

Throughout this prioritization process, the consultants have been reviewing and updating cost estimates, and in return, the team has been refining the Reality List to ensure the project comes in at budget. This work will continue as we move into the development of plans and specifications. As a result, although the primary program components proposed in the Schematic Design aren't proposed to change (unless directed by the County Board), the scope of some of the project components could change.

Proposed Schematic Design

The proposed schematic design (*see Attachment B*) focuses on 11 different program improvement areas in four general categories:

- Entry/Infrastructure Improvements
- Trails
- Play Structures and Play Areas
- Building and Ground Improvements

The construction budget for this work is similar to the Spring Lake Regional Park development project that occurred in 2012. However, one of the primary challenges in the developing the Cedar Lake Farm schematic design is balancing a greater number of improvements within a similar budget. For example, a portion of the Cedar Lake Farm budget is proposed to:

- Provide general support for the park's operation through entry and infrastructure improvements
- Preserve and improve existing buildings by stabilizing the barn and renovating the pavilion building
- Incorporate an on-site satellite maintenance facility

At the same time, the proposed schematic design proposes to enhance visitor experience by installing a new play structure, enhancing the beach, and constructing trails.

One of the more lively topics of conversation that the design team had was related to paved trails. There was clear consensus that paved trails are a high priority. However, the team also acknowledged that other program improvements were also high priorities. Unfortunately, we don't have enough funding to do both. As a result, the schematic design proposes a combination of paved trails in the existing active area of the park, with non-paved trails extending to the north.

Finally, the design team has had conversations around moving from seasonal to year-round use. At this point we are uncertain if we can support year-round operations within our existing operations. We will need to continue to evaluate operational capacity with the proposed improvements and have follow-up conversations with the Parks Advisory Commission and the County Board as the planned improvements are refined.

Public Feedback

In addition to the Design Team's work, we also coordinated an open house for public comment. Approximately 42 people attended. Their comments and responses are attached (*see Attachment C*).

The public feedback on paved versus non-paved trails was similar to the design team's conversation: more paved trails would be ideal, but balancing the other improvements was also warranted. Overall, the feedback we received was very appreciative of the planned improvements.

Winter Lake Access

The one area of feedback that was new was a conversation around winter lake access to the south side of the lake for both emergency response and public use. Based on the comments at the open house, winter access to the south side of Cedar Lake is hindered by a weak point midway on the lake from the two winter public access points on the north (the boat launchers). As a result, anglers have been using a private access from the Grand View Arbour development to access the south side of the lake. The Master Plan for the park does not provide winter vehicle access to the lake, and it did not come up during the master planning process.

Staff and HGA met to discuss this request. We believe that we can provide emergency access relatively easily via the planned automated gate and the park's trail system. However, public access is more challenging.

If we were to create public winter lake access, this would most likely need to occur through the current active use area of the park – most likely utilizing the beach area – or on the far east end off of Cedar Lane. Using the active use area of the park would essentially create a winter road through the core of the park, potentially requiring new maintenance and operational needs. Using the east end of the park would require a new access off Cedar Lane, and impact the woodland area.

If the County Board would like to pursue an additional winter access to Cedar Lake through the park, our recommendation would be to implement the master plan concept for the east end of park and construct the road and parking as proposed with an additional access down to the lake (*see Attachment D*). However, due to the project's budget and timing of this request, this work is not currently within the proposed schematic design. In addition, we haven't had an opportunity to discuss this with either Helena or Cedar Lake Township Boards (the access road would cross the township line), and we haven't gotten any feedback from the design team or lake residents.

As a result, our recommendation is to consider winter access when the east end of the park is developed at some point in the future. There is no additional funding for Cedar Lake Farm in the proposed 2015-2019 Parks Improvement Plan, so unless the County Board directs that current funding go toward this work, it would likely be some time after 2019 before the east end development could be considered unless other non-county funds could be secured for this work.

Parks Advisory Commission Recommendation

The Parks Advisory Commission recommended the schematic design as proposed, with the understanding that the amount of paved trails would be determined as cost estimates are refined.

Thank You to the Design Team

I want to extend our thanks to the members of the design team who have helped shape this project over the past four months!

Citizen Representation

Jed Becher
Sharon Brown
Pam Caselius
Julie Christian
Adam Fitzpatrick
Jon Hendricks
Ann Houghton
Ken Ondich (City of New Prague)
Ken Pomije
Molly Tubbs

Parks Advisory Commission

Kristin French
Jerry Hennen
Barb Hedstrom

Staff

Brad Chock
Patty Freeman
Mike Horn
Jeannine Briol
Jenna Tuma
Mark Themig

HGA/Barr Engineering

Ross Altheimer
Erica Christenson
Nissa Tupper
Kenny Horns
Fred Rozumalski
Jeff Lee
Dan Yudchitz

- Off-Leash Dog Park
 - 30-40 Car Parking Lot
 - 7-10 acre off-leash area
 - Kiosk/Restroom Facility
 - Buffer from Neighborhood and Trail

Woodland Restoration

Manage Existing Woodlands for Invasive Species

Create Safe At-grade Crossing

Boardwalk Potentially Needed for Trail Connection

Create Safe At-grade Crossing

Existing Septic Fields

Multi-Purpose Paved Trail Loop

Sustainable Agriculture Demonstration Fields

Market Learning Center (see enlargement)

Future Wetland Restoration

Future Regional Trail Connection

Approx. Trail Mileage:

- 4 Miles of Paved Trail

Approx. Park Acreage:

- 254 acres planned



Create Neighborhood Connections to Park

Wildlife Viewing/Lake Overlooks

Cedar Lake

Enhance Landscape Buffer

Lakeside Recreation (see enlargement)

LEGEND

	Planned Park Boundary
	Multi-Purpose Paved Trail
	Roads
	Wildlife Blinds
	Parking
	Wetlands
	Open Water
	Prairie Restoration
	Existing Forest
	Woodland Restoration

Master Plan

Cedar Lake Farm Regional Park



LAKESIDE RECREATION AREA ENLARGEMENT



PHASE 1 PROGRAM DETAIL

PHASE 1 OUTCOME

TAKING CARE OF WHAT WE HAVE...

 1. FORMALIZED ENTRY (\$64,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Automated Gate Clean up tree lines Widen driveway Signage 	<p>Better welcome Improved security/wayfinding</p>
 2. TRAILS (\$578,940) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pave 1.2 miles in Core Non-paved, West and North of Juniper: 2.4miles + Boardwalks 	<p>Increased accessible use Increase park use Neighborhood connections</p>
3. INFRASTRUCTURE (\$79,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading and Drainage Site prep Lighting 	<p>Improved visitor experience</p>
 4. PLAY (\$185,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structured play - traditional structure(s) Free play - nature play, undefined space/activities Play Path 	<p>Increase use, multiple age groups Utilize forest for nature play</p>
 5. BEACH EXPANSION (\$95,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add width and depth, define with hard edge Move boat dock North, new accessible entry Formalized picnic area, West and South 	<p>Increase park use Improved visitor experience</p>
 6. POND RESTORATION (\$29,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean up vegetation along pond edge Address drainage/grading 	<p>Accommodate additional programming Improved conditions adjacent to beach</p>
 7. NATURAL RESOURCES (\$39,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Expansion (Connecting Trail Buffer) Oak Savanna (East) 	<p>Take care of critical natural resources Buffer park use and neighborhood Prepare land for future use</p>
 8. GROUP CAMP AREA (\$0) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean-up tree line, possibly re-locate up the hill 	<p>Continue interim camping program</p>
 9. PICNICKING (\$10,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Formalized picnic area Multiple informal, accessible picnic pads 	<p>Increase picnic location options Accessible use</p>
 10. EDIBLE PLANTING (\$10,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Native, edible tree/shrub grove 	<p>Lay foundation for future programming Activate the barn area</p>
 11. BUILDING & GROUND IMPROVEMENTS (\$484,640) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pavilion Upgrade Barn Preservation New Maintenance Facility Boat launch improvements 2 concrete caretaker pads, vegetated screening Farmstead Cleanup (restore and demo) 	<p>Allow concessions, catering, classroom use Preserve the barn for future upgrades On-site and park system maintenance support Improve erosion issues, possible winter emergency access Provide accessible, screened sites Prepare for future use, improve visitor experience</p>

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS: \$1,574,000 (TARGET = \$1.57M)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: \$1,916,000 (TARGET = \$1.9M)



- | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|----------------------------------|
|  | 1. FORMALIZED ENTRY |  | 7. NATURAL RESOURCE ENHANCEMENTS |
|  | 2. TRAILS |  | 8. GROUP CAMP AREA |
|  | 3. INFRASTRUCTURE |  | 9. PICNICKING |
|  | 4. PLAY |  | 10. EDIBLE PLANTING |
|  | 5. BEACH EXPANSION |  | 11. BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS |
|  | 6. POND RESTORATION |  | |



in partnership with



**CEDAR LAKE FARM REGIONAL PARK
NOVEMBER 5, 2014
NOTES FROM OPEN HOUSE**

Questions/Comments/Responses

Can we get as close to the water as possible with the trails? (Core Plan)

There are some restrictions (shoreline restoration, topography) but the intent is that the trail comes close to the lake edge. It's a different condition that those lakes in the Cities.

Can you see the lake from the northern trail?

With some selective and sensitive alignments it's certainly possible.

Can the trail (east side) be looped? It makes it more interesting (lots of nods for loops).

We can explore this.

What about winter recreation for those trails?

People are free to use them, but the County isn't in a position to groom them/maintain them right away.

Will you allow dogs on the trails?

We feel that the County will need to re-evaluate the policy of no dogs at Cedar Lake Farm with the planned improvements. Scott County's ordinance allows dogs on leash on most trails, regardless of surface.

Seems like a lot of paved trails in the core.

We agree and will revisit the extents, particularly once we get good survey data.

What are the plans to acquire land (future dog park?)

There are plans to acquire that land, and the county will pursue the purchase if the land owner is interested in selling. The County doesn't proactively approach land owners to sell – we typically respond to these requests.

If land isn't acquired, will there still be a dog park? I don't see a lot of demand for them in the rural area.

The topic of a dog park has been a frequent discussion item in New Prague. We believe there is still a need for a dog park at Cedar Lake Farm to serve the area.

Can there be vehicular winter access for ice fishing and emergency access to lake through the park?

Team will explore options for one or both access types.

Consider buffer plantings for private property to North of Pond.

**CEDAR LAKE FARM REGIONAL PARK
NOVEMBER 5, 2014
NOTES FROM PARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Questions/Comments/Responses

Fire Access was discussed:

- HGA/SC/3R to meet with fire dept on site
- Review option for access on East side of site: Add to Survey contract?

Trails

- Explore loop and alignment of the east side of Core
- If we do less linear feet of bit. in core and/or go to aggregate surface how far can we pave the path to the north? (“Less is More in the Core”).
Will continue to refine cost estimates for aggregate trail (vs. bit. and soft) and expand bituminous as feasible.

Play:

- Farm themed nature play (structured play?)
- Scale back structured play to do more bituminous trails.

Conclusion:

- Like the concept as is – with some consideration for balancing more paved trails in the north with less play/paved trails in the core
- Recommend the plan to the SC Board



Master Plan: Lakeside Recreation and Market Learning Center

Cedar Lake Farm Regional Park

