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Executive Summary

The purpose of this project report is to provide advice and strategic guidance to the Central Arkansas Library System for creating a transformational public space in Little Rock adjacent to the Hillary Rodham Clinton Children’s Library and inclusive of the War Memorial Park and Little Rock Zoo area. This study presents options for creating this public space and provides information to assist in moving these options forward to fruition.

Recommendations are presented across six primary strategic areas for engaging this project; these are presented in order of importance.

1. Strategic Partnerships
2. Community Building and Support
3. Transportation
4. Health-Oriented Activities
5. Community Amenities
6. Branding

The project report provides background information about the community and considerations for funding sources to support this project. Also included in this project report is a comparative city matrix that provides information about public space amenities enjoyed in similar and aspirational communities across the country.

This report’s key contributions in developing a strategy for creating a family-friendly, community public space are to establish an interlocal agreement with the City of Little Rock to control areas adjacent to the Hillary Rodham Clinton Children’s Library and acquire stakeholder input and support. This project report addresses the challenges of developing comprehensive public space in the City of Little Rock and stresses the importance of utilizing a collaborative approach to forge relationships with the immediate public, community constituents, and interested public, private, and nonprofit entities that can embrace this vision and see this public space to reality.
Table 1. Comparative City Matrix of Public Space Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Size (acres)</th>
<th>Opened</th>
<th>Park Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Park, New York</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Sports Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Water Play Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Park, Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Picnicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathanael Greene/Close Memorial Park, Springfield, Missouri</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteside Park, Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeFleur’s Bluff State Park, Jackson, Mississippi</td>
<td>1700s</td>
<td>Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Park, Fayetteville, Arkansas</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Park, Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Virginia Park, Shreveport, Louisiana</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Play-ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverfront Park, Little Rock, AR</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Boating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial Park, Little Rock, Arkansas</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Field</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>Bike Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Play Features</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>Outdoor Amphitheater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Outdoor Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ice Skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Bike Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Outdoor Amphitheater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play-ground</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Outdoor Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fitness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ice Skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Rental</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Amphitheater</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Art</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ research.

Note: *Recreation center only.
Strategic Partnerships

- Interlocal Agreement with the City of Little Rock
- Strategic and Operational partnerships
- Health Organization partnerships

The Central Arkansas Library system must take advantage of area support and strategically align with community and corporate citizens to establish partnerships to bring the effort to fruition. The Central Arkansas Library system must:
  - explore strategic and operational partnerships with the City of Little Rock and area Health Facilities.
  - establish with the city an interlocal agreement regarding operations in the area; this will enable the Central Arkansas Library system to develop and manage the space.
  - collaborate with area Health organizations (St. Vincent’s, UAMS, Arkansas Children’s Hospital, and Arkansas Department of Health) to exploit their presence and encourage healthy lifestyle activities in and around this space (e.g., Employee Wellness programs in concert with UAMS).

To implement this plan the Central Arkansas Library system (CALS) must partner with various public institutional constituents, as well as create synergies with area nonprofit organizations for mutually beneficial projects; these partnerships are essential to the success of developing this public place. To develop a public space as being proposed, CALS must work first with the City of Little Rock to ensure an interlocal agreement can be forged that catalyzes the development of this public place. Regarding other public sector partnerships, it is necessary to strengthen CALS networks with UAMS, Arkansas Children’s Hospital, St. Vincent’s Hospital, the Arkansas Department of Health, the City of Little Rock, the City of Little Rock Recreation and Parks Department, the Little Rock Zoo, the War Memorial Commission, and the Arkansas Highway Department. An exploration of commitments from these entities, along with the expressed support of area neighborhood groups, churches, community partners, nonprofit agencies, etc., are beneficial to the fruition of this public space as envisioned. Moreover, these suggested partnerships provide synergies to enhance the public space according to many suggestions made in this research.
Community Building and Support

- Build Community Support
- Stakeholder Involvement
- Philanthropic Involvement

Connecting with Community

A primary factor in catalyzing this public space, and also a primary recommendation emerging from this research, entails accurately gauging public support and acquiring public perspectives. Public perspectives are sought from those institutions or citizens affected by, potentially affected by, or having an interest in (direct or indirect) the development of this public space. These perspectives are of those who have a “stake in the process” and thus, are referred to as stakeholders (individuals) and stakeholder groups (groups from neighborhood associations or representing an institutional stakeholder). As Carmin et al (2003: 529) observe, “[s]takeholder involvement has become an integral part of many policymaking processes and can take a variety of forms, ranging from informal and consulting with the public to partnerships and citizen control.” As part of any public venture, understanding stakeholder and public perspectives are paramount to moving these ventures forward. Equally important is ensuring that “commensurate levels of influence should be present among diverse groups of stakeholders” (Carmin et al. 2003: 529). Acquiring a sense of the public’s perspective, particularly those most immediately affected and near the proposed site, allows project planning to incorporate these stakeholder perspectives into the development process from the outset and sustain these throughout the project. As well, these perspectives of those most immediately affected and near the proposed site must be nurtured and revisited recurrently. More importantly, rooting stakeholder involvement into the process from the beginning creates “a broad range of groups . . . dedicated to achieving outcomes that reflect the concerns of a wide variety of interests” (Carmin et al. 2003: 529). Accordingly, stakeholder input is an important factor for connecting with the greater community and developing the place as outlined in this and other research. Through stakeholder input, the project report assimilates the public perspective by providing them a voice in identifying amenities, activities, and programming that generate community support for developing this place.

As demonstrated, understanding and incorporating stakeholders into the process is critical, especially for this public space project. Because of the magnitude of this public space project, numerous stakeholders are identified; stakeholders include representatives from health care organizations and public entities to hobbyist organizations and neighborhood associations. In an effort to gauge these perspectives, capstone students engaged organizations, citizens, and institutional representatives about their perspectives for this project. Stakeholders and stakeholder groups responding to an invitation to meet with project researchers about the public space project were engaged in conversations that involved questions to use as needed for guiding the conversation about this public space, as well as to organize information from
these various conversations. The questions are listed below. Questions were presented to ensure the stakeholder conversations evolved around a similar perception/conceptualization of the public space. In fact, before discussing the public space with each stakeholder or stakeholder group, researchers provided stakeholders with information about the project, which included:

- a brief description of the project – the preparation of “a development and implementation plan for a public space that connects the Children’s Library, War Memorial Park, the Dailey Fitness and Aquatic Center, and the Zoo. The goal is to provide families with recreational, active learning, and healthy living activities and options; and,
- a conceptual plan and map developed for CALS by Polk, Stanley, & Wilcox Architects in September 2012.

Conversation questions for organizing stakeholder perspectives:

1. What do you think about this idea?
2. Do you have family members who would likely use such a place?
3. What things would you or your family members like to see at this place?
4. In your opinion, what activities should not be included at this place?
5. Do you think this is a worthwhile venture for the community? Why?
6. What do you see as the primary advantage of this place?
7. What challenges could keep this project from happening? Name two.
8. Given what we’ve discussed, is the place something you would support or endorse? If not, why not? If so, can we use your name publicly?
9. Is this something you think the city of Little Rock should support? If not, why not?
10. If you could wish for something at this place, even though it might not be feasible, what would it be?
11. We are attempting to contact numerous people. Is there anyone you would recommend we contact?
12. Finally, do you have anything else you would like to add or share?

To determine those entities with which to discuss the public space, 31 organizations were contacted; of those contacted, conversations were held with representatives from community (7), development (2), health (3), hobbyist (4), and public (8) organizations. Twenty-four stakeholder or stakeholder groups participated in these guided conversations (see Table 2). Representatives from seven organizations did not respond when contacted, refused to comment, do not think the project fits into their mission, or referred the caller to another organization.

As connectivity to community is a vital component of this project, stakeholders seemed to echo this sentiment – connections – as they see the opportunity in this project to connect to important community features – the Hillary Clinton Children’s Library, the War Memorial Park, the Little Rock Zoo – as well as communities along Markham to 12th Street. In working with various stakeholders to envision this public space, there is a near uniform consensus that there needs to be a means for connecting pedestrian and bicycle traffic, as well as serving as a corridor to connect across I-630. Stakeholder interviews show that residents and
stakeholders, particularly those living south of I-630, understand the divide the interstate creates and want to see something bridge that divide – most stakeholders emphatically support this space as a means for accomplishing that connection.

A summary of the responses to questions is provided (see below). In an effort to maintain the anonymity of those participating in these conversations (though many agreed to publicly endorse the project), the collective perspective of these stakeholders is offered below; this information is a general interpretation based on all of these conversations.

“What do you think about this idea?”
Representatives from 22 organizations favor the public space development. One organization is indifferent toward the project, one does not support it.

“Do you have family members who would likely use such a place?”
When asked if they had family members who would likely use the public space, representatives from 19 organizations responded favorably, one said maybe, and three said no.

“What things would you or your family members like to see at this place?”
Responses varied to the question regarding activities organization representatives would like to see at the public space. Popular responses included the following:

- multi-use facilities
- extended library programs
- pedestrian friendly areas
- walking paths
- bike paths and racks
- bike-to-bus connections
- bus station with a shelter
- easy parking
- exercise equipment
- drinking fountains or bottle filling stations
- special events (festivals, concerts)
- safe and “green” playground equipment
- connectivity
- picnic tables
- botanical garden
- art
- nature park
- wildlife park
- shaded areas and resting spots (covered benches)
- lighting
- phones
- police presence
Other activities mentioned during these conversations included:

- butterfly house
- cooking activities
- garden-based education activities
- community garden
- bird watching
- green space
- water features
- flowers
- nice landscaping
- interactive sculpture
- connecting trails
- sustainability
- amphitheater
- rides for children
- disc golf
- skateboard park
- dog parks
- sport fields (disc golf, soccer, baseball, basketball, tennis, Frisbee golf)
- building for inside activities (games, fitness)
- entertainment
- shuttles
- restrooms
- tailgating
- community input

“In your opinion, what activities should not be included at this place?”

Answers to this question varied as to the activities that should not be included in the public space. Responses included the following:

- a lot of playground equipment, sports fields, a train, a lot of parking,
- things contrary to conservation and family activities, retail/commercial,
- rollerblades and motorized equipment if the walking/bike path is small,
- skateboard park, too many indoor activities, too many pavilions, a bar,
- bait shops, firing and archery range, foreign plants, secluded parking areas, parking garage, grills, religious events, too many accommodations for tailgating, and caged animals.

“Do you think this is a worthwhile venture for the community? Why?”

When asked whether the public space is a worthwhile venture for the community, representatives from 21 organizations said yes, one said yes and no, and one said no. Representatives agreeing that this was a worthwhile venture provided the following reasons for their perspectives:

- the project bridges communities north and south of I-630, is great for the 12th Street area, improves the library, improves connectivity, adds another dimension of activities to the area, increases community amenities (bike trails, etc.), results in financial savings, increases physical activity, has a positive impact on city finances, increases the quality of life, increases green space in the city, provides needed wellness programs, increases transportation access, and reduces crime. Representatives who disagreed provided the following reasons: there will be no traffic improvements, and the overall scope is too big.
“What do you see as the primary advantage of this place?”
Representatives said the public space would provide multiple advantages, including the following:
- connectivity,
- aesthetic improvements,
- opportunities for additional activities for families,
- park space for children and communities,
- access to public facilities,
- health benefits,
- increased quality of life,
- value to the city,
- green space,
- potential use for area organizations and their stakeholders,
- safe space for community activities,
- a historic home,
- preventing the creation of a warehouse district,
- community revitalization,
- increased employment and economic growth,
- educational benefits,
- and existing facilities.

“What challenges could keep this project from happening? Name two.”
Organizations mentioned multiple challenges to the development of the public space, including the following:
- funding,
- buy-in from neighborhood associations,
- security,
- right-of-way access,
- engineering,
- coordination,
- maintenance,
- politics,
- disagreement over development,
- lack of a champion,
- public perception,
- traffic,
- resistance from homeowners,
- communication about the project,
- overpricing of food by vendors,
- attracting the community,
- and resistance if parking is reduced for existing businesses.

“Given what we’ve discussed, is the place something you would support or endorse? If not, why not? If so, can we use your name publicly?”
Representatives from 20 organizations endorse the public space. Of these 20 organizations, the University District Neighborhood Association and Broodmoor Neighborhood Association voted to publicly support the project. One representative does not think the organization should take a position on the issue, and two do not endorse the project; however, one stated the organization would support it if the public space project becomes a priority for the city manager and board.

“Is this something you think the city of Little Rock should support? If not, why not?”
Representatives from 20 organizations said the city of Little Rock should support the public space development. One representative said the city works with limited resources and questions whether the city should lead the project, and one said if the city manager and board support it, then the city should. One representative does not see a need for the project.
“If you could wish for something at this place, even though it might not be feasible, what would it be?”

When asked what their greatest wish would be for the public space, representatives’ responses include the following:

- open space/not too much structure
- art from local artists
- larger deck over I-630
- cancer survivors’ park
- restaurant that includes sustainable food grown on the property
- continued zoo development in the area
- a train
- waterfall
- zoo programming and attractions across the interstate
- wellness programs
- separation of traffic (pedestrian bicycle vehicles)
- larger pedestrian connections like the River Trail
- amphitheater
- playgrounds
- shelter
- welcoming entrance
- sports fields
- butterfly park for children with disabilities and physical challenges
- interactive sculpture
- walking trails
- water park
- splash pad
- restrooms
- children’s programming
- a permanent children’s committee
- ropes course
- hammock area
- camping
- bushes
- fountains
- sculpture garden
- sidewalk chalk area
- labyrinth/maze
- sculptured fountain
- emergency station
- blue security phones
- free Wi-Fi
- bird watching
- rock climbing for children and youth
- police presence
- pedestrian ramp
- talent shows
- weekend activities for children
- sky tram or monorail system
- bicycles for children
- a bike pit stop.

“We are attempting to contact numerous people. Is there anyone you would recommend we contact?”

Representatives suggest the following additional organizations be contacted: churches, Little Rock Board of Directors for Wards 2 and 3, property owners and neighborhood groups, StudioMAIN, Downtown Partnership, Coalition of Little Rock Neighborhoods, Mark Cannaday (vice chancellor of facilities), City Director Bruce Moore, state representatives, Lisa Beulher (chair of the zoo foundation), Fred Knight (chair of the zoo board of directors), Brad Cazort (zoo board of directors), Gary Smith (former commissioner), Van Tilbury (president of East Harding construction), Stacy Hurst (Arkansas Heritage), Gentry Love (with the city), Casey Covington (Metroplan), Mark Perry (executive director for New Futures),
Tauheed Salaam (Promise Neighborhood Children International), schools in the area, Blue and You Community Benefit, Natural Wonders Partnership Council, Judy Webber (Arkansas Children’s Hospital Research Institute researcher), Emily English, Madison Heights residents, Jason Ray (St. Mark facilities director), Jason Bilson (St. Mark youth pastor), LaShana Bruce (director of the Tyler Street Opportunity Center through Fellowship Bible Church), and Stella Capek (sociology professor at Hendrix).

“Finally, do you have anything else you would like to add or share?”

Representatives of the organizations provided additional comments including the following:

- Public Works should be more involved in the planning;
- capital money from Public Works cannot be used for this project at this time;
- the project is interesting and should be a city project; the project will help uplift the community;
- the zoo would like to be involved in this project and have a relationship with the library;
- concern about the stadium and parking (especially when there are special events);
- the use of War Memorial stadium has changed;
- roundabouts are disliked but can be useful;
- UAMS is interested in possibly providing funding for the public space;
- the public space should be smoke-free (including e-cigarettes);
- the project should move forward quickly and needs a champion;
- should look into the Blue Zone concept and a reduction in absenteeism because of a public space;
- health benefits are tied to a project like this;
- look into the Robert Wood Johnson and Blue and You Foundation for funding; narrowing Jonesboro St. should not be too much of an issue;
- Madison Heights is willing to assist with the project; the public space should increase library use in the area;
- the area is ideal for low-density/multi-family housing;
- should consider retail; and,
- the area should emphasize natural resources and history.
Table 2. Stakeholder Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broodmoor Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Park Residents Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross Baptist Church</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Heights Apartments</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark Baptist Church</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University District Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Community Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Development District</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Children’s Hospital</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Department of Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Advocates of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>Hobbyists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock Bike Pedestrian Coordinator</td>
<td>Hobbyists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Master Gardener Program</td>
<td>Hobbyists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Master Naturalists</td>
<td>Hobbyists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State Highway Commission</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Dept</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock Planning and Development</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock Public Works</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock Zoo</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Region Metro</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial Stadium</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other relevant organizations were contacted, but did not participate for a variety of reasons (e.g., did not think project applicable, did not respond, or referred us to another organization).
Transportation

- Complete Streets
- Intra-park Connectivity
- Arterial Flow & Traffic-Calming measures
- Pedestrian-friendly
- Bike-friendly

CALS must address the area’s transportation situation (intra-park connection; roads; intersections; signage, etc). Working with transportation interests (e.g., BACA; Complete Streets; Arkansas Department of Highways and Transportation; City of Little Rock Department of Transportation, etc), CALS has to explore intra-park transportation solutions with these interests to:
  - correct arterial flow with reconfiguration of through streets and options, e.g., close northbound Jonesboro to daily through traffic (installing removal barricades), reconfigure lanes to accommodate pedestrian/bicycle lanes and less intensive intrapark transportation, and ensure safe pedestrian traffic across the I-630 bridge.
  - support the reconfiguration of intersections and other methods for instituting the Complete Streets concept by introducing road diet and traffic calming measures in area.
  - CALS should explore a partnership with City of Little Rock and the Little Rock Zoo to develop park intra-connectivity via a train/trolley.

Transportation and arterial improvements throughout the public space increases safety, improves alternative transportation methods, supports community development, and encourages healthy lifestyle practices. The three primary modes of transportation in this space are: motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Motor Vehicles
The existing transportation corridors in the area are designed for motor vehicle traffic mobility. With the continued reliance on motor vehicles as a preferred mode of transportation, vehicle miles traveled on public roads have steadily increased over time (USDOT, 2016); while Americans love their cars, new trends reveal younger generations of drivers do not acquire their licenses at the same rate as previous generations (Sivak and Schoettlea 2012), which leads to questions about sustaining current transportation emphases on roads to one that emphasizes “complete streets” and intermodal plans that include alternative forms of transportation, e.g., pedestrian, bicycles, public transit, etc. As a result of these changing patterns of vehicular choice and preferences, improvements to motor vehicle
facilities need to be considered as Jonesboro Drive currently divides the public space and concentrates transportation on motor vehicles.

The existing conditions demonstrate the focus on motor vehicles. Currently, if one heads north on Jonesboro Drive from 12th Street, Jonesboro Drive is a divided four-lane boulevard that dissects the public space and, just south of the Interstate 630 (I-630) overpass, it transitions to a single two-lane road only to change again briefly to a single three-lane roadway on the north side of I-630, and then returns to a single two-lane roadway at Zoo Drive (and the Little Rock Zoo) near the entrance of UAMS/War Memorial parking lot. Though designated as a collector street\(^1\), Jonesboro Drive serves as a “cut-through” between West Markham Street and 12\(^{th}\) Street, but it is mainly a morning and afternoon ingress/egress route for state employees and UAMS employees arriving and leaving work. The average daily traffic volumes (ADT) for state and city roads in the area are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Average Daily Traffic Volumes for Area Streets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>ADT Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro Drive</td>
<td>5,000*</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Street</td>
<td>14,000*</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate 630</td>
<td>105,000**</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: City of Little Rock Department of Public Works  
**Source: Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department

In an effort to focus the public space on transportation modes relevant to recreation and healthy lifestyles and thereby deemphasize motor vehicles in the area, it is necessary to redesign street improvements reflective of multi-use transportation options with an emphasis on pedestrians and bicyclists. To catalyze this re-emphasis, a road diet is recommended; a road diet is a low-cost alternative because instead of reconstructing roads, it reallocates or redistributes the existing roadway space more equitably among all modes of transportation (FHWA, 2014). A road diet for Jonesboro Drive would require it to be moved from four to two travel lanes, which is suitable because such changes are typically successfully implemented on roads with traffic volumes up to 23,000 vehicles per day (Stamatiadis & Kirk, 2012).\(^2\) The first phase of the proposed plan would close the northbound side of the divided Jonesboro Drive, between 12th Street and the I-630 bridge, and move both northbound and southbound traffic to a single lane in each direction on the southbound side of Jonesboro Drive. Traffic would be shifted to the west side of the I-630 bridge to align with the southbound side of Jonesboro Drive, then transition into the existing Jonesboro Drive north of the I-630 bridge.

Realigning Jonesboro Drive to meet 12th Street at South Jackson Street allows for the possible increased likelihood of a traffic signal being warranted at this location, addressing not only stakeholder concerns about the proposed road diet, but likely improving intersection

\(^1\) Collector streets function to provide access to property, as well as to connect local streets to main arterials or other roads designed for larger volumes of traffic. 

\(^2\) Road diets are proven measures to increase safety; road diets result in reduced crash rates of up to 44 percent (Gates, Noyce, Talada, & Hill, 2007). The Federal Highway Administration research suggests that agencies should expect a 29 percent reduction in crash rates after the completion of a road diet project (FHWA, 2015).
operation over existing conditions. The slight curves introduced into the horizontal alignment of Jonesboro Drive will also act as traffic calming measures, as described in the Little Rock Master Street Plan, to improve safety for all users of this transportation corridor.

Any modifications to Jonesboro Drive are subject to approval by the City of Little Rock, likely through the Board of Directors, Planning Commission, and the Departments of Public Works and Planning and Development.

**Non-motorized Vehicles and Pedestrians**

One of the primary goals for resolving transportation issues in this public space is via Complete Streets principles that work to increase connectivity and accessibility and improve safety for all modes of transportation within the space, as well as between the place and adjacent neighborhoods. This goal of creating safe transportation within this place complements the City of Little Rock’s Complete Streets policy (which was passed in April 2015). The Complete Streets policy requires that “streets should be constructed and maintained such that all forms of transportation may safely and freely use the streets of Little Rock – pedestrian, non-motorized, and motorized” (City of Little Rock, 2014). The Complete Streets policy also defines non-motorized vehicles, which are bicycles and tricycles, and pedestrians, which in addition to conventional pedestrians, include those in wheelchairs (manual or electric), on roller skates or rollerblades, or small children on toy bikes. As a result, Complete Streets projects always aim to benefit all users of a transportation corridor, but usually give greater priority to pedestrians and non-motorized vehicles compared to existing conditions with streets designed around accommodating primarily motor vehicles. As well, promoting alternative modes of transportation through policy poses other benefits to citizens, such as health and fitness and community development.

Though the goal is to institute the Complete Streets policy in the public space, the current situation is not conducive to non-motorized and pedestrian use. For example, there are no designated bicycle lanes within the project area and sidewalks are inadequate. There are sidewalks on Fair Park Boulevard, Zoo Drive, 12th Street, and on Jonesboro Drive north of the I-630 bridge; the streets surrounding the Hillary Rodham Clinton Children’s Library have sidewalks (West 10th/Madison Streets). From the Zoo Drive and Jonesboro Drive intersection south, there are sidewalks to the I-630 bridge, at which point these sidewalks end; yet, these sidewalks are not continuous and on the same side of the street. South of the I-630 bridge on Jonesboro Drive, there are no sidewalks. Without sidewalks and a connected sidewalk infrastructure, non-motorized vehicles and pedestrians are forced to share the roadway with motor vehicles. In fact, most egregious is forcing pedestrians and non-motorized vehicles to use the grassy areas along Jonesboro Drive, or navigate the curb-and-gutter along both sides of the divided roadway. These conditions make the area non-ADA accessible or compliant.

Further, Jonesboro Drive is identified as a Class III bike route\(^3\) that only requires “sharrow” markings for bicycles, which is a designation that requires bicyclists to share the road with motor vehicles with no physical separation. Should the proposed road diet be implemented,

---

\(^3\) Streets with speeds less than 30 miles per hour and volumes less than half design volume require Class I or Class II accommodations.
Jonesboro Drive is likely to be reclassified; such a reclassification would require Class I (bike paths) or Class II (bike lanes) facilities, which is proposed as part of this plan.

To accommodate and emphasize non-motorized vehicle and pedestrian use of the public space, the considerations forwarded with regard to transportation involve reconfiguring existing streets and intersections, implementing pedestrian-friendly improvements, and making other intra-connectivity improvements.

The foremost consideration for improving intra-connectivity is to convert northbound lanes of Jonesboro Drive to pedestrian and non-motorized vehicle use only (i.e., no motor vehicle traffic). The change is consistent with road diet measures necessary to promote safety and alternate modes of transportation. Closing northbound lanes of Jonesboro Drive through the I-630 bridge can be accomplished with installing a low-cost physical barrier separating motor vehicles on the west side of the bridge from non-motorized vehicles and pedestrians on the east side of the bridge, e.g., flexible delineator posts (FHWA, 2015). To increase the safety of pedestrian and non-motor vehicle users of the I-630 bridge, railings need to be replaced and raised; the current open railings are only 28-inches high, or about the height of a typical household side table, which does not instill a comfortable, confident, and safe feeling when walking across the bridge. Additionally, for these new railings, themes extolling the virtues of the Hillary Clinton Children’s Library and other War Memorial Park facilities, such as the Little Rock Zoo, can be used in the design of these railings.

The incorporation of library, zoo, and park themes can also be used for other transportation based considerations for improving the connectivity of this public space. Creating hospitable environments for non-motorized vehicle and pedestrians is crucial for establishing connectivity; to do so, the existing sidewalks, as well as any new trails, can incorporate into the concrete and asphalt designs these themes to build a sense of identity for the public space. As well, the existing and new trails and sidewalks that span the greater War Memorial Park can be unified to connect these different parts into a comprehensive trail system. Such connectivity promotes the connection of the Hillary Rodham Clinton Children’s Library, the War Memorial Park area, and the Little Rock Zoo as one unified space.

The Urban Bikeway Design Guide calls for painted bicycle facilities, such as the green lanes, which are promoted as part of the Green Lane Project. Such aesthetic improvements provide visual and artistic appeal to non-motorized vehicles and pedestrians. Moreover, any pavement can be treated to provide additional visual separation from motor vehicles (by using asphalt and concrete treatments, such as asphalt thermoplastic stamping and stamped and/or colored concrete).

---

4 A project affiliated with the National Association of City Transportation Officials.
Health-Oriented Activities

- Healthy Living & Lifestyles
- Health-focused Activities
- Health-focused Amenities
- Nutrition Education and Resources

CALS can establish an overt commitment to healthy living/lifestyles for this public place. Given the presence of area hospitals and health care facilities, this public space should take advantage of these constituent assets to forward a health-oriented focus for the community. Such a focus on health can address obesity (child and adult), physical activity and exercise, nutrition and healthy food availability, and health education. To accentuate and emphasize the area as a healthy endeavor, CALS can capitalize on these area assets to develop activities and enhance facilities.

Healthy Living
As a majority of Americans do not average the minimum physical activity recommended for healthy living (Bedimo-Rung, Mowen, & Cohen, 2005), amenities offered in the public space, such as walking and bike trails, increase access to physical activity for Little Rock’s citizens. For citizens in adjacent neighborhoods, the public space offers opportunities for increased physical activity within walking distance, a benefit that is of great value to communities comprised of minority and children populations (Bedimo-Rung, Mowen, & Cohen, 2005). The outdoor public spaces, such as proposed herein, provide numerous health benefits, including increased access to physical activity and lowered obesity and stress rates (Blanck, Allen, Bashir, et al. 2012; Bedimo-Rung, Mowen, & Cohen, 2005).

There are likely health benefits that can accrue to communities in which healthy living programs are a focus. For example, one of the leading health issues in Arkansas is obesity; Arkansas has the highest adult obesity rate in our nation (Levi et al. 2015). Research demonstrates that lack of activity among children and adults can lead to obesity, which the proposed activities and programs can hopefully address (Bedimo-Rung, Mowen, Cohen. 2005). Increasing access to places conducive to physical activity, such as through a dedicated public space, can positively affect obesity rates and improve the overall health and wellbeing of adults using this public space for exercise (Blanck, Allen, Bashir, et al. 2012; Bedimo-Rung, Mowen, & Cohen, 2005).

Focusing this public space on healthy living aligns with programs already offered by CALS at the Children’s Library. Specifically, having facility enhancements and activities in the public space to address obesity in children and adults only reinforces this healthy living focus through current programs that expose children to healthy eating habits and basic cooking skills; the Children’s Library already houses the Teaching Kitchen and the Teaching Garden. These healthy living proposals complement the Cooking Matters program, which is sponsored
by Arkansas Children’s Hospital, and teaches families healthy eating habits. The Children’s Library is also a distribution site for The Dream Center, a local nonprofit that administers “Food for Good,” a DHS-funded program that provides prepackaged snacks and suppers to individuals in need (Mitchell, 2016). These proposed facility enhancements and activities expand existing healthy-living focused programs and emphasize health, wellness, and nutrition activities in this public space.

Other programs that emphasize or complement this healthy living focus are summarized as potential program, activity or amenity options for such focus. Stakeholders identified some of these activities as those they would like to see included in the public space. A few examples applicable to healthy living include the following:

**Community Garden**

The benefits of community gardens are multi-faceted. In addition to enhanced nutrition and opportunity for increased physical activity, community gardens also build social capital through interactions among diverse groups of people. Additional benefits offered by a community garden are: improved neighborhood aesthetics; a safe outlet for outdoor activities; and, additional opportunities for education programming (Shinew, Glover, & Parry, 2004; Twiss, et al., 2003).

**Farmers Market**

A Farmers Market offers a greater diversity in food product that bolsters community health by creating opportunities for positive social interactions and nutritional education (Brown & Miller, 2008). CALS can model programs of the Center for Urban Education about Sustainable Agriculture (CUESA), a nonprofit organization that provides educational experiences in conjunction with the operation of farmers markets, to highlight the benefits of a sustainable local agriculture to the community (CUESA: Cultivating a Healthy Food System, 2016). CUESA promotes programs aimed at high school students to introduce them to growing and selling their own food (CUESA 2016). CUESA’s FoodWise Kids program introduces elementary school children to fresh produce by showing them the produce and teaching them how to prepare it in their own homes; this program also includes modules about nutrition and sustainability (CUESA 2016).

**Outdoor Kitchen**

An outdoor kitchen works in conjunction with amenities currently provided at the Children’s Library; for example, the Teaching Garden program, which provides hands-on food education experiences, can be aligned with an outdoor kitchen program to demonstrate to patrons how garden items move from the garden to the table. An excellent example of an outdoor kitchen and program is evidenced by the Alemany Outdoor Kitchen in San Francisco (https://center.cca.edu/alemany-outdoor-kitchen).

**Walking Trail Connectivity and Marking**

Establishing a complete area-wide trail system by creating new trails and improve existing trails promotes physical activity that can affect unusually high
obesity rates for Arkansas children and adults (The Trails and Greenways Clearinghouse, n.d.).
Community Amenities

- Active Recreational amenities
- Cultural amenities
- Native Arkansas programming
- Collaborative programming

To sustain this new public space, specific cultural and recreational amenities are a requisite aspect, thus should be an integral part of establishing and sustaining it. Active, collaborative programs and amenities that emphasize or complement the development of this public space are provided below; these suggested programs or amenities are identified by stakeholders as those community amenities to include in the public space. A few examples are offered to exemplify those programs and amenities that community constituents identified as appropriate for such a public space; these are:

Botanical Garden
Identify and develop space for a botanical garden in this public space. A botanical garden comprised of a reasonably permanent and well-documented collection of living plants is maintained not only for aesthetic purposes, but also to aid in research, conservation, and education (Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI), n.d.). A botanical garden offers many benefits that align with the education and conservation goals of the Children’s Library and the Little Rock Zoo; e.g., a section of the garden can be dedicated to the preservation of plant species leading to the restoration and rehabilitation of fragile habitats, research and development of sustainable and hardy plant species, as well as community education on the importance of plant and habitat conservation (BGCI, n.d.).

Children’s Chalk Pad.
A ‘chalk pad’ – a specific area designated for children to create drawings with colored chalk (which is provided) – provides creative entertainment for children and families, as well as outside visitors to the public space. The chalk pad can also serve as a specific location to host art events and other cultural activities held in this public space.

Interactive Art Zone
In collaboration with area art groups, this public space should include a public art space or zone. Public art is art designed by an artist specifically for a public site; typically, these pieces incorporate specifics of the site, audience, environment, and history. Public art bestows many benefits on a community, such as fostering civic dialogue and community, bolstering economic activity, connecting artists with the community, and enhancing public appreciation of art
Interactive exhibits allow patrons of the public space to experience art through hands-on play and exploration; interactive play also fosters creativity and critical thinking among participants. Examples of public art exhibits in parks are available in New York, NY and Lewiston, NY. For specific examples, see the Brooklyn Bridge Park in New York, NY (www.brooklynbridgepark.org/places/public-art) and Emerald Grove in the City of Lewiston’s (NY) ArtPark (www.artpark.net/artpark-visual-arts-emerald-grove-art-installation).

Wildlife & Animal Conservation Program
Simultaneous complementary programming between the Little Rock Zoo and the Children’s Library creates a viable learning-doing connection. A dedicated space for the Little Rock Zoo to implement educational programming for children and families using zoo animals brings the zoo to the library. The Little Rock Zoo is interested in establishing a collaborative relationship with the Children’s Library; this relationship can supplement the zoo’s conservation education mission, as well as expand existing programs (Blakely, 2016; The Little Rock Zoo, n.d.). Such a partnership expands the library’s youth programming, especially in the immediate area, to serve children in neighborhoods adjacent to the library. Examples of such programming are available via the Audubon Nature Institute, Toledo Zoo and Aquarium, and the Phoenix Zoo. Examples of such programs are available; please see: the Audubon Nature Institute’s Zoo Family Nature Clubs (http://www.audubonnatureinstitute.org/education-programs-content/420-Zoo-Family-Nature-Clubs); the program at the Toledo Zoo and Aquarium Nature’s Neighborhood (https://www.toledozoo.org/natures-neighborhood); and, the Phoenix Zoo’s Special Needs Program (http://phoenixzoo.org/camps-programs/special-needs-programs/).

Birdwatching Program
In collaboration with Audubon Arkansas, the Children’s Library can explore a birdwatching program in this proposed public space. The area immediately surrounding the Children’s Library is currently developed to match some of the different native wildlife habitats of Arkansas and can be tailored to watching wildlife, including birds (Central Arkansas Library System, 2016). Audubon Arkansas, the state’s chapter of the National Audubon Society, currently offers educational programming for children and adults at the Little Rock Audubon Center that should be adaptable to the Children’s Library. Developing this public space as a habitat for birdwatching and offering a birdwatching program for patrons will serve to expand these programs to a new audience and enhance programming for both organizations.

Midtown Dog Park
Identify and develop space for a dog park in this public space. Dog parks, public parks that are usually fenced to allow people to play freely with their dogs, are rapidly increasing in number throughout the United States (American Kennel Club, n.d.). Dog Parks offer a number of benefits to dogs, dog owners, and the community at large. Such benefits include providing a safe space for dogs to
exercise and socialize, promoting responsible dog ownership, affording dog owners a place to socialize, and promoting public health and safety (American Kennel Club, n.d.). The dog park in this public space can emulate the existing dog parks in Little Rock, the MacArthur Park Dog Park, and Murray Park Paws Park. These dog parks offer fenced areas on two acres and segregated space for large and small dogs. Each area contains water troughs and fountains, benches, and supplies for owners to clean up after their dogs (Friends of Paws Park, n.d.).

*Outdoor Amphitheater/Outdoor Reading Area*

An outdoor space of this nature, which is commonly referred to as a “library lawn” or “an open-air library,” introduces library programming in a different environment, as well as additional space for programming (e.g., collaborative programs with Audubon, the Little Rock Zoo, the Little Rock Parks Department, and others). Outdoor libraries typically consist of a designated area where books are read (including those checked out at the library) and library programs are conducted. Outdoor libraries exist in numerous cities in the United States and provide opportunities for library users to read outdoors. For example, Auckland, New Zealand uses a large storage container to create an open outdoor library (Auckland’s Heart of the City, 2011), while in Brooklyn (NY) there is a lawn library called Governor’s Island that was started by the New York City Public Library System (Yoneda, 2013) (for more examples see [http://flavorwire.com/386979/20-amazing-outdoor-libraries-and-bookstores-from-all-over-the-world](http://flavorwire.com/386979/20-amazing-outdoor-libraries-and-bookstores-from-all-over-the-world)).
Branding

- Aesthetic Appeal
- Programming
- Proximity
- Connectivity
- Family-friendly
- Active learning
- Accessibility

Successful place-making initiatives have a unifying theme – private and public interests who partner resources to achieve a mutually beneficial vision. A vibrant place-making venture is the result of an active and well-organized association working through CALS with local interests. This collaborative arrangement allows all entities to work together for mutual benefit, while CALS serves as a unified voice representing area interests and facilitating marketing, promotions, and event coordination.

While successful place-making initiatives typically involve a collaborative public/private partnership, most have other entities actively involved in marketing, promotions, and branding efforts. To exploit this public space, a central marketing strategy is required; this strategy should be prepared by a local agency. A comprehensive marketing strategy positions this public space as a vibrant learning, living, social, and recreational center for the community and presents an agreed-upon image of this space to generate public support for the space and area.

A comprehensive marketing plan must be created that combines use of various media to generate excitement about this public space. As is common to most marketing campaigns, there should be a marketing campaign revolving around a central slogan, a commitment to the niche for this place, and collateral materials aimed at the community, current constituents, and prospective private sector interests. As recognized through the extensive outreach conducted for this research, a niche for this public space should be considered; themes emerging from stakeholder conversations included concepts of “connectivity,” “education,” “healthy lifestyles,” “wellness,” and “nutrition.” Branding efforts should recognize these elements to engage the community, which is important for generating and sustaining public support for this effort.
The Community Context

- Community Characteristics
- Public Safety

Community Characteristics

Understanding area communities, their perspectives and assets, is imperative for CALS to succeed in developing this public space. Acquiring community “buy-in” creates validation from key area constituents – the community – about the development of this public space. In gaining community members’ buy-in, CALS garners support from those neighborhoods most directly affected by this public space redevelopment – Fair Park, 12th Street, War Memorial, and Hillcrest. In fact, involving community members in the creation of this public space generates commitment from these communities (Onyemah 2013). Direct and indirect involvement of community members in the creation of the public space engenders their support; direct involvement sees constituents taking an active part in the implementation of the public space, e.g., by creating interest through information, meetings, and activities. With indirect involvement, community member assimilation into the process is accomplished through representation of their community characteristics.

Engaging adjacent communities in inclusive placemaking begins with understanding these communities and identifying community characteristics as assets, e.g., demographic and economic characteristics. The community characteristics also assist the placemaking of this public space by determining amenities and activities that complement the community’s collective identity. Also, understanding the community’s economic circumstances provides insight to the types of amenities and activities that can be supported, as well as the types of educational programming that best serves these community constituents.

Demographic Characteristics (2010 census figures acquired from USA.com are used for this section)
The neighborhoods immediately surrounding this public space are quite diverse. For the 12th Street corridor neighborhoods (physically an area bordered by University to Elm and I-630 to 20th Street), the population consists primarily of Blacks (84%) and Whites (15%) with small populations of Hispanics (1%) and Asians (<1%). The population in this area is dominated by women, who comprise 60 percent of the area’s population; the median age of this area is 34 years old. The predominant age group is the 25 to 44 year old group at 30 percent; the 45 to 64 year old group comprises 23 percent of the area. These neighborhoods are dominated by low income earners, as the median household income for the area is about $25,000; well over half of these households (~60%) in this area earn less than $30,000 annually. Forty-two percent of this population lives in poverty. Housing in the area mirrors the income levels – 43 percent of housing is owner occupied and the median housing value for the area is $75,000;
most homes in the area are over 50 years old, with about 40 percent being built prior to the 1960s.

In contrast to the 12th Street corridor neighborhoods is the Hillcrest neighborhood (physically an area bordered by University to Cedar and Markham to Evergreen/Lookout/Cantrell). The population consists primarily of Whites (88%) and Blacks (6%), with small populations of Asians (4%) and Hispanics (2%). The population in this area is divided between women, who comprise 52 percent of the area's population, and men, who comprise 48 percent of the population. The median age of this area is 34 years old. The predominant age group is the 25 to 44 year old group at nearly 40 percent; the 45 to 64 year old group comprises 26 percent of the area. These neighborhoods are dominated by middle income earners, as the median household income for the area is about $60,000; about one-third of households (~35%) in this area earn more than $75,000 annually. Ten percent of this population lives in poverty. Housing in the area mirrors the income levels – 85 percent of housing is owner occupied and the median housing value for the area is nearly $200,000; most homes in the area are over 50 years old, with about 75 percent being built prior to the 1960s.

**Economic Characteristics**

Understanding the local economic situations aids CALS by informing it of commercial constituents in the area that can benefit from more consumer traffic in the immediate area. In collaborating with area merchants and commercial interests, these entities can support the public space through direct or in-kind support; further, these interests may be able to sponsor amenities or activities as proposed in this report. Cultivating these relationships is important not only to CALS, but also for the community and its neighborhoods.

There are many businesses in the community adjacent to the proposed public space. These businesses consist mainly of fast food restaurants, medical services, and convenience stores (with gas pumps). As CALS can expect this public space to develop into a central destination for outdoor and recreational activities, adjacent enterprises will likely benefit from the influx of new patrons; thus, collaborating with existing businesses, as well as attracting new businesses, can benefit the placemaking effort catalyzing this public space.

**Public Safety**

Safety is an important issue for communities, but especially so in public places such as the public space proposed for this project. One notable way that public space improves the community is by increasing the levels of safety for those who use it. The importance of added safety in this public space increases the likely utilization of this area by the community; as well, enhanced safety encourages community ownership, participation, and shared responsibility of the area.

Creating this public space improves the area by transforming an area currently underutilized in terms of usefulness to the community into an enjoyable and safe environment. Currently, much of the land bordering Jonesboro Drive from 12th Street to I-630 is vacant; these vacant lots are minimally maintained. Vacant land left unattended poses threats to public safety and
security in and around the public space. The proposed public space provides a more safe environment for citizens (Sherer 2006); in fact, as Sherer (2006: 21) observes, “[i]ncreased access to public parks and facilities has been strongly linked to reductions in crime and in particular to reduced juvenile delinquency.” Public safety concerns are declining in the area, particularly with improvements along to the 12th Street corridor, including the Children’s Library and the Downtown Patrol Headquarters (City of Little Rock). Creating a public space as proposed continues this decline by providing a space that will be better utilized by the community. Community involvement in developing the space and aligning programming and recreational activities with community aspirations will likely extend the lower crime trend for the area; in fact, neighborhood parks are correlated with lower levels of crime (Sherer 2006).

In addition to the positive effects likely realized by increased utilization of the land surrounding the Children’s Library and Jonesboro Drive, there are other safety issues addressed with the proposed public space. Pedestrian safety is improved by simply realigning Jonesboro Drive to 12th Street; through realignment, pedestrians and cyclists can more safely navigate the intersection. In addition to realignment, sidewalk improvements in the public space will improve walkability in the area, thus enhancing pedestrian safety as well.

These improvements, coupled with the location of the 12th Street Police Substation, should work to improve the livability of the area. Overall, the proposed public space should positively affect public safety in the immediate community, which is a benefit for all residents living in these neighborhoods.
Funding

- Alternative Funding Sources
- Projected budget

This report offers a proposed budget and funding recommendations to supplement resources for the programming and amenities set forth herein. Public spaces (as well as parks) across the nation depend on a variety of revenue streams to fund operations, amenities, improvements, and expansions. Historically, public spaces exploit a myriad of resources such as taxes, grants, user fees and service fees, private and corporate donations, investment income, bonds, government revenues (general or dedicated), and in-kind contributions or services in order to establish, sustain, or expand operations. The availability of sufficient financial resources for operational and capital expenses for parks is among the myriad of concerns expressed by park and recreation administrators (Rocky et al. 2016). As a result, for contemporary parks and recreation officials, there is no on-size-fits-all approach to secure funding due to the diversity of lands and facilities, as well as differences in park size and scope of operations.

Because of the diverse range of initiatives and features in this project, there are an abundance of potential sources of funding to explore to support this project moving forward. Grants, both federal and local, provide funding and technical assistance for projects with a wide-ranging or general focus, such as education, community development, poverty, the environment, health benefits, and/or economic development. Other grants are available for specific aspects of this public space project that may include leisure and recreation amenities, such as wetland ecosystems, art features, farmers’ markets, community gardens, trails, Arkansas history, and native plant protection. Foundations and corporations with local interests, such as the Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation, Entergy, and Bank of America, all of whom have previously supported community projects, are other potential sources of funding (see Funding Matrix). Walls (2013: 20-24) offers a host of examples for alternative funding for parks – e.g., Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Tax Increment Financing (TIF), Impact Fees, etc. – but accentuates the role of philanthropic organizations in funding parks. Evidently parks in larger metropolitan areas have long engaged “[p]ark advocacy organizations, foundations, and conservancies [to] play a major role in many cities” in financing or funding park activities and operations (Walls 2013: 17).

To inject these alternative funding sources into the conversation about this new public space, examples of local grant funding sources are offered for review and use (see below). These alternative funding sources rely on establishing collaborative partnerships with area institutions – charitable, foundation, and private – sharing similar emphases for specific programming or amenity proposals offered in this report. A selection of these alternative funding sources provides examples of such funding:
The **Blue and You Foundation** for a healthier Arkansas is a charitable foundation established and funded by Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The goal of this foundation is to help promote healthier lifestyles in Arkansas. This organization funds nonprofit and governmental proposals for projects that positively affect the health of Arkansans; the foundation is inclined to support projects emphasizing health-care delivery, health-care policy, and health-care economics. Blue and You offers annual grants ranging from $5,000 up to $150,000, as well as mini-grants of $1,000 that support health improvements and/or health-related activities. This foundation has funded many park/fitness trails in Arkansas over the last three years, e.g., The Exercise Station Project (Wynne Public Schools, $42,900 in 2014), Craighead Forest Park Trail Fitness Project (City of Jonesboro, $145,030 in 2015), and Fighting Obesity with Fitness Plan (City of Camden, $150,000 in 2016); see [http://www.blueandyoufoundationarkansas.com/grants_awarded/](http://www.blueandyoufoundationarkansas.com/grants_awarded/).

**Charitable Hospitals** (i.e., those with nonprofit 501(c)(3) status) adhere to new Affordable Care Act standards requiring Charitable Hospitals to perform a ‘community health needs assessment’ (CHNA) every three years; upon identifying these needs, hospitals are required to address these needs via community investment (for which ‘uncompensated care’ once qualified for and met these investment requirements). The community assessment is required of Charitable Hospitals to maintain their nonprofit status. Once conducted, an action plan must be developed by the hospital in a strategic plan and identify how these findings are implemented. These strategic plans are available from hospitals and, upon inspection, can demonstrate correspondence between CHNA and recommended strategies herein, e.g., wellness programs.

The **Trails for Life Grant Program** provides incentives to promote active healthy lifestyles by supporting the development of exercise facilities in local neighborhoods and parks. Established in 2001, the Arkansas Trails for Life Grant Program uses funds made available to the Arkansas Department of Health through the Tobacco Settlement Proceeds Act. Through this grant program, the Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism and the Arkansas Department of Health work together to establish a foundation for creating a higher level of physical activity and better community health by providing non-matching incentive grants. These grants are limited to trails specifically designed for providing health and fitness benefits ([http://www.outdoorgrants.com/Trail%20Grants/](http://www.outdoorgrants.com/Trail%20Grants/))
Alternative Funding Sources

Funding sources are provided for national and local sources of support for activities and programs suggested in this project report, as well as for existing CALS programs. The information about funding sources is arranged according to funding organization, purpose, etc., (see below) and includes relevant information about the funding source and any pertinent qualifying information or requirements. Yet, as funding sources do change objectives and philanthropic interests, these funding sources must be revisited periodically to determine whether their funding objectives remain consistent with these programs (as listed, or noted below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Funding Organization/Unit</th>
<th>Purpose: a brief objective of funds</th>
<th>Eligibility requirements: any special qualifying requirements specific to acquiring funds</th>
<th>Eligible Organizations: any special organizational qualifying requirements</th>
<th>Cash Match/In kind Match: any special resource qualifying requirements</th>
<th>Notes: any additional information about funding source</th>
<th>Source: a website url for locating funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Sources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> US Department of Agriculture: Farmers Market Promotion Program</td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> to develop farmers markets</td>
<td><strong>Eligibility requirements:</strong> 20% of population live in poverty</td>
<td><strong>Eligible Organizations:</strong> Nonprofits; local government</td>
<td><strong>Cash Match/In kind Match:</strong> no</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> n/a</td>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> <a href="http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?navid=GRANTS_LOANS">http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?navid=GRANTS_LOANS</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong> US Environmental Protection Agency: Smart Growth Implementation Assistance</td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> to provide technical assistance to assist in meeting environmental goals</td>
<td><strong>Eligibility requirements:</strong> “smart growth” mixed land uses, walkable neighborhoods, strong sense of place, community collaboration, preservation of open space, variety of transportation choices</td>
<td><strong>Eligible Organizations:</strong> local and state governments; nonprofits in partnership with a governmental entity</td>
<td><strong>Cash Match/In kind Match:</strong> Technical assistance</td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> typically assist 3-5 communities per year</td>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> <a href="http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth">http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Name:** 5 Star Wetland and Urban Waters Restoration Grants  
**Purpose:** The Five Star and Urban Waters Restoration Grant Program brings together students, conservation corps, other youth groups, citizen groups, corporations, landowners and government agencies to provide environmental education and training through projects that restore wetlands and streams.  
**Eligibility requirements:** Must be a community-based restoration project  
**Eligible Organizations:** Organization with five star projects, such as healthy wetlands.  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** No  
**Notes:** Funding levels range from $10,000 to $40,000, with $20,000 as the average amount awarded per project. At the completion of Five Star projects, each partnership will have experience and a demonstrated record of accomplishment, and will be well-positioned to take on other projects.  
**Source:** [www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov)

---

**Name:** US Department of the Interior: Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)  
**Purpose:** to provide funding and technical assistance for protection and development of public outdoor recreation use  
**Eligibility requirements:** Funds must be administered through appointed State Liaison Officer  
**Eligible Organizations:** States, and through the states to local governments  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** up to 50% of total project-related allowable costs  
**Notes:** n/a  
**Source:** [https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf](https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf)

---

**Purpose:** to promote the long-term conservation and maintenance of North American wetland ecosystems and dependent wildlife (waterfowl)  
**Eligibility requirements:** acquisition, restoration, enhancement of wetlands  
**Eligible Organizations:** No restrictions on who may apply  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** Match can be cash or in-kind  
**Notes:** n/a  
**Source:** [https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf](https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf)
Name: US Department of Interior: Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA)
Purpose: to provide technical assistance for planning or implementing outdoor recreation initiatives
Eligibility requirements: preserving natural areas, developing trails, park planning
Eligible Organizations: state or local government agencies, nonprofits, citizen groups
Cash Match/In kind Match: no
Notes: n/a

Name: US Department of Transportation: Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
Purpose: funding for transportation alternatives
Eligibility requirements: pedestrian and bicycle trails, sidewalks, signals, lighting, safe routes for non-drivers
Eligible Organizations: local governments, regional transportation authorities, education agencies, school districts, public land agencies
Cash Match/In kind Match: 80% federal to 20% state or local match with a sliding scale
Notes: n/a

Name: National Endowment for the Arts: Our Town Program
Purpose: to contribute toward the livability of communities with the arts at their core
Eligibility requirements: projects that improve quality of life, creative activity, community identity, economic development through arts engagement, cultural planning, design
Eligible Organizations: partnership between a cultural nonprofit and local government entity
Cash Match/In kind Match: nonfederal match of 1:1, the in-kind can be allowed as part of the match, or it can be all cash.
Notes: n/a
Name: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation: Environmental Solutions for Communities Grant Program  
**Purpose:** supporting highly visible projects that link economic development and communities and well-being  
**Eligibility requirements:** undetermined  
**Eligible Organizations:** nonprofits, local governments, educational institutions in states where Wells Fargo operates  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** 1:1 match  
**Notes:** n/a  
**Source:** [https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf](https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf)  

Name: National Fish and Wildlife Foundation: Native Plant Conservation Initiative (NPCI)  
**Purpose:** protects, enhances, and restores native plant and pollinator communities on public and private lands  
**Eligibility requirements:** address plant conservation; local communities in restoration or protection of native plants; pollinator conservation  
**Eligible Organizations:** nonprofits, local, state or federal government agencies  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** 1:1 nonfederal match  
**Notes:** n/a  
**Source:** [https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf](https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf)  

Name: National Recreation and Park Association: Community Garden Grant  
**Purpose:** to benefit low-income families  
**Eligibility requirements:** must have existing community garden or sufficient resources to fully develop and plant one; should partner with local organizations  
**Eligible Organizations:** park and recreation agencies or nonprofits  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** no  
**Notes:** n/a  
**Source:** [https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf](https://www.nrpa.org/uploadedFiles/nrpa.org/Advocacy/Resources/Parks-and-Recreation-Grants-Booklet.pdf)  

Name: Arbor Day Foundation  
**Purpose:** to plant trees to enhance the community  
**Eligibility requirements:** membership criteria  
**Eligible Organizations:** schools, communities  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** reimbursement grant – no more than 50% can be used to purchase new trees  
**Notes:** offer various types of memberships; one of the membership programs offers 10 trees at no cost  
**Source:** [http://www.arborday.org](http://www.arborday.org)
Name: KaBoom- Creative Play Grants
Purpose: to help communities begin or complete play space projects
Eligibility requirements: must be involved in a self-guided playground project
Eligible Organizations: City, county or nonprofit community children programs
Cash Match/In kind Match: No
Notes: different grants; e.g., $15,000 used towards playground equipment built by organization
Source: https://apply.kaboom.org/

Name: Kresge Foundation
Purpose: operating support, projects or planning grants, real estate to advance economic development
Eligibility requirements: various areas: arts & culture, education, environment, health, human services
Eligible Organizations: nonprofits, public, and private organizations
Notes: awarded real estate & economic development past projects
Source: http://kresge.org/how-we-fund

Name: Let’s Play Grants
Purpose: an initiative by Dr. Pepper Snapple Group to provide kids and families with the tools, places and inspiration to make active play a daily priority
Eligibility requirements: outdoor project for underserved communities with safe, accessible playgrounds
Eligible Organizations: city, county, nonprofit organizations seeking to build children playgrounds or enhance an existing playground
Cash Match/In kind Match: No
Notes: grants range from $1,000 to $20,000
Source: www.letsplay.com/get-involved/about-lets-play-grants

Name: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Purpose: To make communities healthier and make it easier for people to lead healthier lives
Eligibility requirements: Projects to strengthen and build healthy communities. A focus on child and family well-being through healthy activities
Eligible Organizations: Organizations with a strong focus on building a Culture of Health that enables all individuals and families to lead healthier lives for generations to come
Cash Match/In kind Match: No
Notes: The RWJF works to help expand opportunities to pursue the best health possible. There are many funding opportunities.
Local Sources

Name: Arkansas Community Foundation  
**Purpose:** supports education, libraries, teaching Arkansas history, Delta Initiatives, minority populations  
**Eligibility requirements:** donor or foundation directed grants, identify nonprofits to support foundation directed grants  
**Eligible Organizations:** nonprofits  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** no  
**Notes:** Fund the Following: Giving Tree, Summer Learning, AR Black Hall of Fame Foundation, AR Delta Endowment, Bridge Fund (education)  
**Source:** [http://www.arcf.org](http://www.arcf.org)

Name: Arkansas Highway Department  
**Purpose:** to develop recreational trails  
**Eligibility requirements:** Eligible projects must be on-off-road trail facilities for non-motorized transportation  
**Eligible Organizations:** Nonprofits, government/education agencies  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** yes  
**Notes:** n/a  
**Source:** [http://www.arkansashighways.com](http://www.arkansashighways.com)

Name: Arkansas State Parks  
**Purpose:** projects must include health fitness benefits  
**Eligibility requirements:** only for construction projects  
**Eligible Organizations:** Nonprofits, government/education agencies  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** 50/50 must be cash  
**Notes:** example, Trails for Life  
**Source:** [http://arkarpa.org/](http://arkarpa.org/)

Name: Department of Arkansas Heritage: Collaborative Project Support  
**Purpose:** to assist with the cost of art activities that have an outreach and a collaborative component benefiting Arkansas organizations, schools, and artists  
**Eligibility requirements:** Each applicant must certify that it has on file Section 504 Self-Evaluation for its organization.  
**Eligible Organizations:** Arkansas chartered not-for-profits or 501(c)3 tax-exempt organizations  
**Cash Match/In kind Match:** 1:1 cash match  
**Notes:** $1,000-$10,000 grants; Fort Smith Public Library awarded $8,116  
**Source:** [http://www.arkansasarts.org/aac-grants/collaborative-project-support](http://www.arkansasarts.org/aac-grants/collaborative-project-support)
Name: The Baptist Health Foundation (BHF)—Community Wellness Grants
Purpose: to promote and fund wellness activities, projects, events, and initiatives in surrounding communities, particularly grassroots health activities to communities demonstrating a great need
Eligibility requirements: Health and wellness projects
Eligible Organizations: undetermined
Cash Match/In kind Match: no
Notes: Requests a grant outline or an executive summary before the board will consider accepting an official grant. Funds secured for the wellness program are used for many community health oriented endeavors, such as community walking programs, youth initiatives, women and men health initiatives, Hispanic initiatives, community-based health classes and community-based partnerships
Source: https://www.baptist-health.com/foundation

Name: The Blue and You Foundation (Blue Cross and Blue Shield)
Purpose: to help promote healthier lifestyles in Arkansas
Eligibility requirements: projects that positively affect the health of Arkansans; projects emphasizing health-care delivery, health-care policy, and health-care economics.
Eligible Organizations: nonprofits; governmental agencies
Cash Match/In kind Match: no
Notes: annual grants ranging from $5,000 to $150,000; $1,000 mini-grants
Source: http://www.blueandyoufoundationarkansas.com/grants_awarded/

Name: Clinton Foundation
Purpose: Clinton Foundation usually accepts funds to fund their projects. The foundation may consider funding outside activities that have a measurable social impact.
Eligibility requirements: Projects must be sustainable and have a measurable social impact
Eligible Organizations: works more with nonprofits than the public or government sector
Cash Match/In kind Match: no
Notes: requests a grant outline or an executive summary before the board will consider accepting an official grant
Source: https://www.clintonfoundation.org (501) 374-4242

Name: Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation
Purpose: to address poverty, increase education, funding earmarked for charitable purposes
Eligibility requirements: undetermined
Eligible Organizations: nonprofits, government agencies, schools, colleges, universities
Cash Match/In kind Match: no
Notes: Do not fund initiatives not directly having within-state influence (in Arkansas)
Source: http://www.wrfoundation.org/
Name: Warren Stephens Charitable Family Program  
Purpose: Provide charitable gifts to communities  
Eligibility requirements: Open-family decision  
Eligible Organizations: Open  
Cash Match/In kind Match: No  
Notes: There is no formal application process.  

Name: American Association of Retired Persons (AARP)  
Purpose: a Social Innovation Fund with a powerful approach to transforming lives and communities  
Eligibility requirements: Projects that promote healthy living for individuals 50 and older  
Eligible Organizations: Community leaders, nonprofit organizations, organized groups advocating for better living  
Cash Match/In kind Match: no  
Notes: AARP is an advocate for walkable and livable age-friendly features of the community within and surrounding parks.  
Source: www.aarp.org

Name: Neighborhoods USA (NUSA)  
Purpose: provides opportunities for diverse people and organizations to share their ideas, values and experiences to build stronger communities.  
Eligibility requirements: An organized group working together to preserve and improve neighborhoods. Possible membership in Neighborhoods USA.  
Eligible Organizations: Neighborhood people, groups, associations  
Cash Match/In kind Match: no  
Notes: Neighborhoods USA is a national non-profit organization committed to building and strengthening neighborhood organizations. NUSA encourages networking and information-sharing to facilitate the development of partnerships among neighborhood organizations, government, and the private sector for the ultimate goal of strengthening every neighborhood.  
Source: http://www.nusa.org  
http://www.nusa.org/about-nusa/financial-report

Name: Bank of America  
Purpose: Community development, community revitalization initiatives  
Eligibility requirements: Projects that address preserving property values/improving community health, safety, and welfare.  
Eligible Organizations: nonprofits  
Cash Match/In kind Match: No  
Notes: 2016 funding opportunities have a heavy focus on community development  
Source: http://about.bankofamerica.com/en-us/global-impact/charitable-foundation-funding.html#fbid=l8D5cQ9o0YW
Name: Entergy
Purpose: community improvement/enrichment; healthy families
Eligibility requirements: open grant program
Eligible Organizations: nonprofit 501(c)3, 4; government units-state, county, or city agency
Cash Match/In kind Match: No
Notes: n/a

Name: Entergy’s Charitable Program
Purpose: To provide community services to build playgrounds and stronger communities
Eligibility requirements: Outdoor Recreational Areas and facilities
Eligible Organizations: government units – state, county or city agencies
Cash Match/In kind Match: No
Notes: this is a separate grant from “Entergy”
Source: www.entergy.com/communitygrants

Name: Walmart
Purpose: To benefit the community, sustainability
Eligibility requirements: 501(c)3, 4, 6, 19
Eligible Organizations: government entity: state, county, or city agency
Cash Match/In kind Match: No
Notes: n/a
Source: http://giving.walmart.com/apply-for-grants/local-giving
**Anticipated Project Expenses (projected budget)**

Using the Polk Stanley Wilcox conceptual budget for the “War Memorial Park Children’s Zone” (2013) as a guide, an update projected expense estimate is prepared to provide for likely project costs. The Polk Stanley Wilcox conceptual budget is based on a project that includes: the I-630 Bridge Walking and Bike Way; a Roundabout; a Jonesboro Street Relocation/Rerouting; a Jonesboro Street Walking and Bike Way; and, a renewed New War Memorial Park. The estimates herein simply adjust the Polk Stanley Wilcox conceptual budget to reflect 2016 Consumer Price Index (+1.7%) adjustments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children’s Zone Conceptual Budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polk Stanley Wilcox Architects: Feb. 27, 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated 2016: CPI 1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I-630 Bridge Walking and Bike Way 592,911
   - a. All new construction shall be on top of existing structure, with top of walking and biking surface to match depth of existing 12” thick walk.
   - b. Concrete 12,204
   - c. Planters 32,544
   - d. Stamped concrete 24,408
   - e. Electrical: Walkway lights at 25’ & guardrail lighting 221,706
   - f. Landscape and irrigation with drainage 50,850
   - g. Furnishings (benches and trash cans) 15,255
   - h. Guardrail (including mesh and silhouettes) 235,944

2. Roundabout 894,960
   - a. Civil: 610,200
     1) 2 lanes with rain garden to mediate run-off
     2) No existing ATT lines shall be relocated
     3) Include lighting
   - b. Landscape including rain garden 132,210
   - c. Public Art (e.g. zoo theme. See, for example, Denver Convention Center, "Blue Bear.") 152,550
## 3. Jonesboro Street Relocation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>923,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### a. Jonesboro Street

1) Street shall be 2 lanes wide plus parallel parking along east curb. Provide turn lane for southbound Jonesboro onto east bound 12th Street. This will also help move War Memorial parking from grass to paved surface.

2) Include grading and drainage (can run-off connect to Wetland?)

### b. Traffic light at 12th Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic light</td>
<td>254,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. War Memorial Park Gateway - Vehicular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>War Memorial</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. Lighting (good light fixture, light level similar to MacArthur Park)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>130,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e. Street trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>25,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Jonesboro Street Walking and Bike Way - South

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,128,371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### a. Grading and drainage (runoff drains to Wetland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>50,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Concrete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>76,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Stamped concrete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>149,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. Train:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Engine including rubber tire assist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td>177,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Coaches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>140,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Track including base and bed prep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>170,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) 2 Covered stops (South and North of I630)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>50,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Walkway lights at 75' spacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walkway lights</td>
<td>130,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. War Memorial Park Gateway - Walking and Bike Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>71,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### g. Street trees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>50,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New War Memorial Park:</td>
<td>1,225,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Grading, demolition and drainage (runoff drains to Wetland)</td>
<td>50,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Wetland south from Library</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Furnishings: bike racks, benches, trash cans</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Repurpose post WWII modular home for LR Parks</td>
<td>203,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. General lighting</td>
<td>50,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Landscape and irrigation</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALS will see how well the Wetland works before developing the Park Wetland. Children may help seed the plants from native Arkansas wetland plants.

g. Graphics and Signage | 20,340 |
h. Bus stop | 25,425 |
i. Utility relocation (following are based on CLI) | 569,520 |
| 1) Entergy | 274,590 |
| 2) ATT | 254,250 |
| 3) Water & Sewer | 40,680 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Jonesboro Street Walking and Bike Way - North</th>
<th>252,216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Grading and drainage</td>
<td>15,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Concrete</td>
<td>61,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Stamped concrete</td>
<td>42,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Zoo loop: landscape, irrigation, site amenities</td>
<td>101,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Crosswalk signal</td>
<td>25,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Graphics and signage</td>
<td>6,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total all Scopes | 5,017,379 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Contingency 30%</th>
<th>Design Fees 7%</th>
<th>GC Overhead and profit 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-630 Bridge Walking and Bike Way</td>
<td>177,873</td>
<td>41,504</td>
<td>148,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout</td>
<td>268,488</td>
<td>62,647</td>
<td>201,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro Street Relocation</td>
<td>277,031</td>
<td>64,641</td>
<td>207,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro Street Walking and Bike Way - South</td>
<td>339,271</td>
<td>79,163</td>
<td>242,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New War Memorial Park</td>
<td>367,646</td>
<td>85,784</td>
<td>262,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonesboro Street Walking and Bike Way - North</td>
<td>75,665</td>
<td>17,655</td>
<td>65,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal all contingencies, fees, and overhead         | 2,984,073       |

Total All Scopes including contingencies, fees, and overhead | 8,001,452 |

Note: These figures are based on estimates provided by Polk Stanley Wilcox Architects from the Children's Zone Conceptual Budget, February 27, 2013. 2016 figures are adjusted to reflect 2016 Consumer Price Index (+1.7%).
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