



Input offered by each group, as recorded on the various drawings provided to them at the Task Force meeting, was transcribed as closely as possible in categories related to roadway and trail alignment, picnic shelter arrangement and structure concepts, and public art. Several groups made notes on the drawings and provided separate notes, so some repetition may occur in the summary. In a few cases, the comments could not be easily transcribed, or a transcription was assumed; these instances are noted in the summaries below.

The “conclusions interpreted from comments” is an attempt to briefly summarize comments as direction offered by each group. In some cases, a group was clear about their preferences; in others, this section represents an interpretation of the comments offered.

**Group 1**

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Drawing</i>	<i>Written comment</i>	<i>Drawn comment</i>	<i>Interpretation/summary</i>
<b>Roadway</b>				
	Parallel parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trail next to river</li> <li>Higher bike trail than roadway</li> <li>Commuter or roadway keep segment xxxx to river grade [this comment could not be easily read; what is recorded was the best possible translation of the written comment]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A highlighted line was drawn to show the trail extending along the river over the entire length of the park</li> </ul>	.
	Intermittent median	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slow traffic if there is through traffic</li> <li>What is the difference in expense of road variations?</li> <li>Keep parking areas visible from the road</li> <li>Trail is preferred along the river</li> <li>Where the road narrows needs street signage and slowing effect</li> <li>(sometimes?) What about closing west end of roadway but from each only go the picnic hill?</li> <li>Keep the road open from both ends but slow the traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	.
	Independent alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trailway by river</li> <li>It's the "river"</li> <li>Too much road in park</li> <li>Hazardous [the note was placed near a roadway/trail intersection]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A highlighted line was drawn to show the trail extending along the river over the entire length of the park</li> </ul>	.
	Cross-sections: one-way drive with stabilized turf lane and off-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bike path next to road</li> </ul>	.	.
	Cross-sections: one-way drive with on-street trail	.	.	.
	Cross-sections: independent drive lanes and off-street trail	.	.	.
	Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roads together, bike trail on road</li> </ul>	.	.
	Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	.	.	.
	Cross-sections: xxx	.	.	.

## Picnic area

Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More space without large structures</li> <li>Consensus</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This idea creates a single structure that allows for more space (more space without structures intruding)</li> </ul>
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More centralized</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An arrow pointed from this concept to Concept 1, which suggests that a more centralized idea would be preferred</li> </ul>
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BAD</li> <li>More places, more need for park maintenance vehicles</li> </ul>		

## Shelter

Pods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open for security</li> <li>Harriet Island “party tent”</li> <li>Organic shape</li> <li>Natural materials</li> <li>Shelter—not solid walls</li> <li>Use if true canopies and temporary structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an “X” was placed across the image of the larger pod concept sketch</li> </ul>	
Nostalgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Brick, clay tile</li> <li>Too massive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an “X” was placed across the image of the larger nostalgia concept sketch</li> </ul>	
Urban relics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight the Omaha</li> </ul>		
Nests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growing wall/roof</li> <li>Like the shape</li> <li>Sort of tipi</li> </ul>		

## Public art

Public art possibilities: page 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: [no comment offered]</li> <li>Image 2: like this</li> <li>Image 3: like this, dog park border</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2</li> <li>Image 3</li> </ul>	
Public art possibilities: page 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2: no cutesy little kid art</li> <li>Image 3: nature theme, like</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: an “X” was placed near the image</li> <li>Image 2: an “X” was placed near the image</li> <li>Image 3</li> </ul>	
Public art possibilities: page 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: flood wall theme, possible gathering spot</li> <li>Image 2: monarch butterfly project, prairie planting</li> <li>Image 3: keep spontaneous and unorganized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2:</li> <li>Image 3:</li> </ul>	
Public art possibilities: page 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: keep \$ in community, local/community artist involved</li> <li>Image 2: mosaic only of natural materials</li> <li>Image 3: inappropriate?, scattered rocks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2:</li> <li>Image 3:</li> </ul>	
Public art possibilities: page 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2: [no comment offered]</li> <li>Image 3: [no comment offered]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: an “X” was placed near the image</li> <li>Image 2:</li> <li>Image 3:</li> </ul>	
Public art possibilities: page 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: [no comment offered]</li> <li>Image 2: [no comment offered]</li> <li>Image 3: [no comment offered]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2:</li> <li>Image 3:</li> </ul>	
Public art possibilities: page 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1: [no comment offered]</li> <li>Image 2: [no comment offered]</li> <li>Image 3: \$ in local community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Image 1:</li> <li>Image 2:</li> <li>Image 3:</li> </ul>	

## Other comments

- Permanent tent, sail cloth, etc...
- If you can't go all natural, is it worth it to try to make it... urban relics
- Trellis style, fort
- Organic wall form, stone
- Mosaic trash cans
- Not a bunch of kids' work
- Photography gallery
- Commuter bike lane on roadway
- Trellis/living growing
- Teepee shape
- No adding of nostalgia building
- Remember monarchs
- Shelter—cover only, not solid walls
- Curvy benches alongside trail
- Bike path on road (commuter)
- Regional trailway by river
- 30! Seating? No more than 30, natural, stones, etc.
- Trellis/living growing/nest
- Teepee shape, centralized picnic, tent-like/sail cloth
- No to nostalgia buildings
- Remember monarchs
- Threshold does not have to match the other structure
- Local artists/neighborhood—kid stuff not be permanent
- Grotto
- Mosaic only from found-natural materials

## Conclusions interpreted from comments

- 1 The group seemed to be indicating a preference for a road alignment that was the least amount of road (paving) possible.
- 2 The group preference seemed to be for a trail that took best advantage of the river, although there were also references to a bike path that followed the roadway more directly.
- 3 Directions from the group related to the picnic shelter design were not conclusive, although there seemed to be a preference for a smaller structure (or an objection to a larger structure). There seemed to be a preference for natural materials, with several comments related to the desire for shelter but not enclosure (a canopy, but not walls).
- 4 The group, in several comments, stated a preference for local artists. Images related to natural materials also seemed to be favored. A comment was offered to “cutesy” kid art, but it is unclear if this precluded art produced by children or arts programming that involved children.

## Group 2

Topic	Drawing	Written comment	Drawn comment	Interpretation
<b>Roadway</b>				
	Parallel parkway	· [no comment offered]	·	·
	Intermittent median	· Retain natural areas as much as possible	·	· Roadway and trails were highlighted, but no other comments were offered; it is likely that this alternative was preferred by the group as no other highlights were placed on any of the roadway sketches
	Independent alignment	· Too much spaces used [comment was placed in two areas where median was more generous than other areas]	·	·
	Cross-sections: one-way drive with stabilized turf	·	·	·

lane and off-street trail			
Cross-sections: one-way drive with on-street trail	·	· The title of this sketch was highlighted	·
Cross-sections: independent drive lanes and off-street trail	·	·	·
Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	·	·	·
Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	·	·	·
Cross-sections: xxx	·	·	·

### Picnic area

Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 1	·	· an "X" was placed across the sketch	·
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 2	· Keep structures in picnic hill area	·	·
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 3	· Combo of the two [concept 2 and concept 3]	·	·

### Shelter

Pods	· [No comment offered]	·	·
Nostalgia	· [No comment offered]	·	·
Urban relics	· [No comment offered]	·	·
Nests	· Like the teepee idea	·	·

### Public art

Public art possibilities: page 1	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: · Image 3:	· Image 1: · Image 2: a star was placed near this image · Image 3: a star was placed near this image	·
Public art possibilities: page 2	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: · Image 3:	· Image 1: · Image 2: a star was placed near this image · Image 3: a star was placed near this image	·
Public art possibilities: page 3	· Image 1: · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: a star was placed near this image · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 4	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 5	· Image 1: we don't like this "look" but how about some "blinds" for birding? Perhaps other animal observance · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: an "X" was placed near this image · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 6	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: a star was placed near this image · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 7	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·

### Other comments

	· Discussion about bikes: bikers will bike on roads, no matter what; could provide bike path on road and separate; really need to decide about bike path	·	·
	· Roadway discussion: least intrusive as possible;	·	·

	comparing to Summit Avenue; roadways could be 10' wide or less		
	· Trail design: Group liked trail along the river; bikers may prefer to take the road	·	·
	· Discussion about speed and configuration: group did like independent alignment; comparing parallel vs. intermittent; came down on preference for intermittent; idea for ellipses were good for turnarounds; assumes that it would be more calming	·	·
	· Cross sections: prefer the least amount of pavement; liked one-way drive with on street trail—assuming trail along the river; question: whether pedestrians and bikes would be separate	·	·
	· Picnic areas: preferred picnic area concept—is is more of an intrusion? No one likes Concept 1. Difference more slight from 2 and 3, especially 2	·	·
	· Buildings: mix pods and buildings; like mixing public art; need for weather protection, not big [destination]; didn't like the bigger ones; do like "natural" feel; like the more natural ones	·	·
	· Art: highlighted leaf benches; loved kid thing	·	·
	· Location and sizes of building: keep buildings in picnic hill only, not scattered; if there shelters—should you be could come [transcription accurate]	·	·

### Conclusions interpreted from comments

- 1 The roadway layout described as "intermittent median" is likely the preference of the group based on comments and markings on the drawings, in a configuration this is the least intrusive on the park and user experience. Using the same logic, it would appear that a one-way roadway with an on-street trail is preferred by this group.
- 2 The group is tending toward a picnic hill arrangement that is a combination of the slightly dispersed to more generally dispersed, with a general leaning toward something like concept 2.
- 3 The group indicated they liked the pod concept mixed with buildings, with weather protection and natural feel (this likely suggests covered but not enclosed). The group would encourage mixing of public art with the shelters.
- 4 Few direct comments were offered relative to public art, but there seemed to be a preference for the use of natural materials and found objects; the group might encourage art that encouraged participation of children.

### Group 3

Topic	Drawing	Written comment	Drawn comment	Interpretation
<b>Roadway</b>				
	Parallel parkway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Like variety in trail alignment on this scheme, that is close to the river in some areas and farther away in others rather than continuous along river</li> <li>· This trail alignment create more safety for bikers and picnickers—more eyes [the note refers to a location on the drawing where the road and trail are proximate to the picnic hill</li> <li>· As a regional park there should be a pavilion [assumed transcription] that can seat 50-60 , 8-10 tables</li> <li>· 3-4 table pavilionette and 6-8 table pavilions</li> <li>· Favorite road plan due to mixed use of riverfront between cycling and open areas; also more variety of experience for bikes</li> </ul>	·	·

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For pavilion seating tables use heavy by natural materials as base with artist; non vandalizable, can't be carted [assumed transcription] out, functional, natural-feeling, yet aesthetically pleasing</li> </ul>		
Intermittent median	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This road preferred with a little more divergences; not as much as the other independent alignment in Road #3</li> <li>Why leave bridge given federal grant requests have suggested widening road passage and separate bike underpass</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Red lines drawn suggest greater divergence of the roadways to the north of the picnic hill area only</li> <li>Sketch showing a comparison between a single lane road under the railroad bridge and a two-lane road with a separate bike path</li> </ul>	
Independent alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly scattered picnic tables into remote areas creates security issues</li> <li>Scattered tables where you can see each group are less of an issue</li> <li>Shelter needs to be open/see-through (but with a roof) so homeless folks do not take over</li> <li>Too much asphalt on this scheme</li> <li>This road/trail alignment creates too many road/trail conflicts!!! (6 east to west in this route)</li> <li>Bigger turn arounds create unused land islands</li> <li>Natural materials nostalgia theme (not nest, pod, or relic based) [a line connected this comment to the picnic hill area]</li> <li>Too much road</li> <li>Roofs must protect [a line connected this comment to the picnic hill area]</li> <li>On relic issue, not main theme but a little bit of urban archeology that could be incorporated; a hidden surprise, found objects with small historical notes somewhere</li> <li>Like the idea of taking artists down there and experience space, the ideate (on cocktail napkins) about art to be embedded into park, low profile way, some involving kids from neighborhood</li> <li>Include ecological elements with rain runoff, water move art as aesthetic element</li> </ul>		
Cross-sections: one-way drive with stabilized turf lane and off-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		
Cross-sections: one-way drive with on-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		
Cross-sections: independent drive lanes and off-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		
Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		
Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		
Cross-sections: xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		

## Picnic area

Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consensus, best arrangement</li> </ul>		
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[no comment offered]</li> </ul>		

## Shelter

Pods	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Nostalgia	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Urban relics	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Nests	· [no comment offered]	·	·

**Public art**

Public art possibilities: page 1	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 2	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 3	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 4	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 5	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 6	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 7	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·

**Other comments**

	· [no additional comments offered]	·	·
--	------------------------------------	---	---

**Conclusions interpreted from comments**

- 1 The group’s preference seemed to be directed to a roadway alignment that used the intermittent median with some added divergence (probably limited to one area). They clearly stated a preference for the trail alignment in the parallel parkway alignment, as it offered a greater diversity of experiences for trail users. They noted the value of a road and trail alignment that converged on the picnic hill area, particularly for the sense of safety (surveillance) that it offered. The group would encourage creation of a larger passage under the railroad bridge.
- 2 The group noted the clustered arrangement as indicated in concept 2 as the preference for the picnic hill.
- 3 The group indicated the shelter should be see-through, and offer protection from weather but not enclosure. Security is a concern with something that is too enclosed. Their preference seemed to be directed toward the nostalgia concepts for the structure created with natural materials.
- 4 Public art directions seemed to favor ideas that that would be “low profile” surprises, using objects or themes found in the park. The group noted that children could be a part of the public art program.

**Group 4**

Topic	Drawing	Written comment	Drawn comment	Interpretation
<b>Roadway</b>				
	Parallel parkway	· This is the preferred trail alignment with intermittent median · Like to experience both the lake and the river from the	· The trail between the boat launch and the swing bridge was highlighted	·



	trail		
Intermittent median	·	· A series of “X” marks were placed on the trail along the river between the boat launch to a point along the river north of the picnic hill; this area was noted as “foot path” · A line was drawn that more generally followed the road to indicate a trail that reached the riverfront at a point along the river generally north of the picnic hill, and then continuing along the river to the swing bridge	·
Independent alignment	· Breaks up habitat	· A series of “X” marks were placed at intersections of the trail and roadway	·
Cross-sections: one-way drive with stabilized turf lane and off-street trail	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Cross-sections: one-way drive with on-street trail	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Cross-sections: independent drive lanes and off-street trail	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Cross-sections: two-way drive with on-street trail	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Cross-sections: xxx	· [no comment offered]	·	·

### Picnic area

Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 1	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 2	· Stations—satellites · Variety of sizes, stage-like for one	· An asterisk was placed near this concept	·
Picnic area plans: picnic area concept 3	· Too spread out?	·	·

### Shelter

Pods	· Pods scare Jon especially if lit, little shop of horrors	·	·
Nostalgia	· [no comment offered]	·	·
Urban relics	· Like rusty steel	· An asterisk was placed on this sheet	·
Nests	· [no comment offered]	·	·

### Public art

Public art possibilities: page 1	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 2	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 3	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 4	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 5	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered] · Image 3: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2: · Image 3:	·
Public art possibilities: page 6	· Image 1: [no comment offered] · Image 2: [no comment offered]	· Image 1: · Image 2:	·



Public art possibilities: page 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Image 3: [no comment offered]</li> <li>· Image 1: [no comment offered]</li> <li>· Image 2: [no comment offered]</li> <li>· Image 3: [no comment offered]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Image 3:</li> <li>· Image 1:</li> <li>· Image 2:</li> <li>· Image 3:</li> </ul>
----------------------------------	--	--

### Other comments

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Like the middle #2—include something stage-like</li> <li>· Mix of different shelters—urban relic, teepee, mushroom, possibly satellite picnic areas</li> <li>· Like stone walls, dividers—grotto</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Like intermittent median, bike path by river, maybe undulate a little</li> <li>· Like trail coming back to central area, footpath along river</li> <li>· Limit or avoid guardrails—except where necessary</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· “gabion”</li> </ul>	

### Conclusions interpreted from comments

- 1 The group preference for a roadway alignment was for the intermittent median alignment. Guardrails should be limited, and used only where needed.
- 2 The alignment shown in the parallel parkway alignment is preferred for the trail because of the variety of experiences offered and the lack of conflicts with the roadway. A footpath would more directly follow the river and be separated from the regional trail. The alignment of the trail was suggested to undulate a little.
- 3 The group indicated a preference for the second concept, with picnic facilities clustered and possibly using different shelter types. They suggested a variety of sizes, with one being more “stage-like.”
- 4 No comments were offered related to public art concepts.

C:\Users\mjs\Desktop\Lilydale Regional Park\Task Force meeting two, summary of input, 20101206.doc