific use of hockey pens, tennis courts, or other potential locations for a Seasonal Adaptive OLA should be considered and approved on an annual basis.

3.4 OLA MANAGEMENT

The policies and standards included in **OLA Management** provide direction for the effective management and operation of OLAs throughout Winnipeg. The following section describes standards for maintenance and operations; signage; education; and compliance. Public education will be an important part of managing the City's OLAs. The public should be clearly informed of the differences between the various OLA Classifications, as well as the Code of Ethics of Dog Owners, in order to encourage compliance within Winnipeg's OLAs.

3.4.1 *OLAMP MANAGEMENT POLICY CONSIDERATIONS*

1. Management of the OLAs shall comply with the most current management (or service level) standards, as outlined in the OLAMP.

3.4.2 *OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: MAINTENANCE & OPERATIONS*

3.4.2.1 The City will establish service levels, which reflect the available operating budget, for each of the different OLA Classifications, as per the OLAMP. These service levels will establish general maintenance standards for OLAs that will be performed by the City, and may include details pertaining to the following items:

a. OLA monitoring and inspection;
b. Emptying waste receptacles;
c. Maintaining fencing or other site boundary features;
d. Maintaining site furnishings, such as seating, lighting, signage, and if applicable, water features;
e. Maintaining surfacing; and
f. Maintaining site landscape features such as trees, shrubs, and grass.

3.4.2.2 The number and type of waste receptacles within an OLA will be guided by funded service levels.

3.4.2.3 Waste receptacles will be located for OLA users, as well as City maintenance vehicles.

3.4.2.4 A community OLA association that advocates for specific OLA(s) amenities, or are stewards of a specific OLA, may be responsible for the management of some or all of the following:

a. Maintaining and managing notice boards;
b. An annual 'spring clean-up' of OLA sites; and/or
c. Maintaining OLA supported amenities such as an agility course, waste bag dispensers, water features, etc.

3.4.3 *OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: SIGNAGE*

3.4.3.1 The City will ensure that OLA signage is clear, consistent, and visible in all OLAs to help articulate clear expectations and assist with wayfinding in and out of on-leash and off-leash areas.

3.4.3.2 OLA signage will include:

a. The OLA Code of Ethics;



b. The rules of the OLAs as per Section 4(5) of By-law No. 92/2013;

c. The OLA boundaries; and

d. A 'single-use' or 'multi-use' designation; if the OLA is 'single-use', its signage will articulate that all recreational activities other than those activities associated with off-leash dog use will be prohibited in the OLA.

3.4.3.3 'Entering OLA' and 'Leaving OLA' signs shall be posted at key entrances/exits to OLAs to clarify OLA boundaries.

3.4.3.4 The City should post signs at key locations along pathways and trails indicating that pathways and trails located adjacent to OLAs are not part of the OLAs (i.e., "Pathways are Always On-Leash Unless Otherwise Specified").

3.4.3.5 Notice boards should be considered for installation at the entrances to each OLA (in accordance with the appropriate OLA Classification) for public use and monitored by the City (i.e., discriminatory or offensive materials will be removed).

3.4.4 *OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: EDUCATION*

3.4.4.1 The City will produce and promote educational initiatives to improve the safety and success of OLAs.

3.4.4.2 The City will enhance its current education and communication efforts regarding OLAs, particularly the difference between 'single-use' and 'multi-use' OLAs. Specific signage must be displayed at each of the City's 'multi-use' OLA locations to alert park users of the presence of un-leashed dogs.

3.4.4.3 The City will periodically update the OLA webpage to ensure that the features of each OLA are described in detail; notify users of temporary OLA closures; and inform users of upcoming OLA-related events, public engagement opportunities, etc.

3.4.5 *OLA MANAGEMENT STANDARDS: COMPLIANCE*

3.4.5.1 The City will ensure that OLA by-laws and standards are enforced by the applicable municipal divisions (i.e., Animal Services, By-law Enforcement, 311, etc.)

3.4.5.2 The City will encourage the public to report all dog-related issues and by-law infractions within OLAs by calling 311. This will be communicated via the City's webpage, on-site signage, and through public service campaigns.

3.4.5.3 The City will track all OLA dog-related by-law infractions and 311 calls to assist in the management of OLAs (e.g., adjusting hours of operation, site amenities, etc.). This data could also advise the siting of future OLAs.

3.4.5.4 It is recommended that some additions are made to the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law No. 92/2013 or the OLA Code of Ethics to clarify some rules and regulations governing OLAs as follows:

a) The City should further define/clarify the OLA-establishment/siting policies as outlined in By-law No. 7147/98, by incorporating specific setback distances, OLA size requirements and other standards, as per this Plan.

b) The City should consider incorporating the following policies into either the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law No. 92/2013 or the OLA Code of Ethics:

i) Children must be supervised by their guardian at all times;

ii) All participants enter an OLA with the understanding that they are responsible for their dog(s) actions at all times;

iii) Do not approach a dog without the handler's permission;

iv) Within 'multi-use' OLAs, all visitors must be aware and prepared to encounter off-leash dogs; and

v) Within 'single-use' OLAs, all activities other than those activities associated with off-leash dog use will be prohibited.



4 OLA ESTABLISHMENT PROCESS

The following section describes how the City will establish permanent and temporary OLAs, and concludes with potential funding strategies to assist with implementation. It is assumed that the City will take the lead on establishing future permanent OLAs throughout Winnipeg; however, the public service may also want to consider OLA interests expressed by developers, community organizations, or members of the public.

4.1 ESTABLISHING A PERMANENT OLA

The City will be responsible for the planning and design of new OLAs, beginning with the area of Winnipeg ranked as "highest priority", as per the **OLA Siting Criteria** (found in **OLA Siting Standards**) in **Section 3.2.3**.

The establishment of a new OLA will require a public engagement program, guided by the International Association for Public Participation's (IAP2) principles and code of ethics. Each public engagement program will vary in design based on the proposed OLA's Classification and general location within the city. All public engagement activities will align with the 'inform' and 'consult' components of the IAP2 spectrum:

- **Inform**: To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities, and/or solutions; and
- **Consult**: To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or key decisions.

The City may consider incorporating a higher level of engagement for an area where a higher level of controversy exists.

Once the City has identified its current "highest priority" area, the City will then identify specific OLA site options within that area. Stakeholders, the public, and subject matter experts will be invited to participate at key decision-making points during the OLA planning and design process. The City will use the **OLA Public Engagement Radius Standards** to guide the public engagement process, in accordance with the applicable OLA Classification.

Table 3: OLA Public Engagement Radius Standards

OLA Classification	Regional OLA	Community OLA	Neighbourhood OLA
Engagement Radius	200 m from edge of proposed OLA	150 m from edge of proposed OLA	100 m from edge of proposed OLA

Input received through the public engagement process will help inform the specific siting and design of the new OLA. Once the siting and design process is complete, the City's project manager will initiate implementation of an approved OLA in accordance with the standard Parks and Open Space implementation process.

See **Figure 13** for an illustration of this process.





Figure 13: Permanent OLA Establishment Flowchart

4.2 ESTABLISHING A SEASONAL ADAPTIVE OLA (TEMPORARY)

Seasonal Adaptive OLAs may be developed on sites that are underutilized during various times of the year (off-season for the intended use). This is a cost effective way to fulfill the need for an OLA.

The establishment of a Seasonal Adaptive OLA will likely be initiated by a Community Centre Board of Directors, a community organization, or a member of the general public. For the purposes of this process, they will be referred to as the 'initiating party'.

This process will require approval from the City, as well as a third party (based on the location of the proposed OLA). For example, if a Seasonal Adaptive OLA is proposed within a hockey pen during the summer months, this would require the approval of a Community Centre Board of Directors.

The 'initiating party' and/or third party will come to an agreement detailing the location, size, design requirements, maintenance, timeframe, signage, and operation of the Seasonal Adaptive OLA. Consistency with the **OLA Policies and Standards** outlined in the OLAMP will be required. The 'initiating party' and/or the third party will be responsible for all capital and operating costs associated with the OLA.

The 'initiating party' will provide this agreement to the City for their review. If the City supports the agreement, they will notify the 'initiating party', who will then be provided with permission to establish the Seasonal Adaptive OLA.

The City will perform an inspection of the OLA once it is open to ensure it complies with the provisions of the agreement and the **OLA Policies and Standards** outlined in the OLAMP.

See **Figure 14** for an illustration of this process.



Figure 14: Temporary OLA Establishment Flowchart

4.3 OLA ESTABLISHMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The following should be considered by the City as potential funding strategies to help leverage its ability to implement future OLAs.

CAPITAL PLANNING

The City should incorporate the intent to establish OLAs into their financial plans to ensure that OLA development is accounted for in the City's capital planning process.

INTEGRATION

The City should integrate OLA planning into their land-use planning processes where possible, for example, within Park Improvement Plans, Secondary Plans, and Precinct Plans.

STRATEGIC INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PARTNERSHIPS

To assist in the implementation and establishment of OLAs, the City could seek funding from other levels of governments, and through partnerships with the private sector and community groups. Please see **Appendix F**, which outlines potential funding and partnership opportunities that the City could explore.

APPENDIX



A
CURRENT POLICY

This document is an office consolidation of by-law amendments which has been prepared for the convenience of the user. The City of Winnipeg expressly disclaims any responsibility for errors or omissions.

CONSOLIDATION UPDATE: OCTOBER 28, 2015

THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

BY-LAW NO. 92/2013

A By-law of THE CITY OF WINNIPEG to regulate the presence of wild and domesticated animals within the City, their activities and the activities of their owners

THE CITY OF WINNIPEG, in Council assembled, enacts as follows:

Short title

1 This By-law may be cited as the Responsible Pet Ownership By-law.

Definitions and interpretation

2(1) in this By-law

"animal", unless otherwise defined in this By-law, means a live non-human being with a developed nervous system;

"animal rescue organization" means an organization that the Chief Operating Officer has determined meets all of the following criteria:

(a) it is not operating for the preponderant purpose of earning a profit;

(b) its primary goal is the rescue, rehabilitation and adoption of dogs or cats;

(c) it does not adopt dogs or cats unless the dog or cat is sterilized at the time of the adoption or, if the adopted dog or cat is under the age of six months, only adopts the dog or cat on condition that the adopter sterilize it within six months of the adoption and it is actively enforcing that condition;

(d) it is not engaged in the breeding of dogs or cats;

(e) it has been endorsed as to its care of animals by a veterinarian licenced to practice in the Province of Manitoba;

(f) it is not in contravention of *The Animal Care Act* or the zoning by-law applicable to its location; and

(g) if required, it has obtained an excess animal permit under this Part.

"Animal Services Agency" means the Animal Services Agency established as a special operating agency by the Council of the City of Winnipeg effective January 1, 2000;

"bee colony" means a cluster of worker bees with a queen and drones;

"cat" means a member of the subspecies *Felis catus*;

"Chief Operating Officer" means the Chief Operating Officer of the Animal Services Agency or designate;

"commercial animal" means animals of a domesticated species used for agricultural purposes and includes horses, cattle, hogs, goats, sheep, poultry and bee colonies but does not include wildlife as defined by *The Wildlife Act*, even if used for agricultural purposes;

"designated committee" means the Standing Policy Committee on Protection, Community Services and Parks;

amended 106/2015

"designated employee" means

(a) the Chief Operating Officer; and
(b) any other employee of the City, to the extent that he or she is acting within the authority delegated to him or her to enforce or administer all or part of this By-law;

"dispose", when referring to the disposition of an animal to which this By-law applies, includes

(a) adopting the animal to an individual in accordance with policies developed or approved by the Chief Operating Officer;
(b) releasing the animal to the care of an animal rescue organization; and
(c) euthanizing the animal;

"dog" means a member of the subspecies *Canis lupus familiaris*;

"enforcement officer" includes

(a) a designated employee of the City of Winnipeg, to the extent that he or she has been appointed a special constable with authority to enforce all or part of this By-law;
(b) an officer of the Winnipeg Police Service; and
(c) any other person appointed as a special constable and authorized to enforce this By-law;

"harbouring" in relation to an animal, includes constructing, erecting, locating or keeping on the premises of which the person is the occupant a structure designed to be used as a shelter by the animal;

"owner", in respect of an animal, means a person, including a corporation,

(a) who has been identified on the animal's licence as the owner of the animal;
(b) who has legal title to the animal;
(c) who has possession or custody of the animal, whether temporarily or permanently; or

(d) who harbours the animal, or allows the animal to remain on his or her premises;

"off-leash area" means an area that has been designated by the Chief Administrative Officer of the City of Winnipeg or designate pursuant to the Parks By-law as an area in which dogs are not required to be restrained by leashes;

"park" has the same meaning as in the Parks By-law;

"petting zoo" means a collection of commercial animals which are made available to the public to touch, pet or feed, and which are of a size and temperament that are suitable for this purpose;

"poultry" includes, but is not limited to, chickens, turkeys, ducks and, geese but does not include pigeons;

"pet store" means a business selling animals or offering animals for sale which operates at a location approved for a retail sales use under the Winnipeg Zoning By-law or the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law;

"playground" means a property owned or leased by the City of Winnipeg in which swings, slides, a climbing apparatus, wading pool or other equipment or facilities for the use and enjoyment of children have been installed but does not include adjacent areas, benches or tables set back from the equipment or facilities;

"prohibited animal" means an animal that is not permitted to be harboured or kept in the City of Winnipeg under section 29 (*Keeping commercial animals in violation of zoning by-law prohibited*) of this By-law;

"pursue", in the context of an animal pursuing, means to chase in an aggressive or menacing manner;

"running at large", unless otherwise defined, means that an animal is not

(a) either on its owner's property, or on other property with the consent of the owner or occupant;
(b) securely confined in a vehicle or other enclosure; and
(c) securely leashed and in the custody of someone competent to control it;

"school" means a public school or a private school, as those terms are defined in *The Education Administration Act*;

"service animal" means an animal that is determined by the Chief Operating Officer to have been legitimately trained and certified to provide assistance to a person with a disability that relates to that person's disability;

"sports field" means an area in a park owned or leased by the City of Winnipeg that has been clearly identified by lines or other markers as a field of play and does not include areas adjacent thereto;

"sterilized", in relation to an animal, means a male animal that has been neutered or a female animal that has been spayed;

"veterinarian" means a currently licenced member of the Manitoba Veterinary Medical Association.

2(2) In this By-law, a reference to a period of impoundment includes the day on which the impoundment began but does not include any day in which the place of impoundment is closed to the public.

PART 1 - DOGS

Definitions

3 Notwithstanding subsection 2(1) (*Definitions and interpretation*), in this Part,

"animal" means a dog, cat or commercial animal;

"running at large", in reference to a dog, means that the dog is not

(a) on its owner's property;
(b) on other property with the consent of the owner or occupant;
(c) in an off-leash area;
(d) securely confined in a vehicle or other enclosure; or
(e) securely leashed and in the custody of someone competent to control it.

Owner's responsibilities

4(1) Subject to this section, the owner of a dog that is in the City of Winnipeg must

(a) ensure that, if the dog is over the age of six months, it is sterilized unless a valid dog licence for an unsterilized dog has been issued for the dog.

(b) ensure that the dog does not run at large;

(c) ensure that, except when it is

(i) on the owner's property;

(ii) on the property of another person who has consented to the presence of the unleashed dog; or

(iii) in an off-leash area;

the dog is at all times kept on a leash that is never longer than 20 feet in length and no longer than 6 feet in length when the dog is on a street, on a path or any other place that is not an open space or when people or other animals are within 20 feet of the dog;

(d) subject to subsection (2), ensure that the dog has been vaccinated for rabies and, where requested to do so by an enforcement officer, provide a certificate of vaccination demonstrating this fact;

(e) ensure that the dog does not bark or howl or otherwise unduly disturb the quiet of any individual;

(f) where the dog defecates on any property other than the property of the owner, cause the excrement to be removed immediately and disposed of in a sanitary manner;

(g) ensure that the dog does not damage public or private property belonging to someone other than the owner;

(h) ensure that the dog does not pursue any individual or animal;

(i) ensure that the dog does not bite, wound or otherwise injure any individual or animal;

(j) ensure that the dog is not in any of the following areas;

(i) school grounds,
(ii) playgrounds,
(iii) sports fields,
(iv) any other area where dogs are prohibited by posted signs;

(k) ensure that the dog does not upset garbage cans and other waste receptacles, or scatter the contents of waste receptacles; and

(l) ensure that a female dog that is in heat is confined on the owner's property during the entire period that she is in heat.

4(2) The requirement set out in clause (1)(d) (*vaccination for rabies*) does not apply to the owner of a dog who can provide a written statement from a veterinarian declaring that vaccinating the dog for rabies is not advisable for medical reasons.

4(3) The requirements in clauses (1)(f) (*owner must remove excrement*) and (1)(j) (*dog not permitted on certain properties*) do not apply if the dog is a service animal accompanying the disabled individual the service animal dog is serving.

4(4) The requirement in clause (1)(j) (*dogs not permitted on certain properties*) does not apply to the grounds of a school if the appropriate school authorities authorize the dog to be on the school grounds.

4(5) When the dog is in an off-leash area, the owner of a dog must

(a) be present and have the dog within view at all times;

(b) ensure that the dog is not in heat and that it does not act in a dangerous or aggressive manner towards humans or other dogs;

(c) remove the dog from the off-leash area immediately if the dog is in heat or acts in a dangerous or aggressive manner towards humans or other dogs;

(d) ensure that the dog comes when called;

(e) have a leash available to restrain the dog if needed;

(f) remedy any harm caused by the dog, including filling in holes dug by the dog; and

(g) immediately remove and properly dispose of any excrement left by the dog.

Dog licence mandatory

5(1) Subject to this By-law, if a dog over the age of six months is in the City of Winnipeg, its owner must ensure that the dog has a valid dog licence issued under this section. This obligation does not apply to any dog owner who can provide proof that he or she owns the dog and is not a resident of the City of Winnipeg.

5(2) In order for the designated employee to issue a dog licence

(a) the owner, who must be at least 18 years of age, must

(i) pay the licence fee and any other applicable fees;

(ii) provide, in a form acceptable to the Chief Operating Officer, any information reasonably required to administer and enforce this By-law; and

(b) the dog must not be prohibited under section 7 (*Prohibited dog breeds*) or otherwise from being in the City.

5(3) If a cheque used to pay for a licence is returned for insufficient funds, the licence purchased by the cheque is void.

5(4) An applicant for a dog licence must provide accurate information when applying for a licence. In particular, an applicant for a dog licence must not provide incorrect information concerning whether a dog is sterilized.

5(5) A dog licence is not valid after its expiry date. In order to ensure that his or her dog has a valid dog licence, an owner must renew its dog licence before its expiration date.

5(6) A dog licence may not be transferred to another dog.

5(7) The licence fee set by Council or Council's delegate for a dog that is unsterilized must be higher than the licence fee for a dog that is sterilized.

Valid licence tag must be worn by dog

6(1) The owner of a dog must ensure that his or her dog wears a valid licence tag when the dog is not on the owner's property.

6(2) Unless he or she is a designated employee, the dog's owner or has the consent of the dog's owner, no person may remove a valid licence tag worn by a dog.

Prohibited dog breeds

7(1) Subject to this section, no person may bring into the City of Winnipeg or, being its owner, allow to be in the City of Winnipeg, a dog which has the appearance and physical characteristics predominantly conforming to the standards of the Canadian Kennel Club or the United Kennel Club for any of the following breeds:

amended 77/2014

(a) *repealed 77/2014*

(b) American Pit Bull Terrier;

(c) Staffordshire Bull Terrier;

(d) American Staffordshire Terrier;

7(2) Upon payment of a fee established by Council, the owner of a dog is entitled to obtain a written opinion by a veterinarian retained by the Chief Operating Officer as to whether a dog meets the criteria established in subsection (1). Where the veterinarian concludes that a dog does not meet the criteria established in subsection (1), such a statement is conclusive proof that the dog is not prohibited under subsection (1) and no prosecution or enforcement action under subsection (1) may be undertaken with respect to the dog.

7(3) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to issue a special permit authorizing a dog prohibited by that subsection to be in the City of Winnipeg for a temporary period of time and may impose any conditions on the permit he or she considers sufficient to protect individuals and animals from any harm caused by the dog.

Care for dogs in need of protection

8(1) A designated employee is authorized to take into the custody of the Animal Services Agency a dog whose owner is unable to provide it with proper care due to the owner's mental or physical illness, incarceration, death or for any other reason.

8(2) A designated employee is authorized to release a dog referred to in subsection (1) into the care of the owner's family or friends or any other person he or she considers to be able and willing to care for the dog on condition that the person agrees to return the dog to the owner if and when the owner is able to care for the dog.

8(3) If a designated employee has not released the dog under subsection (2) within ten days after the dog was taken into custody, the Chief Operating Officer may dispose of the dog in any manner he or she considers appropriate.

Impoundment of dog running at large

9(1) An enforcement officer is authorized to capture and impound a dog that he or she finds running at large.

9(2) A designated employee is authorized to impound a dog that has been turned over to the Animal Services Agency as having been running at large if the designated employee has reasonable grounds to believe that the dog was in fact running at large. The designated

employee is authorized to require the person turning over a dog to execute a statutory declaration concerning the circumstances in which he or she took possession of the dog.

9(3) Unless it is redeemed earlier under section 12 (*Redemption of impounded dogs*), a designated officer shall impound such a dog

(a) for a minimum period of ten days in the case of a dog that is wearing a valid licence tag; or

(b) for a minimum period of three days, in the case of any other dog.

9(4) If a dog being impounded under subsections (1) or (2) is wearing a valid licence tag, a designated employee must notify the owner of the dog's impoundment. The owner is entitled to redeem the dog under section 12 (*Redemption of impounded dogs*) at any time during its impoundment.

9(5) If a dog has been impounded for the period of time specified in subsection (3) without having been redeemed, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the dog in any manner he or she considers appropriate.

Impoundment and quarantine for rabies observation

10(1) Subject to this section, if

(a) a designated employee suspects that a dog has been exposed to rabies; or

(b) a dog bites or scratches an individual with its teeth so that the skin is broken, regardless of the circumstances of the bite or scratch,

the designated employee is authorized to capture, impound and quarantine the dog at the facilities of the Animal Services Agency for a period of no less than ten days from the day of the bite or scratch for observation.

10(2) If a designated employee gives notice to the owner of a dog that he or she is acting under the authority of subsection (1), the owner must surrender the dog to the designated employee for impoundment and quarantine immediately.

10(3) As an alternative to impounding and quarantining the dog under subsection (1), the designated employee is authorized to permit or require the owner of the dog, at the owner's expense, to

(a) have the dog quarantined at a veterinary clinic within the City of Winnipeg; or

(b) have the dog quarantined on the property of its owner.

The designated employee is authorized to act under this subsection if he or she determines that the dog will be securely held and will not leave the property. The designated employee may impose conditions on a quarantine permitted or required by this section that are reasonable to

ensure that the dog is appropriately confined during the quarantine period. An owner who fails to ensure that the dog is securely held on the property or fails to ensure compliance with other conditions imposed by a designated employee commits an offence.

10(4) If a dog is quarantined at the Animal Services Agency or on the property of its owner, a designated employee must observe it for symptoms of rabies. If it is quarantined at a veterinary clinic, the veterinarian must observe it for symptoms of rabies. If, during the quarantine period, it is determined to have rabies, the dog must be euthanized, if it has not already died or been euthanized. The dog's body must then be examined for proof of rabies at the expense of the owner of the dog.

10(5) If a dog impounded and quarantined at the facilities of the Animal Services Agency is wearing a valid licence tag, a designated officer must notify the owner of the dog's impoundment and quarantine.

10(6) A dog quarantined at the Animal Services Agency, unless it is determined to have rabies, may be redeemed under section 12 (*Redemption of impounded dogs*) after its mandatory period of impoundment and quarantine has ended. If it has not been redeemed within 48 hours after the end of its period of impoundment and quarantine under this section, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the dog in any manner he or she considers appropriate.

Impoundment of potentially dangerous dog

11(1) A designated employee is authorized to impound a dog if

(a) there is evidence that the dog has acted in a dangerous or aggressive manner toward humans or animals; and

(b) the designated employee concludes that leaving the dog in the keeping of its owner could pose a danger to humans or animals.

11(2) Rather than impounding a dog under subsection (1), the designated employee may impose conditions on the dog's owner designed to minimize any threat posed by the dog pending a determination under section 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*) or section 15 (*Destruction of exceptionally dangerous dog*) or both.

11(3) A dog impounded under subsection (1) is not eligible to be redeemed under section 12 (*Redemption of impounded dogs*) until and unless either

(a) the Chief Operating Officer has determined that the dog should neither be designated as dangerous under section 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*) nor destroyed as exceptionally dangerous under section 15 (*Destruction of exceptionally dangerous dog*); or

(b) the Chief Operating Officer has designated the dog as dangerous under section 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*) and its owner is able and willing to comply with the restrictions resulting from that designation.

11(4) Where the Chief Operating Officer has determined that a dog impounded under this section should neither be designated as dangerous under section 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*) nor destroyed as exceptionally dangerous under section 15 (*Destruction of exceptionally*

dangerous dog), it is eligible to be redeemed within 48 hours after its owner has been notified of this determination in compliance with subsection 13(4). After that point, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the dog in any manner he or she considers appropriate.

11(5) Where the Chief Operating Officer has determined that a dog impounded under this section should be destroyed as exceptionally dangerous under section 15 (*Destruction of exceptionally dangerous dog*), the dog must continue to be impounded until either it is destroyed under that section or the determination that the dog should be destroyed is overturned on appeal.

Redemption of impounded dogs

12(1) The owner of a dog that has been impounded under this By-law and that is eligible to be redeemed may redeem it if he or she can demonstrate to the satisfaction of a designated employee that he or she is the owner of the dog.

12(2) In order to redeem an impounded dog, its owner must:

(a) pay all applicable fees;

(b) pay the monetary penalty imposed in section 42 (*Monetary penalty for the costs of capturing animals*); and,

(c) if the dog requires a licence, obtain a licence for the dog.

Dangerous dog designation

13(1) The Chief Operating Officer is authorized to designate a dog as dangerous if he or she concludes that the dog

(a) is likely to cause significant harm or injury to individuals or animals; or

(b) is used primarily to guard property.

13(2) In making a dangerous dog designation on the basis of clause (1)(a), the Chief Operating Officer must take into account:

(a) any recent incident in which the dog has

(i) caused harm or injury to individuals or animals; or

(ii) pursued or menaced individuals or animals;

(b) the nature of any incidents referred to in clause (a), including the seriousness of any harm or injury caused by the dog;

(c) all the circumstances of any incidents referred to in clause (a) and, in particular, whether the dog was provoked; and

(d) the behaviour of the dog since the incident.

13(3) Before making a dangerous dog designation under subsection (1), the Chief Operating Officer must

(a) give notice to the dog's owner that a determination as to whether the dog should be designated a dangerous dog will be made;

(b) provide the reasons why such determination is being made; and

(c) give the dog's owner a reasonable opportunity to be heard.

13(4) The Chief Operating Officer, in compliance with section 116 of *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, must give notice to the owner of a decision to designate a dog as dangerous or not to designate it as dangerous.

13(5) The owner of a dog that is designated as dangerous may appeal the designation to the designated committee in accordance with section 189 of *The City of Winnipeg Charter* within 14 days of being given notice of the decision under subsection (4). If a dog has been impounded under section 11 (*Impoundment of potentially dangerous dog*), the impoundment must continue pending the appeal unless the owner complies with 14(1)(a) to (i).

13(6) The owner of a dog that is primarily used to guard property may apply to the Chief Operating Officer to have the dog designated as dangerous.

Consequences of dangerous dog designation

14(1) The owner of a dog that has been designated as dangerous must thereafter

(a) ensure that, while on the owner's property, the dog is either kept securely confined indoors or is kept in a securely enclosed and locked pen, structure or yard which

(i) prevents the dog from escaping and young children from entering;

(ii) is at least ten feet wide and five feet deep;

(iii) provides adequate protection from the elements for the dog;

(b) not permit the dog off the owner's property unless it is muzzled and restrained by a leash or chain of no more than six feet in length which is held by a person capable of controlling the dog;

(c) provide to the Chief Operating Officer a certificate of a policy of comprehensive liability insurance which provides coverage in the amount of no less than $1.0 million for harm or injury caused by the dog;

(d) notify a designated employee immediately if

(i) the dog is running at large;

(ii) the dog has harmed any individual or animal;

(e) provide a designated employee with the name and address of the new owner within two working days of selling or giving away the dog;

(f) have a microchip containing the owner's name and current address as well as the fact of its dangerous dog designation implanted into the dog's skin by a licenced veterinarian;

(g) notify a designated employee of the dog's death within two working days and provide evidence to prove the dog's death;

(h) pay any applicable licence fees for the dangerous dog;

(i) permanently and prominently display at each entrance to the property and any building in which a dangerous dog is kept, a sign designed and provided by a designated officer which warns visitors of the presence of a dangerous dog; and

(j) ensure that the dog is sterilized.

14(2) The requirements in subsection (1) are imposed

(a) if the owner fails to appeal the dangerous dog designation, as soon as the appeal period expires; or

(b) if the owner appeals the dangerous dog designation and if the designated committee upholds the dangerous dog designation, when the designated committee makes that decision.

If the dog has not been impounded under subsection 11(1) (*Impoundment of potentially dangerous dog)*, any conditions imposed by a designated employee under subsection 11(2) continue in force pending the appeal or expiry of the appeal period.

14(3) The requirement in clause (1)(j) does not apply to any dog that has been designated as dangerous prior to the coming into force of this By-law.

14(4) If the owner of a dog that has been designated as dangerous under this section fails to comply with the requirements of subsection (1), in addition to any other remedies or enforcement actions available, a designated officer is authorized under the City's authority to act in emergencies to immediately impound the dog and the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to consider whether to the dog is exceptionally dangerous and should be destroyed under section 15 (*Destruction of exceptionally dangerous dog*).

Destruction of exceptionally dangerous dog

15(1) The Chief Operating Officer must make a determination as to whether a dog is exceptionally dangerous and should be destroyed where either

(a) the dog

(i) has repeatedly bitten, clawed or otherwise attacked individuals or animals;

(ii) has engaged in an exceptionally brutal attack on an individual or an animal;

(iii) after having been designated as "dangerous" under section 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*), has caused injury or harm to, or has pursued or menaced, individuals or animals; or

(iv) has demonstrated other behaviour that causes the Chief Operating Officer to consider that the dog may be exceptionally dangerous; or

(b) the owner of a dog that has been designated as dangerous fails to comply with the restrictions in section 14 (*Consequences of a dangerous dog designation*).

15(2) The Chief Operating Officer is authorized to determine that a dog is exceptionally dangerous and should be destroyed if

(a) he or she concludes that the dog's behaviour is such that it poses a serious risk to the safety of individuals or animals that cannot be adequately addressed by restrictions imposed with respect to the dog, including those imposed with respect to a dangerous dog under section 14 (*Consequences of a dangerous dog designation*); or

(b) the owner refuses to, or there are reasonable grounds to believe that he or she will fail to, comply with restrictions that the Chief Operating Officer concludes are necessary to protect the safety of individuals or animals.

15(3) Before making a determination under subsection (1), the Chief Operating Officer must:

(a) give notice to the dog's owner that a determination under subsection (1) will be made;

(b) provide the reasons why a determination under subsection (1) is being made; and

(c) give the dog's owner a reasonable opportunity to be heard.

15(4) In making a determination under subsection (1), the Chief Operating Officer may consider any facts or evidence that are relevant to this determination.

15(5) Where the Chief Operating Officer makes a determination under subsection (1), he or she must give notice of this determination to the owner pursuant to section 116 of *The City of Winnipeg Charter*.

15(6) The owner of a dog that is determined to be exceptionally dangerous under this section may appeal the determination to the designated committee in accordance with section 189 of *The City of Winnipeg Charter* within 3 days of being given notice of the decision under subsection (5).

15(7) If a dog that has been determined to be exceptionally dangerous under this section is not impounded at the time the determination is made, its owner must destroy the dog or surrender it to an enforcement officer for impoundment within 24 hours of being given notice of the determination under subsection (5). If the dog is neither destroyed nor surrendered within 24 hours' notice, the Chief Operating Officer shall act immediately to impound the dog.

15(8) If a dog has been determined to be exceptionally dangerous, unless its owner destroys it under subsection (7), the Chief Operating Officer shall have the dog destroyed.

(a) if the owner fails to appeal the determination, as soon as the appeal period expires; or

(b) if the owner appeals the determination and if the designated committee upholds the determination, when the designated committee makes that decision.

15(9) If on appeal the designated committee does not uphold the determination that a dog is exceptionally dangerous and should be destroyed, the Chief Operating Officer may nonetheless designate the dog as dangerous under section 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*).

Police dogs exempted

16 Sections 10 (*Impoundment and quarantine for rabies observation*), 11 (*Impoundment of potentially dangerous dog*), 13 (*Dangerous dog designation*) and 15 (*Destruction of exceptionally dangerous dog*) do not apply to a Winnipeg Police Service dog or a dog owned by a law enforcement agency.

PART 2 – CATS

Definitions

17 Notwithstanding subsection 2(1), in this Part,

"animal" means a dog, cat or commercial animal;

"running at large", in reference to a cat, means that the cat is not

(a) on its owner's property;
(b) on other property with the consent of the owner or occupant;
(c) securely confined in a vehicle or other enclosure; or
(d) securely leashed.

Owner's responsibilities

18(1) Subject to this section, the owner of a cat that is in the City of Winnipeg must

(a) ensure that, if the cat is over the age of six months, it is sterilized unless a valid licence for an unsterilized cat has been issued for the cat;

(b) ensure that the cat does not run at large;

(c) ensure that, except when it is

(i) on the owner's property; or

(ii) on the property of another person who has consented to the presence of the unleashed cat;

the cat is at all times kept on a leash that is never longer than 20 feet in length and no longer that 6 feet in length when the cat is on a street, on a path or any other place that is not an open space or when people or other animals are within 20 feet of the cat;

(d) subject to subsection (2), ensure that the cat has been vaccinated for rabies and, where requested to do so by an enforcement officer, provide a certificate of vaccination demonstrating this fact;

(e) where the cat defecates on any property other than the property of the owner, cause the excrement to be removed immediately in a sanitary manner;

(f) ensure that the cat does not damage public or private property belonging to someone other than the owner;

(g) ensure that the cat does not bite, wound or otherwise injure any individual or animal;

(h) ensure that the cat does not upset garbage cans and other waste receptacles, or scatter the contents of waste receptacles; and

(i) ensure that a female cat that is in heat is confined on the owner's property during the entire period that she is in heat.

18(2) The requirement set out in clause (1)(c) (*vaccination for rabies*) does not apply to the owner of a cat who can provide a written statement from a veterinarian declaring that vaccinating the cat for rabies is not advisable for medical reasons.

Cat licence mandatory

19(1) Subject to this By-law, if a cat over the age of six months is in the City of Winnipeg, its owner must ensure that the cat has a valid cat licence issued under this section. This obligation does not apply to any cat owner who can provide proof that he or she owns the cat and is not a resident of the City of Winnipeg.

19(2) In order to obtain a cat licence, the owner, who must be at least 18 years of age, must

(a) pay the licence fee and any other applicable fees; and

(b) provide, in a form acceptable to the Chief Operating Officer, any information reasonably required to administer and enforce this By-law.

19(3) If a cheque used to pay for a licence is returned for insufficient funds, the licence

purchased by the cheque is void.

19(4) An applicant for a cat licence must provide accurate information when applying for a licence. In particular, an applicant for a cat licence must not provide incorrect information concerning whether a cat is sterilized.

19(5) A cat licence is not valid after its expiry date. In order to ensure that his or her cat has a valid cat licence, an owner must renew its cat licence before its expiration date.

19(6) A cat licence may not be transferred to another cat.

19(7) The licence fee set by Council or Council's delegate for a cat that is unsterilized must be higher than the licence fee for a cat that is sterilized.

Valid licence tag must be worn by cat

20(1) Subject to subsection (3), the owner of a cat must ensure that his or her cat wears a valid licence tag when the cat is not on the owner's property.

20(2) Unless he or she is a designated employee, the cat's owner or has the consent of the cat's owner, no person may remove a valid licence tag worn by a cat.

20(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to a cat that is identifiable by a tattoo or imbedded microchip that has been registered with the Animal Services Agency.

Impoundment of cat running at large

21(1) A designated employee is authorized to impound a cat that has been turned over to the Animal Services Agency as having been running at large. In acting under this provision, a designated employee may require that a person turning over a cat do so at the facilities of the Winnipeg Humane Society or some other agent.

21(2) Unless it is redeemed earlier under section 24 (*Redemption of impounded cats*), the designated employee shall impound or ensure that a cat impounded under subsection (1) is impounded

(a) for a minimum period of eight days in the case of a cat that is wearing a valid licence tag; or

(b) for a minimum period of three days, in the case of any other cat.

21(3) If a cat being impounded under subsection (1) is wearing a valid licence tag, a designated employee must notify the owner of the cat's impoundment. The owner is entitled to redeem the cat under section 24 (*Redemption of impounded cats*) at any time during its impoundment.

21(4) If a cat has been impounded for a period of time specified in subsection (2) without having been redeemed, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the cat in any manner he or she considers appropriate.

Use of cat traps

22(1) A designated employee is authorized to rent or loan cat traps to individuals for the purpose of capturing cats running at large on condition that the individual agrees to

(a) turn a captured cat over to the Animal Services Agency or its designated agent for impoundment;

(b) treat the captured cat humanely; and

(c) comply with any other conditions imposed by the Chief Operating Officer.

22(2) A person who borrows or rents a cat trap from the Animal Services Agency must comply with the terms and conditions imposed under subsection (1).

Impoundment and quarantine for rabies observation

23(1) Subject to this section, if

(a) a designated employee suspects that a cat has been exposed to rabies; or

(b) a cat bites or scratches an individual with its teeth so that the skin is broken, regardless of the circumstances of the bite or scratch,

the designated employee is authorized to capture, impound and quarantine the cat at the expense of the owner for a period of no less than ten days from the day of the bite or scratch for observation.

23(2) If a designated employee gives notice to the owner of a cat that he or she is acting under the authority of subsection (1), the owner must surrender the cat to the designated employee for impoundment and quarantine immediately.

23(3) As an alternative to impounding and quarantining a cat under subsection (1), the designated employee is authorized to permit or require the owner of the cat, at the owner's expense, to

(a) have the cat quarantined at a veterinary clinic within the City of Winnipeg; or

(b) have the cat quarantined on the property of its owner.

The designated employee is authorized to act under this subsection if he or she determines that the cat will be securely held and will not leave the property. The designated employee may impose conditions on a quarantine permitted or required by this section that are reasonable to ensure that the cat is appropriately confined during the quarantine period. An owner who fails to ensure that the cat is securely held on the property or fails to ensure compliance with other conditions imposed by a designated employee commits an offence.

23(4) If a cat is quarantined by a designated employee or on the property of its owner, a designated employee must observe it for symptoms of rabies. If it is quarantined at a veterinary clinic, the veterinarian must observe it for symptoms of rabies. If, during the quarantine period, it is determined to have rabies, the cat must be euthanized, if it has not already died or been

euthanized. The cat's body must then be examined for proof of rabies at the expense of the owner of the cat.

23(5) A cat quarantined by the designated employee under subsection (1), unless it is determined to have rabies, may be redeemed under section 24 (*Redemption of impounded cats*) after its mandatory period of impoundment and quarantine has ended. If it has not been redeemed within 48 hours after the end of its period of impoundment and quarantine under this section, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the cat in any manner he or she considers appropriate.

Redemption of impounded cats

24(1) The owner of a cat that has been impounded under this By-law and that is eligible to be redeemed may redeem it if he or she can demonstrate to the satisfaction of a designated employee that he or she is the owner of the cat.

24(2) In order to redeem an impounded cat, its owner must:

(a) pay all applicable fees; and

(b) pay the monetary penalty imposed in section 45 (*Monetary penalty for costs of capturing animals*); and,

(c) if the cat requires a licence, obtain a licence for the cat.

PART 3 – EXCESS ANIMAL PERMITS

Restriction on number of cats and dogs on property

25(1) This section does not apply to properties in the use category "kennel" or "animal hospital of veterinary clinic" under the Winnipeg Zoning By-law or the use category "veterinary" under the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law.

25(2) Subject to this section, unless the person holds a valid excess animal permit issued under section 26 (*Procedure for obtaining excess animal permit*), no person may own, harbour, keep, have in his or her possession, or have on a single parcel of land of which he or she is the occupant a total of more than six dogs and cats over the age of six months, of which no more than four may be dogs.

25(3) The obligation in subsection (2) applies even though a person holds a valid companion animal breeding premises licence or a kennel licence issued under *The Animal Care Act*.

Procedure for obtaining excess animal permit

26(1) When an application is made in compliance with this section, the Community Committee within whose geographical area the parcel of land for which an excess animal permit is sought is located is authorized to issue an excess animal permit authorizing the applicant to harbour, keep or have on a particular parcel of land dogs, cats or both dogs and cats that exceed the number permitted by section 25 (*Restriction on number of dogs and cats on property*).

26(2) In order to obtain an excess animal permit under subsection (1), an applicant must

(a) apply to the Chief Operating Officer using a form acceptable to the Chief Operating Officer;

(b) provide all information reasonably required in order to consider the application; and

(c) pay the requisite application fee.

26(3) After receiving an application, the Chief Operating Officer must forward to the Community Committee

(a) the application; and

(b) a report prepared by the Chief Operating Officer setting out the following information:

(i) whether the applicant or the parcel of land for which the excess animal permit is sought has ever been the subject of an application for an excess animal permit or an approval for excess numbers of animals in the past;

(ii) the use and nature of the parcels of land immediately adjacent to the subject parcel and the character of the district within which the subject parcel is located;

(iii) any other information the Chief Operating Officer considers relevant to the application.

26(4) At least 4 days before the application is considered by the Community Committee, the City Clerk must post on the City of Winnipeg website, a copy of the report that has been or will be submitted to the Community Committee under clause (3)(b).

26(5) At least 14 days before the application is considered by the Community Committee, the applicant must post in conspicuous locations on the subject parcel of land copies of a notice which sets out:

(a) the date, time and place of the Community Committee meeting at which the application for an excess animal permit will be dealt with; and

(b) the website referred to in subsection (4) on which the report referred to in clause (3)(b) can be found when it is posted.

The copies of the notice must be posted facing every street or alley adjacent to the parcel and must be no more than one metre inside the parcel. The copies of the notice must remain posted until the meeting has taken place.

26(6) If the parcel of land for which an excess animal permit is sought is rented or leased, the applicant must, at least 14 days before the application is considered by the Community Committee, serve the notice referred to in subsection (5) on the owner of the property by

personal service, or by sending it by registered mail or delivery to the owner's address.

26(7) Before deciding to issue or refuse to issue an excess animal permit, the Community Committee must consider written or verbal representations from any person who wishes to be heard.

Decision re. excess animal permit

27(1) An excess animal permit may only be issued if the Community Committee considers that

(a) the dogs, cats or both dogs and cats for which the applicant is seeking a permit will not unduly annoy or disturb the occupants of nearby properties; and

(b) the applicant can and will comply with this By-law, *The Animal Care Act* and all other applicable legislation in respect of the dogs, cats or both dogs and cats for which the applicant is seeking an excess animal permit.

27(2) The excess animal permit may be issued in respect of specifically identified dogs or cats or both dogs and cats, or may permit a specific number of unidentified dogs or cats or both dogs and cats. The excess animal permit may be issued indefinitely or for a limited time and may have conditions imposed on it.

27(3) It is a condition of every excess animal permit that the permit holder must comply with this By-law, *The Animal Care Act* and all other applicable legislation in respect of the dogs, cats or both dogs and cats to which the permit applies. If this condition or any other condition imposed on the permit is violated, the Community Committee is authorized to suspend or revoke the permit.

27(4) An excess animal permit applies to a specific person and to a specific parcel of land. It is not capable of being transferred to another person or to another parcel of land.

27(5) The City Clerk must give notice of the decision of the Community Committee to the applicant and every person who made representations at the Community Committee meeting in accordance with section 116 of *The City of Winnipeg Charter*.

27(6) The decision of the Community Committee concerning an excess animal permit is final and may not be appealed.

Variation of conditional excess animal permit

28 The holder of an excess animal permit may seek a variation or the removal of conditions imposed on the permit from the Community Committee that would have jurisdiction if a new application were being made for an excess animal permit. The procedure that applies to an application for an excess animal permit applies to the application for the variation or removal of conditions imposed on the permit.

PART 4 – COMMERCIAL ANIMALS

Keeping commercial animals in violation of zoning by-laws prohibited

29(1) Subject to this section, no person may keep a commercial animal in the City of Winnipeg except on a property where this is permitted under the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law or the Winnipeg Zoning By-law.

29(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), no person may keep or raise poultry except in districts zoned "agricultural" under the Winnipeg Zoning By-law.

29(3) The prohibitions in subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to

(a) schools and post-secondary institutions that harbour commercial animals for educational or research purposes; and

(b) petting zoos that are located in one location for a maximum period of one week.

Running at large prohibited

30(1) An owner and a person having custody of a commercial animal must ensure that it does not run at large.

30(2) For the purposes of this Part, a bee colony is running at large if it is swarming.

Impoundment of commercial animals

31(1) An enforcement officer is authorized to capture and impound a commercial animal that is running at large, has caused or is likely to cause damage or harm to people or property, or otherwise poses a danger to individuals or property.

31(2) Unless it is redeemed earlier under section 32 (*Redemption of commercial animals*), a designated employee shall impound a commercial animal impounded under subsection (1) for a minimum period of five days.

31(3) If a commercial animal has been impounded for five days without having been redeemed, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the animal in any manner that he or she considers appropriate.

Redemption of commercial animals

32(1) The owner of a commercial that has been impounded under this By-law may redeem it if he or she can demonstrate to the satisfaction of a designated employee that

(a) he or she is the owner of the animal; and

(b) when redeemed, the animal will either be kept outside the boundaries of the City or kept on a property zoned for this use under the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law or the Winnipeg Zoning By-law.

32(2) In order to redeem an impounded commercial animal, its owner must pay:

(a) all applicable fees; and

(b) the monetary penalty imposed in section 42 (*Monetary penalty for costs of capturing animals*).

PART 5 – PROHIBITED ANIMALS

Prohibited animals

33(1) Subject to this section, no person may keep or harbour within the City of Winnipeg an animal of a species identified in Schedule A, which is attached to and forms part of this By-law, or a hybrid of such an animal.

33(2) Subsection (1) does not apply to an animal that is in the custody and care of

(a) the Assiniboine Park Zoo;

(b) the Health Sciences Centre;

(c) the Manitoba Museum;

(d) the Manitoba Wildlife Rehabilitation Organization;

(e) the Prairie Wildlife Rehabilitation Centre;

(f) the University of Manitoba;

(g) the University of Winnipeg;

(h) FortWhyte Alive;

(i) St. Boniface Hospital and St. Boniface Hospital Research Centre.

33(3) Subsection (1) does not prohibit a person from keeping or harbouring a specific animal if the owner registers the animal under subsection (4) within 90 days after this By-law has been enacted.

33(4) A person is entitled to register an animal with a designated employee for the purpose of exempting it from the prohibition in subsection (1) if the person can show that, at the time this By-law came into effect,

(a) the person owned the animal; and

(b) the animal was being lawfully kept within the City of Winnipeg:

Special permits issued by COO

34(1) Notwithstanding section 33 (*Prohibited animals*) but subject to subsection (2), the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to issue a special permit authorizing an animal prohibited by section 33 to be kept or harboured in the City of Winnipeg and may impose any conditions on the permits he or she considers appropriate to

(a) protect people, property or the environment from the animal; and

(b) ensure humane treatment of the animal.

34(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Chief Operating Officer does not have the authority to issue a special permit in order to authorize a travelling zoo, travelling exhibit or a circus from keeping or harbouring a prohibited animal while in Winnipeg.

Impoundment of prohibited animal

35(1) An enforcement officer is authorized to seize and impound an animal that is prohibited under section 33 (*Prohibited animals*) immediately where the animal is running at large or where the enforcement officer considers that

(a) the animal poses a danger to people or property; or
(b) it is likely to be concealed by its owner to prevent enforcement of this Part.

35(2) Unless it is redeemed earlier under section 36 (*Redemption of impounded prohibited animals*), a designated employee shall impound an animal that is impounded under this section for a minimum period of five days.

35(3) If a prohibited animal has been impounded for five days without having been redeemed, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the animal in any manner that he or she considers appropriate.

Redemption of impounded prohibited animals

36(1) The owner or person responsible for an animal impounded under section 35 (*Impoundment of prohibited animal*) may redeem the animal if he or she can demonstrate to the satisfaction of a designated employee that

(a) he or she is the owner of the animal;

(b) if redeemed, the animal will not pose a danger to people or property; and

(c) the animal will be removed from the City of Winnipeg within a reasonable period of time determined by the designated employee.

36(2) In order to redeem an impounded prohibited animal, its owner must pay:

(a) all applicable fees; and

(b) the monetary penalty imposed in section 42 (*Monetary penalty for costs of capturing animals*).

PART 6 – GENERAL

Other animals running at large

37(1) The owner of an animal that is not a cat, dog or commercial animal must ensure that the animal does not run at large.

37(2) An enforcement officer is authorized to seize and impound, or accept for impoundment, an animal that is running at large in contravention of subsection (1).

37(3) Unless it is redeemed earlier under subsection (4), a designated employee shall impound an animal that is impounded under this section for a minimum period of five days.

37(4) The owner or person responsible for an animal impounded under this section may redeem the animal if he or she can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the designated employee that he or she is the owner of the animal and by paying

(a) all applicable fees; and

(b) the monetary penalty imposed in section 42 (*Monetary penalty for costs of capturing animals*).

37(5) If an animal has been impounded for five days without having been redeemed, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to dispose of the animal in any manner that he or she considers appropriate.

General prohibitions

38(1) No person may:

(a) negligently or willfully open a gate, door or other opening in a fence or enclosure in which an animal has been confined and thereby allow an animal to run at large in the City;

(b) entice an animal to run at large;

(c) tease an animal caught in an enclosed space; or

(d) throw or poke any object into an enclosed space when an animal is caught or confined therein.

38(2) No person other than the owner of an animal or with the consent of the owner may untie, loosen or otherwise free an animal which has been tied or otherwise restrained;

PART 7 - ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Interference with enforcement officers prohibited

39 No person may:

(a) interfere with or attempt to obstruct an enforcement officer who is attempting to

capture or who has captured an animal which is subject to impoundment under this By-law;

(b) release or attempt to release an animal from a vehicle in which an animal that has been captured by an enforcement officer is being held for impoundment; or

(c) remove, or attempt to remove any animal from the possession of an enforcement officer.

Identification must be provided

40 When an enforcement officer intends to issue a document to initiate a prosecution against an individual for a contravention of this By-law, the individual must at the request of the enforcement officer provide identification sufficient to establish the individual's name and address.

Compliance with adoption contract required

41(1) Where a designated employee arranges for the adoption of a dog or cat as a means of disposing of the dog or cat, the dog or cat must be sterilized prior to the adoption or, alternatively, the adoption contract must require that the dog or cat be sterilized by the new owners within six months.

41(2) The owners of a dog or cat adopted from the Animal Services Agency must comply with the obligation set out in the adoption agreement to sterilize the dog or cat within the time period set out in the adoption contract.

Monetary penalty for costs of capturing animals

42(1) Where a designated employee captures or impounds an animal that is subject to impoundment under this By-law, the animal's owner must pay a monetary penalty imposed pursuant to subclause 175(d)(i) of *The City of Winnipeg Charter* in the amount of the costs directly attributable to the capture and the impoundment of the animal.

42(2) The costs referred to in subsection (1) may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) overtime pay required for the capture;

(b) vehicles and equipment rented for the purposes of the capture;

(c) additional personnel retained for the capture; and

(d) the provision of food, shelter, veterinary care and other care reasonably required by the animal during the impoundment.

42(3) Subject to subsection (4), the monetary penalty imposed under subsection (1) is due and payable 30 days after an invoice setting out the amount of the monetary penalty is sent by the Chief Operating Officer to the animal's owner at an address determined in accordance with section 47 (*Address for service*) by registered mail or delivery. It may be collected in any manner in which a tax imposed by the City of Winnipeg may be collected under *The City of Winnipeg Charter*.

42(4) The animal's owner may appeal the application of the monetary penalty or the amount of the monetary penalty within 14 days after the invoice has been sent to the owner under subsection (3).

Powers of designated employees and enforcement officers

43(1) Designated employees and enforcement officers have authority to conduct inspections and take steps to administer and enforce this By-law or remedy a contravention of this By-law in accordance with *The City of Winnipeg Charter* and, for those purposes, have the powers of a designated employee under *The City of Winnipeg Charter*.

43(2) Without restricting the general authority given in subsection (1), enforcement officers have the authority, after providing reasonable notice to the occupant of the property, to enter into a property to examine an animal or to capture and impound an animal in order to administer and enforce this By-law.

43(3) Because it is impractical or impossible to give notice to the occupant of property when in pursuit of an animal running at large, enforcement officers who are in pursuit of an animal running at large are hereby authorized to enter property, other than a building, without the requirement to give notice to the occupant of the property before the entry.

Powers of COO

44 In addition to his or her powers under section 43 (*Powers of designated employees and enforcement officers*), the Chief Operating Officer has authority to:

(a) waive licence and other fees, charges or monetary penalties

(i) for specific categories of animals, including service animals and animals recently adopted from registered animal rescue organizations;

(ii) for animal rescue organizations;

(iii) as part of an amnesty program or another program that serves the long-term interests of the Animal Services Agency;

(iv) in order to relieve pressure on the capacity of the City's animal care facilities;

(v) in order to ensure the adoption of an animal that would not otherwise be adopted; or

(vi) where it would be unjust or unreasonable to impose the fee, charge or monetary penalty;

(b) subject to the Materials Management Policy, make arrangements with veterinary clinics, pet stores and other businesses to sell licences on behalf of the City of Winnipeg, which may provide for a commission to be retained by the business;

(c) allow, or choose not to allow, a licence to be transferred to the new owner of the same animal.

Responsibility and powers of COO for animals within the custody of Animal Services

45(1) While an animal is impounded under this By-law or is otherwise within the custody of the City, the Chief Operating Officer must ensure that it is properly housed, fed, watered and provided with appropriate veterinary care.

45(2) Notwithstanding any provision of this By-law, the Chief Operating Officer is authorized to euthanize an impounded animal or an animal within the custody of the City where he or she, in consultation with a veterinarian, determines that

(a) euthanasia constitutes a humane measure to end the animal's suffering;

(b) the animal is suffering from a terminal illness which will shortly end in death; or

(c) the costs of necessary veterinary or other care for the animal would be significant and are unlikely to be reimbursed by the animal's owner.

Appeals

46(1) Subject to this section, where an appeal from an order or decision under this By-law is authorized by *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, the appeal may be made to the designated committee in accordance with The City of Winnipeg Charter.

46(2) Subject to subsection (3), an administration fee in an amount determined by Council or by a person to whom Council has delegated this power is hereby imposed for an appeal made under this By-law. An appeal may not be accepted by the City Clerk until the administration fee has been paid to the City Clerk.

46(3) The designated committee is authorized to order the administration fee imposed by subsection (2) to be refunded to the appellant if the appeal has been made in good faith and has some merit.

Address for service

47 Where it is necessary to determine an address for sending or delivering an order, notice or some other document under this By-law, any one of the following methods of determining the address may be used:

(a) if the person to be served has been issued a licence under this By-law or is registered pursuant to this By-law, the address provided by the person when applying for the licence or when registering, or any updated address provided by the person, may be used;

(b) if the person to be served is a registered corporation that is not dissolved, the registered office of the corporation shown in the articles of incorporation or in the last notice filed under section 19 of *The Corporations Act* may be used;

(c) if the person to be served is reasonably determined to reside at a particular address in the City of Winnipeg, the address of his or her residence may be used.

Preset fines and early payment options

48(1) A person who contravenes a provision of this By-law referred to in Schedule B, which is attached to and forms part of this By-law, is guilty of an offence and is liable, upon summary conviction, to the preset fine set out in the column identified as setting out a preset fine, plus mandatory fees and costs as provided by *The Summary Convictions Act*, for the contravention of that provision.

48(2) Notwithstanding subsection (1), a person who contravenes a provision of this By-law referred to in Schedule B may pay a discounted fine set out in the column identified as setting out early payment fine options, plus mandatory fees and costs as provided by *The Summary Convictions Act*, within 15 days following the date the offence notice alleging the contravention was issued, and thereafter will not be prosecuted for the contravention.

Consequential amendment to Parks By-law

49 The Parks By-law No. 85./2009 is amended by renumbering section 6 as subsection 6(1) and adding the following immediately thereafter:

6(2) Without restricting the generality of subsection (1), the Chief Operating Officer may designate parks or areas of parks in which dogs are not required to be restrained by leashes. The Chief Operating Officer may only make such a designation if he or she determines that the parks or areas of parks so designated will minimize the risks that unleashed dogs will

(a) be injured by or interfere with nearby vehicular, railroad or pedestrian traffic;

(b) interfere with activities taking place in or on children's play areas, school grounds, athletic fields and public open spaces, including picnic areas and public gardens.

Pound By-law and Exotic Animals By-law repealed

50(1) Subject to subsection (2), the Pound By-law No. 2443/79 and the Exotic Animals By-law No. 3389/83 are repealed upon enactment of this By-law by Council.

50(2) Subsections 28(13) and (14) of the Pound By-law are repealed on January 1, 2015.

Coming into force

51 Sections 19 *(Cat licence mandatory)* and 20 *(Valid licence must be worn by cat)* of this By-law come into force on January 1, 2015. All other provisions of this By-law come into force immediately upon enactment of this By-law by Council.

DONE AND PASSED, this 17th day of July, 2013.

SCHEDULE "A" TO
THE RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP BY-LAW

LIST OF PROHIBITED ANIMALS (Section 33)
amended 77/2014

1 All dogs, other than domesticated dogs (Canis familiaris), including, but not limited to, wolf, fox, coyote, hyaena, dingo, jackal, raccoon dog, bush dog, and any hybrid offspring of a wild dog and domesticate dog.

2 All cats other than domesticated cats (Felis catus), including, but not limited to, lion, tiger, leopard, ocelot, jaguar, puma, panther, mountain lion, cheetah, wild cat, cougar, bobcat, lynx, serval, and any hybrid offspring of a wild cat and domesticated cat.

3 All bears, including polar, grizzly, brown and black bear.

4 All fur bearing animals of the family Mustelidae, including, but not limited to, weasel, marten, mink, badger, ermine, skunk, otter, pole cat, wolverine, except the domestic ferret (Putorius furo).

5 All Procyonidae, including raccoon, kinkajou, cacomistle, cat-bear, panda and coatimundi.

6 All carnivorous mammals of the family Viverridae, including, but not limited to, civet, mongoose, and genet.

7 All bats (Chiroptera).

8 All non-human primates, including, but not limited to, monkey, ape, chimpanzee, gorilla and lemur.

9 All squirrels (Sciuridae).

10 Reptiles (Reptilia)

(a) all Helodermatidae (e.g. gila monster and Mexican bearded lizard);

(b) all front-fanged venomous snakes, even if devenomized, including, but not limited to:

i. all Viperidae (e.g. viper, pit viper),

ii. all Elapidae (e.g. cobra, mamba, krait, coral snake),

iii. all Atractaspididae (e.g. African burrowing asp),

iv. all Hydrophiidae (e.g. sea snake), and

v. all Laticaudidae (e.g. sea krait);

(c) all venomous, mid- or rear-fanged, Duvernoy-glanded members of the family Colubridae, even if devenomized;

(d) any member or hybrid offspring of the family Boidae, including, but not limited to, the common or green anaconda and yellow anaconda, except members of the family Boidae reaching an adult length of no greater than two (2) meters;

(e) any member of the family Pythonidae, including, but not limited to, the African rock python, the Indian or Burmese python, the Amethystine or scrub python, except members of the family Pythonidae reaching an adult length of no greater than two (2) meters;

(f) any member of the family Varanidae, including, but not limited to, the white throated monitor, the water monitor, the Komodo monitor or dragon, the Bornean earless monitor, the Nile monitor, the crocodile monitor, except members of the family Varanidae reaching an adult length of no greater than one (1) meter;

(g) any member of the family Iguanidae, including the green or common iguana;

(h) any member of the family Teiidae, including, but not limited to, the golden, common or black and white tegu;

(i) all members of the family Chelydridae, including snapping turtle and alligator snapping turtle;

(j) all members of the order Crocodylia, including, but not limited to, alligator, caiman and crocodile;

(k) all other snakes of a species or subspecies that can reach an adult length greater than three meters, whether the particular snake exceeds that length or not; and

(l) all other lizards of a species or subspecies that can reach an adult greater than two meters, whether the particular lizard exceeds that length or not.

11 Birds (Aves) in the following categories unless they are kept as commercial animals under Part 4 of the By-law:

(a) all predatory or large birds (e.g. Accipitrids, Cathartids), including, but not limited to, eagle, hawk, falcon, owl, vulture and condor;

(b) anseriformes, including, but not limited to, ducks, geese and swans;

(c) galliformes, including, but not limited to, pheasants, grouse, guinea fowl and turkeys; and

(d) struthioniformes, including, but not limited to, flightless ratites such as ostriches, rheas, cassowaries, emus and kiwis.

12 Arachnida and Chilopoda

(a) all venomous spiders, including, but not limited to, tarantula, black widow and solifugid, scorpion, except the following species of tarantula: Chilean Rose

(Grammostola rosea), Mexican Red-Knee (Brachypelma smithi) and Pink-Toed (Avicularia); and

(b) all venomous arthropods, including, but not limited to, centipede.

13 All large rodents (Rodentia), including, but not limited to, gopher, muskrat, paca, groundhog, marmot, beaver, prairie dog, viscacha, and porcupine.

14 All even-toed ungulates (Artiodactyla) other than domestic sheep, including, but not limited to, antelope, giraffe and hippopotamus.

15 All odd-toed ungulates (Perissodactyla) other than domesticated horses (Equus caballus), including, but not limited to, zebra, rhinoceros and tapir.

16 All marsupials, including, but not limited to, Tasmanian devil, bandicoot, kangaroo, wallaby, opossum, wombat, koala bear, cuscus, numbat and pigmy, and greater glider, except the sugar glider.

17 Sea mammals (Cetacea, Pinnipedia and Sirenia), including, but not limited to, dolphin, whale, seal, sea lion and walrus.

18 All elephants (Proboscides).

19 All hyrax (Hyracoidea).

20 All pangolin (Pholidota).

21 All sloth, anteater, and armadillo (Xenarthrata).

22 Insectivorous mammals, including, but not limited to, aardvark, tenrec, shrew species, mole species and hedgehog species, except the African pygmy hedgehog.

23 Gliding lemur (Dermoptera).

24 All other venomous or poisonous animals.

25 All protected or endangered animals, whether native or non-native, whose possession or sale is prohibited in Manitoba because they are designated as protected or endangered pursuant to an international, federal, or provincial law, regulation, rule or agreement. This prohibition does not apply to an animal that has been obtained in accordance with international, federal or provincial law, as applicable, unless it is otherwise identified on this List.

SCHEDULE "B" TO
THE RESPONSIBLE PET OWNERSHIP BY-LAW

MINIMUM FINES AND EARLY PAYMENT FINE OPTION (Section 48)
amended 77/2014

SECTION NUMBER	OFFENCE	PRESET FINE	EARLY PAYMENT FINE OPTION
	Part 1 – Dogs		
4(1)(b)	Fail to prevent dog from running at large	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(c)	Fail to keep dog on required leash	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(d)	Fail to ensure that dog is vaccinated for rabies or fail to provide proof of vaccination	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(e)	Fail to prevent dog from barking, howling or unduly disturbing others	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(f)	Fail to remove dog excrement	$400.00	$200.00
4(1)(g)	Fail to prevent dog from damaging property	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(h)	Fail to prevent dog from pursuing person or animal	$200.00	
4(1)(i)	Fail to prevent dog from injuring person or animal	$350.00	
4(1)(j)	Fail to prevent dog from being on certain properties	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(k)	Fail to prevent dog from upsetting garbage cans or scattering garbage	$200.00	$100.00
4(1)(l)	Fail to confine dog in heat	$200.00	$100.00
4(5)	Fail to comply with rules for off-leash parks	$200.00	$100.00
5(1)	No dog licence	$250.00	$125.00
5(4)	Fail to provide accurate information on licence application form	$500.00	$250.00
6(1)	Fail to have dog licence on dog	$50.00	$25.00
6(2)	Illegally removing dog licence	$200.00	$100.00
7(1)	Owning or bringing prohibited dog breed into Winnipeg	$1500.00	$1000.00
10(2)	Fail to immediately surrender dog for rabies observation	$1500.00	
10(3)	Fail to properly observe home quarantine	$1000.00	
14(1)(a)	Fail to ensure dangerous dog is kept secure	$1000.00	
14(1)(b)	Fail to ensure dangerous dog remains on owner's property unless muzzled and restrained	$1000.00	
14(1)(c)	Fail to provide certificate of liability insurance	$1000.00	$500.00
14(1)(d)	Fail to notify designated employee if dangerous dog is running at large or has harmed someone	$250.00	$125.00
14(1)(e)	Fail to provide designated employee with name of new owner of dangerous dog	$250.00	$125.00

14(1)(f)	Fail to implant microchip	$1000.00	$500.00
14(1)(g)	Fail to notify designated employee of dog's death	$250.00	$125.00
SECTION NUMBER	**OFFENCE**	**PRESET FINE**	**EARLY PAYMENT FINE OPTION**
14(1)(h)	Fail to pay applicable licence fee	$250.00	$125.00
14(1)(i)	Fail to post signage	$250.00	$125.00
14(1)(j)	Fail to sterilize dangerous dog	$1000.00	$500.00
	Part 2 - Cats		
18(1)(b)	Fail to prevent cat from running at large	$200.00	$100.00
18(1)(c)	Fail to ensure that cat is on required leash	$200.00	$100.00
18(1)(d)	Fail to ensure that cat is vaccinated for rabies or fail to provide proof of vaccination	$200.00	$100.00
18(1)(e)	Fail to remove cat excrement	$400.00	$200.00
18(1)(f)	Fail to prevent cat from damaging property	$200.00	$100.00
18(1)(g)	Fail to prevent cat from injuring person or animal	$200.00	$100.00
18(1)(h)	Fail to prevent cat from upsetting garbage cans or scattering garbage	$200.00	$100.00
18(1)(i)	Fail to confine cat in heat	$200.00	$100.00
19(1)	No cat licence	$250.00	$125.00
19(4)	Fail to provide accurate information on licence application form	$500.00	$250.00
20(1)	Fail to have cat licence on cat without registering licenced cat's microchip or tattoo	$50.00	$25.00
20(2)	Illegally removing cat licence	$200.00	$100.00
22(2)	Fail to comply with conditions on cat trap	$500.00	$250.00
23(2)	Fail to immediately surrender cat for rabies observation	$1500.00	
23(3)	Fail to properly observe home quarantine	$1000.00	
	Part 3 – Excess Animal Permits		
25(2)	Exceed restriction on maximum number of animals without excess animal permit	$500.00	$250.00
	Part 4 – Commercial Animals		
29	Keeping commercial animals in violation of zoning by-laws	$400.00	$200.00
30(1)	Fail to prevent commercial animals from running at large	$200.00	$100.00
	Part 5 – Prohibited Animals		
33(1)	Keep or harbour prohibited animal in city	$1500.00	$750.00
	Part 6 - General		

37(1)	Fail to prevent animal from running at large	$200.00	$100.00
38(1)(a)	Open gate to allow animal to run at large	$200.00	
38(1)(b)	Entice animal to run at large	$200.00	
38(1)(c)	Tease animal in enclosed space	$400.00	
SECTION NUMBER	**OFFENCE**	**PRESET FINE**	**EARLY PAYMENT FINE OPTION**
38(1)(d)	Throw or poke object into enclosed space with animal in the space	$400.00	
38(2)	Untie or free restrained animal	$200.00	
	Part 7 – Administration and Enforcement		
39	Interfere with enforcement officer	$500.00	
40	Fail to provide identification to enforcement officer	$500.00	$250.00
41(1)	Fail to sterilize adopted dog or cat	$500.00	$250.00

APPENDIX



B

PRECEDENT REVIEW

APPENDIX B - PRECEDENT REVIEW

A precedent review was completed to look at best practices of other urban municipalities who have OLA/dog park management plans. Five municipalities were examined, and the contents of their OLA plans and related by-laws are below.

The five municipalities examined were: Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Surrey (BC), and Denver, CO. These municipalities were chosen based on their size, climate, and the timing of completion of their OLA plans.

Toronto, Saskatoon, and Vancouver where also looked at to examine their OLA plans, however, at the time the City of Toronto and the City of Saskatoon did not have extensive OLA plans, and the City of Vancouver was in the process of completion/formalizing their OLA plan.

The following table summarizes the subject matter provided in each of the respective municipalities' OLA plans. This table is followed by a more in-depth summary of each plan.

Plan/Policy Area	Calgary	Edmonton	Denver	Saskatoon	Surrey	Winnipeg
Vision and/or Guiding Principles	✓		✓		✓	
Public Engagement Process	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Number of OLAs within Municipality (currently)	150	41	12	10	11	11 (with one other construction and one receiving modification)
Planning & Siting Criteria						
Classifications	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Distribution	✓	✓			✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Location	✓		✓		✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Size	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Parking/ Access	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Adjacent Land Uses		✓	✓		✓	✓ (Responsible Pet Ownership By-law No. 92/2013)

Single-Use	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Shared Use	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Design Criteria						
Amenities	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Design/ Construction Material Guidelines	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Signage	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Circulation		✓			✓	
Boundaries & Edges	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓ (*Guidelines*, not formally adopted by City)
Seasonal Considerations		✓			✓	✓
Environmental Considerations	✓	✓			✓	✓
Operational & Management Criteria						
Maintenance	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Waste Management	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Community Engagement	v	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Partnerships	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Implementation & Evaluation Criteria						
Code of Conduct	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ (OLA Code of Ethics)
Funding	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Land Ownership						
Partnerships	✓		✓	✓		
Safety/ Enforcement	✓	✓		✓		✓ (Responsible Pet Ownership By-law No. 92/2013)
Monitoring/ Assessment		✓			✓	

CALGARY OFF-LEASH AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN 2020

PLAN DETAILS	
Name & Location:	Off-Leash Area Management Plan 2020, Calgary, AB
Plan Adopted as By-law/Year/Status of Plan:	2010
Plan's Development Process:	In 2007 City Administration was directed by Council to report on rules and standards that could apply to a few strategically placed dog parks in Calgary. As a result, in January 2008, Council then directed Administration to continue working collaboratively with communities and dog interest groups to provide off-leash access to Calgarians; and include off-leash areas in the hierarchy of open space options available to communities. In June 2008 the request was added to review the management of off-leash dog areas as well. The Off-Leash Areas Implementation Plan was approved in March 2010 and Administration was directed to report back with a progress update to the Standing Policy Committee on Community and Protective Services. In February 2011, Administration presented the Off-leash Areas Management Plan to the Committee including opportunities to: - Create fully fenced off-leash dog areas; - Identify options and review budget feasibility; and - Lease surplus City lands to non-profit groups to manage and provide programs and services for dogs and their owners.
Review Period:	
Vision:	**Mission** The City of Calgary provides safe, sustainable off-leash opportunities to citizens. **Triple Bottom Line Vision** ***Social*** Off-leash area use enhances the well-being of people and dogs. ***Environmental*** Management of multi-use off-leash areas maximizes enjoyment and safety for all users while minimizing negative impacts on the environment. ***Economic*** A successful off-leash dog strategy contributes to Calgary's reputation as a desirable place to live and augments The City of Calgary's reputation as a leader in open space and responsible pet owner management.
Purpose:	Administrative document that outlines the procedure for the establishment, management and operation of off-leash areas (OLAs) in the City of Calgary.
Guiding Principles:	**Core Principles:** - The privilege to allow dogs off-leash in public space comes with responsibility and owners must adhere to all relevant by-laws including, but not limited to, picking up after dogs at all times; - The interests of a variety of stakeholders must be considered with the provision of OLAs; - The management of OLAs is sustainable in all respects; - The safety of all park and pathway users and dogs takes precedence of off-leash opportunities; - The protection of park assets, particularly natural habitats and wildlife, takes precedence over off-leash opportunities; - Minimize user conflict and safety concerns through quality design; - Stakeholder engagement is subject to current council-approved policy;

	- Dog owners/walkers and or commercial dog walkers, are legally responsible for their own dog(s) and any injuries or damage caused by their dog(s); - Individuals who choose off-leash areas do so at their own risk; and - All relevant Provincial and Federal regulations and Municipal by-laws supersede this plan.		
Rationale for Plan Development:	In Calgary there were 95,563 dogs identified, during the 2001 census and over 122,000 were confirmed during the 2010 census. Steady increases in dog populations creates a greater demand for OLAs within existing open space and open space planned for new communities. Walking/exercising with your dog off-leash is a valid form of recreational activity and one that promotes a healthy lifestyle.		
Municipal By-laws/Policies used to Inform Plan:	Responsible Pet Ownership By-law #23M2006 Parks and Pathways By-law #20M2003 Natural Areas Management Plan 1994 Calgary Pathway and Bikeway Plan 2000 Parks and Pathways Sign Manual 2007 Development Guidelines and Standards Specifications Landscape Construction 2010 *engage!* Policy 3rd Edition 2007 Calgary Open Space Plan 2003 Community Services & Protective Services Business Plan CSPS 2009-211		
OFF-LEASH AREA DETAIL SUMMARY			
CLASSIFICATION (will be different per plan)	**Neighbourhood OLA** – less than 4.3 ha, intended to serve 800 metre walking distance.	**Community Cluster OLA** – between 4.3 ha and 19.9 ha, intended to serve an eight minute drive distance.	**Regional OLA** – over 19.9 ha, intended to serve a 20 minute drive distance.
General Description:			
Single/Shared Use:	OLAs should accommodate multi-use functions in public parks, not for exclusive off-leash activity.		
SITING CRITERIA			
Distribution:	Distribute OLAs throughout city factoring in number of dogs, geography, growth, use patterns and the off-leash establishment checklist. Include off-leash activity as a key consideration in the park planning process for established communities and in the community planning process for new communities.		
Site Size:	At least .5 ha		
Location:	- Should be in the parks inventory or leased for purposes of a dog park; and - Should occupy less than 30% of regional/multi-use site.		
Adjacent Land Uses:	*None stated.*		
Siting Standards (Metrics), i.e., req'd population catchment area:	*None stated.*		
Criteria to Establish New Off-Leash Areas:	- Is the land in the parks inventory or is there an opportunity to lease the land? - Does it fill a gap in service area? - Is it at least .5 ha in size? - Does it occupy less than 3-% of a regional/multi-use site? - Is it safe for people and dogs? - Can effective strategies be implemented to mitigate potential safety concerns and/or conflict between users if the site is adjacent to: No Dog Areas; pathways; residents; major roadways?		

	- Are stakeholders likely to support the site? (proximity to adjacent residents, natural areas, already used informally as off-leash?) - Is there adequate parking and/or space available to provide parking? - Is the site easily accessible by the public and by service vehicles? - Can boundaries be clearly delineated? - Is the terrain/topography suitable for off-leash and not susceptible to erosion? - Is the site currently used for passive unstructured activity? - Where a section of a park is considered, can a peripheral area be designated rather than central area? - Is it a permanent site or site not expected for development in the next 10-20 years? - Is the cost to implement reasonable in relation to the length of term of a temporary site? - Can it be demonstrated that the site is in accordance with natural habitat goals when adjacent to or within special protection or environment park areas? - Can it be demonstrated that the site is in accordance with natural habitat goals when adjacent to or within an environmentally significant area?		
Criteria to Eliminate Off-Leash Areas:	*None stated.*		
Access/Parking:	See above.		
Minimum Setback Distances:	*None Stated.*		
DESIGN CRITERIA			
Services and Amenities:	**Neighbourhood OLA**	**Community Cluster OLA**	**Regional OLA**
Standard waste removal?	✓	✓	✓
Standard maintenance schedule?	✓	✓	✓
Clear signage	✓	✓	✓
Online maps	✓	✓	✓
Responsible pet ownership and other education information	✓	✓	✓
By-law enforcement (where required)	✓	✓	✓
Parking		✓ **off-site** **On site only when necessary and feasible**	✓ **Off/on-site**
Partial or fully enclosed fencing or natural barriers to separate use	✓	✓	✓
Increased waste removal service in enclosed areas	✓	✓	✓
Benches		✓ **Where feasible**	✓
Enhanced maintenance schedule			✓
Washrooms – where feasible – in Regional OLAs only			✓ **Where feasible**

Enhanced Services:			
Dog waste bags and dispensers	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**
Drinking water for dogs	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**
Responsible pet ownership information and seminars	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**
Other enhancements proposed of funded by stewards	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**	✓ **Where feasible**
Amenities:	*See above.*		
Circulation:	*None stated.*		
Materials:	*None stated.*		
Signage:	- Create signage plan. - Clear boundary markers must be added to alert citizens they are entering or leaving off-leash areas. - Utilize other approved Parks sign guidelines.		
Seasonal Considerations:	*None stated.*		
Entrance/Exit	Apply signage where necessary.		
Environmental Considerations:	- Consider new OLAs near Special Protection Natural Environment Parks, Major Natural Environment Parks and Environmentally Significant. - Must conduct impact assessment and monitoring plan. - Eliminate impacts on native plants and wildlife or the fragmentation of natural areas. - Determine access to water bodies. - Education strategies on the carrying capacity for OLAs.		
Other Design Considerations:	*None stated.*		
MAINTENANCE			
General Maintenance:	Parks is responsible. Maintain OLAs based on current Parks inventory maintenance practices.		
Waste Management:			
Operating Agreements/ Partnerships:	Negotiate operating agreements between Parks and other stakeholders where appropriate. Agreements must outline roles and responsibilities of all parties including community, public or private parties.		
SAFETY/ENFORCEMENT/COMMUNICATIONS/OPERATIONS			
Allowable Use (i.e., other animals…):	*None stated.*		
By-law Enforcement:	Enforcement lies with City of Calgary Animal and Bylaw Services Ensure collaborate between Parks, Animal and Bylaw Services, and other stakeholders regarding enforcement. Develop a communication plan. Focus bylaw enforcement/education strategies on dog waste pick up, control of animals and dogs running at large.		
Code of Conduct:	Post consistent city-wide off-leash rules which apply to all sites on both the Animal and Bylaw Services, and Parks websites.		
Education & Communications:	See Enforcement.		
Monitoring & Assessment	Evaluation criteria to include: - 3-1-1 complaints; - Risk management issues; - Damages to surfaces and natural environment; - Damages to amenities; - Impacts on wildlife and natural habitats;		

	- Use patterns; - Pathway users; - Dog feces not picked up; and - Water quality issues.
IMPLEMENTATION	
Implementation Process:	
Funding:	Include capital, operating and lifecycle maintenance costs. Funding sources could include Parks, developers, community, private, grants, or combination thereof.
Land Ownership:	*None stated.*
Partnerships:	
MULTIPLE USERS CRITERIA	
Policies to Balance User Needs:	

EDMONTON'S DOGS IN OPEN SPACE STRATEGY: A 10-YEAR STRATEGY TO GUIDE THE PLANNING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT OF OFF-LEASH AREAS IN EDMONTON

PLAN DETAILS	
Name & Location:	Edmonton Dogs In Open Spaces Strategy: A 10-Year Strategy to Guide the Planning, Design and Management of Off-leash Areas in Edmonton, Alberta
Plan Adopted as By-law/Year/Status of Plan:	January 2016
Plan's Development Process:	- The purpose of the Dogs in Open Spaces 10-year Strategy is to provide recommendations based on best practices used in other North American Cities, for planning, design and management of off-leash sites. - In 2015, a consultant was retained and worked in collaboration with Administration to develop the strategy intended to guide the planning, design and management of off-leash areas in Edmonton. - The project included public engagement, a municipal practices review (dog off-leash program policies and practices), evaluation of the current City of Edmonton off-leash program, identification of areas of the city that are deficient in dogs off-leash opportunities, and creation of a new strategy. - The proposed strategy reflects best practices from select winter cities across North America and recommendations were tailored to be specific to Edmonton. Animal control and parkland bylaws, natural area policies, Breathe, Edmonton's Green Network Strategy (formerly the Open Space Plan), The Ways plans, Urban Parks Management Plan and other existing plans and initiatives were considered in the development this 10-year strategy.
Review Period:	10 years.
Vision:	*None stated.*
Guiding Principles:	*None stated.*
Purpose or Rationale for Plan Development:	With an increasing population of dogs in cities, and with more Canadian households having dogs than children, there is growing demand for cities to accommodate residents and their dogs in public places. Many municipalities are recognizing dog Off-Leash Areas as legitimate uses of public parks with potential benefits to dog owners and to the city more broadly.

Municipal By-laws/Policies used to Inform Plan:	A number of current City policies have been referenced and incorporated into the Dogs in Open Spaces Strategy Technical Report, to ensure the recommendations are consistent with existing policies and initiatives that are under development. Policies that are applicable to dogs off-leash include: - Animal Licensing and Control Bylaw C13145 (consolidated in February 2010); - Natural Area Systems Policy C531 (amended June 2007); - Natural Connections Strategic Plan (2007); - North Saskatchewan River Area Redevelopment Plan (Bylaw 7188) (consolidated July 2012); - Open Space Master Plan (under development); - Parkland Bylaw C2202 (consolidated November 2003); - Ribbon of Green Concept Plan (1990) and Master Plan (1992); - The Way We Live: Edmonton's People Plan (2010); - The Way We Green: Edmonton's Environmental Strategic Plan (2011); - The Way We Grow: Edmonton's Municipal Development Plan (2010); - Urban Parks Management Plan (2006-2016); and - WinterCity Strategy (2012).

OFF-LEASH AREA DETAIL SUMMARY

CLASSIFICATIONS ***(will be different per plan)***	**Neighbourhood**		**District Off-leash Area**	**River Valley & Ravine Off-leash Areas**
	Off-Leash Area	**Fenced Dog Park**		
General Description:	Unfenced area that serves residential neighbourhoods within walking distance. Variable sizes and surfacing options depending on level of use.	Fenced area that serves residential neighbourhoods within walking distance. Variable sizes and surfacing options depending on level of use. Includes small, durable "urban dog parks" or "dog runs."	A destination area with priority off-leash use. Selective use of fencing may be considered. Site may also accommodate a small Neighbourhood Fenced Dog Park.	Shared-use and relatively undeveloped area with selective fencing and special measures to protect wildlife and river valley or ravine ecosystems. Site may also accommodate a small Neighbourhood Fenced Dog Park.
Single/Shared Use:	Shared Use.	Dedicated off-leash use.	Shared Use.	Shared Use.
SITING CRITERIA				
Distribution:	Target number to be determined based on population density and dog ownership numbers.	No target. Sites to be determined based on park planning objectives, land availability, demand, and fence cost recover from the community.	Target 1 per district (northeast, northwest, southeast, southwest).	No target.

<table>
<tr><td>Site Size:</td><td colspan="2">From 0.2 ha to 2 ha.</td><td>From 2 ha to 4 ha</td><td>From 0.5 ha – size to be based on River Valley planning objectives.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Location:</td><td colspan="4">Not stated.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Adjacent Land Uses:</td><td colspan="4">- Preferred adjacent land uses: commercial, municipal facilities, employment zones.
- Preferred land types: open space, transportation, or infrastructure right-of-ways, utility right-of-ways, drainage lands, or other public land holdings.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Siting Standards (Metrics), i.e., req’d population catchment area</td><td>± 20 minute walk.</td><td>No target.</td><td>± 20 minute drive.</td><td>No target.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria to Establish New Off-Leash Areas:</td><td colspan="4">- City’s identification of an underserved or high demand area, application for new development or redevelopment, or a request from the public through an application process.
- Comprehensive public engagement should be undertaken at the district scale.
- Evaluated to approved guidelines and site selection criteria.
- Established as pilot projects to allow for monitoring and adjustments.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria to Eliminate Off-Leash Areas:</td><td colspan="4">- Sites may be closed or areas be reduced if they are identified to be located in an over-serviced area for Off-leash Areas.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Access/Parking:</td><td colspan="2">Street Parking and use of existing parking lots where possible; limited off-street parking. Should be located along walking, biking, and transit routes.</td><td>Off-street parking is recommended. Should have access from collector or arterial roads.</td><td>Parking is adjacent to area. Should have access to collector or arterial roads.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6">Minimum Setback Distances (by use):</td><td>Residential Areas (to property line) & Cemeteries</td><td colspan="3">100 m unless separated with berm(s), solid fencing, or other mitigation measures.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Arterial Roads,
Golf Courses,</td><td colspan="3">50 m unless separated by fencing or other mitigation measures.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Public areas that attract high concentrations of people – i.e., sites that host special events or are common tourist destinations.</td><td colspan="3">50 m unless separated by fencing or other mitigation measures, such as temporary fencing during special events.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Multi-use trails & equestrian trails.</td><td colspan="3">25 m unless separated by fencing or other mitigation measures.</td></tr>
<tr><td>School grounds and associated walking routes,
Play areas and associated walking routes,
Pools and splash pads,
Sports fields &
Picnic Areas.</td><td colspan="3">Neighbourhood and District Off-leash Areas: 25 m buffer zone from activities and Off-leash Area to be partially or completely fenced if the site is within a shared-use park with any one of these activities. A band of planting is recommended around the fenced area to deter children from coming up to the fence, while still allowing views in and out of the Off-leash Area.
River Valley and Ravine Off-leash Areas: 50 m unless separated with mitigation measures.</td></tr>
</table>

	Natural areas, wildlife corridors, and otherwise environmentally sensitive areas.	To be determined based on guidance from planning staff in the Parks + Biodiversity Section. May include seasonal or time restrictions, wildlife-friendly fencing, or other mitigation measures.		
DESIGN CRITERIA				
Boundaries & Edge Conditions: Recommended fencing options include post and wire fencing, post and rail fencing with mesh panels or chain link fencing with black vinyl coating. Soft edges are recommended where possible to integrate the Off-leash Area into the surrounding site, and to reduce capital costs. Soft edges can be created through the use of vegetation, land forms, or other materials, such as split rails fencing or straw bales.	Generally considered an unfenced area, however, selective fencing may be considered depending on street traffic, adjacent park uses and environmental considerations. Boundaries are clearly defined and legible to all park users. Where conflicting adjacencies occur options may include boundary review, temporary or permanent fencing, or closure/relocation.	Fenced dog parks at sites with high street traffic, incompatible or sensitive adjacent park uses, environmental considerations, or with demand for dedicated fenced areas.	Selectively fenced on a case-by-case basis depending on street traffic, adjacent park uses, environmental considerations, and demand for fenced Off-leash Areas. Boundaries are clearly defined and legible to all park users. Where conflicting adjacencies occur, options may include boundary review, fencing, or closure/relocation.	Selectively fenced (wildlife-friendly fencing) on a case-by-case basis depending on street traffic, adjacent park uses, environmental considerations, and demand for fenced Off-leash Areas. Boundaries are clearly defined and legible to all park users. Where conflicting adjacencies occur, options may include boundary review, wildlife-friendly fencing, or closure/relocation.
Amenities: Standard amenities include waste bins, waste bag dispensers, signage, open space and trees. Special amenities include seating, drinking water, dog cleaning station, washrooms, notice boards, mix of conditions, separated areas for small dogs and large dogs, shelter structure, or lighting.	Standard Amenities.		Special Amenities	Standard Amenities
Circulation:	- Include a variety of looped, shaded walking circuits that encourage owners to keep moving with their dogs. - Primary trails should be universally accessible, and the width and surfacing of trails should be proportional to their intensity of use and operational requirements. - An animal behaviourist should be involved in reviewing concept designs for new or redeveloped Off-leash Areas to ensure that potential points of dog conflict are mitigated. - Circulation within the Off-leash Area should consider maintenance requirements, such as vehicle access to waste bins. Concrete or asphalt paths are optional to facilitate vehicle access.			

	- In shared-use areas separate trails should be provided for bikes and dogs off-leash. - Off Lease Areas should be separated from multi-use pathways. Where this is not possible a combination of hard and soft boundaries should be used to separate uses as much as possible. - In shared use parks, access to the Off Lease Area should be provided directly from the street or parking lot.
Materials:	- The selection of surface materials should be guided by intensity of use, site drainage, maintenance demands, capital costs, and topography. - Grass or other groundcover plants are recommended for large, open, well-draining areas with low intensity of use. - Crushed stone surfacing is well-suited for pathways and areas of high use, such as entry locations. - Concrete or asphalt are recommended for paths that are to be regularly plowed and highly used in winter, and for areas around dog wash stations or drinking fountains. Maintenance vehicle access routes can also be surfaced with concrete or asphalt in high use sites. - Sand and pea gravel can be useful surfaces in poor-draining areas.
Signage:	- Signage messaging should be concise, easily readable, and presented in a hierarchical manner to emphasize priority items. Positive messaging is valued by dog owners, and can help foster compliance with the rules. - Entry signs at Off-leash Areas should be prominently posted, and should include bylaws and code of conduct, a map of Off-leash Area boundaries, and contact information for emergencies and bylaw enforcement. - Kiosks or notice boards should be incorporated at the main park entry or entries for City and public use. - Educational signage can be incorporated to encourage responsible dog ownership.
Seasonal Considerations:	- Priority winter-access sites should be designed to create or take advantage of good winter microclimates. 'Winter-use' gathering areas should be close to park entries, and should have good sun exposure and be protected from winter winds. - Vegetation and landforms can be used to create windbreaks for shelter. - The Off-leash Area website should indicate which sidewalks and pathways in Off-leash Areas are cleared of snow, and which sites have access to year-round washrooms. The website should also provide information about the safe use of Off-leash Areas in winter. - The City could support the creation of private indoor off-leash facilities for the winter months.
Entrance/Exit	
Environmental Considerations:	- Ideally locate Off-leash Areas away from areas of environmental sensitivity, such as natural areas, wildlife corridors, or other important ecological areas. - Mitigation measures may include changing Off-leash Area boundaries, establishing buffer zones and protective fencing around sensitive areas, seasonal and/or time restrictions, and managing access to water bodies. - Dog waste and drainage need to be managed carefully to reduce negative impacts of dog waste on receiving water bodies and wildlife.

Other Design Considerations:	**WASTE MANAGEMENT - DESIGN ELEMENTS** - The number and type of waste bins should be informed by demand and available maintenance resources. - Large capacity, in-ground bins with lids are recommended as they can help reduce maintenance demands and reduce odours. - Waste bins should be located at all park entries and at key locations throughout the park to encourage owners to pick up and dispose of dog waste. Locations should also be accessible for waste collection vehicles. - Waste bag dispensers should be provided as a standard amenity to encourage owners to pick up dog waste. - There should be highly visible signage to encourage owners to pick-up and properly dispose of dog waste. **DRAINAGE AND EROSION CONTROL** - While Off-leash Areas are best located away from surface water and sensitive groundwater areas, they should also be designed to capture and filter runoff from the site. Runoff treatment options will depend on site topography and soil conditions. - On well-drained sites with low water tables, runoff should be directed to infiltrate on site. On sites with high water tables and/or low infiltration rates Off-leash Area boundaries may need to be changed, or the site can be designed to direct runoff to specially-designed infiltration and/or treatment areas. - Off-leash Areas should be located on relatively level terrain to reduce soil erosion and runoff of eroded soil. Dogs should be restricted from accessing steep slopes. - Off-leash Areas should be regularly monitored for drainage and erosion problems and measures should be taken to address problems promptly. **VEGETATION** - A diversity of vegetation conditions should be provided to create interest for both dogs and owners. Plants should be durable and non-toxic. - Planting can be used to delineate boundaries, provide visual screening, buffer adjacent site uses, provide shelter, and create seasonal interest, while visually integrating the site with its surroundings. Planting can also be designed to support urban biodiversity. - Areas of unmown grass or meadow can provide good opportunities and scents to engage dogs, and can reduce maintenance demands for the City. - Existing vegetation within existing or proposed Off-leash Areas should be protected from the potential impacts of off-leash dog activity. **PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY** - Risk of conflict at Off-leash Areas can be reduced if the site is adequately sized, is located away from incompatible uses, has good circulation to disperse activity, has a variety of vegetation and terrain to break up low sightlines, has good enforcement presence, and has education programs to foster responsible dog ownership. - In shared-use areas additional strategies should be implemented to minimize conflict, such as separation of uses, education campaigns, and improved signage. - Public health risks from dog waste can be minimized by having good waste management strategies in place, enforcing dog waste pick up, ensuring good drainage, and educating people about the health risks. - Off-leash Areas should also be designed using Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles, in order to promote user safety and positive site activity.

MAINTENANCE	
General Maintenance:	- Maintenance requirements can be minimized by thoughtfully designing waste management elements and circulation, incorporating durable and well-draining surfacing, and selecting durable and easily repaired site furnishings. - In-ground waste bins with lids are recommended to reduce collection frequency. Bins should be located along maintenance vehicle access routes, and ideally along routes with snow clearing. - Park users, Off-leash Area Ambassadors, or private partners should be engaged in the restocking of dog waste bag dispensers. - Incentive programs can be explored to encourage compliance with dog waste bylaws. - The demands of vegetation management at park sites can be reduced by limiting the extent of mown grass areas. Leaving defined areas of the site unmown can increase the site's interest for dogs, while reducing maintenance demands, and potentially offering some habitat value.
Waste Management:	*See design considerations above.*
Operating Agreements/ Partnerships:	- The City should build on the success of the Jackie Parker Pooch Patrol as the basis for creating Off-leash Area Ambassador groups across the City. - It is recommended that, as a condition of establishing a new Off-leash Area, there should be the commitment of an Off-leash Area Ambassador group, similar to the requirement when establishing a new community garden in the City. - Standard terms of reference or operating agreements should be drafted to outline the roles and responsibilities of the Off-leash Area Ambassadors, and those of the City. - Members of Off-leash Area Ambassador groups can play an important role in promoting safety and education, such as encouraging dog owners to pick up dog waste, and handing out information brochures.
SAFETY/ENFORCEMENT/COMMUNICATIONS/OPERATIONS	
Allowable Use (i.e. other animals…):	*None stated.*
By-law Enforcement:	- The regular presence of bylaw officers at Off-Leash Areas is recommended to provide an incentive for dog owners to follow the rules. - Off-Leash Area Ambassadors can also play a role in helping encourage dog owners to follow Off-leash Area etiquette. - Park users should be encouraged to report bylaw infractions and problems at Off-leash Areas through the City's 311 phone line or other tools to be developed (e.g., smartphone app). - Off-leash Area rules should be promoted through annual dog licensing, vet offices, and private businesses.
Code of Conduct:	- Rules should be concise, clearly stated, and easily understood. It is recommended that the City simplify and prioritize the current list of rules / code of conduct.
Education & Communications:	- Expanded education efforts should target all park users regarding expected behaviour within shared-use spaces. In shared-use Off-leash Areas messaging at park entries should alert all park users to the possible presence of dogs, and to who has the right-of-way along the trail. - Signage should be updated to show Off-leash Area maps, with off-leash trails and shared-use trails (if applicable) clearly indicated. - The Off-leash Area website should be expanded to provide more detail about the features and characteristics of each Off-leash Area (e.g., size, fencing, shared-use, amenities, and trail information). - Communication tools, such as a dog owner email list and smartphone app, can be developed to distribute information to dog owners about

	events, educational opportunities, Off-leash Area planning initiatives, and alerts at Off-leash Areas. The app could also be used to provide information about Off-leash Areas and to allow users to report site problems to the City. - Educational resources can be offered through the website or through partnerships with dog welfare groups. - Responsible pet ownership can be further promoted by the City by offering discounted licensing fees (or other incentives) to owners whose dogs have participated in a certified obedience training course, or who have passed the "Canine Good Neighbour" test.
Monitoring & Assessment	- Monitoring and inspections of each Off-leash Area should take place on a regular schedule. - Keeping track of monitoring data can be facilitated by the development of an Off-leash Area evaluation checklist. - Monitoring data should be recorded in an Off-leash Area database so that, over time, trends by Off-leash Area and across the city can be identified. - Off-leash Area Ambassador groups and regular site users can be engaged in site monitoring as well.
IMPLEMENTATION	
Implementation Process:	*See site selection criteria.*
Funding:	- Sites should be planned and designed to minimize capital and operating demands. - All sites should have a standard level of amenities. Additional amenities can be considered through funding partnerships with private partners and Off-leash Area Ambassador groups. - Additional funding sources may include private sponsorship, developer amenity contributions, increased licensing fees, user fees, and/or special grants. - The City may wish to encourage the development of privately-run Off-leash Areas on private or privately-leased land, or at indoor sites for winter use.
Land Ownership:	*None Stated*
MULTIPLE USERS CRITERIA	
Policies to Balance User Needs:	*None Stated.*

CITY OF DENVER: DOG PARK MASTER PLAN & POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

PLAN DETAILS	
Name & Location:	Dog Park Master Plan & Policy Recommendations
Plan Adopted as By-law/Year/Status of Plan:	2010
Plan's Development Process:	- 'Game Plan' Recommendations Adopted 2003 - Public Input Survey Spring 2009 - Examination/Evaluation of Denver's Existing Facilities and Needs - Study and Evaluation of Local and National Best Practices - Development of Draft Recommendations for sites, amenities, policies, implementation and development of long-term partnerships - Public Meetings - Final Plan 2010
Review Period:	*None stated.*

Vision or Goals:	Based on observed and related experiences with dog owners and non-dog owners in Denver's parks, staff and committee members agreed that fostering healthy relationships between dog owners, non-dog owners, and all park users was critical to future success. Additionally, the importance of fostering healthier relationships and improving parks and open spaces that support and accommodate all users in a healthy, sustainable environment is understood and agreed upon.
Purpose:	*None stated.*
Guiding Principles or Objectives:	- Evaluation of current dog parks and consideration of possible spaces and solutions for future dog park facilities. - Design options and recommendations that are site specific. - Developed of recommendations for more and for better city-wide enforcement of dog off-leash regulations. - Improvement of community and citizen involvement in addition to development of future ongoing partnerships.
Rationale for Plan Development:	Denver's population is thriving and growing, and there is evidence that it will continue to grow, placing ever greater demands on its public space. Continued growth also means continued demand for more and better park amenities for all park users. Additionally, more and more citizens are experiencing their neighbourhood, community and regional park with their dog. Dogs and their owners present Denver Parks with a unique challenge in addressing the impacts of more dogs in the parks. This is of particular concern in Denver's most dense areas of development, where higher density means little or no space for exercising dogs a dog. The expressed desire of Denver's citizenry to address the issue of dogs in parks has led Denver Parks and Recreation to draft this Dog Park Master Plan.
Municipal By-laws/Policies used to Inform Plan:	Denver Parks and Recreation "Game Plan" 50-year master plan (2003) City of Denver Leash Law
OFF-LEASH AREA DETAIL SUMMARY	
CLASSIFICATION (will be different per plan)	*None stated.*
General Description:	Parks can range in size from single-use (fully fenced, preferred alternative) to shared use (partially fenced, time of day restrictions). Key elements for new locations are walking distance from neighbourhoods as well as equitable distribution city wide. As always, community involvement is key as new areas must be supported by the local community.
Single/Shared Use:	Can be both.
SITING CRITERIA	
Distribution:	Equal, throughout the city.
Site Size:	Minimum size 1 acre, with preference given to 2 or 3 acre
Location:	- Cannot be a designated natural area or wildlife habitat. - Cannot contain toxic residue from previous uses.
Adjacent Land Uses:	- No other site within same service area (2-mile radius or 1-mile radius, depending on population density).
Siting Standards (Metrics), i.e., req'd population catchment area	- Good connection to adjacent/surrounding neighbourhoods via pedestrian/bicycle trails.
Criteria to Establish New Off-Leash Areas:	*None stated.*
Criteria to Eliminate Off-Leash Areas:	*None stated.*
Access/Parking:	Must have access to parking.

Minimum Setback Distances:	- Distance of 100 ft (30.5 metres) from a playground or other children's facility. - No arterial streets within 200 ft (61 metres) unless the area is fully fenced.
DESIGN CRITERIA	
Boundaries & Edge Conditions:	- When fencing, use a 4-feet tall decorative perimeter fence. - Attractive visual buffer from surrounding residents and/or park areas (vegetation, fence treatment).
Amenities:	- Optional amenities may include shade structures, a water source, and bench seating. - Minimum of four doggie clean up stations (bag dispenser and trash barrels).
Circulation:	- Non-linear to maximize usable space.
Materials:	- Gravel fines surfacing around entrance at least 30'x30' (9 metres x 9 metres). - Minimum 1 acre of alternative surface (sand-based soil mix, synthetic turf, or infield mix) – balance of area can be native vegetation; no turf.
Signage:	Community bulletin board.
Seasonal Considerations:	*None stated.*
Entrance/Exit	minimum two double-gated entrances plus two 10 ft (3 m) wide maintenance gates, ADA accessible paved entrance path
Environmental Considerations:	*None stated.*
Other Design Considerations:	n/a
MAINTENANCE	
General Maintenance:	*None stated.*
Waste Management:	*None stated.*
Operating Agreements/ Partnerships:	Recommended that the City of Denver partner with a strong organization on issues of educational outreach, clean-up of facilities, and monitoring and compliance of off-leash policies and laws.
SAFETY/ENFORCEMENT/COMMUNICATIONS/OPERATIONS	
Allowable Use (i.e. other animals…):	*None stated.*
By-law Enforcement:	It will be a violation to provide false information to an animal control officer, or fail to display a dog license. $250 fine per occurrence.
Code of Conduct:	All Denver Dog Parks have the enclosure rules posted: 1. Off-leash dog area will be open from sunrise to sunset, seven days a week unless closed for maintenance. 2. Enter at your own risk. 3. Dogs must be leashed when entering and leaving the enclosure. 4. Handlers assume full responsibility for their dogs. 5. Handlers must dispose of dog feces properly and immediately. 6. Dogs must be supervised and under handlers' control at all times. 7. Dogs must have current rabies tag and Denver dog license (for Denver residents). 8. Dogs must be spayed or neutered, or have a current Denver intact permit (for Denver residents). 9. Dogs must be accompanied by a person 18 years or older. 10. No children under 12 years of age in the enclosures; children 12-17 years of age must be accompanied by an adult. 11. No aggressive dogs, no pitbulls, no female dogs in heat, no ill dogs. 12. No human food (dog treats OK). 13. No toys, chairs, water dishes or trash left behind.

	Any bit, attack, violations, or problems must be immediately reported to the Denver Division of Animal Control located at XXXX. In case of emergency, call 911. All users of the off-leash area must abide by the posted rules, also referenced in the Revised Municipal Code of the City and County of Denver, Colorado. Violators are subject to fines.
Education & Communications:	Hiring two additional animal control officers for education purposes.
Monitoring & Assessment	*None stated.*
IMPLEMENTATION	
Implementation Process:	*None stated.*
Funding:	New fee structure provided for additional funding opportunities.
Land Ownership:	*None stated.*
Partnerships:	Establishment of a Denver Dog Owners Group (D.O.G.).
MULTIPLE USERS CRITERIA	
Policies to Balance User Needs:	*None stated.*

SASKATOON DOG PARK POLICY

PLAN DETAILS			
Name & Location:	Dog Park Application Program		
Plan Adopted as By-law/Year/Status of Plan:	*n/a*		
Plan's Development Process:	*n/a*		
Review Period:	*n/a*		
Vision:	*None Stated.*		
Purpose:	The goal of the Dog Park Program Plan is to strategically place Dog Parks throughout the city, including within district, neighbourhood, and linear park spaces. The Recreation and Sport Division welcomes applications for new Dog Parks to assist with reaching these programming goals.		
Guiding Principles:	*None Stated.*		
Rationale for Plan Development:	The City of Saskatoon recognizes the growing demand for Dog Parks and is eager to support future developments. The City is committed to providing the best possible services to meet the dynamic needs and high expectations of Saskatoon citizens as outlined in the Strategic goal of Continuous Improvement within the City's Strategic Plan.		
Municipal By-laws/Policies used to Inform Plan:	Animal Control Bylaw No. 7860 Dangerous Animal Bylaw No. 8176		
OFF-LEASH AREA DETAIL SUMMARY			
CLASSIFICATION (will be different per plan)	**Neighbourhood**	**Suburban**	**City Wide**
General Description:	Within walking distance for users.	Typically driven to by users from adjacent neighbourhoods. Fenced by either manmade fencing, or by natural barriers such as trees or steep grades.	A destination location identified by amenities either natural or manmade.
Single/Shared Use:			
SITE SELECTION CRITERIA			
Distribution:			

Site Size:	
Location:	
Adjacent Land Uses:	
Siting Standards (Metrics), i.e., req'd population catchment area	
Criteria to Establish New Off-Leash Areas:	New dog parks can be selected either by the council administration or by a community based user group with administrative approval.
Criteria to Eliminate Off-Leash Areas:	
Access/Parking:	
Minimum Setback Distances:	
DESIGN CRITERIA	
Boundaries & Edge Conditions:	
Amenities:	
Circulation:	
Materials:	
Signage:	
Seasonal Considerations:	
Entrance/Exit	
Environmental Considerations:	
Other Design Considerations:	
MAINTENANCE	
General Maintenance:	All dog parks are provided basic services by the Recreation and Sport Division including garbage collection, grass cutting and signage.
Waste Management:	Included in basic services.
Operating Agreements/ Partnerships:	Any programming or maintenance above the basic level of service provided is the responsibility of the Dog Park Ambassadors of a local User Group and is subject to City approval for enhancements.
SAFETY/ENFORCEMENT/COMMUNICATIONS/OPERATIONS	
Allowable Use (i.e. other animals…):	
By-law Enforcement:	
Code of Conduct:	
Education & Communications:	
Monitoring & Assessment	
IMPLEMENTATION	
Implementation Process:	
Funding:	
Land Ownership:	
Partnerships:	
MULTIPLE USERS CRITERIA	
Policies to Balance User Needs:	

CITY OF SURREY: DOG OFF-LEASH AREA STRATEGY 2012-2021

PLAN DETAILS	
Name & Location:	City of Surrey 2012-2021 Dog Off-leash Area Strategy
Plan Adopted as By-law/Year/Status of Plan:	2012
Plan's Development Process:	During the production of this strategy the consultant team undertook a detailed literature review, international precedent research, and numerous public consultation events. This combination of research methods has resulted in valuable information about the planning, design and operations of dog off-leash areas. OPEN HOUSES + WORKSHOPS Public input was key to the development of this Dog Off-leash Area Strategy. The consultant team, together with City staff, facilitated the following events and surveys to provide members of the community with opportunities to share their insights and opinions: - April 2011: Staff Workshop with parks planning and operations staff. 7 Staff members attended. - May 2011: Six Open House events, conducted in each Town Centre. 101 community members attended and 104 survey responses were returned. - May – June 2011: Phone Survey.* 1200 respondents. - May – June 2011: Online Survey available to the public. 147 respondents. - July 2011: Stakeholder Workshop. 11 community members attended. - September 2011: Three Open House events. 83 community members attended and an equal number of survey responses were returned.
Review Period:	2012-2021
Vision:	*Not stated*
Purpose:	The 2011 Dog Off-leash Area Strategy will serve as a decision making tool to guide the planning, design, and operations of off-leash areas in the City of Surrey. The Strategy is intended to accomplish the following: - Documents precedents for successful dog off-leash areas. - Documents public input on potential future locations for dog off-leash areas. - Documents public input on issues related to the planning, design and operations of dog off-leash areas. - Identifies opportunities to reflect the aims of Surrey's Sustainability Charter (Section 1.2). - Identifies strategies to minimize the environmental impact of dog off-leash areas (Section 2.4). - Recommends provision and location guidelines to inform selection of new off-leash areas (Section 2.7). - Recommends off-leash area amenities, including opportunities to create parks that are fun for dogs and people (Section 3.1). - Recommends design guidelines for new dog off-leash areas (Section 3.5). - Recommends seven sites for new dog off-leash areas in Surrey (Section 3.6). - Identifies opportunities for park stewardship by dog owners (Section 4.3). - Identifies operational challenges and subsequent best management practices (Section 4.7).

Guiding Principles:	The development of dog off-leash areas in Surrey should reflect the goals and values of the Sustainability Charter to ensure that such developments help the City achieve its vision and goals for sustainability. Key goals of the Sustainability Charter are as follows: - Accessible and appropriately located services within the city. - Quality of design in new development and redevelopment. - Sustainable land use planning and development practices.		
Rationale for Plan Development:	*Not stated.*		
Municipal By-laws/Policies used to Inform Plan:	2001 Dog Off-leash Master Plan Surrey Dog Responsibility By-law Surrey Parks Regulation By-law		
OFF-LEASH AREA DETAIL SUMMARY			
CLASSIFICATION ***(will be different per plan)***	**Neighbourhood:** to serve the neighbourhood	**Community:** to serve town centre community	**Destination:** to serve the City of Surrey
General Description:	n/a		
Single/Shared-Use:	Single-use.		
SITING CRITERIA			
Distribution:	To be distributed across Surrey's six town centres. Long-term goal of accessibility to the majority of the population via safe walking routes.		
Site Size:	Recommended min. size of 1 hectare (2.5 acres) thought sites between 0.5 ha and 1 ha may be considered.		
Location:	- Location will be informed by public consultation. - Demographics will be considered. - Environmental impact. - Aquatic systems impact. - Soil conditions. - Should be connected to existing pedestrian routes. - Anticipated future park development.		
Adjacent Land Uses:	- Existing land uses will help inform site selection. It is intended that dog off-leash areas will be compatible with adjacent land uses. - Dog off-leash areas located adjacent to sites commonly occupied by **children** will be **fully enclosed with min. 1.2 m (4') high fencing** and **double-entry gates** to minimize conflict among park users. Entry and exit locations and pathways will be positioned away from children's areas. Solid fencing / screening may also be recommended. - Dog off-leash areas located adjacent to sites commonly occupied by **people engaged in sports** and active recreational uses will be **fully enclosed with min. 1.2 m (4') high fencing** and double-entry gates to minimize conflict among park users. Fence height may vary according to adjacent sport activity. - Dog off-leash areas located adjacent to **busy vehicle traffic** areas will be **fully enclosed with min. 1.2 m (4') high fencing** and double-entry gates to promote safety for dogs and people. - Dog off-leash areas located adjacent to **residential areas** will incorporate a **minimum setback distance and a buffer** to mitigate noise where feasible. Visual screening may also be recommended.		
Siting Standards (Metrics), i.e., req'd population catchment area	*Not stated, but intended to serve majority of population by 2021.*		
Criteria to Establish New Off-Leash Areas:	Should meet the siting standards.		
Criteria to Eliminate Off-Leash Areas:			

Access/Parking:	- Neighbourhood Parks require no parking. - Community parks either on or off street parking required. - Destination parks have off street parking to accommodate the most patrons.
Minimum Setback Distances:	See "Adjacent Land Uses" above
DESIGN CRITERIA	
Boundaries & Edge Conditions:	Perimeter fencing is recommended. Suggested materials include: - Chain link fencing; - Rail fencing with wire mesh; - Wooden posts and page wire; - Moveable chain link fencing; and - A "ha-ha" wall (sunken ditch/retaining wall used in England to keep grazing animals out of gardens. Fencing should be minimum 1.2 m but no more than 1.8 m.
Amenities:	**Recommended:** - Waste disposal - Entry Gates - Seating - Shade and Shelter - Drinking Water **Optional:** - Cleaning Stations - Washrooms - Agility Training features - Lighting (important for winter, but should be similar to residential needs) - Water Features (from spring to fall, either hose bibs or two level water fountains for people and dogs) **Rationale:** classification of leash area and corresponding service shall play a roll in the type of amenities chosen. Capital and maintenance costs, as well and the availability of existing utilities connections at park sites.
Circulation:	Should provide looped walking trails for circulation. Consider connecting to existing pedestrian routes where possible, while maintaining separation between routes used by active transportation and dogs for safety.
Materials:	- Natural Turf - Sand - Crusher Dust (gravel) - Artificial Turf **Rationale:** provide combinations of surface materials, well drained, durable, with eye for entrances and high use areas.
Signage:	Provide signage at areas of high visibility. Consider notice boards for public use. Consider signage a place for health and safety issues such as dog classes, vaccinations, or managing aggressive dogs. Provide space for a park etiquette statement (rules) to be publicly posted in all off-leash areas.
Seasonal Considerations:	Lighting can be an issue.
Entrance/Exit	Double-gated entries are recommended, self-closing, lockable, and accessible.
Environmental Considerations:	Implement design features to minimize surface water retention (waste disposal areas).

Other Design Considerations:	- Consider proximity to high density housing and plan for influx of smaller dog populations. - Consider berms, mounds, stumps and boulders for a varied play environment. - Maintain clear site lines. - Consider more substantial buffers depending on adjacent land uses.
MAINTENANCE	
General Maintenance:	Identified maintenance tasks include: - Picking up uncollected dog waste; - Emptying waste receptacles; - Maintaining surfacing; - Pruning trees and shrubs; - Maintaining fencing or other edge devices; and - Maintaining any site furnishings, including seating, lighting, shelter, water play features, drinking water, washing stations.
Waste Management:	Suggested waste management services include: - Dog waste dispenser bags; - Providing shovels, cardboard scoops, or metal scoops; - "Pooch patches" – sandy areas where dogs can be directed to defecate; - Consider options for biodegradable bags and composting services (either on or off site composting); - On site septic system; - On site aerobic digester; and - Commercial pick up.
Operating Agreements/ Partnerships:	Suggested community engagement/stewarding roles include: - Fundraising; - Volunteer site maintenance; - Liaising with city staff in regard to enforcement/maintenance; - Communication with each other and surrounding community (public notice board or facebook/email); - Training sessions; - Adoption help; - Business partnerships; and - Group insurance for pets.
SAFETY/ENFORCEMENT/COMMUNICATIONS/OPERATIONS	
Allowable Use (i.e. other animals…):	*Not stated.*
By-law Enforcement:	Self-policing is normally accepted and suggested.
Code of Conduct:	Code of conduct should be done with the participation of dog owners and off-leash area users. Rules should be clearly posted in at least one location on each site, with additional outreach through newsletters or brochures. Some membership based groups suggest that new users must sign an agreement indicating they will abide by the rules and encourage others to do the same.
Education & Communications:	And educational approach is accepted to encourage compliance with by-laws and or codes of conduct
Monitoring & Assessment	Monitoring efforts should include: - Condition of surface materials; - Functioning of site lighting, gates, water systems; - Presence of uncollected dog waste and capacity for waste receptacles; and - Encourage reporting by users to monitor and solicit feedback.

IMPLEMENTATION	
Implementation Process:	Recommended sites are put forward to Parks, Rec and Culture Committee and City Council with development taking place over three phases between 2012 and 2021.
Funding:	Developed as funding becomes available
Land Ownership:	*Not stated.*
Partnerships:	*See above.*
MULTIPLE USERS CRITERIA	
Policies to Balance User Needs:	*Not stated.*

APPENDIX



C

OLA BACKGROUND REVIEW MAPS


Prairie Dog Central Railway
Hyland Provincial Park
Canadian Pacific
Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway
Memorial Provincial Park
Assiniboine River
Red River
Beaudry Provincial Park
Greater Winnipeg Water District
Canadian National
Trappist Monastery Provincial Park
St Norbert Provincial Park
Dun Rodin Provincial Park
Central Manitoba Railway
Created by: MMM Group Limited
U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\Mxd1_ParkInventory_Landscape_36x48_20170330.mxd
0 1,200 2,400 4,800 Metres
0 2,500 5,000 10,000Feet
N
Projection: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14N
Data Source(s): City of Winnipeg, StatsCan, MLI, MMM Group
Date Created: March 29, 2017
Revision Date: March 30, 2017
Legend
Community Centre
Off-Leash Dog Area
Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
Proposed Neighbourhood Site
Park, Open Space and Facility
Athletic Field
Hockey Pen
Park and Open Space
Provincial Park
CityLimit_Boundary
Water
Road Type
Provincial Trunk Highway
Provincial Road / Local Street
Railway Line


Prairie Dog Central Railway
Canadian Pacific
Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway
Central Manitoba Railway
Greater Winnipeg Water District
Canadian National
Assiniboine River
Red River
Hyland Provincial Park
Memorial Provincial Park
Beaudry Provincial Park
Trappist Monastery Provincial Park
St. Norbert Provincial Park
Duff Roblin Provincial Park
Legend
Off-Leash Dog Area
Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
Proposed Neighbourhood Site
Dog Park Catchment Area Distance
as per the Guidelines for Off Leash Dog Parks Study
Neighbourhood Catchment Area (1 km)
Community Catchment Area (3.75 km)
Regional Catchment Area (7.5 km)
Provincial Park
CityLimit_Boundary
Water
Road Type
Provincial Trunk Highway
Provincial Road / Local Street
Railway Line
0 1,200 2,400 4,800 Metres
0 2,500 5,000 10,000Feet
N
Projection: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14N
Data Source(s): City of Winnipeg, StatsCan, MLI, MMM Group
Date Created: March 29, 2017
Revision Date: March 30, 2017
Created by: MMM Group Limited
U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\MXDImpl2_DogParkCatchmentArea_Landscape_36x48_20170330.mxd


Hyland Provincial Park
Memorial Provincial Park
Assiniboine River
Red River
Beaudry Provincial Park
Trappist Monastery Provincial Park
St. Norbert Provincial Park
Duff Roblin Provincial Park
Manitoba 101
Manitoba 100
U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\Mpp3_DogLicensePointKDensity_Landscape_36x48_20170412_V2.mxd
Created by: MMM Group Limited
Legend
Dog Licenses Location Density By Count
100 +
100
80
60
40
20
0
Off-Leash Dog Area
Neighbourhood Site
(1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
Community Site
(3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
Regional Site
(7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
Proposed Neighbourhood Site
Provincial Park
CityLimit_Boundary
Water
Road Type
Provincial Trunk Highway
Provincial Road / Local Street
Railway Line
0 1,200 2,400 4,800 Metres
0 2,500 5,000 10,000Feet
N
Projection: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14N
Data Source(s): City of Winnipeg, StatsCan, MLI, MMM Group
Date Created: March 29, 2017
Revision Date: April 12, 2017

APPENDIX



D

OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS ENGAGEMENT REPORT



CITY OF WINNIPEG

ENGAGEMENT REPORT

OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS MASTER PLAN

APRIL 2018

Winnipeg wsp



ENGAGEMENT REPORT

OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS MASTER PLAN

CITY OF WINNIPEG

PROJECT NO.: 17M-00378-00
DATE: APRIL 2018

WSP
111-93 LOMBARD AVENUE
WINNIPEG, MB, R3B 3B1

TEL: +1-204-943-3178
FAX: +1-204-943-4948
WSP.COM



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES 2

3 PROMOTION 3

4 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES 4

4.1 Master Plan Workshops 4

4.1.1 City Staff Workshop 4

4.1.2 Stakeholder Workshop 8

4.2 Council brief 12

4.3 Pop-up Information Booths 13

4.4 Survey 15

4.4.1 Question 1: Dog Ownership 16

4.4.2 Question 2: Do You Visit the City's OLAs? 16

4.4.3 Question 3: OLA Visitation, Dates & Times 17

4.4.4 Question 4: Why OLAs Are Used/Visited 17

4.4.5 Question 5: Why OLAs Are Not Used/Visited 19

4.4.6 Question 6: Which of the City's OLAs Are Most Visited 21

4.4.7 Question 7: Site Specific Reasons Why OLAs Are Visited 22

4.4.8 Question 8: Which OLAs Users Tend To Not Visit 23

4.4.9 Question 9: OLA Improvements 24

4.4.10 Question 10: Other Parks/Open Spaces in the City That People Enjoy Taking Their Dog(s) 25

4.4.11 Question 11: The Other Parks/Open Spaces That People Take Their Dogs in Winnipeg and Why 26



4.4.12 Question 12: Reasons Why Respondents Do Not Take Their Dogs to Other Parks/Open Spaces in Winnipeg 28
4.4.13 Question 13: Top Concerns Associated With Existing OLAs 29
4.4.14 Question 14: Concerns in Dogs in Parks and Open Spaces 30
4.4.15 Question 15: Dog-Related Concerns Typically Experienced in Winnipeg 30
4.4.16 Question 16: Key Values That Should Be Reflected in the City's OLAMP 32
4.4.17 Question 17: Additional 'Key Values' 33
4.4.18 Question 18: OLAMP Vision Statement 36

4.5 Online Mapping Tool 37

4.5.1 Map 1: Where I Live & OLAs I Walk and Drive To 42
4.5.2 Map 2: Areas Where I Would Like To See an OLA 43
4.5.3 Map 3: Areas Where I Do Not Want To See an OLA 44
4.5.4 Map 4: Other Outdoor Spaces I Take My Dog(s) 45

5 CONCLUSION 46



TABLES

TABLE 1: ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY SUMMARY TABLE 2
TABLE 2: ENGAGEMENT PROMOTION SUMMARY TABLE 3
TABLE 3: GROUPS REPRESENTED AT STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS 8
TABLE 4: SURVEY Q4 SUMMARY – PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU VISIT THE CITY'S OLAS 18
TABLE 5: ONLINE SURVEY Q5 SUMMARY – PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU DO NOT VISIT THE CITY'S OLAS 19
TABLE 6: SURVEY Q7 SUMMARY – PLEASE EXPLAIN THE REASONS WHY YOU VISIT CERTAIN OLAS 22
TABLE 7: SURVEY Q9 SUMMARY – PLEASE DESCRIBE SOME IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD BE MADE TO THE CITY'S EXISTING OLAS 24
TABLE 8: SURVEY Q11 SUMMARY – EXPLAIN WHY YOU ENJOY TAKING YOUR DOG TO THESE LOCATIONS 27
TABLE 9: SURVEY Q12 SUMMARY – EXPLAIN WHY YOU DO NOT TAKE YOUR DOG TO OTHER PARKS AND OPEN SPACES IN WINNIPEG 28
TABLE 10: SURVEY Q13 SUMMARY – EXPLAIN YOUR TOP THREE (3) CONCERNS ASSOCIATED WITH WINNIPEG'S EXISTING OLAS 29
TABLE 11: SURVEY Q15 SUMMARY – PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CONCERNS EXPERIENCED REGARDING DOGS IN WINNIPEG'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACES 31
TABLE 12: SURVEY Q17 SUMMARY – ADDITIONAL KEY VALUES 33
TABLE 13: SURVEY Q17 SUMMARY – OTHER FEEDBACK RECEIVED APPLICABLE TO OLAMP'S EXISTING KEY VALUES 36



FIGURES

FIGURE 1: SAMPLE OF CITY STAFF WORKSHOP ACTIVITY #3 MAP 7
FIGURE 2: SAMPLE OF STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP ACTIVITY #2 FLIPCHART 11
FIGURE 3: POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH AT KILCONA PARK, DECEMBER 2, 2017 13
FIGURE 4: POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH AT CINDY KLASSEN RECREATIONAL COMPLEX, DECEMBER 7, 2017 14
FIGURE 5: POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH AT WINNIPEG HUMANE SOCIETY 14
FIGURE 6: SURVEY Q1 - DO YOU OWN A DOG? 16
FIGURE 7: SURVEY Q2 - DO YOU VISIT THE CITY'S OLAS? 16
FIGURE 8: SURVEY Q3 – WHAT TIMES AND DAYS DO YOU TYPICALLY VISIT OLAS? 17
FIGURE 9: SURVEY Q4 – PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU VISIT THE CITY'S OLAS 19
FIGURE 10: SURVEY Q5 – PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU DO NOT VISIT THE CITY'S OLAS 21
FIGURE 11: SURVEY Q6 – WHICH OF THE CITY'S OLAS DO YOU VISIT 21
FIGURE 12: SURVEY Q8 – WHICH OF THE CITY'S OLAS DO YOU TEND NOT TO VISIT 23
FIGURE 13: SURVEY Q10 – ARE THERE OTHER PARKS OR OPEN SPACES IN WINNIPEG YOU ENJOY TAKING YOUR DOG? 26
FIGURE 14: SURVEY Q14 – HAVE YOU EXPERIENCED ANY CONCERNS REGARDING DOGS IN WINNIPEG'S PARKS AND OPEN SPACES? 30
FIGURE 15: SURVEY Q16 – PLEASE RANK 'KEY' VALUES FROM MOST IMPORTANT TO LEAST IMPORTANT 33
FIGURE 16: MAP ILLUSTRATING 'WHERE I LIVE', 'OLAS I WALK TO', AND 'OLAS I DRIVE TO' 38
FIGURE 17: MAP ILLUSTRATING 'WHERE I WOULD LIKE TO SEE AN OLA' 39



FIGURE 18: MAP ILLUSTRATING ‘WHERE I WOULD NOT LIKE TO SEE AN OLA’ 40
FIGURE 19: MAP ILLUSTRATING 'OTHER OUTDOOR SPACES I TAKE MY DOGS' 41



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A | PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS
APPENDIX B | CITY AND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP WORKBOOKS
APPENDIX C | POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH STORYBOARDS
APPENDIX D | POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH PAPER SURVEY



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.



2 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

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

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

EVENT	DATE	METHOD OF PROMOTION
City Staff Workshop	April 19, 2017	Direct email invite to select City of Winnipeg staff.
Community Workshop (#1)	May 31, 2017	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.
Community Workshop (#2)	June 1, 2017	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.
Council Seminar	November 3, 2017	City of Winnipeg administration sent direct email invites to City of Winnipeg Council.
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; — 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.
Mapping Tool	Available online from November 3, 2017 – December 21, 2017	
Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#1)	November 25, 2017	The project pop-up information booths were advertised/promoted using the following methods: — The project webpage: 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 (#2)	December 12, 2017	
Project Information Pop-Up Booth (#3)	November 2, 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.



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

Description of Stakeholder Group	No. of Individuals in Attendance Representing Stakeholder Group	
	May 31 Workshop	June 1 Workshop
OLA/Local Dog Park Organizations	13	5
Community Club District Boards	5	
Recreational/Health Organizations	1	2
Dog rescue associations/organizations	1	
Resident Associations	2	6
School Division	-	1

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.



Figure 2: Sample of Stakeholder Workshop Activity #2 Flipchart

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.



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.



Figure 4: Pop-up Information Booth at Cindy Klassen Recreational Complex, December 7, 2017

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.



Figure 5: Pop-up Information Booth at Winnipeg Humane Society

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;
- OLA's 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.



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.



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

Major Theme	Sub-Themes	No. of Responses that Contained this Major Theme
Physical wellbeing/health of dog	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 (espeically 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.	1,331
Opportunity to socialize (dogs and owners)	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.	1,010
Ensures fair treatment of dogs	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'.	722
Dog-friendly environment	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.	157
Safety	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.	143
Lack of other options	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.	106
Enjoyable experience	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.	89
Can't be categorized	1 Visited OLA only because it was in my neighbourhood.	74



Figure 9: Survey Q4 – Please explain why you visit the City's OLAs

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

Major Theme	Sub-Themes	No. of Responses that Contained this Major Theme
Safety concerns	1 Have either witnessed or heard of dogs being attacked by aggressive dogs in OLAs. 2 Used to go, but stopped after my dog was attacked. 3 Too many other poorly trained dogs (jumping onto other people/dogs at the OLA). 4 My dog has health issues (very old, poor vision, behavioural issues). 5 Fear of large dogs attacking the small dogs.	143

Major Theme	Sub-Themes	No. of Responses that Contained this Major Theme
	6 Other irresponsible dog owners not watching their dogs/being responsible.	
No OLA in the locality	Proximity/distance is an issue: 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.	105
Do not own dogs	1 Not a dog owner.	81
Inadequate fencing	Inadequate fencing leads to potential dangers for dogs: 1 Running into traffic; and 2 Running away.	61
Lack of comfort and amenities	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 Unpleaseent experience with irresponsible dog owners.	51
Owns untrained dog/tiny dog	1 My dog is too small and needs more training. 2 My dog is unfriendly and may create problems for others' and their dogs.	47
Are not in favor of OLAs	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.	44
Interested, may visit in the future	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.	25
Personal reasons	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).	19
Inadequate information	1 Hearing about OLAs for the first time. 2 Have heard of OLAs, but do not know where they are located.	15
Can't be categorized	Answers included responses such as 1 'No particular reason'. 2 'I don't know'. 3 'No use'.	7



Figure 10: Survey Q5 – Please explain why you do not visit the City's OLAs

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.



Figure 11: Survey Q6 – Which of the City's OLAs do you visit

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

OLA	Major Themes	Responses per OLA
Maple Grove Park	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.	721
Kilcona Park	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.	673
Charleswood Dog Park	1 Proximity to home. 2 Lots of parking. 3 Fenced. 4 Pooling water/drainage not an issue. 5 Nice large size.	657
Little Mountain Park	1 Proximity to home. 2 Paths/trails. 3 Quieter setting. 4 Ample parking. 5 Large size.	574
King's Park	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.	373
Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest	1 Proximity to home. 2 Forested and trails. 3 Nice size. 4 Feels like you aren't in the city.	212
Bourkevale Park	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.	174

OLA	Major Themes	Responses per OLA
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

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.



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

OLA	Major Themes	Responses per OLA
Bourkevale Park	1 Define boundary of OLA - Needs fencing. 2 Increase size, currently too crowded. 3 Develop barrier to protect from river. 4 Develop barrier to protect from bike path/community centre. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.*	701
Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue OLA	1 Needs fencing (separate from traffic and wildlife). *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.*	681
Brenda Leipsic/Parker Forest	1 Needs fencing. 2 Too wet/muddy – improve drainage. 3 Increase parking. 4 Develop barrier to proctect from rail. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.*	678
Mazenod Park	1 Develop barrier around retention pond (a health risk for dogs). 2 Improve parking. 3 Improve barriers around park, too close to trucking route. 4 Incorpoate more shelter from elements and more trees. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.*	662
Woodsworth Park	1 Fence in OLA, protect from retention pond. 2 Improve maintenance, i.e., garbage pickup. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.*	662
Westview Park	1 Improve maintenance, lots of glass and garbage on trails, lots of gopher holes. 2 Fence-in OLA, conflicts between dogs and runners/cyclists. 3 Incorporate more garbage receptacles. 4 Improve lighting. 5 Incorporate shelter from elements. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.*	639
King's Park	1 Improve by-law enforcement. 2 Fence in OLA. 3 Provide more direct access to OLA from parking lot, perhaps some off-leash paths. 4 Improve signage.	597

OLA	Major Themes	Responses per OLA
	5 Incorporate water source. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.*	
Kilcona	1 Too busy. 2 Improve fencing. 3 Improve water quality issues/retention ponds. 4 Better separation from other park uses. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home or were unaware of this OLA.*	592
Little Mountain Park	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. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.*	563
Charleswood Dog Park	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. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.*	556
Maple Grove Park	1 Incorporate more benches. 2 Incorpoate 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. *Many respondents noted they do not visit due to proximity from home.*	494

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.



Figure 13: Survey Q10 – Are there other parks or open spaces in Winnipeg you enjoy taking your 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;
- Bioreserve 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

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



Major Themes	Sub-Themes	Responses per Theme
	2 Visit parks near parents'/friends' home, or near kid's school. 3 Ideal place for dogs to play with children. 4 Kids like to go to these parks/spaces, good place to visit with family.	

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

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

Major Themes	Sub-themes	Responses per Theme
Cannot be categorized	1 Lives outside the City. 2 Does not own a dog(s).	53
Safety concerns	1 Location close to heavy traffic. 2 Poorly trained, aggressive dogs. 3 Irresponsible dog owners. 4 No separate area for smaller and larger dogs. 5 Dogs have poor recall and run away.	37
Inadequate fencing	Only partially fenced/no fencing, leading to: 1 Dogs running into traffic; and 2 Fear of dogs running away.	31
Lack of information	1 Did not know of any other OLAs.	17

4.4.13 Question 13: Top Concerns Associated With Existing OLAs

Question 13 asked survey participants to identify the top three concerns that are associated with *existing* OLAs in Winnipeg. In total 1,834 respondents provided answers to the question; 1,632 of those responses came from dog owners, and 202 of those responses came from those respondents who do not own a dog. Concern #1 received 1,827 responses, Concern #2 received 1,515 responses, and Concern #3 received 1,144 responses. Note that some of the respondents' concerns were repeated throughout three categories.

The following is a summary of the feedback obtained for this question. Because many of the concerns from the public overlapped, the below table identifies all of all the major themes that were identified:

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?

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

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



Major Themes	Sub-themes	No. of Responses per Theme
	— OLAs have less facilities compared to other parks. — No protection from the elements. — No garbage receptacles. — Security issues. — Lack of directional signage. — Inadequate lighting. 3 Not comfortable when there are large dogs. 4 Drugs/alcohol being used (needles and glass found).	
Other Concerns	1 Waste/destruction of City's greenspace (urban encorachment). 2 Poor signage in OLAs leading to arguments. 3 Small dogs easily get lost in large OLAs. 4 Dangeous driving in parking lots 5 Lack of knowledge of people in OLAs 6 Unlawful ticketing.	42
Poor Dog Monitoring	1 Inadequate monitoring of aggressive dogs. — Aggressive dogs with incidents reported on them should be banned. 2 Poor/no enforcement (in OLAs and leashed areas). 3 No regular checks on dog licenses and vaccinations.	33

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 Acessibility;
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 Socialbiltiy, 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

'Additional' Key Value	Important Points Raised/Additional Sub-themes	No. of Responses per Key Value
Dog friendly regulations/facilities	1 Giving priority to dogs in OLAs. — OLAs should be a place for dogs and owners to have fun. 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.	75

'Additional' Key Value	Important Points Raised/Additional Sub-themes	No. of Responses per Key Value
Better OLA planning	1 Better planning of OLA location. — More accessible OLAs (OLAs should accommodate needs of all categories of dog owners, include those who do not drive). — Locating OLAs in urban areas/established neighbourhoods may reduce urban sprawl. — OLAs should be connected by pedestrian routes. — Planning for dogs' safety from traffic (planning OLAs away from busy streets). — OLAs should be functional in all seasons. — Separate dog-friendly places from crowded locations. — Locate OLAs near greenspaces/water to enhance overall experience. *Considerations:* — Locating OLAs away from trails and natural areas where others' also would like to go vs. locating OLAs near greenspace. — Locate OLAs away from residential areas or no-pet parks/away from traffic. — Develop more small-size OLAs vs. large-size OLAs. 2 Better OLA planning to reduce conflict of interest between various users. — Options to minimize conflict of interest between dog-owners' while opening new OLAs (compatibility of OLAs to adjacent uses). — Do not convert well-used public spaces to OLAs. — Options such as division between spaces for small and large dogs (based on weight). *Considerations:* — Include off-leash options downtown or inside the City, vs. interests of non-dog owners. — Dog-owners vs. other OLA users. — Dog-owners vs. neighbouring communities. — Single-use vs. multi-use spaces. 3 Ensure information availability for better OLA management. — Programs to train/educate dogs and their owners (for better handling of animals). — Ensuring information is available to all visitors (on rules and regulation).	69

'Additional' Key Value	Important Points Raised/Additional Sub-themes	No. of Responses per Key Value
	4 Better OLA design. — OLAs should be planned as part of complete community planning. — One standard design should not be applied to all OLAs. — Must have sufficient parking area. — Designated underutilized greenspaces as OLAs. — Implement successful OLA practices from other Canadian and US cities. — OLAs should be functional in all seasons. *Considerations:* — Single-use parks vs. multi-use parks.	
High quality spaces	Provide support to ensure OLAs are high-quality, interesting places to visit in the community 1 Measures to ensure comfort and amenities of all users. — Biodegradable doggie bags. — Access to drinking water for dogs. — More exercise options for dogs. — Well-maintained ponds and pools. — Adequate lighting. — Waste and water solutions. — Availability of bathroom facilities. — Adequate landscaping.	66
Improved dog owner responsibility	1 Initiatives to encourage good ownership: owners attend training programs for better handling of their pets. 2 Encourage single-use OLAs so that owners are held to their responsibilities. 3 Dog owners/OLA users must respect the interest of the communities where OLAs are located.	49

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

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

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**);







City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

- Where I live
- Off-leash areas I walk to
- Off-leash areas I drive to

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Community Centre
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: February 08, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 16

Public Engagement
Where I Live, OLAs I Walk to and OLAs I Drive to

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\PublicEngagementMaps\MAP1_WhereILiveOLAWalkDrive_Bsize_20180208.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

- Would like to see off-leash areas

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Community Centre
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: February 08, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 17

Areas in the city where I would like to see an OLA

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\PublicEngagementMaps\MAP2_WouldLikeToSeeOffLeashArea_Bsize_20180208.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

- Would not like to see off-leash areas

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Community Centre
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: February 07, 2018
Revision Date: February 08, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 18

Areas in the city where I would not like to see an OLA

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\PublicEngagementMaps\MAP3_WouldNotLikeToSeeOffLeashArea_Baize_20180208.mxd





City of Winnipeg
Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

Legend

- Other outdoor spaces where I take my dog

Current Off-Leash Dog Area

- Neighbourhood Site (1 km, 5min. drive, 20 min. walk)
- Community Site (3.75 km, 10 min. drive)
- Regional Site (7.5 km, 20 min. drive)
- Community Centre
- City Limit Boundary
- Park and Open Space
- Provincial Park
- Provincial Trunk Highway
- Provincial Road / Local Street
- Railway Line
- Water

Coordinate System: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14 N
Data Source: ESRI, MLI, NRCAN, WSP
Date Created: January 24, 2018
Revision Date: February 08, 2018

N

0 0.5 1 2 3 4
Kilometres

FIGURE 19

Other outdoor spaces where I take my dog (s)

wsp

U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-00378-00_DogParkMasterPlan\MXD\PublicEngagementMaps\MAP4_OtherOutdoorSpacesToTakeDogs_Beize_20180208.mxd

- 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 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.

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 Edey 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/establish 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.

APPENDIX



A

PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS

Winnipeg



OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS MASTER PLAN

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

Winnipeg



PLAN DIRECTEUR SUR LES TERRAINS POUR CHIENS EN LIBERTÉ

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

Pop-Up Information Booth

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!

Date: Saturday, November 25, 2017
Time: 11 a.m. – 1 p.m.
Location: Animal Services, photos with Santa Event, 1057 Logan Ave.

Date: Saturday, December 2, 2017
Time: 10 a.m. – 12 p.m.
Location: Kilcona Off-Leash Dog Park, parking lot off McIvor Ave., 1229 Springfield Rd.

Date: Thursday, December 7, 2017
Time: 4 p.m. – 6 p.m.
Location: Cindy Klassen Recreation Complex, front hall, 999 Sargent Ave.

For more information about the project and to take our online survey, visit us at: **winnipeg.ca/offleashareas**

For those who require alternate formats or ASL interpretation in order to participate, please contact **Brittany.Shewchuk@wsp.com.**



APPENDIX



B

CITY AND STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP WORKBOOKS



Off-Leash Dog Areas Master Plan

City Staff Workshop Guide

April 19th, 2017

Name:

Group:



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

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

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
- Publically 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

Name:

Group:



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

Start Time	Activity & Details	Length
6:00 – 6:15 p.m.	Workshop Introduction & Presentation	15 mins
6:15 – 6:20 p.m.	Activity 1 – Visioning & Key Values: Presentation	5 mins
6:20 – 6:40 p.m.	Activity 1 – Visioning & Key Values: Group Work	20 mins
6:40 – 6:55 p.m.	Activity 1 – Visioning & Key Values: Report Back	15 mins
6:55 – 7:10 p.m.	**Refreshment Break**	15 mins
7:10 – 7:30 p.m.	Activity 2 - Identification of Issues: Group Work	20 mins
7:30 – 7:45 p.m.	Activity 2 - Identification of Issues: Report Back	15 mins
7:45 – 7:55 p.m.	Activity 3 – Site Selection Criteria: Presentation	10 mins
7:55 – 8:15 p.m.	Activity 3 – Site Selection Criteria: Group Work	20 mins
8:15 – 8:30 p.m.	Activity 3 – Site Selection Criteria: Report Back	15 mins

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



C

POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH STORY BOARDS

Winnipeg



OFF-LEASH DOG AREAS MASTER PLAN

POP-UP EVENT

winnipeg.ca/OffLeashAreas

ABOUT THE MASTER PLAN

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.

Project Timeline





TYPES OF OFF-LEASH AREAS

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'







OFF-LEASH AREAS IN WINNIPEG

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		
Regional Facilities	7.5 km radius	20 minute drive
Community Facilities	3.75 km radius	10 minute drive
Neighbourhood Facilities	1 km radius	5 minute drive 20 minute walk

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



COMMON ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICES

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:

Calgary

- OLAs should accommodate multi-use functions in public parks
- Include OLAs as a key consideration in park planning for established and new communities
- Must be at least 0.5 ha in size
- Location must be informed by a comprehensive public engagement strategy

Denver

- Must be a minimum of 100 ft. from a children's playground/children's facility
- No arterial streets within 200 ft. unless fully fenced

Surrey

- 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
- 'Neighborhood' OLAs do not require parking

Edmonton

- Preferred adjacent land uses: commercial, municipal facilities, employment zones
- Preferred land use types: open space, transportation/infrastructure/utility ROWs
- Comprehensive public engagement undertaken for each new OLAs
- Winter OLA considerations
- The site cannot be a designated natural area or wildlife habitat

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.



Winnipeg



PLAN DIRECTEUR SUR LES TERRAINS POUR CHIENS EN LIBERTÉ

ÉVÉNEMENT SPONTANÉ

www.winnipeg.ca/francais/ppd
PublicEngagement/OffLeashAreas

LE PLAN DIRECTEUR

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 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





TYPES DE TERRAINS POUR CHIENS EN LIBERTÉ

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







TERRAINS POUR CHIENS EN LIBERTÉ DE WINNIPEG

À l'heure actuelle, la Ville de Winnipeg exploite 10 TCL au sein de son réseau de parcs.

Terrains régionaux (>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

Terrains communaux (1 à 8 ha)	
Mazenod Park	6 ha
King's Park	4,41 ha
Sturgeon Road et Silver Avenue	4,03 ha
Westview Park	4 ha
Brenda Leipsic Park **(emplacement temporaire)**	17 ha

Terrains de quartier (< 1 ha)	
Woodsworth Park	0,83 ha
Bourkevale Park	0,28 ha
Bonnycastle Park	en construction
Devonshire Park	en construction

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.

Zones desservies		
Terrains régionaux	7,5 km radius	20 minutes en voiture
Terrains communautaires	3,75 km radius	10 minutes en voiture
Terrains de quartier	1 km de rayon	5 minutes en voiture

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 feuillet 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.

Terrains


1. Kilcona Park
2. Maple Grove Park
3. Parc à chiens Charleswood
4. Little Mountain Park
5. Mazenod Park
6. King's Park
7. Chemin Sturgeon et avenue Silver
8. Westview Park
9. Brenda Leipsic Park (emplacement temporaire)
10. Woodsworth Park
11. Bourkevale Park
12. Bonnycastle Park (en construction)
13. Devonshire Park (en construction)
Légende
Sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté
Terrain de quartier
(1 km, 5 min en automobile, 20 min à pied)
Terrain communautaire
(3,75 km, 10 min en automobile)
Terrain régional
(7,5 km, 20 min en automobile)
Terrain de quartier proposé
Distances des zones desservies des parcs à chiens
Zone desservie de parc de quartier (1 km)
Zone desservie de parc communautaire (3,75 km)
Zone desservie de parc régional (7,5 km)
Parc provincial
Limite de la ville
Eau
Type de route
Route provinciale à grande circulation
Route provinciale secondaire/Rue locale
Ligne de chemin de fer
0 1,200 2,400 4,800 Metres
0 2,500 5,000 10,000Feet
N
Projection: NAD 83, UTM Zone 14N
Data Source(s): City of Winnipeg, StatsCan, MLI, MMM Group
Date Created: March 29, 2017
Revision Date: March 30, 2017
Created by: MMM Group Limited
U:\Projects\PROJECTS_2017\17M-000178-00_DogParkMaster\Plan\MXD\Mxd2_DogParkCatchmentArea_Landscape_36x48_26170330.mxd

PROBLÈMES COMMUNS ET PRATIQUES EXEMPLAIRES

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.

- Les TCL doivent être à un minimum de 100 pieds d'un terrain de jeux ou d'une installation pour enfants.
- Il ne doit pas y avoir de rue artérielle à moins de 200 pieds, à moins que le TCL ne soit clôturé.

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.



APPENDIX



D

POP-UP INFORMATION BOOTH PAPER SURVEY

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: _____



☐ Little Mountain Park: _____
☐ Maple Grove Park: _____
☐ Mazenod Park: _____
☐ Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue Off-Leash Area: _____
☐ Westview Park: _____
☐ Woodsworth 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.

La Ville de Winnipeg

Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté

enquête



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 proximité 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: _____



☐ 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: _____



☐ Sturgeon Road & Silver Avenue Off-Leash Area: _____
☐ Westview Park: _____
☐ Woodsworth Park: _____

6. Aimez-vous promener votre chien dans d'autres parcs ou espaces en plein air de Winnipeg? Veuillez nommer les autres parcs et espaces en plein air de Winnipeg où vous promenez votre chien, et expliquez pourquoi vous aimez l'y promener. Les raisons peuvent comprendre : la commodité, les installations, l'emplacement, l'accessibilité, etc.

_____
_____
_____
_____

7. Que vous visitiez 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.



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 protègeront, 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.**

Vos renseignements personnels sont recueillis en vertu de l'alinéa 36(1) b) de la Loi sur l'accès à l'information et la protection de la vie privée (LAIPVP). Ils seront utilisés pour aider à l'élaboration du Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté de la Ville de Winnipeg et pour servir de source de renseignements au processus de participation publique. Ces renseignements ne seront ni utilisés ni divulgués à d'autres fins, sauf celles prévues par la loi. Les renseignements que vous avez indiqués dans ce sondage seront résumés et utilisés pour aviser l'élaboration du Plan directeur sur les terrains pour chiens en liberté, et vos renseignements personnels ne seront pas rendus publics. Si vous avez des questions sur la collecte ou sur l'utilisation de ces renseignements, communiquez avec le coordinateur de la LAIPVP par courrier au Bureau du greffier, Bâtiment administratif — 510, rue Main, Winnipeg (Man.) R3B 1B9, ou par téléphone au 311.

APPENDIX



E

OLA USER COUNTS

APPENDIX E - OLA USER COUNTS

In September of 2017, OLA user counts were performed in three of Winnipeg's OLAs, during the week of Saturday, September 23 to Saturday, September 30, 2017; counts were not performed on the days it rained during that week. The purpose of these counts were to develop a baseline count of OLA use and make some general qualitative observations.

Counts were completed within the Kings Park OLA, Maple Grove, and Westview Park. These three OLAs were specifically chosen based on their size and limited access points, which made the counts easier to facilitate, and likely more accurate.

OLA User Count Methodology:

To perform the OLA user counts, Miovision cameras were utilized which were supplemented by in-person counts performed by members of the OLAMP project team. The purpose of the in-person counts were to validate the Miovision camera counts, as well as monitor multiple access points into the respective OLAs.

Miovision cameras are all weather video cameras that can be set-up outside, and withstand the elements for an extended period of time. Miovision cameras are typically used to count and collect traffic data used to inform transportation related projects and are typically set-up at intersections over a specific period of time to monitor traffic patterns, however, these cameras can also count pedestrians and cyclists.



Figure 1: OLA User-count Notification Sign

To protect the privacy of the public, signage was posted near the cameras which outlined FIPPA information (The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act) as follows:

Any personal information collected is done so under the authority of s.36(1)(b) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. This information will be used to perform a usage audit of the facility and will not be used or disclosed for any other purposes, except as authorized by law. If you have any questions about the collection 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.

As per FIPPA rules, the user-count videos were retained for only four weeks after the user-counts were performed.

The in-person counts were completed in 1-hour time slots; two were completed at each OLA, one of these occurred on a weekend around noon, and the other occurred on a weeknight in the early evening.

Count Schedule:

Initially, the OLA counts were planned to occur over a two day period, one weekend day, and one weekday, however, due to inclement weather, the count days were extended, and occurred over the following days, from sun-up to sun-down:

- Saturday, September 23, 2017
- Monday, September 25, 2017
- Thursday, September 28, 2017
- Friday, September 29, 2017
- Saturday, September 30, 2017

Counts were not completed on Sunday, September 24; Tuesday September 26; and Wednesday September, 27 due to rain.

The above camera counts were supplemented by in-person counts which occurred on the following dates and times:

- Maple Grove OLA – the secondary entrance was monitored during the in-person counts:
    - Saturday, September 23, 2017 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
    - Monday, September 25, 2017 from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- Kings Park OLA – a secondary access into the OLA area was monitored during the in-person counts:
    - Saturday, September 23, 2017 from 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.
    - Monday, September 25, 2017 from 6:15 p.m. to 7:15 p.m.
- Westview Park – the in-person counts were performed at the top of the hill in the parking lot, which is able to capture people entering the southern entrance of the park:
    - Saturday, September 23, 2017 from 2:15 p.m. to 3:15 p.m.
    - Thursday, September 28, 2017 from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Outlying Factors Affecting Counts:

Weather

The project team determined that the OLA counts would be performed during mid-to late September for the following reasons:

- Moderate weather, not too hot or cold; and
- The majority of the public are back in their 'regular' routines, i.e. have returned to work or school from summer vacation.

Access

As suggested, one of the reasons that the three OLAs were chosen for the user-counts were the limited number access points within each of the OLAs. Performing counts in OLAs with limited access points leads to greater accuracy.

OLA attendance on the days the counts were performed may have been higher, as it is possible that many dogs and people visiting the OLAs were not captured by the Miovision camera or project team member performing the in-person counts.

User-Counts

The following section provide a baseline summary of the OLA counts. The intent of this information is to provide the City with baseline user data for certain OLAs, with the recommendation that the City perform more in-depth user-counts in more of the City's OLAs.

In the future, the City may want to use more comprehensive user-counts to advise the potential future location/size of future OLAs, however, the following numbers are not substantive enough to base future decisions on.

Figure 2 and **Figure 3** illustrate the weekend and weekday averages of OLA use in the three OLAs the counts were performed in.



Figure 2 – OLA Counts, Weekend Average



Figure 3 - OLA Counts, Weekday Averages

Maple Grove Park Counts:



Figure 4: Maple Grove OLA User-Count Information

Time	Arriving		Leaving	
	Dogs	**People**	**Dogs**	**People**
WEEKEND AVERAGE				
Early Morning 6:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**27**	26	12	13
Mid Morning **9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**	**118**	125	86	101
Noon 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**35**	41	54	60
Early Afternoon 1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	**97**	135	78	99
Late Afternoon 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	**89**	130	105	147
Evening 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	**47**	62	65	80
WEEKDAY AVERAGE				
Early Morning 6:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**23**	25	22	21
Mid Morning 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**61**	71	66	71
Noon 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**20**	20	24	25
Early Afternoon 1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	**38**	40	30	31
Late Afternoon **3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.**	**101**	127	109	116
Evening 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	**67**	85	86	110

In-person Counts – Secondary Access:

Time	Count Method & Location	Arriving	
		Dogs	**People**
Saturday, September 23, 2017 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	Main Access (camera count)	43	44
	Secondary Access (in-person)	13	13
Monday, September 25, 2017 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Main Access (camera count)	34	46
	Secondary Access (in-person)	5	4

Observations:

- The Maple Grove OLA is a very popular and well-used OLA, and attendance remained high throughout the duration of the counts, on weekdays and weekends.
- The most popular times to visit the park were on weekends before noon, however, early weekend afternoons (between 1:00 and 6:00 p.m.) were also peak times for visitation.
- On weekdays, peak visitation was late afternoon (between 3:30 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.).
- It was observed that some dog owners will bring their dogs to the OLA prior to 9:00 a.m. on weekdays.
- Most, if not all, OLA visitors drive to Maple Grove.
- Human arrivals slightly outnumbered dog arrivals; it was observed that multiple people (at most times, couples), visit the OLA with one dog. In general, it was uncommon to see one person bring multiple dogs to the OLA.
- The dog to human ration at Maple Grove OLA is as follows:
    - Weekends: 1 dog : 1.25 humans
    - Weekdays: 1 dog : 1.19 humans
- For many, especially visitors on weekends, Maple Grove is seen as a ‘destination’ OLA that provides a recreational activity for individuals or families and their dog.

Kings Park OLA Counts:



Figure 5: Kings Park OLA User-Count Information

Time	Arriving		Leaving	
	Dogs	**People**	**Dogs**	**People**
WEEKEND AVERAGE				
Early Morning 6:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**7**	8	11	12
Mid Morning 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**25**	39	24	27
Noon 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**9**	12	8	14
Early Afternoon **1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**	**26**	41	16	29
Late Afternoon **3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.**	**26**	48	26	43
Evening 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	**13**	22	13	28
WEEKDAY AVERAGE				
Early Morning 6:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**5**	4	2	2
Mid Morning 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**16**	16	15	17
Noon 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**3**	4	3	3
Early Afternoon 1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	**10**	11	8	9
Late Afternoon **3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.**	**22**	28	13	17
Evening 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	**18**	24	16	22

In-person Counts – Secondary Access:

Time	Count Method & Location	Arriving	
		Dogs	**People**
Saturday, September 23, 2017 12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.	Main Access (camera count)	11	19
	Secondary Access (in-person)	8	13
Monday, September 25, 2017 6:15 p.m. – 7:15 p.m.	Main Access (camera count)	5	7
	Secondary Access (in-person)	14	17

Observations:

- On the weekends, the peak time for Kings Park OLA visitations is during the afternoon (between 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.).
- During the week, visitation is at its peak in the late afternoon (between 3:30 and 6:00 p.m.), however after 6:00 p.m. is also a popular time to visit the OLA.
- Although the OLA are is fairly large, it is located away from the park's parking lot. As a result, many dog owners may not be aware of this OLA.
- This OLA is accessed by many users via motor vehicle, but also by pedestrians.
- The dog to human ration at the Kings Park OLA is as follows:
    - Weekends: 1 dog : 1.6 humans
    - Weekdays: 1 dog : 1.2 humans

Westview Park Counts



Figure 6: Westview Park OLA User-Count Information

Time	Arriving		Leaving	
	Dogs	**People**	**Dogs**	**People**
WEEKEND AVERAGE				
Early Morning 6:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**5**	7	3	3
Mid Morning **9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**	**8**	10	3	3
Noon 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**4**	3	2	2
Early Afternoon **1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**	**8**	7	6	5
Late Afternoon 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	**4**	5	5	6
Evening 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	**3**	3	2	2
WEEKDAY AVERAGE				
Early Morning 6:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**2**	1	0	0
Mid Morning 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**4**	4	2	2
Noon 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	**0**	0	0	0
Early Afternoon 1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	**1**	1	0	0
Late Afternoon **3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.**	**7**	13	4	7
Evening 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.	**2**	3	1	3

In-person Counts – Secondary Access:

Time	Count Method & Location	Arriving	
		Dogs	**People**
Saturday, September 23, 2017 2:15 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.	Main Access (camera count)	2	1
	Secondary Access (in-person)	10	8
Thursday, September 28, 2017 5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Main Access (camera count)	6	9
	Secondary Access (in-person)	26	33

Analysis:

- Westview Park is a 'multi-use' OLA; off-leash dog use is permitted throughout the entire park.
- Due to the park's topography, it is also a popular park for runners and mountain bikers; a significant amount of runners and mountain bikers visited the park when the counts were performed, particularly on weekday evenings.
- Peak visitation times (for OLA use) at Westview were in the mid-morning and mid-afternoon on weekends, and late afternoon on weekdays.
- It was observed that OLA visitations significantly decrease at Westview Park into the weekday evenings. It is assumed this trend occurred as dog owners actively avoid the park when it is occupied by a high amount of runners and cyclists (to mitigate potential conflicts).
- During the in-person visit, it was observed that some parts of the pathways/trails in Westview Park contained a significant amount of broken glass – this may deter dog owners from taking their dogs to this OLA, and also may allude to potential safety/security concerns within the park.

APPENDIX



F

POTENTIAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES & PARTNERSHIPS

APPENDIX F - Potential Funding and Partnership Opportunities

The costs associated with OLAs present a challenge to municipalities across North America. Here in Winnipeg, the City generally funds the development and ongoing maintenance of OLAs through the City Parks and Open Space capital budget. Once an OLA is developed, an OLA association (where applicable) may fundraise and seek sponsorships for additional park improvements and amenities.

The following section explores a variety of potential funding options that the City and OLA associations could explore to help establish, maintain, and enhance Winnipeg's OLAs in the future. It also explores a number of potential partnerships that could assist in the implementation and improvement of OLAs.

The purpose of this section is to provide municipal authorities and the public with a list of options and ideas – 'food for thought' - as it relates to the management, operations, enhancement, and development of current and future OLAs. The opportunities described here reflect feedback received during the OLAMP public engagement activities, as well as information obtained from a precedent review of other urban municipalities' OLA plans.

POTENTIAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

OLA USER FEES (PUBLIC)

The City could establish an annual membership program to enter and use the City's OLAs. These funds would help to maintain and improve existing OLAs and eventually develop new OLAs.

OLA USER FEES (PRIVATE)

Each OLA could establish a user fee and annual membership program to enter and use a specific OLA. Alternatively, a larger regional OLA association could establish a user fee and annual membership program that would be applicable to all of Winnipeg's OLAs. These funds would help to maintain and improve existing OLAs and eventually develop new OLAs.

PROJECT MATCHING

The City could direct a portion of its Land Dedication Reserve for the purposes of OLA project matching. For example, if an OLA association raises $50,000 for agility equipment in a certain OLA, the City would "match" the funds with land in-lieu.

AGILITY EQUIPMENT RENTALS

If an OLA incorporates agility equipment into its design, the corresponding OLA association could rent this equipment out to businesses, organizations, and groups who run canine competitions, training, schools, etc. This could open the door to additional funding and revenue streams for both rentals and large and small-scale events. In addition, agility equipment could enhance the appeal and usage of the park, thereby increasing visitor numbers and corresponding user fees (if applicable). The City would require a lease agreement to collect some revenue which would be dedicated for site maintenance.

SPONSORSHIP & ADVERTISING

OLAs may include specific amenities such as agility features, water fountains for dogs, dog water features, and dog waste bags and/or dispensers. Private sponsors could help provide these amenities in exchange for limited advertising space in the park (in alignment with City of Winnipeg Parks & Open Space advertising policies). OLA associations could also seek out corporate sponsorships to assist with ongoing maintenance and park improvements in exchange for online advertising and advertising at fundraising events. In some cases, sponsors may even provide discounts to OLA association members, which in turn, could help encourage membership. A number of Winnipeg's OLA associations currently raise funds to support their OLAs through sponsorships and advertising. All sponsorship arrangements must comply with the City of Winnipeg sponsorship policy.

DEDICATIONS

Dedicating a special amenity or location at a favourite OLA is another potential means of private sponsorship. OLA users may be interested in funding a section of trail, bench, picnic table, tree, waste bin, disposable bag stand, agility feature, dog water fountain, dog water feature, a piece of a memory wall, or statue in memory of a beloved pet. This process would be similar to the Parks and Open Space program to dedicate a park bench.

FUNDRAISING

OLA associations (and/or a larger regional OLA association) could continue to fundraise for special amenities and other upgrades at OLAs. A few examples of fundraising activities include:

- Doggie Dash – a run with your dog;
- Swim with your Dog – a swim with your dog at a local pool or nearby lake;
- Dog-o-Ween – a Halloween party and dog costume judging;
- Pictures with Santa – get a photo of you and your dog with Santa;
- Paint for Paws – a paint night fundraiser;
- Car & dog wash;
- OLA promotional t-shirts, collars, dog toys, etc.;
- FundYourPark.org – crowdfunding site dedicated to Parks and Recreation;
- 50/50 & other raffles (certain licenses are required);
- Dog Calendar;
- Fundraiser dinners (e.g., Bud, Spud & Steak);
- Dog Park Derby;
- Dog Park BBQ & festivities; and
- Retail outlets and businesses that provide dog-related goods and services could be encouraged to provide customers with an opportunity to donate to a fund that enhances Winnipeg's OLAs.

GRANTS

There are a number of grants available for community building, and a few tailored specifically to creating and renovating OLAs. Some of these include:

- Winnipeg Foundation – One Time Community Grant;
- Investors Group - Community Projects Fund;
- Assiniboine Credit Union - Community Grant;
- CIBC – Community Grant;
- Cambrian Credit Union – Community Grant;
- Thomas Sill Foundation;
- Nutro Room to Run Foundation; and
- Walmart Canada – Community Project Grant, etc.

POTENTIAL PARTNERSHIPS

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

With Multiple OLA Associations

The City could explore the possibility of leasing City-owned land to OLA associations as an approach to public-private partnerships. The City could charge the OLA associations leasing fees. In turn, the OLA associations could charge membership or entrance fees to OLA-users in order to help pay for maintenance, park improvements, and amenities. Alternatively, OLA associations could aim to cover these costs solely through volunteer work (park clean up and maintenance, fundraising, and seeking sponsorships and private donations).

With a Regional OLA Association

The City could explore the possibility of leasing City-owned land to one overarching regional OLA association as a broad approach to a public-private partnership. This partnership would be identical to the approach described above, except that the regional OLA association would represent, advocate, and be responsible for taking the lead (in terms of the establishment, maintenance, improvement, etc.) of all of Winnipeg's new OLAs.

Providing OLAs through a public-private partnership would help to reduce the growing pressure on the Parks & Open Space department to provide ongoing OLA maintenance. It would also help to instill an even greater sense of pride and ownership among OLA members and volunteers. The City and OLA associations (or regional OLA association) could also work together to provide incentives for OLA members, including:

- Free or discounted meeting spaces for dog park group meetings; and
- Free or discounted venues for OLA fundraising events.

PRIVATE DEVELOPERS

Planning for a new neighbourhood, particularly within areas designated as "Major Redevelopment Sites" or "New Communities" in *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities*, could include provisions for a new OLA. Requirements for a new OLA could be included as part of a development agreement. The City could encourage the development of new OLAs on private land, for permanent use, as well as an interim use of future development sites.

UNDERUTILIZED ROAD OR UTILITY RIGHT-OF-WAYS

Underutilized road or utility right-of-ways could provide the space for an OLA. The City could work with owners of local rights-of-way to identify any underutilized areas that could potentially provide for additional OLAs throughout Winnipeg. To achieve this, the City would likely be required to lease the land from its owner, if applicable.

UNIVERSITIES, COLLEGES, INSTITUTIONS & HEALTH CARE AND OTHER CAMPUSES

The City could approach local universities, colleges, and other large campuses to inquire whether they currently own any underutilized land that could be converted to an OLA or used as an OLA as an interim use of a future development site.

ARTISANS AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

OLA associations (or a regional OLA association) could collaborate with local artists and landscape architects to incorporate public art and architectural elements within the City's OLAs. This would help add visual appeal to the parks and provide a form of advertising and promotion for the artists and landscape architects. This type of partnership would not directly help fund the OLAs, but would enhance the user experience and potentially increase dog park membership and visitor numbers.