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## Appendix B – Trails and Pathways Prioritization Criteria

### Trails Desirability Criteria Scoring Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Features within 500 feet</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unique Feature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Unique Features</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Unique Features</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Unique Features</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unique Features</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Segment already complete</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% - 25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% - 75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% - 90%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks within 1 mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Parks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Parks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Trails within 1 mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within the loop?</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 50-100% within</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 0-49% within</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but connects to the loop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, no connections to the loop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Segment Connects to a Completed Pathway or Trail</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, less than 1 Mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 1-2 Miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 3-4 Miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 4-5 Miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 5 Miles or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of Path Segment within Natural Feature Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Path Segment within Natural Feature Area</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-95%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Schools within 1 Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Schools within 1 Mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection partially within 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius but no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius and has partial connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile, within catchment area and connects to completed trail/path within 1 mile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within catchment area and touches school property</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private schools within 1 mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private schools within 1 mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection partially within 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection is entirely within 1 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius, but no connection within 1 mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile and connects to completed trail/path within 1 mile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile, touches school property</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shopping Area within 1 mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Area within 1 mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (Importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection partially within 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection is</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trail Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entirely within 1 mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius, but no connection within 1 mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile and connects to completed within 1 mile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile, touches commercial property</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pathways Desirability Criteria Scoring Worksheet

#### Unique Features within 500 feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unique Feature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Unique Features</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Unique Features</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Unique Features</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Unique Features</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Regional Trails within 1 mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Access</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Parks within 1 mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Parks</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Park</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Parks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Parks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Parks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Parks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Within the Loop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 50-100% within</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 0-49% within</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, but it connects to it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, doesn’t connect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Traffic Count on Adjacent Street (vehicles per 24 hrs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Count</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-2,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500-5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of Segment already Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Segment already Completed</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% - 25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% - 75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% - 90%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Segment Connects to Completed Pathway or Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment Connects to Completed Pathway or Trail</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, less than 1 Mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 1-2 Miles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 3-4 Miles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 4-5 Miles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 5 Miles or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-750</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Schools within 1 Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Schools within 1 Mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection partially within 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius but no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius and has partial connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile, within catchment area and connects to completed within 1 mile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within catchment area and touches school property</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private schools within 1 mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private schools within 1 mile</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, no connections within 1 mile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection partially within 1 mile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside 1 mile radius, connection is entirely within 1 mile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile radius, but no connection within 1 mile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile and connects to completed pathway within 1 mile</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 1 mile, touches school property</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Commercial Area within 1 mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gravel or Paved Parallel Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weight (importance)</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Community Park

Generally these areas provide the individual an opportunity to enjoy contact with broad expanses of natural scenery, but an equally important purpose is to provide a pleasant environment in which he can engage in a variety of recreational activities. It is usually designed and developed for the enjoyment and diversified use of large numbers of people.

One facility/40,000 residents therefore, two in the township

Minimum acreage: 50 acres

Oriented toward more extensive outdoor uses not possible in small recreation areas

The park can be combined with additional community needs for intensive recreation uses (swimming pools, tennis courts, skating rinks, ball fields) or with needs for municipal buildings to require a 100 acre site

Neighborhood Park

Generally there should be a recreation area near the center of every residential area. A neighborhood is usually considered to be the geographical area served by an elementary school. Two types of areas have served the neighborhood - the playlot, serving a radius of 1/8 mile, and the playground or park, serving a 1/2 mile radius.

1 acre/1000 residents - minimum acreage: 6 acres

Usually designed for passive, unsupervised play. The neighborhood park is desirably combined with a playground (1/3000, 4 acres) and ballfields (3/6000, 7 acres) and if possible located at a school. This would total a 26 acre school site, larger than conventional. Neighborhood parks might also be associated with critical natural areas. There are 21 proposed elementary schools in the Master Plan; assuming each of these satisfies the requirements for playgrounds and ball fields, we are considering, in addition, 15-21 neighborhood parks of 6 acres each.
These neighborhood parks will be provided by:

1. Working with the school districts to insure suitable site and size selection.

2. Working with developers to provide open spaces and recreation facilities in subdivisions.

3. Acquisition of neighborhood park sites near concentrations of population where suitable open space has not otherwise been provided. Priority will be given to critical resource areas where preservation of the resource is compatible with intensive recreational use.

Critical Resource Areas

Here, fixed acreage requirements cannot be assigned. Acquisition will depend on a careful inventory of township lands and be based on an evaluation of the environmental, economic and social consequences of conversion to urban use.

"As part of an outdoor educational program, it would be well to consider the preservation of a system of natural areas representative of those found in the township. These would include oak, beech maple, swamp and floodplain forests, bogs, marshes, sedge meadows, lake ponds and streams, meadows and prairies. With careful selection a number of other important natural features could be included in the above areas such as glacial channels, moraine, till and outwash plain, eskers, glacial knobs and various land forms. By careful choice it would also be possible to include the principal soil types on these tracts. These would be useful in demonstrating the relationship of vegetation to soil characteristics and land patterns. These natural area preserves could also serve a dual purpose by preserving the natural scenic beauty of the township and providing the protective natural vegetative cover for retarding erosion of steep slopes and controlling flood waters along floodplain areas. Swamps, bogs and marshes could also serve as valuable natural reservoirs which in turn function to retard flood damage and give more even flow to streams and creeks. All preserves of sizeable area would be important wildlife sanctuaries and would provide opportunities for bird study and other related activities. These tracts would provide examples of the natural flora of the area, especially retaining outstanding examples of the colorful spring wildflower stands which are to be found in certain locations."

### Community Park Site Evaluation Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parcel Size Rating** 4 2 0

**Resources Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodland vegetation</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
<td>3 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative natural area</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic view</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landform</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic feature</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use Potential Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Potential</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Recreation</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive recreation</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive recreation</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Sports</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot potential</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal or recreation building</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility of resource protection and use</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Planning Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Planning</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with current adjacent land uses</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Township Master Plan (Future land uses)</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility by local residents</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for school use</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with other Township and comparable park sites</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Probability of Loss Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale is likely in near future</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of conversion</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price related to time</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Neighborhood Park Site Evaluation Worksheet

**Site designation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCEL SIZE RATING</th>
<th>4 2 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES RATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland vegetation</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative natural area</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic view</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land form</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic feature</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE POTENTIAL RATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water recreation</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive recreation</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive recreation</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter sports</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot potential</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal or recreation building</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility of resource protection and use</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY PLANNING RATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with current adjacent land uses</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Township Master Plan (Future land uses)</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility by local residents</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for school use</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with other Township and comparable park sites</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROBABILITY OF LOSS RATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale is likely in near future</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of conversion</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price related to time</td>
<td>4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Critical Resource Area Site Evaluation Worksheet

**Site designation**

**Resources Rating**

- Wildlife habitat
- Representative natural area
- Water resources
- Rare ecological community
- Rare plant or animal species
- Landform
- Historic feature

**Use Potential Rating**

- Educational or scientific use
- Selected recreational use
- Compatibility of resource protection and use

**Community Planning Rating**

- Compatibility with current adjacent land uses
- Fit with Township Master Plan (Future land uses)
- Accessibility by local residents
- Accessibility for school use
- Fit with other Township and comparable park sites

**Probability of Loss Rating**

- Sale is likely in near future
- Threat of conversion
- Price related to time

---
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FACTOR CHECKLIST

PARCEL SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Size of potential site is within the desirable range for the type of park contemplated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Size of potential site is outside the desirable range, causing drawbacks or an extra public expense, but still usable for the type of park contemplated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Size of potential site is such that usability is doubtful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESOURCES FACTORS

WOODLAND VEGETATION

To provide scenic beauty; to shade, separate and buffer activities; to provide wildlife cover and food; to control erosion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Woodland vegetation covers about ( \frac{1}{4} ) to ( \frac{1}{3} ) of site, and has most or all of the characteristics listed below.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Woodland vegetation covers about ( \frac{1}{3} ) to ( \frac{1}{2} ) of site, but lacks some of the characteristics listed below.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Woodland vegetation covers only about ( \frac{1}{4} ) or over ( \frac{1}{2} ) of site, and lacks several of the characteristics listed below.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Woodland vegetation covers very little or almost all of the site, and lacks most of the characteristics listed below.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Woodland vegetation not present. Characteristics: Trees arranged in clusters advantageous for park use. Boundary buffer characteristics. Wide range of tree species, ages and sizes. Provide wildlife cover, nesting and feeding.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILDLIFE HABITAT

To provide opportunities for formal and informal observation of all forms of plant and animal life; to preserve plant and animal species in an urbanizing community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Diverse and significant wildlife species are present. Adequate cover and food for continued existence. Buffering from human activities both external to and within the park.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Habitat suitable for continued support of a substantial variety of wildlife.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Extensive habitat for common species of plants and animals.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Some habitat for common species which can be expected to be preserved.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. No potential for wildlife habitat preservation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPRESENTATIVE NATURAL AREA

To preserve outstanding examples of representative natural areas found in the Township, for their educational and scenic values. These areas include: oak forests, swamp and floodplain forests, marshes, sedge meadows, lakes or ponds, streams and dry meadows.

A. An outstanding example of a representative natural area is present, with significant populations of the important component species, and of sufficient extent to assure continued vitality.

Factor Points
4 - community or critical resource
2 - neighborhood

B. A good example of a representative natural area is present, but lacking substantial populations of some important species or lacking the extent for assured vitality.

2 - community or critical resource
1 - neighborhood

C. Site does not have a natural area which displays representative features.

WATER RESOURCES

To provide scenic beauty and recreational opportunity; to preserve natural systems for flood control, water quality control, and aquifer recharge.

Factor Points
4

A. Site includes a lake or free-flowing stream, with significant buffer zones

B. Site includes a lake or free-flowing stream lacking natural buffer zones;
   OR
   Site includes floodplain or wetland with significant retention and aquifer recharge capacity;
   OR
   Site has potential for a significant impoundment.

3

C. Site includes wetlands with some retention and recharge capacity;
   OR
   Site includes major drainage swales.

2

D. Site has potential for storm-water retention.

1

E. No potential contribution to water resources.

0
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TOPOGRAPHY

A variety of topographic features is visually appealing, and may include examples of important glacial land forms. Slopes can provide vertical differentiation of activities and buffering from surrounding uses; slopes can be useful for recreational use, but can also present limitations to use.

A. Site is largely in gentle and moderate slopes, with some steep slopes in locations advantageous to park use. Factor Points

B. Site has mixed slope types, but over half of the site has one predominant type. 2 community

C. Site is almost entirely flat, or almost entirely covered with steep slopes. 1 neighborhood (flat)

Slope types: Gentle - less than 8% gradient
       Moderate - 8 to 20% gradient
       Steep - over 20% gradient

SCENIC VIEWS

To enhance attractiveness of a park, and to preserve outstanding scenic views for public enjoyment.

A. Site affords unusual scenic views for park users; contributes to amenity of adjacent properties and passers-by. Factor Points

B. Site affords pleasant yet not unusual scenic views 1

C. Site does not afford scenic views 0

LAND FORM

To include significant land forms in a system of natural areas, for their educational and scenic values, and in order to retard erosion and control flooding. These land forms include: glacial channels, moraines, till and outwash plains, eskers, glacial knobs, swamps, bogs, marshes and floodplains.

A. Site includes a significant land form which is well-displayed and is entirely or sufficiently contained within the site. Factor Points

B. Site includes a significant land form, but it is not well-displayed or a large part lies off the site. 2-critical resource

C. Site does not include a significant land form. 1-comm.or neighbor
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HISTORIC FEATURE

To incorporate historic features when their location coincides with other park resources, and their inclusion is economically feasible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Site includes a structure of recognized historic significance in the community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Site includes the location or remains of a former structure or activity of historic significance in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Site does not include a historic feature</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RARE ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITY (Critical Resource Area)

To preserve ecological communities which are rare in the Township and the region, for their educational, scientific and heritage value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A rare ecological community is present, with significant populations of the important component species, and of sufficient extent to assure continued vitality</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A rare ecological community is present, but lacking substantial populations of some important species or lacking the extent for assured continued vitality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. No rare ecological community is present</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RARE PLANT OR ANIMAL SPECIES (Critical Resource Area)

To preserve rare or endangered species and their habitats, for their educational, scientific and heritage value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A significant population of a rare or endangered species of plant or animal is present, with adequate habitat for continued existence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A smaller population of a rare or endangered species of plant or animal is present; OR Habitat is less reliable for continued existence of the species</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. No rare plant or animal species known to be present</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USE POTENTIAL FACTORS

WATER RECREATION

In most cases a site adjacent to a river, lake or wetland is preferred to a site with no surface water; water-related recreation has prime use value.

| Factor Points | A. Potential for swimming, plus some of the following | 4 |
| B. Potential for boating, plus some of the following | 3 |
| C. Potential for fishing, plus the following | 2 |
| D. Potential for wildlife observation and visual amenity, related to surface water | 1 |
| E. No surface water on site | 0 |

INTENSIVE RECREATION

Intensive recreational use includes:

- Field games - softball, baseball, football, soccer, golf practice
- Court games - tennis, basketball, volleyball, shuffleboard, handball, horseshoes
- Playground or tot lot

| Factor Points | A. Site has potential for incorporating 5 or more intensive recreational uses (Community) | 4 |
| B. Site has potential for incorporating 4 intensive recreational uses (Community) | 3 |
| C. Site has potential for incorporating 3 intensive recreational uses (Community) | 2 |
| D. Site has potential for incorporating 1 or 2 intensive recreational uses (Community) | 1 |
| E. Site has no potential for intensive recreational use | 0 |
PASSIVE RECREATION

Major passive recreational uses include:
- Picnicking
- Hiking and bridle trails
- Informal and formal nature study and wildlife observation

A. Site has excellent potential for two or more passive recreational uses
   Factor Points
   2

B. Site has excellent potential for one passive recreational use; OR
   Site has lower quality potential for two or more passive uses
   Factor Points
   1
   1

C. Potential for passive recreation is questionable
   Factor Points
   0

WINTER SPORTS

Winter sports include:
- Ice skating and hockey
- Coasting hill
- Cross-country skiing

A. Site has excellent potential for two or more winter sports
   Factor Points
   (2)

B. Site has excellent potential for one winter sport; OR
   Site has lower quality potential for two or more winter sports
   Factor Points
   (1)
   (1)

C. Site lacks potential for winter sports
   Factor Points
   0
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PARKING LOT POTENTIAL

An adequate area for vehicle parking is essential for a community park site; parking lot potential may be desirable but not essential for a neighborhood park or a critical resource area.

A. Site has parking lot potential meeting all criteria listed below.

B. Site has some parking lot potential, but meets only 2 or 3 of the criteria listed.

C. Parking lot potential meets no more than one of the criteria listed.

Criteria:
- Lot area could serve estimated peak number of vehicles.
- Soil conditions would permit lot construction.
- Lot construction would cause minimal damage to resources.
- Lot(s) would have good access from public road.

MUNICIPAL OR RECREATION BUILDING

A fully-developed community park could include a full-sized recreation building, or could be combined with a site for a large municipal building such as a library or administration building. A neighborhood park could include a small recreation building or a small municipal building such as a fire station.

A. Building site potential meets all criteria listed below.

B. Building site potential lacks one or more of the criteria listed.

C. Building site potential is lacking.

Criteria:
- Building could be of desired scope.
- Building could be of normal construction.
- Desirable building location is available.
EDUCATIONAL OR SCIENTIFIC USE (Critical Resource Area)

"In modern education, natural areas serve as outdoor laboratories for demonstrating the important application of ecological principles to modern conservation and stress(ing) the need to preserve our valuable natural resources such as forests, waters and wildlife." - Paul W. Thompson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Educational or scientific potential meets all criteria listed (below).</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Site meets 3 of the criteria listed.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Site meets 2 of the criteria listed.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Site meets only one of the criteria listed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Site lacks educational or scientific potential.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria:
- Site can be used to demonstrate one or more types of natural areas found in the Township.
- Site can be used to illustrate one or more glacial landforms and/or representative soil types.
- Site functions as a wildlife sanctuary and offers opportunities for wildlife observation and study.
- Site has potential for development of a support building for educational or scientific uses.

SELECTED RECREATIONAL USE (Critical Resource Area)

Certain recreational uses may be appropriate on a critical resource site and would fulfill community expectations. These appropriate uses include:
- Boating
- Picnicking
- Hiking and horseback riding
- Ice skating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Site has potential for two or more recreational uses.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Site has potential for one recreational use.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Site lacks recreational potential.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPATIBILITY OF RESOURCE PROTECTION AND USE

A. Site meets all criteria listed below. [Factor Points: 4]

B. Site meets only 2 or 3 of the criteria listed. [Factor Points: 2]

C. Site would not meet more than one of the criteria. [Factor Points: 0]

Criteria:

Areas needed for recreational uses would not include principal resource areas of site. Activity areas could be separated from resource areas by buffers such as slopes, tree groupings, or waterways. Users could reach activity areas without causing damage to resource areas. Site location and characteristics would permit surveillance, if necessary to prevent abusive use.
COMMUNITY PLANNING FACTORS

The Community Planning factors are less quantifiable than the resources and use potential factors, so the factor checklists do not assign specific point values to the favorable criteria. The compiler will have to consider the relevant information as related to the criteria, and use judgment in assigning a point value.

COMPATIBILITY WITH CURRENT ADJACENT LAND USES

Favorable criteria

Site would not be adversely affected by noise, visual impact, fumes, traffic, or other negative features of current adjacent land uses.

Projected park traffic or on-site activities would be compatible with existing adjacent conditions.

Current adjacent land uses would blend visually with the type of park under construction.

Adjacent landowners would regard a park as an asset to the area.

Park could be coordinated with existing private recreational activities in the adjacent areas (e.g. horseback riding, boating, or fishing, cross-country skiing).

FIT WITH MASTER PLAN (Future land uses)

Favorable Criteria:

Site is consistent with the Greenways portion of the Master Plan.

Site would be compatible with future adjacent land uses as projected in the Master Plan.

Site would serve to guide community development, by establishing open space in a strategic location.

Site could provide a location for other municipal uses (e.g. library, administrative offices, fire station) which are projected in Master Plan or other planning documents.

Park use, vs. urban development of site, would beneficially modify future Township plans for utility extensions (e.g. lowered public costs, decreased development pressures in vicinity).
ACCESSIBILITY BY LOCAL RESIDENTS

Favorable criteria:

Site is located where present or projected land use indicates a significant number of residents may be within an easy walk. For a community park, this could be a one-mile radius (20-minute walk); for a neighborhood park, this could be a ½-mile radius (10-minute walk); this locational factor would be less important for a critical resource area.

Site can be reached by safe pedestrian routes from locations of present or future residential developments.

Site can be connected to Township pedestrian trail system.

Site can be reached by a safe bicycle route or a projected Township bikeway.

Site can be connected to Township bridle trail system.

Site can be reached by automobile via present or projected roads which are adequate.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR SCHOOL USE

Favorable criteria:

Site is within one mile (preferably ½ mile) from an existing school, for pedestrian access.

Site can be reached from an existing school via a safe pedestrian access.

Site is within the neighborhood for a projected school in the plans of the school system or the Master Plan.

Site is adjacent to a school site (present or projected) and can be developed in coordination with school site.

FIT WITH OTHER TOWNSHIP AND COMPARABLE PARK SITES

Favorable criteria:

Area served for pedestrian access does not overlap area served by another present or projected park site.

Site would fulfill a need in Township park master plan.

Site location would attract mainly local use, little regional use.
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**PROBABILITY OF LOSS FACTORS**

The probability of loss factors are less quantifiable than the resources and use potential factors, so the factor checklists do not assign specific point values to the relevant information. The compiler will have to use judgment in assigning point values to the information, with higher values indicating greater probability of losing the opportunity to acquire the site.

**SALE IS LIKELY IN NEAR FUTURE**

**Relevant information:**

Owner has placed property on the real estate market, or has made private contracts offering it for sale.

Potential private purchasers have made purchase offers or have stated a definite interest in purchasing the property.

Owner is known to have personal situations conducive to a sale of the property (e.g. tax burden, age, change of residence).

**THREAT OF CONVERSION**

**Relevant information:**

Urbanized development of the site could occur in the near future, if left in private hands.

Site is threatened with damaging uses, although not urbanized development, if left in private hands.

Scenic or conservation easement would not suffice for long-range protection (for a critical resource).

**PRICE RELATED TO TIME**

**Relevant information:**

Site is available at an advantageous price, due to current conditions.

Purchase price may increase in future.

Financial situation of Park Commission would permit purchase at this time.
Land Preservation Millage

Charter Township of Oakland
Parks and Recreation Commission

4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306 1670
telephone: (248) 651-7810 • Fax: (248) 601-9106

At a regular meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission held on Wednesday April 17, 2002 the following resolution was offered by Commissioner Bennett and seconded by Commissioner Barkham.

RESOLUTION
02-01

A Resolution establishing a policy for the evaluation and selection of parcels as candidates for Oakland Township’s land preservation funding.

Whereas on September 11, 2001 Township residents approved a proposal authorizing the Charter Township of Oakland to levy .75 of 1 mill for a period of ten years, starting with the December 2001 levy, for the purpose of providing funds for the acquisition of land, the protection of natural habitat, and the preservation of green spaces within the Township (the “millage funds”), and

Whereas the Parks and Recreation Commission is the Township entity primarily responsible for the review of potential purchases and acquisition of properties on behalf of the Township using these millage funds, and

Whereas the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Township Board are currently undertaking the process of considering and adopting an ordinance and program which will establish the procedure and requirements to be followed in acquiring property and property rights using the millage funds, and

Whereas the Parks and Recreation Commission has been approached by a property owner in the Township offering to convey certain property to the Township, which property appears to be of potential environmental value consistent with the purposes of the land preservation millage, and

Whereas, if the Parks and Recreation Commission does not engage in some initial steps to begin the evaluation of this property for possible purchase, the opportunity to purchase said property may be lost, and

Whereas the Parks and Recreation Commission desires to capitalize on opportunities to work with willing landowners in the near term to preserve remaining Township green spaces, and

Whereas the Parks and Recreation Commission desires to evaluate parcels consistently and objectively according to a policy utilizing an established review process and screening criteria;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Charter Township of Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission does hereby adopt the following process as an interim policy governing the evaluation and selection of parcels for possible acquisition (pending adoption of an ordinance and program by the Township Board), whether these parcels have been previously evaluated, are currently being evaluated or will be considered in the future as candidates for Oakland Township’s land preservation funding:
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1. Property Owner or Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) shall complete and submit a Property Owner Nomination Form.

2. PRC Staff shall gather the following types of information on the property: aerial photo, natural features, zoning, land use, development potential, title information, and tax valuation records.

3. Property information shall be forwarded to the PRC Land Preservation Parcel Recommendation Subcommittee.

4. The Subcommittee shall evaluate applications based on following screening/evaluation criteria types, using a format adopted by the PRC upon recommendation by the PRC Site Selection Criteria Subcommittee:

Water Resources, Special Landforms, Animals, Plants and Plant Communities; Adjacency to Protected Lands, Parcel Size, Compatibility with Community Planning, Environmental Hazards, Aesthetic Value, Feasibility of Acquisition, Condition of Title, Availability of Property and Probability of Loss, Cultural Value and other unique factors.

If the Subcommittee decides that an application warrants further study, a site visit will be scheduled with the property owner for the Subcommittee (and any necessary staff or consultants).

If, after the site visit and the establishment of clear title to the property, the Subcommittee believes the property should be considered for acquisition, various conservation techniques and financial scenarios would be evaluated and discussed with the property owner (including Township accounting, legal and conservation consultants as the Subcommittee deems necessary).

5. After initial discussions with the property owner, the Subcommittee shall recommend to the Parks and Recreation Commission whether the property should be appraised and/or a Phase I Environmental Assessment requested. If the Parks and Recreation Commission approves an appraisal and/or Phase I request, the written report(s) will be shared with the property owner. If the property owner disagrees with the appraisal and/or Phase I, they may obtain a second appraisal and/or Phase I at their own expense and this should be filed with the Parks and Recreation Commission.

6. When the Subcommittee and the property owner agree on the method and dollar amount for the acquisition, the Subcommittee will recommend to the Parks and Recreation Commission whether the property should be acquired using a particular conservation technique, indicating the financial impact of the acquisition on future land preservation revenues.

7. If the Parks and Recreation Commission agrees with the recommendation of the Subcommittee to purchase the property, they shall direct the Oakland Township Legal Counsel to complete the documents necessary to complete the transaction.

8. The Township is not in any way obligated to purchase or to agree to purchase any property unless and until an approved and signed agreement for such purchase is in place, i.e., neither this Resolution nor any policy adopted hereunder give rise to an obligation to purchase any given property in the Township even should that property meet any stated or unstated criteria.
Ayes: MACKLEY, TOMBOULIAN, BENNETT, BARKHAM, PERUZZI, GODIN

Nays: NONE

Absent: PHILLIPS

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution offered and adopted by the Parks and Recreation Commission of the Charter Township of Oakland at a Regular meeting held on April 17, 2002 at 7:00 pm in the Oakland Township Parks/Police Building, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306, with a quorum present.

Mindy Milos-Dale

Dated: 4-18-02

Mindy Milos-Dale, Park Manager, Charter Township of Oakland
## PROPERTY OWNER NOMINATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Daytime Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this nomination partly the result of encouragement by others? □ Yes □ No

If yes, please note the group or organization:

| Address: | City: |

### Property Location

| Address: | City: |

| Size: (Number of Acres) | Parcel ID Number (sidewalk): |

### SUGGESTED ACTION

- □ Donation of Property
- □ Donation of Easement or Development Rights
- □ Fee Simple Purchase
- □ Easement or Property Development Rights Purchase
- □ Lease to Purchase
- □ Other

Are there any existing easements or rights of way? □ Yes □ No

If yes, please describe:

Are there any other encumbrances or liens on property? □ Yes □ No

If yes, please describe:
PROPERTY OWNER NOMINATION FORM (continued)

FEATURES OF PROPERTY (check those that apply to all or part of the property)

☐ Woodland
☐ Prairie/Meadows
☐ Waterbody
☐ Rare or endangered plant/animal species
☐ Stream or Water course
☐ Wetland
☐ Adjacent to protected land
☐ Roads/drives enter/bisect property
☐ Cultivated lands (past or present)
☐ Existing structure(s)
☐ Historical site or property
☐ Existing foot trails
☐ Varied topography
☐ Other ____________________________

Are you aware of the existence of any environmental contaminants or concerns associated with the property?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, please describe:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Has a general environmental assessment been conducted of the property by a qualified consultant?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, is a copy of the report available for review?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

Has a review of the property, for natural areas values, been performed by a recognized expert (biologist, wetlands consultant, ecologist)?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, is a copy of the report available for review?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

Are Oakland Township staff, officials and consultants permitted to visit your property if you are notified prior to the scheduled visit?  ☐ Yes ☐ No

PLEASE ALSO ATTACH ANY AVAILABLE PHOTOGRAPHS, AERIAL MAPPING, MAPS, REPORTS OR OTHER DEPICTIONS OF THE PROPERTY.

________________________________________________________________________

Signature

Date

Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission
4393 Collins Road
Rochester, MI 48306

(248) 651-7810
(248) 601-0106 Fax
www.oaklandtownship.org

Revised (2/6/02)
### Appendix C- Millage Funds Use Criteria

#### Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission

**Land Preservation Program Screening/Review Criteria** *(revised 12/18/02)*

Property Owner

Property Location

Instructions: If property fits in more than one category assign the highest value and circle any information which applies in that category. (*next to criteria requiring a site visit*)

#### A. Water Resources

1. **Water Resources Access/Frontage. Does the property have frontage on a lake, Paint or Stony Creeks or a perennial tributary of the Paint or Stony Creeks?**
   - Yes
   - No

   **Size and Name of Lake:**

   **Linear Feet of Frontage and Name of Creek:**

   If the property borders an aquatic ecosystem assign relative screening score following table below. If it fits in more than one category use highest value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borders Lake, large pond, or chain of ponds</th>
<th>Borders perennial creek (as shown on USGS quad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontage is 100-500 ft. Medium</td>
<td>50 – 100 feet Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage is 501-1000 ft. High</td>
<td>100 – 2000 ft. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage &gt; 1000 ft. or entire system is contained in the parcel. Very High</td>
<td>&gt;2000 ft. or &gt;500 ft. on both sides Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. Surface water quality protection. Is the property directly connected to a surface-water ecosystem?

- Yes
- No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the property drain to:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A seepage system with significant public access and/or ownership</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small drainage system such as Bear Creek</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A larger drainage system such as the Paint Creek, Stony Creek, Gallagher Creek or Trout Creek</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. Ground water quality protection. Does the parcel contain any known or expected recharge areas?

- Yes
- No

| Does the property contain significant areas of known or expected groundwater recharge (as defined in the 1991 Paint Creek Nonpoint Sources Control Plan, 1992 Biological Survey of Paint, Sargent and Gallagher Creeks or as cited in Paul Thompson’s Inventory) |   |
| Regional groundwater recharge | Medium |
| Local high velocity recharge for throughflow/groundwater connections to surface water such as lakes or perennial creeks | High |
| Local high velocity recharge for throughflow/groundwater connections to private or public well or drinking water supply systems as documented by existing occupied structures, approved site plans or plats | Very High |
## IV. Wetland Conservation/protection
Does the parcel contain or border wetland areas as defined in National Wetlands Inventory and Oakland Township Wetlands Inventory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Wetland Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Does the property contain or border 5-10 acres of lacustrine, riverine, or palustrine wetlands
- Does the property contain or border 10 or more acres of lacustrine, riverine, or palustrine wetlands
- Does the property contain >5 acres of a complete wetland of any type
- Note: Lacustrine = lake, Riverine = river/creek, Palustrine = standing water such as marsh, bog, swamp

## B. Special Landforms, Animals, Plants and Plant Communities

### I. Landforms
Does the parcel contain any unique glacial landforms (as cited in Paul Thompson’s Inventory or another source)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Contains part of a moraine, glacial channel, till or outwash plain, esker, glacial knob, or ice contact formation such as kettle lake or a kame
- Contains all of a moraine, glacial channel, till or outwash plain, esker, glacial knob or ice contact formation such as kettle lake or a kame
- Contains all or part of more than one landform: moraine, glacial channel, till or outwash plain, esker, a glacial knob, or ice contact formation such as kettle lake or a kame

### II. Wildlife Habitat*
Does the property support important terrestrial or aquatic populations or habitat or add to adjacent property/ies that would protect wildlife populations or habitat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documentation attached:

- The property contributes high quality home range habitat for wide ranging resident wildlife compatible with surrounding land uses.
- The property secures important habitat within the property or in combination with adjoining properties for at least one of the following: migrating songbirds, migrating waterfowl, desirable resident species requiring specialized habitat conditions.
- The property secures essential habitat for rare, threatened or endangered species.

### III. Adequate Habitat Area
Is the habitat area (property minus a 200 ft. wide buffer adjacent to unprotected property) larger than 10 acres?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The core area contains &gt;10 and &lt;40 acres.</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The core area contains &gt;40 and &lt;80 acres.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The core area contains &gt;80 acres.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IV. Special Plants and Plant Communities*. Does the property have some native vegetation?  
Yes  No  
Documentation attached:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The property contains sufficient components of pre-European settlement vegetation to allow restoration to pre-European settlement conditions. There has been minimal degradation by invasive plants.</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The property supports populations of plant species that show a fidelity to high quality natural communities and specialized habitats within the property. There has been minimal degradation by invasive plants.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property secures essential habitat for rare, threatened or endangered plant species or rare, imperiled or critically imperiled plant communities such as oak barrens, oak &quot;openings&quot;, prairies, fens, or conifer swamps.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Adjacency to Protected Land  

Adjacency and enhancement. Does the property under consideration abut, or is otherwise integral to, a permanently protected tract of public or private land being held for conservation or recreation purposes?  
Yes  No  
If yes, which land?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The property under consideration contains &lt;25% of an adjacent ecosystem or will provide &lt;200 ft wide buffer for adjacent permanently protected tract.</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The property under consideration contains &lt;50% of an adjacent ecosystem or will provide &lt;300 ft wide buffer for adjacent permanently protected tract.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property under consideration contains &gt;50% of an adjacent ecosystem or will provide &gt;300 ft wide buffer for adjacent permanently protected tract.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Property Size  

Is the property larger than 10 acres?  
Yes  No  
Size:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The property contains &gt;10 and &lt;40 acres.</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The property contains &gt;40 and &lt;80 acres.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property contains &gt;80 acres.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Community Planning

#### I. Location’s Relationship to Surrounding Land Uses

In which quadrant of the Township is the property located?
- Northwest _____, Northeast _____, Southwest _____, Southeast _____

Does this quadrant have less than 300 acres of Township Parkland? _____ Yes _____ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The property is located in a quadrant containing between 200 and 300 acres of Township park, conservation or environmental areas.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property is located in a quadrant containing between 80 and 200 acres of Township park, conservation or environmental areas.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property is located in a quadrant containing less than 80 acres of Township park, conservation or environmental areas.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. Accessibility by Local Residents

Is the property accessible either from a publicly owned road, safety path, or trail? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, which ones?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site is located where present or projected land use indicates a significant number of residents may be within a 3 mile radius.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is located where present or projected land use indicates a significant number of residents may be within a 1 mile radius (20 minute walk).</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is located where present or projected land use indicates a significant number of residents (or schoolchildren) may be within a ½ mile radius (10 minute walk).</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. Is property consistent with Greenways portion of the Township Master Plan?

_____ Yes _____ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Consistency Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property is consistent with Greenways portion of the Master Plan, is not adversely affected by and is compatible with current or future adjacent land uses.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property is consistent with Greenways portion of the Master Plan, is not adversely affected by, is compatible with current or future adjacent land uses and is viewed by adjacent landowners as an asset to the area.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is consistent with Greenways portion of the Master Plan and would serve to guide community development, by establishing open space in a strategic location.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Environmental Hazards

Source of Information: ______ Common Knowledge ______ Current Owner ______ Phase I

Is the property or any adjoining property currently being used or have been used in the past for the following purposes: gas station, motor vehicle service or repair facility, commercial printing facility, dry cleaners, photo developing lab, junkyard, landfill, waste treatment, storage, processing or recycling or disposal facility?

Yes ______ No ______ If Yes, indicate which use: ________________________________

Are any of the following currently being stored, discarded or used or have been used in the past on the property or any adjoining property: automotive or industrial batteries, pesticides or other chemicals used in agricultural practices, paints, industrial waste or other chemicals in drums or other containers or storage tanks?

Yes ______ No ______ If Yes, indicate which use: ________________________________

If yes to either, documentation attached: ________________________________

G. Aesthetic Value

I. Scenic View*. Does the property preserve an outstanding scenic view or access to an outstanding scenic view?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property preserves access to or contains scenic view for parks users as well as passers-by. Examples might include panoramic overlooks, open water bodies, tree galleries, and actively pastured or farmed agricultural fields.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property preserves access to permanently protected unusual scenic view for parks users as well as passers-by. Examples might include panoramic overlooks, open water bodies, tree galleries, and actively pastured or farmed agricultural fields.</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property contains unusual scenic view for parks users as well as passers-by. Examples might include panoramic overlooks, open water bodies, tree galleries, actively pastured or farmed agricultural fields.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Variety of Topographic Features.

| Site is almost entirely flat or almost entirely covered with steep slopes. | Medium |
| Site has mixed slope types, but over half of the site has one predominant type. | High |
| Site is largely in gentle and moderate slopes, with some steep slopes in advantageous locations. | Very High |

Note: Gentle = less than 8% gradient, Moderate = 8 – 15% gradient, Steep = over 15% gradient
Appendix C - Millage Funds Use Criteria

H. Feasibility of Acquisition. Would the acquisition of this property be compatible with the Land Preservation fund’s short-term and long-term budgetary guidelines?

Yes  No  Type of Acquisition:

Appraisal Value: Township Expenditure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Simple purchase of Property at or below the value determined by Township’s independent appraiser.</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee simple purchase of an easement or development rights at or below the value determined by the Township’s independent appraiser.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Support, Donation of portion or entire property value, or donation of a conservation easement or development rights.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Availability of Property and Probability of Loss.

Is the property currently available for acquisition?

Yes  No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner is known to have personal situations conducive to a sale of the property (tax burden, age, change of residence).</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner has placed property on the real estate market or has made private contracts offering it for sale.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private purchasers have made known purchase offer or have stated a definite interest in purchasing the property.</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Cultural Value.

Does property include the location or remains of a former structure or activity of historic significance in the community such as an archeological site, native American village, burial ground or ceremonial mound? This would be as a result of evidence found or indicated through site’s presence on Oakland Township Historic and Cultural Resources Inventory Map.

Yes  No  If yes, please indicate cultural resource(s):

K. Other Unique Factors.

I. Does the property offer other unique characteristics which were not covered in these criteria but would serve to benefit our community?

Yes  No  If yes, please indicate resource(s):

II. Are there other unique factors which were not covered in these criteria that would detract from the property or cause it to be a detriment to our community?

Yes  No  If yes, please indicate resource(s):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criteria</th>
<th>Does Criteria Apply? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Value Assigned: (NA, Medium, High, Very High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Access/FRontage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Borders lake, large pond(s)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or B. Borders perennial creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Surface Water Quality Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Ground Water Quality Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Wetland Conservation/Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Special Landforms, Animals, Plants and Plant Communities Total Values Assigned:</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium, High, Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Criteria</td>
<td>Does Criteria Apply? (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Value Assigned: (NA, Medium, High, Very High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Landforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Wildlife Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Adequate habitat Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Special Plants and Plant Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Adjacency to Protected Land Total Values Assigned:</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium, High, Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Property Size Total Values Assigned:</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium, High, Very High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission

**Land Preservation Property Evaluation Worksheet (12/18/02)**

Property Owner: 

Property Location: 

**E. Community Planning Total Values Assigned:** Yes, No, NA
   - Not Applicable, Medium, High, Very High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criteria</th>
<th>Does Criteria Apply?</th>
<th>Value Assigned (NA, Medium, High, Very High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Location’s Relationship to Surrounding Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Accessibility by Local Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Consistency with Greenways Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Environmental Hazards:** Yes, No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criteria</th>
<th>Does Criteria Apply?</th>
<th>Value Assigned (NA, Medium, High, Very High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Scenic View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Variety of Topographic Features</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**G. Aesthetic Value Total Values Assigned:** Yes, No
   - Medium, High, Very High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criteria</th>
<th>Does Criteria Apply?</th>
<th>Value Assigned (NA, Medium, High, Very High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Scenic View</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Variety of Topographic Features</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H. Feasibility of Acquisition Values Assigned:** Yes, No
   - Medium, High, Very High

**I. Availability of Property and Probability of Loss Total Values Assigned:**
   - Yes, No
   - Not Applicable, Medium, High, Very High

**J. Cultural Value:** Yes, No

**K. Other Unique Beneficial Factors:** Yes, No
   - I. Other Unique Beneficial Factors: Yes, No
   - II. Other Unique Detrimental Factors: Yes, No

---
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Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission
Land Preservation Property Evaluation Worksheet (12/18/02)

Property Owner: __________________________________________

Property Location: __________________________________________

Additional Important Considerations Concerning Evaluation:

FINAL SUMMATION OF CRITERIA WITH VALUES ASSIGNED (17 possible):

Total Values Assigned: Yes _______ Medium _______ High _______ Very High _______

No _______ Not Applicable _______

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (NO VALUE ASSIGNED):**

Environmental Hazard: Yes _______ No _______

Cultural Value: Yes _______ No _______

Other Beneficial Factors: Yes _______ No _______

Other Detrimental Factors: Yes _______ No _______

Date Evaluation Was Completed: ____________________________

Land Preservation Parcel Recommendation Subcommittee Members Participating in Evaluation:

_________________________________________________________

Oakland Township Staff/Consultants Participating in Evaluation:

_________________________________________________________
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Resources Needed to Complete Land Preservation Property Evaluation Worksheet

A. Water Resources and B. Special Landforms, Animals, Plants and Plant Communities:

Oakland County Natural Feature Information including:
Current Aerial Photo, 2001 MNFI Natural Areas, Woodlands, Wetlands, Topography, Rivers, Lakes, 100 year floodplain, Soil Types

A. Water Resources:
Maps showing watersheds and groundwater recharge areas in Township
1991 Paint Creek Nonpoint Sources Control Plan
1992 Biological Survey of Paint, Sargent and Gallagher Creeks
USGS Quad Maps for Oakland Township
National Wetland Inventory
Oakland Township Wetlands Inventory (by J&L Consulting)

B. Special Landforms, Animals, Plants and Plant Communities:
1996 Revision of Oakland Township Ecological Survey by Paul Thompson
Current listing of MNFI plant communities
Current listing of MNFI element occurrences
Current MDNR Listing of Michigan’s Rare Threatened or Endangered Species
MDNR Floristic Quality Assessment Manual
Presettlement Vegetation Map from Oakland County Planning

C. Adjacency to Protected Land:
Oakland County Plat Map

D. Property Size:
Parcel Tax Valuation Records

E. Community Planning:
Oakland Township Zoning and Land Use Plan
Oakland Township Master Plan

J. Cultural Value:
Oakland Township Historic and Cultural Resources Inventory Map
Appendix D – Parks and Recreation Inventory Tables

Bear Creek Nature Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>740 West Snell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>47 acres, held by Six Rivers Regional Land Conservancy (SRRLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Passive Recreation and Natural Area Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3 @ playground + 7 along trails + 8 on docks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges/Boardwalk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks/Decks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Wooden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Split rail fence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields – Open Lawn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Open lawn area only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Includes charcoal disposal bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiosks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>22 spaces</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Reservable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Located in shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Toilets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Barrier Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Shed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Connected to restroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating Pond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8’ wide ADA access / 5’ wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – mowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5’ wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – woodchip</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3’ wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths

- Best access to multiple activities of any Township properties
- Well designed pavilion and picnic space suitable for events
- A Welcoming Park
- Trail and interpretive maps are available
- Access off of Gunn and Snell Roads, from the Township Hall property, and through a private subdivision easement
- Contains high-quality oak-hardwood forests and Bear Creek Marsh and Pond
- Excellent location for ecological, environmental and scientific study
Challenges

- Natural areas stewardship along edges shared with subdivision property, succession of old farm fields
- Erosion problems due to the trails
- Dumping and park storage drops create spread of weeds
- Neighbor encroachment and dumping of yard waster is problematic

Potential Opportunities

- Kiosk at parking lot/trailhead indicating park amenities along with trail locations and distances, completion of two interpretive signs
- Neighbor education regarding dumping followed up with site visits to discuss uniqueness of site
- Return fire to the park to stimulate and promote growth while inhibiting invasive species
- Trail management and maintenance – assess where trails are truly needed/desirable
- Minimize trail-side mowing
- Monitor erosion along Gunn Road
Blue Heron Environmental Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fields – farm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Leased by local farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest (upland and wetland)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rookery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Thriving population until 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths

- Environmental area
- 25 to 50 active heron nests; documented 1976 – 2008, in 2009 heron population severely reduced
- Upland hardwood forest, swamp, and shrubby wetlands
- Cultural conservation of agriculture history
- Size of the preserve
- Diversity of plant species and high floristic quality
- Located along Rochester Road, which offers the opportunity to reach the public and allow a greater appreciation of the park

Challenges

- Public access is only provided through seasonal guided nature programs to protect heron nesting rookery during nesting season
- No established access: i.e. parking or trails
- High impact of deer on the site due to the forested area; must reduce the deer population to maintain and restore the quality of the area

Potential Opportunities

- Take advantage of educational opportunities to raise awareness for need for protected habitat and demonstrate the value of the rookery to the community
- Fields could be used for native plant propagation, community garden is organic garden; water is available for this
- Proposed connection to Township Trail system along Rochester and Gunn Roads
- Restore natural area connectivity within the park
- Neighbor education regarding dumping along west, north, and south
### Charles Ilsley Park

**Location** | East Predmore Road  
--- | ---  
**Size (acreage)** | 120  
**Acquisition** | 1990, 2005  
**Easement** | N/A  
**Predominant Usage** | Passive Recreation  
**Accessibility Assessment** | Level 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails - mowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**
- Rolling hills  
- Open pastoral setting  
- Access from Wyndstone subdivision to west  
- Has excellent restoration potential

**Challenges**
- Panhandle entrance limits visibility of park and facilities from Predmore Road  
- Restricted to a passive nature area until 2014  
- High impact of deer on the site; must reduce the deer population to maintain and restore the quality of the area

**Potential Opportunities**
- Recreation activities such as cross country skiing, hiking and horseback riding  
- Panhandle entry could be dynamic “parkway” drive into main park area in post-2014 development  
- Proposed connection with Township Trail system along Predmore and up to Romeo Road  
- Conduct prescribed burns  
- Restore natural area connectivity within the park  
- Convert agricultural fields to a native plant community  
- Establish appropriately placed trails to minimize disruption  
- Neighbor education regarding dumping along west and southwest
Appendix D - Parks and Recreation Inventory Tables

Cranberry Lake Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>388 West Predmore Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>1996, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>52 acres SRRLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Passive Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmstead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Farmhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings within H.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>20 spaces</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Barrier Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port-a-toilet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Barrier Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – dirt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3 feet wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – mowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5 feet wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails - woodchip</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>3 feet wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths

- Beautifully restored national and state historic site: 1840’s Axford-Coffin Farm
- Location for Concerts and other special events and farm programs
- Shore fishing
- Nature education, bird watching and orienteering programs
- Great location for hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, and cross-country skiing
- Connection between Predmore and Romeo Roads
- Cranberry Lake high quality – mixed hardwood swamp, bog, and shrub swamp
- Very diverse flora and high floristic quality

Challenges

- To provide appropriate access to Cranberry Lake and its shoreline
- The trails appear to require a bit more maintenance to keep to the quality standards set at other Township parks
- Completion of historic district rehabilitation
- Weeds continually establish along the edges of the lake
- Climate changes over time suggest that bogs will eventually disappear in southern Michigan
Potential Opportunities

- Developing programming and revenue source for the historic Buildings
- Kiosk at parking lot/trailhead indicating park amenities along with trail locations and distances
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Determine and implement future efforts to protect the bog
- Eventual connection with Addison Oaks and Bald Mountain and Lost Lake Nature Park via Township and County Park and Trails
- Primitive camping experience
Draper Twin Lake Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1181 Inwood Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Passive Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benches</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2 @ dock, 1 @ trailhead, 2 along trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk/Fishing Docks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>22 cars &amp; trailers, gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Shed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – Limestone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10’ wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths
- New facilities – parking, limestone trail, clock in 2008/2009
- Trail connection between Inwood and Parks Roads
- High quality wet meadow bordering the lake to the south

### Challenges
- Large wetland separates west and east sides of park
- Must reduce the deer population to protect natural features of the park

### Potential Opportunities
- Relocation of existing park signage; current location is confusing as it is located next to a barricaded entry to the park; we should take care of this now
- Kiosk at parking lot/trailhead indicating park amenities and trail locations and distances
- Connecting west and east sides of park with trail
- Active recreation opportunity in old farm fields at northeast corner of property
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Establish appropriately placed trails to minimize disruption
- Discontinue agriculture and convert agricultural fields to a native plant community
- Restore natural area connectivity within the park
Gallagher Creek Park

Location | Silver Bell Road  
Size (acreage) | 15  
Acquisition | 2000  
Easement | N/A  
Predominant Usage | Nature Preserve  
Accessibility Assessment | Level 1

**Asset Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**

- Near high population density of subdivision; safety paths proposed for both sides of Silverbell in that area
- Contains a delicate balance of upland area, cattail marsh, and the Gallagher Creek headwaters area
- Unique riparian corridor; one of the strongholds for brook trout in southeastern Michigan
- If maintained, park could act as an important refugia for bird species
- Location offers both an educational outlet and valuable resource for neighbors

**Challenges**

- Location along busy Silver Bell Road
- Must reduce the deer population to protect natural features of the park

**Potential Opportunities**

- Wildlife observation
- Future plans include a picnic pavilion, playground, and nature trail
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Address the impact of development on water quality and hydrology
- Restore natural area connectivity within the park; extend management beyond site boundaries to include natural areas immediately outside park
Lost Lake Nature Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>846 Lost Lake Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>57.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2004, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Passive Recreation and Natural Area Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asset Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker’s House / Future Nature Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiosks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbuildings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Outbuildings and converted barns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Lawn/gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Tables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portable Toilets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sled Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Shed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – dirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 foot wide from Caretaker’s House to top of sled hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warming Shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**
- Music in the Meadows Events in the Summer
- Winter organized events and Sledding
- Non-motorized lake access to 8-acre Lost Lake
- 7 acres of wetlands
- Mature oak and white pine forest
- Highest quality natural area in the Township parks system
- Portions of park west and south of Green Lake offer a chance to expand the extent of the high-quality upland and wetland areas

**Challenges**
- Parking lot may benefit from gravel surface to bring it to the standards set in other Township parks; size is too small for many events
- Several invasive species are present
Potential Opportunities

- Conversion of the Caretakers home into a nature center
- Provision of barrier-free lake access
- Collaboration and trail connection with Oak View Middle School
- Continue to maintain oak/pine barren community
- Improve the habitat for the eastern massasauga rattlesnake on site
- Manage the wetlands surrounding Lost Lake
- Conduct prescribed burns
Marsh View Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Clarkston Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Active and Passive Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>With adjustable height net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Signs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Sports Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>190 x 330, soccer, Lacrosse, football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Deck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Archery Range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>70 spaces</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms portable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Barrier-free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>90 x 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – asphalt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>10 foot width ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails - gravel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>To observation deck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails – mowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>At north end of park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths

- New facilities in 2009
- Native plantings, prairies and wetlands
- Emergent marsh most remarkable natural feature of the site

### Challenges

- Separation of archive, passive and nature area preservation areas
- Intensive past land alteration evident in relative lack of diverse native species and presence of former agricultural plants

### Potential Opportunities

- Future development of the north portions of the park including improved trails, boardwalks, overlooks, amphitheater and open recreation areas; native plantings, prairies and wetlands
- Future addition of playground and picnic pavilion at south end of park
- Connection to Bald Mountain Recreation Area
- Connection to the Paint Creek Trail
- Continue reduction of deer population
Marsh View Connector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Orion Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Trailhead and trail connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Asset Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Strengths**
- Property strategically purchased to offer trail connections between Township parks, trails and pathways, regional trails and state parklands; pathways at south end of March View park being constructed in 2009
- Trail’s immediate adjacency to the wet meadows provides a nice education outlet and chance for passersby to appreciate wetland without leaving trail

**Challenges**
- No development has occurred since purchase; not being constructed yet
- Connecting path and trail here along Clarkston and Orion Roads
- Highly disturbed and invaded parcel

**Potential Opportunities**
- Future trailhead and link between Marsh View Park, Bald Mountain Recreation Area, and the Paint Creek Trailway
- Conduct prescribed burns
### Mill Creek Crossing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Orion Road west of Snell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Trail Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**
- N/A

**Challenges**
- N/A

**Potential Opportunities**
- N/A
Mill Race Trail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gallagher Road and Orion Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Trail Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over Mill Race</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Wooden – pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Race Control Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail - woodchip</td>
<td>0.3 miles</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths
- Off-road connection between the Goodison and Paint Creek Cider Mills
- State designated historic site: Paint Creek Millrace

### Challenges
- Millrace dam prevents passage of fish and mussels in Paint Creek

### Potential Opportunities
- MDNR has potential to get federal funding to remove dam
- 2 Mill Race control structures are located on other property also owned by Oakland Township; this other property could provide trail connection to Gunn Road
O’Connor Nature Park

Location | NE corner Mead & Rochester
Size (acreage) | 10
Acquisition | 2008
Easement | N/A
Predominant Usage | Nature Preserve
Accessibility Assessment | Level 1

Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths
- Nature preserve area with limited access for protection of natural features

Challenges
- Natural area stewardship along edges shared with subdivision to the north and houses to the east; must stop neighbor dumping and remove yard waste
- Erosion associated with the abutting roads and their right-of-ways

Potential Opportunities
- Proposed connection to Township Trail system along Rochester and Mead Roads
- Neighbor education regarding dumping followed up with site visits to discuss uniqueness of site
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Educate neighbors about weeds on their property
- Use check dams to slow the flow of water and establish a native plant community along the Rochester Road right-of-way
Paint Creek Heritage Area – Wet Prairie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Paint Creek Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Nature Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deer Enclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Silver Bell Road parking lot of Paint Creek trailway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths

- Preservation of grassland ecosystem and wildlife
- Adjacent to and accessible from the Paint Creek Trail
- Hosts approximately 200 native species and has very high floristic quality

Challenges

- Natural area interpretation done from edge of Paint Creek Trail
- No established trail network

Potential Opportunities

- Installation of interpretive signage at trail edge
- Coordination of natural area stewardship/protection of adjacent subdivision natural area, Hirt easement, and Paint Creek Trail
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Remove invasive species and work with southern neighbor to do the same
Appendix D- Parks and Recreation Inventory Tables

Paint Creek Trail - Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Paint Creek Trail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Nature Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamarack Wetland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strengths
- Nature Preserve with limited access for protection of natural features
- Only prairie fen in the Township park system (fens are biologically and geologically unique wetlands only found in the Midwest)

### Challenges
- No established trail network; interpretation to be done from edge of Paint Creek Trail
- Small size makes it more vulnerable to present and future site stressors
- Invasive species are present
- Neighbors are encroaching on the site

### Potential Opportunities
- Installation of interpretive signage at trail edge
- Coordination of natural area stewardship with SRRLC Conservation easement to west and Paint Creek Trail
- Work with the neighbor to the west to end encroachment (mowing along west and northwest edges)
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Remove invasive species
- Work with southern landowners to extend management further into wetland complex
- Minimize negative effects of trailside mowing
Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Knob Creek Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size (acreage)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>36 acres, SRRLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominant Usage</td>
<td>Nature Preserve and Passive Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Assessment</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asset Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Asset/Amenity</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trails – dirt</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Trails fade within 200’ of entrance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths

- Located across Snell Road from Stony Creek Metropark
- Scenic stream valley with fishing opportunity
- Oak forest
- Undisturbed natural areas
- High floristic quality
- Extremely variable habitat – dry-mesic southern forest, wet meadow/floodplain forest, steeply sloped dry-mesic southern forest, early forest succession/old field/prairie remnants

Challenges

- Succession of old farm fields
- Walk-in access only at this time
- Parking locations are challenging due to access connection thru residential street and potential conflict with Metropark over southern boundary parking
- Controlled archery antlerless hunting two days per week Oct. 1 – Jan. 1

Potential Opportunities

- Parking lot located near the southern edge of the park would provide best access for residents
- Developed trails and picnic areas
- Fishing piers and/or boardwalks at the stream
- Interpretive Panels along a nature walk
- Marked trail system
- Trail connection to Stony Creek Metropark
- Proposed connection to Township Trail system from Snell Road
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Remove invasive species
Watershed Ridge Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Inventory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leased to local farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forested Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Building I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**
- Rolling Hills
- Property includes both Paint Creek and Stony Creek subwatersheds
- Cultural conservation of agricultural history
- Central location, size, and combination of natural and highly altered landscapes make it an excellent candidate for both active and passive uses

**Challenges**
- No defined access: i.e. parking area on trails
- Agricultural portions of park add to complications of containing drain tiles that flow into natural areas

**Potential Opportunities**
- Active recreation accessed from Buell Road, limited to acreage not purchased with Land Preservation millage
- Interpretation of hydrology in two watersheds that are included in park
- Addition of parking lot and trail system
- Trail construction within park would contribute to Township Trail system’s proposed connection between Buell and Stony Creek Roads
- Conduct prescribed burns
- Convert agricultural fields to a native plant community
- Establish appropriately placed trails to minimize disruption
- Integrate active-use areas within the agricultural fields
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## Appendix E – Public Input Results

### Trails and Pathways Open House

**June 11, 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had discussions and continuing with concepts regarding the intersection of 32 mile and Rochester Road. Can a plan be conceived between public and private efforts with regarding to the SW corner. This is a Brownfield site that can be beautified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the way the loop will connect with other existing trails someday! Stony Creek Park, Bald Mtn, Paint Creek Trail... all very exciting! Please consider keeping some trails as just mowed trails in our parks. These are my favorites. Nice and quiet no gravel noise no shin splints from pavement. I am a big fan of the mix of trails at Bear Creek. I am a big walker and when the mowed trails (my 1st choice) are wet there are the limestone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking Delta Kelly Elementary (with parking) to the Paint Creek Trail would help bring visitors to the area. Segments P4-04 and T4-03 are critical to this benefit as well as opening trail access to a high-density residential area. Thanks for all the work on this valuable trail system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (1) I would like to see mileage markers along the trails. At the very least, put them along “the loop” and maybe the longer stretches of trails/paths. 
(2) Maybe some directional (N S E W) signs too. |
| Let’s schedule a brainstorming session to bridge the connection and relationship of Downtown Romeo to Lake Orion. I have been studying, discovering and doing research on this demographic for the past 3 ½ years. I have been preparing much info for presentation. Let’s stay in touch. |
| Good info and display. It would be good to do this again once you know the side of the road the paths will be. |
| Excellent display and info. |
| Great program, however we need more trails to Marsh View Park which is going to have active rec. We have to keep kids with bikes, etc. off the roadways – let’s give them trails from all parts of the Township!! |
| We like your plans and are looking forward to riding our bikes on some of the trails, etc. If possible it would be nice to have paved trails – We live in Rochester Hills but prefer the Macomb Orchard Trail because it is paved. We like having all of the paved, bike paths in Rochester/Rochester Hills – so – hopefully you’ll be able to have yours paved also? |
| I’m pleased with the plans for the paths & pathways through our township. How will the paths and pathways be maintained and how often? At what projected cost? By whom? |
| Speaking as one who likes to use a bicycle for transportation whenever I can I find a need for safer North-South routes through the Township E-W still has enough gravel roads but N-S is lacking. |
| Property Right of Way issues – structures (houses) close to the existing right of way – a need to know probable path placement (which side of the road) path will be on to enable personal decisions regarding maintenance and any improvement issues. |
| Has anyone thought about showers? The person who has completed exercise may go to work, other activities, may find a shower handy. |
| I am not sure the paths/trails will work together with people on bikes and mothers with strollers. Peoples on bikes tend to ride at a faster speed. |
| I am glad to see HORSES are being accommodated. Good job with the plans – overall. Thanks for the open house. |
| I would like to thank the Parks & Rec for all their hard work, they do an excellent job. Would it be... |
Appendix E - Public Input Results

(6) Some people asked why Rochester Road didn’t list high as a priority. I’m excited to think we will finally get some roads to all the disjointed sections by the sub. I’m anxious to be able to walk from my house to the trail.

(7) Although there has been public access to the Stony Creek Road & Sheldon Road to Bear Creek entrance, to Stony Creek Park Entrance, etc. We see many bike riders and joggers now. Some riders and joggers will be on the new 45 mph speed has already doubled road kill & 2 family dogs. I believe a priority should be constructed. Respect for private property needs to be addressed.

(8) Prioroty is clearly needed for safety issues as well as recreational issues. The only concern has been public access to the Stony Creek.

(2) Question to Mindy was to better identify the road into a parking area to the north entrance to East Snell Rd. East of Sheldon Road to Bear Creek entrance, to Stony Creek Park Entrance. We see some people asking why Rochester Road didn’t list high as a priority. I’m excited to think we will finally get some roads to all the disjointed sections by the sub. I’m anxious to be able to walk from my house to the trail.

(3) I think the “loop” is a terrific idea. The extension along the park parallel roads. NOT that it will make a vehicular traffic slow down to enjoy beauty of the park. It would probably be used if it was built.

(4) Will the trail system be designated along gravel & paved roads. NOT that it will make a vehicular traffic slow down to enjoy beauty of the park.

(5) There will be stations along the way where interested users can pick up a map of trails with parking areas clearly marked: i.e.: the extension of Addison Park, east of Walker Road path.

(6) Asking for the new map. A few times into towns and would be nice to have paths. I know a person who walks along the road into the parking area the north entrance to Rochester Road.

(7) E. Gunnewald proposed path is against its construction. FACT: E. Gunnewald currently is 30 feet into our front yard. Our speed limit is just raised to 45 mph. Question: should the path be completed. I’m excited to think we will finally get some roads to all the disjointed sections by the sub. I’m anxious to be able to walk from my house to the trail.

(8) Very through the front yard. Over the years I’ve walked at least 30 miles into the park. It was a great place to walk. Some riders and joggers will be on the new 45 mph speed has already doubled road kill & 2 family dogs. I believe a priority should be constructed. Respect for private property needs to be addressed.

(9) E. Gunnewald proposed path is against its construction. FACT: E. Gunnewald currently is 30 feet into our front yard. Our speed limit is just raised to 45 mph. Question: should the path be completed. I’m excited to think we will finally get some roads to all the disjointed sections by the sub. I’m anxious to be able to walk from my house to the trail.

(10) Asking for the new map. A few times into towns and would be nice to have paths. I know a person who walks along the road into the parking area the north entrance to Rochester Road.

(11) E. Gunnewald proposed path is against its construction. FACT: E. Gunnewald currently is 30 feet into our front yard. Our speed limit is just raised to 45 mph. Question: should the path be completed. I’m excited to think we will finally get some roads to all the disjointed sections by the sub. I’m anxious to be able to walk from my house to the trail.

(12) Asking for the new map. A few times into towns and would be nice to have paths. I know a person who walks along the road into the parking area the north entrance to Rochester Road.
Key Leader Interviews and Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings  
June 24-25, July 7-8, and August 11-12, 2009

1. Have you used any of the parks and recreation amenities offered by Oakland Township Parks and Recreation? If so what parks and or recreation amenities have you used?

Summary of Question #1:
Users appreciate the nature-based, music and children’s programs. The most liked amenities involved the natural areas, including but not limited to, the bicycling, hiking, and horse trails.

Community Input:
- Music in the Parks is a great program
- The trails and the natural areas look nice
- The children’s programs are great and the hiking is wonderful
- Lost Lake and the sledding area
- Deer Creek. The bicycling on the roads and the of the park trails are challenging
- Some like the rural aspect of the Township
- Some like the natural programs that are offered: e.g. the historic farm
- Milford has done a nice job along their horse trails
- Bear Creek park is nice for biking and the play structure
- Paint Creek trail is nice for hiking - Paint Creek Mill Race
  - Paint Creek Trailway to Bike especially in the fall and spring
  - Paint Creek Trail frequently to walk and bike Draper and Twin Lake park are used for the fishing dock
- No one uses the parks
- Cranberry Lake Park is nice - Cranberry Lake Winter Festival
  - Swimming, boating, and fishing
- The cross country skiing and events are attractive
- Boy Scout activities or organizing other various events
- Goodison
- BCNP for Hiking, Cross County Skiing, and Dog Walking.
  - BCNP in the past for the former 4th Grade ‘Swamp Rats’ Science Program, and to walk dog

2. Have you used other recreation agencies including public, private or not-for-profit in Oakland Township? Which agencies best meet your needs and why?

Summary of Question #2:
Residents use other recreation agencies such as Oakland University, City of Rochester Hills, Metro Parks, and Oakland County Parks as well as other school parks, both public and private. The Payne Creek Trail seems to best meet people’s needs due to its diverse
trails and opportunity for cross-country skiing. Other agencies are utilized because they offer alternative activities such as a rifle range, disc golf, and racquetball courts.

**Community Input:**
- Bald Mountain is great for hiking. It also has a rifle range
- Stony Creek is a great park and they have a lot of activities
- The Payne Creek Trail offers many bike trails and is widely used. It is nice for cross country skiing at times as well
- Addison Oaks used to groom the trails and the County stopped doing that. It was a nice feature for cross country skiers
- Oakland County Dog Park is a nice facility
- Michigan Nature Association
- City of Rochester Hills, Metro Parks, and Oakland County Parks are all nice.
- Oakland University Racquetball Courts
- The OCP in Rochester and walk their track
- Lake Orion active parks for soccer and softball
- School parks, both public and private
- Auburn Hills has a disc golf course that the kids have a good time with it
- Pontiac Lake, the Township Park out in Springfield
- Lifetime Fitness
- Local museums
- RARA for Track
- Oakland University Sledding Hill
- Bloomer Park (for Cross Country and Track Meets)
- Rochester Municipal Park (The Arts and Apples Fair brought students to the Rochester Municipal Park)

3. What are the strengths of the Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department that we need to build on for this Strategic Master Plan?

**Summary of Question #3:**
The friendliness and responsiveness of the staff and Director of the Parks and Recreation Department have been highlighted throughout the focus group meetings as one of the strengths of the Department. Additionally, even the support of the Commissioners was mentioned as an asset.

Furthermore, the natural areas with attention to passive recreation make the rural feel of the parks more attractive. The distribution of parks throughout the township was appreciated by the community.

The acquisition of land for future development along with the parks quarterly activities and brochures entices residents to visit the agencies. Others feel that the operating ethics, stewardship of the natural resources, diversity of programming and the communication are strengths that we need to build on.

**Community Input:**
- It is nice that the parks are spread out in the township
- Planning and its rural feel
• Natural areas and the attention to passive recreation is a strength
• Programming, staffing, grant writing (Mindy), and acquisition are strengths
• Bear Creek and Paint Creak are both assets to the system
• The communication between the Townships and the residents is great
• Maintenance Days, where the community comes together and assists the staff, are a strength within the department
• The Oakland County Historical Society and the moving of the barn. It was a great project
• The quarterly activities and the brochures are great
• Responsiveness to the residents needs
• Land that has been acquired for future development and land is not commercialized
• People and the image of the Township and its expansive land ownership
• Operating ethics and stewardship of the land and financial resources
• The Commission is balanced and capable of seeing both sides of the issues, while willing to work together
• Family programming is a nice feature of the Department
• The parks are good about bringing the Fire Department into the planning process
• The parks do well with maximizing topography
• Dedicated Commissioners
• The attention to green infrastructure is very good
• Communication and good support from the community
• Free programs, free entry into parks, programs and services for horse lovers to runners and bikers
• Reaching out to neighboring agencies, and they don’t operate within a cylinder
• Parks are well maintained and a great community asset
• Green Belt/Barrier is well maintained and a great thing. Even BCNP has a natural element to it.
• Specific signage or specific park name(s) that tell what the park is for, ie. ‘recreational park,’ ‘sports park,’ ‘picnic park,’ ‘hiking park,’ ‘trail park,’ or ‘preservation park or area.’
• Attended a birthday party at the pavilion that was fun
• The Gazebo at BCNP was used for pictures and that the scenic nature of the parks is a strength that could be built upon by holding a ‘photo contest’
• The sled hill is great, but ropes are needed to climb up the hill, and the hill is very fast

4. What are the key issues facing Oakland Township as it applies to parks and recreation that we need to address in this Strategic Master Plan?

Summary of Question #4:
The main issue that emerged from these meetings focused on prioritizing tasks and creating a balanced system of offerings. The Department needs to develop a clear sense of direction and focus on financial sustainability in these tough economic times.

Safety and lack of signage were brought up as concerns. The community wants to enhance the connectivity in the neighborhood with additional trails.

There are competing priorities with balancing active park development with conservation of open spaces and passive parks. Some residents feel that children’s programming is lacking.
Others stated limited programming targeted towards and increasing demographic segment: older adult and senior citizens. Regardless, a major issue is the lack of usage by citizens and the failure to educate people on the park offerings and activities.

Community Input:
- Need to see a clear sense of direction
- Must establish the priorities over the next 5 to 10 years and ensure that the citizens have input in the process
- To be smarter financially where possible
- There is a need for kids to have a safe place to ride on the roads
- More programs for children, developed by the parks and recreation system
- Closer access to trails
- Trails are a priority for the Township, but active parks are also required
- The census bureau says that one in six people are seniors and the parks are not sufficient in attracting such a demographic
  - The demographic shift towards seniors and getting youth involved is an issue
- The deer and other invasive species problems needs to be dealt with
- Connecting the parks with bike trails is important
- It is a struggle to get people out to use the parks
- Lack of signage. Signage should reflect that of Bear Creek
- Financing (now and for the future), light pollution, some auto theft, and speeding are all issues
- Need to attack the buckhorn trees problems in the parks
- The community needs to be brought together more and the sense of community has dried up since the people are holed up in their homes
- The Marsh park site is not well maintained
- The economy and tax base issues
- Publicity/communication, lack of signage, and a lack of recreation are issues
- Education of the community regarding the sustainability efforts of the department have not been executed well
- There is a lack of association with schools
- There are competing priorities between active and passive parks and the balance of recreation into the system
- Timely development
- Because the park land is valuable, the township may have to make a decision about whether or not it is effective to keep the land.
- Oakland Township has no problem passing ballot issues related to parks and recreation. But, everyone gets concerned about increased taxes. Talk about how our money is being used and educate residents.
- The economy and whether we are prepared to deal with the future
- Being careful to not over commit and paying attention to community needs with the limited resources
- Do not benchmark or share information among similar providers. Rochester, Rochester Hills and Oakland Township are isolated from the rest
- There is a silo mentality. There is no collaboration
• People use private providers for parks and recreation, which could make the services extinct
• The advertising is terrible and there is not enough safety
• A lot of events and programs are lightly attended, though concerts are popular

5. What do Oakland Township residents value most about parks and recreation in our Township?

**Summary of Question #5:**
Residents value the natural elements, such as the hiking and riding trails, the solitude, the wildlife and the wild flowers the most. They also value the vast open land with the programming and safeness. Variety of program offerings and concerts in the parks are valued. The transparency and continued communication is also valued by the staff. Overall, residents value recreation, preservation of the land, and accessibility.

**Community Input:**
• The hiking and riding trails
• Trail connectivity, beauty, solitude, preservation of the land, programming, accessibility, wildlife and wild flowers
• Recreation, education, and maintenance
• The open land in the Township (rural feel)
• The water and the lakes are really nice and the Herron rookery
• Accessibility of horse riding in the parks
• Multi-use of the trails and the concerts in the parks are valuable
• Variety in the music programs is valued by the community
• The staff and its communication and transparency are valued
• A safe environment is important
• The activity centers and playground, the fishing hole at Draper park and the diversity of property and amenities
• Commitment to planning is number one
• Preserve the resources and invite people to participate through programs
• Education and facilities
• The newsletters
• Nature walks

6. How balanced do you think the parks and recreation systems are in Oakland Township in terms of park types (neighborhood, community, regional, and trails)?

**Summary of Question #6:**
Respondents vary in opinion when it comes to the balance of the parks and recreation systems. Few argue that the system is well balanced, while many others feel that it is unbalanced for a variety of reasons. Those reasons encompass the active versus passive park issue. Some citizens feel that the parks are only accessible for trail users and trail users feel the there is not a sufficient balance of paved versus crushed limestone trails. However, the system cannot serve everyone to their liking if it begins to stretch resources too thin.
Community Input:
• Need a balance of paved and crushed limestone trails
• A balance between active and passive usages is necessary
• This is important and there is a good balance, but with the trails development it will be an even greater balance
• Great strides have been made, but there is still a gap in kid’s fields; although, we are starting to take care of that
• Not very balanced because they all seem to be the same
• There is a good balance
• They have been giving the community what they wanted
• Rochester is serving a wider audience of users than what they can support and they can’t keep doing that
• The types of parks are not balanced and this needs to be addressed in the system
• It is unbalanced. There are great properties, but they are not accessible unless you are a trail user
• There are not any pocket parks and there is a reliance on developers to provide that
• The passing of the pathway is huge and has advanced everything in the system
• Not balanced at all. We have the best trails around. We are heavy in environmental protection and more passive recreation than program oriented
• Within the context of Oakland County, the south parks are more active. They seem to be fairly balanced
• It is one sided recreation. If you like active sports, there is no place for you. They are too passive
• There is a good complementary inventory of parks

7. What types of recreation facilities or amenities are missing in the Township that this plan needs to address?

Summary of Question #7:
While some are satisfied, many of the citizens of Oakland Township express a desire for a wide array of facilities or amenities that are missing in the system. The needs center on expanding the system’s reach to new activities. Sports fields and sports courts are also among the biggest needs. In particular, many would like to see baseball and soccer fields as well as multi-purpose sport courts, both indoor and outdoor.

Restrooms and picnic areas seem to be a main concern among users. Other alternative facilities include a splash park and community pool, a skateboard park, snowmobile trails, community gardens, and a fitness course within the trails. Due to the nature of the area, citizens request a warming hut for those trails that are cross-country ski accessible.

Community Input:
• There are very few playgrounds. The Bear Creek playground is the best
• Need a horse mound stop for people to get on and off the horses to take care of the horse waste
• BMX and mountain biking routes
• Drinking fountains and courses for sports training
• Hitching posts for tying horses up to the trail heads and restrooms.
• A dog park and a turning radius for horse trailers
• Restrooms are needed for children at Bear Creek. They should be flush toilets
• Outdoor restrooms along the trail so that people do not have to use the banks of restrooms by the Cider Mill property
• Needs to be more opportunities for cross country skiing with a warming hut
• An amphitheatre for the community to go to would be a nice addition
• A nature center and some basketball courts in the parks
• Soccer fields and amenities are missing in the townships
• Need another multi-purpose age group activity park
• Play structures are needed in all the parks with accessible parking lots close by
• Need for baseball/softball facilities in the parks
• A skating rink would be nice (e.g. Loss Lake in the winter)
• Need to have a fenced area for dogs in the Township
• A fitness course of sorts in the parks
• Need a community center or a fieldhouse in the area (e.g. Troy’s rec. center)
• Tennis courts, benches, informational kiosks, volleyball courts, and picnic pavilions
• Skateboard park
• Mountain biking on limestone trails is not safe
• There should be trash/recycle cans and drinking fountains available on all trails
• Community pools are missing and the only providers are the YMCA and school pools
• Sports courts – both outdoor and indoor
• There is a need for more courts in the existing parking lots at the Cider Mill site
• Most of everything is missing
• Need more community gardens in the Township
• A splash park and snowmobile trails are missing
• Risk management is important when we think about less safe activities. As awareness increases, there will be more interest in this type of program
• Overnight camping
• Equestrian only trails
• A few more docks at Draper
• The seniors and others with disabilities have been forgotten. Special parking needs to be available
  o Must have more accessible docks for seniors around the lakes
• More large picnic facilities/pavilions (big enough for approximately 100-150 people)
• Grills and disc golf
• Fireplace(s), pool (year round)
• Warming House (Brief discussion followed regarding LLNP warming hut)

8. What are the recreation program needs you hear about that are needed in Oakland Township?

**Summary of Question #8:**

Recreation programs that need to be enhanced include fitness classes, such as yoga, tai chi, dance, and aquatics. Other fitness programs could be developing clubs for specific activities (e.g. running club, triathlon club, etc.) There needs to be more program offerings, especially in the summer, focusing on both academic and physical fitness.
Citizens see a need for music, photography, literary, and art oriented programs as well as cross-generation/family programming that involve people of all ages.

**Community Input:**
- Need to be innovative in our programming, but not exclusive
- Active programming is missing
- Need more field and historical programming
- Music oriented programs
- Implementation of events is not good
- Most programs are geared toward teens and young kids
  - There aren’t limited adults or toddler programs
  - There is a need for family programming and programming for children that is close to the residences
  - Need cross-generational activities
- Summer recreation programs are lacking
- The Park System should work with RA/RA to provide summer programs but make it simple
- Get the parks and businesses together to incentivize companies to do walking programs
- More uses in the parks to entertain different interests (e.g. equestrian uses)
- Environmental programs like archery, fishing, accessible pathway systems and having interpretive components at parks
- Need to see more dance classes offered
- Lectures, tours (wild flower id/education)
- Boat Rental (ie. canoe/kayak/row boats)
- Group Biking and/or Trail Hiking
- Networking Opportunities (ie. Non-traditional group activities)
- Historic farm needs to have more activities offered
- Yoga in the Parks is needed
- Two science training programs have been offered and we would like to see more programs like Dinosaur Hills offers
- Clinton River Council is doing fishing for kids and adults on Payne Creek which they could be more involved in
- Evaluate the possibility for camping nights in the parks
- Need to develop programming for the scout programs
- Develop an “Adopt-A-Park or Trail” program with local groups
- There should be a photography program/class offered
- Literary and art programs should be considered
- Marshview program needs include archery and basketball
- Need a go-to-place for wildlife enhancement
- Activity specific group programming; running, equestrian, bicycling, etc.
- There should be some type of Tai Chi and other outdoor classes offered
- Offer golf for youth with a three par course and a “first tees program”
- Bow hunting
- A ‘Sports Day’ or a ‘really big Field Day,’ on an open field, for teenagers
- Beach Volleyball
- Outside Ice Skating (respondent was very enthusiastic about this)
9. Are there any operational or maintenance issues that need to be addressed in Oakland Township Parks in the Strategic Master Plan?

Summary of Question #9:
The majority of the concerns dealt with maintenance issues dealing with mowing, trail upkeep and safety and trash pickup. In some cases, the community wanted the Department to focus on enhancing safety on the trails along with maintenance.

Community Input:
- More maintenance staff as a whole for all parks/recreation facilities
- They are nice pieces of property and appropriately maintained/cleaned
- The crew would like a central work place
- Need to have trails groomed or the hard surface trails swept off during the winter months due to the snow
- The grass is not mowed often enough
- The grass is not cut enough at Cranberry Lakes and needs better care
- The equestrian path to Addison Oaks needs to be improved
- Trash pick-up and gate controls at Bear Creek Park need attention
- A maintenance plan for Marshview is non-existent
- Yellow jacket warning should be prevalent
- Ilsley can have better drainage and tilling. They only mow in a big circle.
- The Trail is maintained way too much and the extra expense would be better spent on enhancing trail safety
- There are piles of limestone in the middle of the parks from time to time

10. Are their opportunities for partnering in Oakland Township for the development or delivery of parks, recreation facilities or programs that the Township should be working towards?

Summary of Question #10:
To alleviate some of the operational/maintenance and funding issues, residents feel that the department could partner with local sports clubs, associations and schools in the area. Partnering with the university could provide support as interns in the parks and recreation study departments could help maintain and enhance the park as practicum hours. The parks should also partner with wildlife agencies and other nature associations as a means of obtaining funding.

Organizations could provide assistance with maintenance issues in exchange for field/court time or usage rights. Furthermore, partnering with the various organizations will allow for sharing of resources so as to enhance the quality of recreation, programming, and facilities within the Department. Resources include more
than material. They also include knowledge that can be shared among the whole staff on best practices.

Community Input:
- There is an opportunity for more connectivity within the park systems and their respective trail managers
- The park system could partner with the sports associations in the area for maintenance and funding purposes
- Townships should partner to share resources and enhance the quality of recreation programming.
- There are no opportunities to partner with other organizations/associations
- The park could partner with Upland Ecological Facility and/or the Michigan Nature Association, the Oakland County Community College, the Art Center, RA/RA, and 4-H, Scouts
- The wildlife agencies need to be a partner with the Township
- University interns could partner with the Township in wildlife management and all its disciplines for practicum hours
- The department could partner with Payne Creek Arts to help provide for art programs
- The department could partner with the Board of Education
- The University Cycling Team in Rochester could volunteer to help in developing trails through the woods and the bike shops might be willing to help
- Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, etc. or other small businesses
- Joint marketing among communities
- Partnership with the Rochester soccer association
- Paint Creek Trail commission
- Friends of the park, Mountain Bike Association, Homeowner Association, and Clinton River Watershed Group
- Concession vendors
- Share resources with Rochester and Rochester Hills since we use their downtown, etc.
- ‘Tie-Ins’ with Crittenton Hospital Wellness Programs and local veterinarians
- Utilize TV to communicate parks and park events
- PRC could contact the RCS Elementary ‘In-School Enrichment’ Consultant for science, Betty Crowder
- Partner with Paint Creek Center for the Arts
- Spirit Week/Events at Schools
- Running Trails could be used by track and cross country teams
- Water/Boater safety certification

11. What role do you see parks and recreation playing in the long term sustainability for Oakland Township?

Summary of Question #11:
Parks and recreation could play a large role in the long term sustainability as they attract more people to the area and increase the property values, while also creating jobs and help to develop our youth for the future. The system shows the Township’s commitment to the people enticing others to join the community.
Community Input:

- To create a sustainable plan for the future and decipher what the community is willing to pay for
- Parks could be the attraction to the area. They could be destination facilities
- It increases the quality of life for the people (and improving the tax base)
- The township needs to plan for the future expansion
- The park system could create jobs for people in the area
- Trails and parks are a critical component for the future of the township
- Focus is on developing our youth for the future
- A focus on sustainable use of our natural resources
- To assist in deciding which lands should be left in its natural state and which ones should be active space
- The parks and recreation system shows the commitment to the townspeople
- Local park and recreation authorities are the voice of the resources. They play an important role in speaking about the natural setting
- It is helpful to provide for economic benefits for the Township

12. If you could change one thing in parks and recreation in Oakland Township in the next 10 years what would it be?

Summary of Question #12:

Many of the citizens would like to see the trail plan move from a 30 year plan to a 10 year plan because they feel it would be a great addition to the system because it would act as a connection amount the different parks. Others would like to see an improvement and expansion in the restroom facilities while also improving the accessibility and usage, including usage for education by partnering with area schools.

Community Input:

- Move the trail plan to a 10 year versus a 30 year plan
- The department prioritizing and complete the trails
- Improve the parking, loop trails, restroom facilities, communication, ease of access, and usage
- There needs to be more awareness and outreach to educate non-users
- More active versus passive recreation areas and programming
- More partnerships with the schools on education programs is most desirable
- More transparency and collaboration with similar providers and new developers
- Connecting more of these properties and preserve the properties for future generations and connections to the schools
- With the economy the way it is, the department should consider seeking assistance from its surrounding associations and townships so as to lighten the financial burden in the future
- Better communication with surrounding agencies
- Develop what we have, instead of buying more property
- A Nature Center would be a nice addition
- Better connection among the different parks
- The fundraising for the parks in the community needs to increase
• Transportation to get kids to concert, events and the parks needs improvement
  Alternative transportation that is less reliant on cars
• Expand the entrance to Bear Creek
• The park should ensure that they are not inhibiting potential users
• The design of the trails needs to be applicable to all types of users
• Park should advertise that you can get Wi-Fi in the parks
• I would reverse direction and minimize efforts to improve things
• To see the trail green again and away from black top
• Vision of the future for the trail is to have a trail, not a road
• Invasive species problems need to be eliminated
• A volunteer coordinator should be a priority

13. What would you like to share with me that I haven’t asked you?

Summary of Question #13:

The people of Oakland Township see the need for improvement in the Parks and Recreation System, but the major concern is funding. There is a general consensus that the parks are not utilized to their full potential. Therefore, many residents suggest increased marketing efforts and promotional activities to help raise awareness and encourage participation in the programming and events.

In addition, each individual has their own ideas as to what facilities and amenities should be added. This creates a varying degree of need, but many would argue that additions to the park should be multi-purpose. The trails are greatly appreciated, but the rest of the park needs to be developed. Ultimately, a successful Department will not be possible unless the proper people are in place from management and maintenance staff to coordinators and volunteers.

Community Input:
• There is a lot of land but we don’t push our parks. There needs to be more activities to motivate people to use the park
  o Need an educational foundation to serve as a clearing house for answering residents key questions
  o Need to be developing more marketing efforts to get kids out
  o Promotional activities and educational activities need to be enhanced to get the word out and we need a long term plan for promoting what we have to offer
  o Need to brand the township as part of this plan
• There is a need for additional space in the region and when there is poor weather teams cannot get in a full season
  o The quality of elementary fields is very poor
  o Most of the schools have facilities for organized sports
• Establishing a mission and philosophy towards pricing of services is needed as part of this plan
• Must have good people in place to manage the system correctly
  o Maintenance will become more important as the system grows
- Need help in directing people in the parks and how to use them and what they can and cannot do in the parks
- Identify the partners to work with the townships to help deliver on the future of the parks system
- There needs to be a maintenance facility for the maintenance staff
- Should create a “Friends of the Parks Association” Need a list of things that volunteers could do to help
  - Needs to be someone responsible for working with volunteers to provide and assist the staff in developing
- Need appropriate benchmarks to demonstrate we are in the right direction
  - This is a step forward and this needs to happen more frequently to establish the direction for the township
- Everything has to be multi-use facilities to make it work and to encourage people to pay to use the services and amenities
  - Should have some of the parks dedicated to pick up games versus having so much open area
- Carbon banking is becoming an important element in the soils to bring down the carbons in the area
- The 23 mile loop around the township is critical to the success of the parks
  - It would be nice to be able to develop trails to a point where kids can move freely through the township without interference with cars
- Nature centers all compete with each other and we don’t need an additional one
- OPC should be expanded to include people under 50 years of age
- Use Cider Mill as a meeting place for all the groups to build the advocacy
- The new area at West Buell could be an equestrian park (similar to Genesee County)
- More access to the lakes is needed
- Would like to see Wi-Fi in the parks
- The tree and plant sale was a excellent idea
- Develop an outdoor adventure school for teaching kids how to enjoy the outdoors
- Add themed playgrounds in each park
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Focus Group for School District Representatives and Teens  
September 17, 2009

School District Representatives

Present:  
Marsha Andres, Principal, Delta Kelly Elementary  
Amy Carels, Parent of an Adams High School Key Club Member  
Betty Crowder, K-12 Science Consultant, RCS

Patty Godin thanked the representatives for their attendance. Patty explained that the information provided today will contribute to the master plan and strategic plan update, noted that OT owns 14 parks, and provided the park handout with maps.

Do you use any of the Township’s parks and recreation services? If so, what do you use?

Summary: Yes. All 3 respondents have used BCNP, and/or Paint Creek Trailway. Respondents added that they ‘do not know the parks.’

Input:

• Yes. BCNP for Hiking, Cross County Skiing, and Dog Walking.
• Yes. BCNP in the past for the former 4th Grade ‘Swamp Rats’ Science Program, and to walk dog, and Paint Creek Trail frequently to walk and bike.
• Yes. Paint Creek Trailway to Bike especially in the fall and spring.
• Paint Creek Heritage Area was stated as ‘used’ since respondent rides by it on the trail.
• Don’t know how to access park.
• The sign for BCNP, on Gunn Road, does not convey to user what is allowed in the park by looking at the sign.
• Signage only includes the name of the park.
• Signage does not convey where the entrance and/or parking is for the park.
• Unclear/Lack of helpful signage
• Signage for CLP does not inform user where to enter, where to park.

How would you assess the overall strengths of Oakland Township Parks and Recreation?

Summary: Respondents were very positive about the acquisitions of natural land and non-commercialized nature of the Parks. Respondents felt the parks were well maintained, and that ‘green belts’ are a good thing.

Input:

• Paint Creek Trailway is ‘a jewel’
• Parks are well maintained
• Parks are a great community asset
• Mindy Milos-Dale did a great presentation at Delta Kelly Elementary
• Parks Department could communicate more effectively w/residents about how special the parks are
• ‘Applaud’ the PRC for acquiring natural land
• ‘Not commercialized’
• Green Belt/Barrier is well maintained and a good thing. Even BCNP has a natural element to it.
• 1 Respondent provided positive feedback regarding the survey recently conducted
• Specific signage or specific park name(s) that tell what the park is for, i.e. ‘recreational park,’ ‘sports park,’ ‘picnic park,’ ‘hiking park,’ ‘trail park,’ or ‘preservation park or area.’
• More informative signage
• Better signage directing users to entrance, parking, and amenities

Are there any opportunities for improvement that you can think of OT can work on?

Summary: Answers were based around the theme of linking with the schools, and linking more with Rochester and Rochester Hills, as well as special ‘tie-ins’ with Crittenton Hospital (ie. Crittenton Wellness Programs), and businesses, (ie vets) as well as communication methods that the schools use such as ‘mailouts.’

Input:
• Share resources with Rochester and Rochester Hills since we use their downtown, etc.
• Connect with Rochester and Rochester Hills
• Link the parks network between Rochester, Rochester Hills, and OT. (Would ‘territorialism’ hinder this?)
• Paint Creek Trailway is used by many non-OT residents
• ‘Tie-Ins’ with Crittenton Hospital Wellness Programs (Amy can provide contact info)
• ‘Tie-Ins’ with local veterinarians for dog programs
• Establish OT usage first, then expand usage to Rochester and Rochester Hills
• Utilize TV to communicate parks and park events
• Deb Hartman is the Director of Communications for RCS. By contacting her, PRC may be able to: Utilize the RCS e-mail blast service to alert student families of a special student/family program, i.e. ‘Elementary Day at LLNP.’ Utilize School e-mail blast service to alert students and their families that the PRC newsletter is attached, or has been mailed. Or, a similar service.

Are there any opportunities for your school to partner with Oakland Township?

Summary: PRC should bring program ideas, which tie in with curriculums, to RCS. Marsha Andres stated they could be open to PRC ‘making an offer’ to RCS for fieldtrip ideas eventually. Also, see above responses.

Input:
• In-School Enrichment Programs are used to enhance the curriculum at specific grade levels in the areas of social studies and science, and ‘once a fit is established’ a program could be brought into the schools.
• Bring presentations/programs to schools. Program/presentation must align with curriculum, i.e. a Naturalist for a particular science program
• PRC could contact the RCS Elementary ‘In-School Enrichment’ Consultant for science, Betty Crowder. (Also an attendee)
• Get out to the users, i.e. ‘road show’ bring presentation to the school
• PRC could raise awareness of parks while doing these programs
• PRC could ‘book the school’ using the RCS Facilities Calendar on RCS website, and could actually hold programs on school grounds or in school facilities – even evening programs could be held at schools if arranged. Even events for Elementary students and families are well attended.
• Partner with Paint Creek Center for the Arts
• Partner with Private Schools
• Stewardship Opportunities i.e. stream monitoring, bird observation, frog/toad count (this applies to RCS students and OPC)
• Water/Boater safety certification is offered by RCS(?) and it was suggested that PRC could tie in with that somehow(?)
• An Astronomy program at the school during evening hours on school property could be possible by arranging w/RCS

Are there any recreation programs you feel Oakland Township can offer that they currently are not offering?

Summary: Networking opportunities, Adult Programming
Input:
• For The OPC community:
  - Lectures
  - Tours (wild flower id/education)
  - Boat Rental (i.e. canoe/kayak/row boats)
• Boat Rental (i.e. canoe/kayak/row boats)
• Group Biking
• Group Trail Hiking
• Networking Opportunities (i.e. Biking Group Sat a.m.s)

Are there any Park or Recreation Amenities/facilities Oakland Township should develop?

Summary: Picnic tables, grills, pavilions, restrooms, water. Pool was mentioned, and not mentioned by the student group.
Input:
• All development has been great
• More Picnic Facilities which would be big enough for approximately 100-150 people
• More, larger Pavilions (related to above item)
• Grills
• Fireplace(s)
• Skate Park (Marsh Andres noted students sometimes use school parking lot)
• Pool (year round)
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- Restrooms
- Water
- Warming House (Brief discussion followed regarding LLNP warming hut)
- Disc Golf

What can Oakland Township Parks and Recreation do to help you with your services?

Input:
- Present at a PTA Meeting?
- ‘Get to the People’
- Have Dinosaur Hill do some of their programs in OT Parks
- Network with RCS to tie in w/curriculum
- Network with Paint Creek Center for the Arts
- Stewardship for Young People
Focus Group for School District Teens
(Middle and High School Students)

Present: Gabrielle Carels, Adams High School Student
Stephanie Mahan, Adams High School Student
Rachel Struve, Adams High School Student
Emma King, Adams High School Student
Dan Bogalski, Adams High School Student
Anna House, Adams High School Student
Ryan Martin, Marist Academy Student
Julia Philp, Hart Middle School Student
Maddie Fleischer, Hart Middle School Student

Patty Godin explained the process of a master plan and a strategic plan update, noted that OT owns 14 parks, and noted that the purpose of this focus group is to obtain opinions from middle and high school students, which will contribute to the Parks Department Master and Strategic planning for the next five and ten year period.

Have you used any of the parks and recreation amenities offered by Oakland Township Parks and Recreation? If so, what have you used?

Summary: Yes. 7 out of 9 respondents have used Lost Lake Nature Park, Paint Creek Trailway, and/or Bear Creek Nature Park.

Input:

- LOST LAKE NATURE PARK: 3 respondents have used the sledding hill
- PAINT CREEK TRAILWAY: 3 Respondents stated they have used the Paint Creek Trailway. Out of this 3, 1 noted that he hasn’t used it lately, but his father uses it ‘all the time’ to bike. ‘It seems to be used by younger children and adults.’
- BEAR CREEK NATURE PARK: 4 Respondents stated they had walked, hiked, or mountain biked the trails at BCNP.

What, if anything, prevents you from using Oakland Township Parks?

Summary: There is not a lot of advertising of the parks, and respondents ‘haven’t heard of the parks.’

Input:

- 1 Respondent goes away to a cottage all summer and plays in her yard in the winter
- There is ‘not a lot of advertising’
- ‘Haven’t heard of the parks’
- Would have room in their schedules to attend extracurricular activities held outside in the parks, specifically if they were held on Friday and Saturday nights
- Tired? ‘yeah, kind of’
- Don’t have time – ‘Lots of homework on the weekends; tests on Monday’
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Have you used other recreation agencies, or your school, including public, private or not-for-profit in Oakland Township? Which agencies best meet your needs and why?

Summary: All 9 Respondents have used the Rochester Municipal Park. At least 1 respondent stated they have used the following:

Input:
- RARA for Track
- Oakland University Sledding Hill (because it is closer to her home)
- Bloomer Park (Cross Country Track Meet)
- Rochester Municipal Park (The Arts and Apples Fair brought students to the Rochester Municipal Park)

How aware are you of what Oakland Parks and Recreation has to offer?

Summary: There is no advertising for the parks; ‘not aware of parks’

Input:
- Parks are ‘hidden; need signs’
- Need More Events
- Need more 5k runs
- Would Like summer water events, like water slides setup; inflatables set up, i.e. once/month in a park during the summer.

Do you have any ideas about how the Township can better connect with potential park and recreation users such as yourself?

Summary: Advertise through the schools; Post flyers in places that families tend to visit; Post posters regarding park events at highly visible bulletin boards such as the Village, or at intersections that are passed frequently. Posters should be limited to advertising 1 single park, or 1 single park event, i.e. should be clear and effective announcing an event or include a picture of a special or unique identifying feature of a park.

Respondents noted that they do not read any newspapers.

PG asked what extra curricular activities the students are involved in. The students listed the following: Baseball/Golf/Basketball/Ice Skating/Gymnastics/Piano/German/Dance/Religious Ed/Work Part Time Job (at American Eagle)/Youth Group. PG asked the respondents if they would take some of their extracurricular time to spend out of doors in an OT Park and the students noted that this would be very possible, specifically if events were held on Friday and Saturday nights.

Input:
- Hold Art Fairs (Arts and Apples brought these students to Rochester Municipal Park)
- Advertise thru the schools; possibly as part of ‘morning announcements’ (students thought that the ‘school would allow’ this)
- Advertise with clear concise posters, posted at frequently passed locations such as intersections.
• Include a unique feature or landmark when designing and planning parks so that it stands out in peoples minds, i.e. ‘a standout or identifying feature’
• Put Flyers or posters in family frequented areas such as churches, youth groups
• Family events
• Posters at Grocery Stores could work
• Posters should highlight just 1 park, or park event per poster
• A Drive In Movie, or other types of special, fun, outdoor activities for students on Friday and Saturday nights, for students
• Connect parks to schools or develop parks closest to schools

What are the strengths of the Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department that we need to build on for this Strategic Master Plan?

Summary: BCNP Trails and Pavillion, LLNP Sled Hill, and the Scenic Nature of the Parks, ie. The Gazebo at BCNP

Input:
• 1 Respondent noted that she attended a birthday party at the pavilion which proved to be a ‘fun, unstructured free day.’
• 1 Respondent noted that the Gazebo at BCNP was used for pictures and that the scenic nature of the parks is a strength that could be built upon by holding a ‘photo contest.’
• 1 Respondent noted that the sled hill is great, but ropes are needed to climb up the hill, and that the hill is very fast.

Can you think of any areas Oakland Parks and Recreation needs to improve?

Summary: Advertising could be improved upon.

Input:
• Like the natural aspect of the parks; it’s fun to look at nature
• “Not much to do”
• Restrooms
• Sports Teams
• Areas for Sports
• Playset for Older Kids
• Food Stand
• Skate Parks
• Drinking Fountains
• Sports Training Courses
What types of recreation facilities or amenities are missing in the Township that this plan needs to address?

Summary: Advertising. ‘Don’t know a lot about the Parks, therefore the respondents stated that it was difficult to answer this question.

Input:

- A concrete trail for rollerblading, but keep nature feature also.
- Skateboard Parks
- BMX Bike Routes
- More Mountain Bike Paths
- More Fishing
- Basketball Courts
- Community Pool
- Soccer Fields
- Baseball Fields
- Better Playsets
- Volleyball Courts

Are there any recreation programs you feel the Department should offer, programs that you would be interested in?

Summary: Really good ideas from these students. Some are brand new programs, and others would be a variation of an already provided program, i.e. Summer concerts, geared towards students.

Input:

- A ‘Sports Day’ or a ‘really big Field Day,’ on an open field, for teenagers, i.e. ‘Pick-up Games’
- Beach Volleyball
- Outside Ice Skating (respondent was very enthusiastic about this)
- Live Music During the Summer
  - Pop Music (Student suggested contacting ‘The Factory’ in Rochester since they book bands for an audience of this age group)
  - Hot dogs, snacks, refreshments, drinks
  - Students noted that, yes, they would attend such an event
- 5K Runs/Running Races
- More Volunteer Community Service Hours are needed by students. Opportunities to volunteer or take part should be advertised to students as opportunities to earn Community Service Hours
Would you have any interest in volunteering with the Department, such as being a part of a “green” teen committee?

Summary: Volunteering. 5 out of 9 respondents answered yes, in order to gain community service hours and to just help improve the parks. Committee. 8 out of 9 respondents answered yes, they would be interested in being on a committee, and 1 respondent answered ‘yes, if he had time.’

Input:
- Yes, would volunteer at an event, i.e. an art fair, and would volunteer to pull weeds/invasive plants.
- High School and Middle School students are always looking for ‘Community Service Hours’ and this could count towards these hours.
- Parks Department could advertise volunteer opportunities as a way to earn community service hours to students.
- Parks Department could advertise thru the school newspapers, and via ‘guidance counselors’ page’ to students
- Students would be willing to participate in more focus groups
- Key club members need to work 4 service hours per quarter

What opportunities are there for Oakland Parks and Recreation to partner with your school district?

Summary: The students briefly mentioned events that take place in their school(s), and noted the trails as opportunities to partner.

Input:
- Spirit Week/Events at Schools
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Executive Summary
Overview of the Methodology

The Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission conducted a Community Attitude and Interest Survey during August and September of 2009 to help establish priorities for the future acquisition, development and operations of parks, trails, recreation facilities, and programs within the community. The survey was designed to obtain statistically valid results from households throughout Oakland Township. The survey was administered by a combination of mail and phone.

Leisure Vision worked extensively with Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission officials in the development of the survey questionnaire. This work allowed the survey to be tailored to issues of strategic importance to effectively plan the future system.

Leisure Vision mailed surveys to a random sample of 2,000 households throughout Oakland Township. Approximately three days after the surveys were mailed each household that received a survey also received an electronic voice message encouraging them to complete the survey. In addition, about two weeks after the surveys were mailed Leisure Vision began contacting households by phone. Those who indicated they had not returned the survey were given the option of completing it by phone.

The goal was to obtain a total of at least 400 completed surveys from Oakland Township households. This goal was accomplished, with a total of 424 surveys having been completed. The results of the random sample of 424 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +/-4.8%.

The following pages summarize major survey findings.
Community Attitude and Interest Survey for Oakland Township

Major Survey Findings

- **Visiting Oakland Township Parks.** Eighty-seven percent (87%) of households have visited Oakland Township parks during the past year. This is significantly higher than the national benchmarking average of 72%. The most frequently mentioned parks that households have visited during the past year include: Paint Creek Trail (74%), Bear Creek (46%), Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park (20%), and Lost Lake Nature Park (18%).

- **Reasons Preventing the Use of Oakland Township Parks and Trails.** “Lack of leisure time” (47%) is the most frequently mentioned reason preventing households from using Oakland Township parks and trails more often. Other frequently mentioned reasons include: “I do not know locations of parks” (26%) and “I’m not familiar with the park system” (18%).

- **Potential Township Park Improvements.** The most frequently mentioned improvements that respondents would like to have made to Township parks include: restrooms (43%), well defined trail access points (31%), road signs directing to parks (29%), and picnic tables/benches (25%).

- **Participation in Township Recreation Programs and Special Events.** Eighteen percent (18%) of households have participated in summer concerts, and 11% have participated in Goodison Good Tyme.

- **Reasons Preventing the Use of Oakland Township Programs or Special Events.** “Lack of leisure time” (49%) is the most frequently mentioned reason preventing households from using Oakland Township programs or special events more often. Other frequently mentioned reasons include: “I do not know what is being offered” (34%) and “I’m not interested in attending programs/events” (21%).

- **Preferred Option Regarding Future Use of Parkland.** Forty-six percent (46%) of respondents prefer to develop some parkland for active recreation, 35% prefer not to develop any parkland for active recreation, and the remaining 19% indicated “don’t know”.

- **Need for Parks and Recreation Facilities.** There are four parks and recreation facilities that at least 50% of households have a need for: walking and biking trails (85%), greenspace and natural areas (62%), nature center and trails (56%), and winter sledding hills (50%).

- **Most Important Parks and Recreation Facilities.** Based on the sum of their top four choices, the parks and recreation facilities that households rated as the most important are: walking and biking trails (64%), greenspace and natural areas (29%), nature center and trails (28%), and swimming pools (18%).
Need for Nature, Sports, and Recreation Programs. The recreation programs that the highest percentage of households have a need for include: special events (46%), adult fitness and wellness programs (38%), and nature programs/environmental education (36%).

Most Important Nature, Sports, and Recreation Programs. Based on the sum of their top four choices, the nature, sports, and recreation programs that households rated as the most important include: special events (35%), adult fitness and wellness programs (29%), and nature programs/environmental education (26%).

Organizations Used for Indoor and Outdoor Activities. Forty-seven percent (47%) of households have used Oakland Township for indoor and outdoor recreation activities. Other frequently mentioned organizations that households have used include: Huron Clinton Metroparks (43%), private clubs (41%), school district facilities (34%), and State of Michigan Parks (34%).

Ways Respondents Learn about Township Programs and Activities. Eighty percent (80%) of respondents have learned about Oakland Township programs and activities through the parks and recreation newsletter. Other frequently mentioned ways that respondents have learned about Township programs and activities include newspaper articles (45%) and from family, friends and neighbors (25%).

Allocation of $100 among Township Parks, Trails, Sports, and Recreation Facilities. Respondents would allocate $35 out of $100 to improvements/maintenance of existing parks. The remaining $65 were allocated as follows: acquisition and development of walking, biking, and horse trails ($16), acquisition of new parkland and natural areas ($13), stewardship of natural areas ($13), development of new specialized facilities ($11), construction of new sports fields ($9), and “other” ($3).

Preferred Trail and Pathway Use. Seventy-five percent (75%) of respondents prefer to use trails and pathways for recreation usage and wellness and fitness. Twelve percent (12%) prefer to use trails and pathways for frequent transportation to a specific destination, 2% selected “other”, and 11% did not provide a response.

Activities That Households Would Participate in at Proposed Trails and Pathways. Eighty-six percent (86%) of respondents would use proposed trails and pathways for walking. The other most frequently mentioned activities that respondents would participate in at trails and pathways include family bicycling (65%) and nature observation (48%).
- **Most Important Destinations to Access from Proposed Trails and Pathways.** Based on the sum of their top three choices, the destinations that respondents indicated would be most important to access from proposed trails and pathways include: Paint Creek Trail (78%), parks/natural areas (54%), and urban areas (41%).

- **Greatest Needs That Households Have for Trail/Pathway Amenities.** Based on the sum of their top three choices, the greatest needs that households have for trail/pathway amenities include: restrooms (59%), drinking fountains (35%), and bike racks (30%).
Charts and Graphs
Q1. Oakland Township Parks and Trails Used During the Past Year
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Paint Creek Trail: 74%
- Bear Creek Nature Park: 46%
- Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park: 20%
- Lost Lake Nature Park: 14%
- Cranberry Lake Park, including Historic District: 14%
- Paint Creek Heritage Area-Wet Prairie: 11%
- Draper Twin Lake Park: 9%
- Mill Race Trail, including Historic District: 9%
- Charles Ilsley Park: 5%
- Marsh View Park: 5%
- Blue Heron Environmental Area: 5%
- Gallagher Creek Park: 5%
- None: 13%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q2. Oakland Township Parks and Trails Used Most Often During the Past Year
by percentage of respondent households that selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Paint Creek Trail: 68%
- Bear Creek Nature Park: 41%
- Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park: 16%
- Lost Lake Nature Park: 13%
- Cranberry Lake Park, including Historic District: 9%
- Paint Creek Heritage Area-Wet Prairie: 7%
- Draper Twin Lake Park: 6%
- Mill Race Trail, including Historic District: 5%
- Marsh View Park: 3%
- Blue Heron Environmental Area: 2%
- Gallagher Creek Park: 2%
- Charles Ilsley Park: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q3. Reasons Preventing Households From Visiting Oakland Township Parks or Trails More Often
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Lack of leisure time: 47%
- I do not know locations of parks: 26%
- I'm not familiar with the park system: 18%
- Lack of walking/biking access to parks: 17%
- Appreciate open space without using a park: 14%
- Not interested in using parks: 14%
- Lack of parking: 9%
- Use park facilities in other communities: 8%
- Facilities/amenities not available: 8%
- Safety concerns: 7%
- Rustic trails are difficult to use: 5%
- Parks lack the right equipment: 4%
- Parks are not well maintained: 2%
- Not accessible for people with disabilities: 2%
- Insufficient staffing or services: 1%
- Other: 14%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q4. Improvements Respondents Would Most Like to Have Made to Oakland Township Parks
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Restrooms: 43%
- Well defined trail access points: 31%
- Road signs directing to parks: 20%
- Picnic tables/benches: 17%
- Signs directing within parks: 16%
- Parking: 14%
- Drinking fountains: 14%
- Informational/Interpretive signs within parks: 14%
- Hard surface trails: 14%
- Grooming park trails for cross-country skiing: 14%
- Bike racks: 11%
- Restoration of natural areas: 11%
- Winter sports equipment rental: 7%
- Handicap accessibility (parking, trails): 7%
- Sand volleyball courts: 5%
- Portable soccer goals: 5%
- Horseshoe pits: 5%
- Volleyball nets: 4%
- Badminton/pickle-ball courts: 4%
- Lawn area for croquet and bocce: 4%
- Other: 16%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q5. Oakland Township Recreation Programs or Special Events Participated in During the Past 12 Months

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Summer Concerts: 18%
- Goodison Good Tyme: 11%
- Nature Programs: 9%
- Winter Carnival: 9%
- Curamus Terram Races: 3%
- Natural Area Stewardship Workdays: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

---

Q5a. How Respondents Rate the Overall Quality of the Oakland Township Recreation Programs or Special Events Participated in During the Past 12 Months

by percentage of households that have participated in recreation programs or special events

- Winter Carnival: Excellent 65%, Good 32%, Fair 3%, Poor 2%
- Nature Programs: Excellent 61%, Good 37%, Fair 3%, Poor 2%
- Summer Concerts: Excellent 60%, Good 37%, Fair 3%, Poor 4%
- Goodison Good Tyme: Excellent 50%, Good 46%, Fair 4%, Poor 8%
- Curamus Terram Races: Excellent 71%, Good 21%, Fair 7%, Poor 1%
- Natural Area Stewardship Workdays: Excellent 20%, Good 50%, Fair 30%, Poor 7%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q6. Reasons Preventing Households From Attending Oakland Township Programs or Special Events More Often

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Lack of leisure time: 49%
- I do not know what is being offered: 34%
- Not interested in attending programs/events: 21%
- I do not know locations of parks: 13%
- Participate in programs in other communities: 5%
- Program or special event not offered: 4%
- Not accessible for people with disabilities: 1%
- Insufficient staffing or services: 1%
- Other: 12%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q7. Which of the Following Is Your Preferred Option Regarding Future Use of Parkland?

by percentage of respondents

- Develop some parkland for active recreation: 46%
- Don’t develop any parkland for active recreation: 35%
- Don’t Know: 19%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q8. Land Acquisition Options That Households Support the Most
by percentage of respondents (sum of top two choices)

- Acquire land for natural area protection, passive use, & active recreation: 44%
- Acquire land for natural area protection: 34%
- Acquire land for passive recreation use: 30%
- No new land should be acquired: 18%
- Acquire land for active youth and adult recreation: 11%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q9. Respondent Households That Have a Need for Various Parks and Recreation Facilities
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Walking and biking trails: 85%
- Greenspace and natural areas: 62%
- Nature center and trails: 56%
- Winter sledding hills: 50%
- Fitness trails: 45%
- Small neighborhood parks: 42%
- Outdoor ice skating rink: 41%
- Picnic shelters: 40%
- Large community parks: 40%
- Fishing/Observation dock: 39%
- Canoe/kayak launch: 33%
- Swimming pools: 32%
- Playground structures: 31%
- Off-leash dog park: 26%
- Splash parks: 24%
- Tennis courts: 22%
- Youth soccer/lacrosse fields: 21%
- Youth baseball and softball fields: 21%
- Outdoor basketball courts: 17%
- Primitive camping: 12%
- Skateboarding park: 10%
- Archery Range: 9%
- Adult softball fields: 9%
- Disc golf: 8%
- Adult soccer/lacrosse: 7%
- Horse trails: 3%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q9a. Estimated Number of Households in Oakland Township That Have a Need for Various Parks and Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Need for Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>3,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace and natural areas</td>
<td>2,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center and trails</td>
<td>2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter sledding hills</td>
<td>2,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness trails</td>
<td>1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>1,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor ice skating rink</td>
<td>1,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters</td>
<td>1,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>1,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/Observation dock</td>
<td>1,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/kayak launch</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools</td>
<td>1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground structures</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog park</td>
<td>1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash parks</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth soccer/lacrosse fields</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth baseball and softball fields</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive camping</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding park</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Range</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball fields</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult soccer/lacrosse</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse trails</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

---

Q9b. How Well Parks and Recreation Facilities in Oakland Township Meet the Needs of Respondent Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Meet Needs Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenspace and natural areas</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature center and trails</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter sledding hills</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness trails</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor ice skating rink</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelters</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large community parks</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing/Observation dock</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/kayak launch</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground structures</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog park</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash parks</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult softball fields</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse trails</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive camping</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding park</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Range</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult soccer/lacrosse</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor ice skating rink</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q9c. Estimated Number of Households in Oakland Township Whose Needs for Parks and Recreation Facilities Are Only Being 50% Met or Less

by number of households based on 4,341 households in Oakland Township

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q10. Parks and Recreation Facilities That Are Most Important to Respondent Households

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q11. Respondent Households That Have a Need for Various Nature, Sports and Recreation Programs
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Special events, i.e. concerts, festivals: 46%
- Adult fitness and wellness programs: 38%
- Nature programs/environmental education: 36%
- Walking, hiking, and running clubs: 30%
- Adult programs for 50 years and older: 30%
- Youth sports programs: 24%
- Adult fine arts and performing arts: 21%
- Youth fine arts and performing arts: 20%
- Youth summer day camp programs: 19%
- Teen oriented programs: 17%
- After school programs: 15%
- Preschool programs: 10%
- Programs for persons with special needs: 8%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q11a. Estimated Number of Households in Oakland Township That Have a Need for Various Nature, Sports and Recreation Programs
by number of households based on 4,341 households in Oakland Township

- Special events, i.e. concerts, festivals: 1,988
- Adult fitness and wellness programs: 1,650
- Nature programs/environmental education: 1,554
- Walking, hiking, and running clubs: 1,311
- Adult programs for 50 years and older: 1,302
- Youth sports programs: 1,046
- Adult fine arts and performing arts: 920
- Youth fine arts and performing arts: 868
- Youth summer day camp programs: 829
- Teen oriented programs: 716
- After school programs: 634
- Preschool programs: 360
- Programs for persons with special needs: 360

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
by percentage of respondent households that have a need for programs

Nature programs/environmental education
- 19% meet needs
- 29% meet needs
- 32% meet needs
- 14% meet needs
- 6% meet needs

Special events, i.e. concerts, festivals
- 23% meet needs
- 24% meet needs
- 28% meet needs
- 18% meet needs
- 8% meet needs

Walking, hiking, and running clubs
- 26% meet needs
- 16% meet needs
- 26% meet needs
- 15% meet needs
- 18% meet needs

Preschool programs
- 20% meet needs
- 11% meet needs
- 34% meet needs
- 23% meet needs
- 11% meet needs

Adult programs for 50 years and older
- 13% meet needs
- 17% meet needs
- 20% meet needs
- 19% meet needs
- 32% meet needs

Youth sports programs
- 13% meet needs
- 17% meet needs
- 19% meet needs
- 21% meet needs
- 31% meet needs

Adult fitness and wellness programs
- 12% meet needs
- 16% meet needs
- 29% meet needs
- 18% meet needs
- 26% meet needs

After school programs
- 11% meet needs
- 16% meet needs
- 22% meet needs
- 29% meet needs
- 22% meet needs

Youth summer day camp programs
- 16% meet needs
- 10% meet needs
- 15% meet needs
- 22% meet needs
- 36% meet needs

Programs for persons with special needs
- 7% meet needs
- 14% meet needs
- 14% meet needs
- 24% meet needs
- 41% meet needs

Adult fine arts and performing arts
- 9% meet needs
- 11% meet needs
- 33% meet needs
- 17% meet needs
- 31% meet needs

Youth fine arts and performing arts
- 8% meet needs
- 10% meet needs
- 20% meet needs
- 23% meet needs
- 39% meet needs

Teen oriented programs
- 5% meet needs
- 5% meet needs
- 16% meet needs
- 23% meet needs
- 50% meet needs

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q11c. Estimated Number of Households in Oakland Township Whose Needs for Nature, Sports and Recreation Programs Are Only Being 50% Met or Less
by number of households based on 4,341 households in Oakland Township

Adult fitness and wellness programs
- 1,190 households

Special events, i.e. concerts, festivals
- 917 households

Adult programs for 50 years and older
- 818 households

Nature programs/environmental education
- 761 households

Walking, hiking, and running clubs
- 741 households

Adult fine arts and performing arts
- 737 households

Youth sports programs
- 716 households

Youth fine arts and performing arts
- 639 households

Teen oriented programs
- 607 households

Youth summer day camp programs
- 460 households

After school programs
- 309 households

Preschool programs
- 286 households

Programs for persons with special needs
- 228 households

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top four choices

- Special events, i.e. concerts, festivals: 35%
- Adult fitness and wellness programs: 29%
- Nature programs/environmental education: 26%
- Adult programs for 50 years and older: 23%
- Walking, hiking, and running clubs: 22%
- Youth sports programs: 18%
- Adult fine arts and performing arts: 13%
- Youth summer day camp programs: 12%
- Youth fine arts and performing arts: 11%
- Teen oriented programs: 11%
- After school programs: 8%
- Preschool programs: 5%
- Programs for persons with special needs: 4%
- Other: 1%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q13. Organizations That Respondent Households Have Used for Indoor and Outdoor Recreation Activities During the Past 12 Months

by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Oakland Township Parks/Rec: 47%
- Huron Clinton Metroparks (e.g. Stony Creek): 43%
- Private clubs: 41%
- School District facilities: 34%
- State of Michigan Parks (e.g. Bald Mountain): 34%
- Oakland County Parks (e.g. Addison Oaks): 31%
- Churches: 28%
- Recreation facilities in other communities: 26%
- Nature Centers: 22%
- Older Persons Commission: 22%
- RARA: 21%
- Homeowners associations: 20%
- Private youth sports leagues: 16%
- YMCA: 12%
- College recreation facilities: 11%
- Other: 5%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q14. Organizations That Respondent Households Use the Most for Indoor and Outdoor Recreation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Use Most (%)</th>
<th>Use 2nd Most (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private clubs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Township Parks/Rec</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron Clinton Metroparks (e.g. Stony Creek)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District facilities</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Persons Commission</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan Parks (e.g. Bald Mountain)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RARA</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation facilities in other communities</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland County Parks (e.g. Addison Oaks)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private youth sports leagues</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners associations</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Centers</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College recreation facilities</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q15. Ways Respondents Learn About Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department Programs and Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Method</th>
<th>Use (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation newsletter</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From family, friends and neighbors</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Township Web site</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event postcards</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec. facilities</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Township Government</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers distributed at school &amp; local businesses</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversations with Parks/Rec. staff &amp; Commissioners</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable access television</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agency sources</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q16. Portion of Costs for Various Programs That Should Be Covered by User Fees

by percentage of respondents

Children's programs (ages 0-7 years)
- 23% 10% 25% 13% 30%

Youth programs (ages 8-13 years)
- 22% 12% 27% 16% 24%

Teen programs (ages 14-18 years)
- 23% 9% 29% 16% 23%

Adult programs
- 31% 9% 29% 15% 17%

Senior adult programs (ages 55+)
- 20% 8% 24% 19% 29%

Programs for persons with disabilities
- 16% 5% 16% 14% 48%

Community-wide special events for families
- 20% 6% 26% 14% 34%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q17. How New Outdoor Parks, Recreation Facilities and Programs Should Be Funded

by percentage of respondents

- Mostly User Fees 24%
- Mostly Taxes 38%
- 100% User Fees 12%
- 100% Taxes 14%
- Not Sure 12%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q18. How Respondents Would Allocate $100 Among Various Township Parks, Trails, Sports, and Recreation Facilities

by percentage of respondents

- Improvements/maintenance of existing parks: $35
- Acquisition of new parkland and natural areas: $13
- Construction of new sports fields: $9
- Acquisition and development of walking, biking, and horse trails: $16
- Development of new specialized facilities: $11
- Stewardship of natural areas: $13
- Other: $3
- Not provided: $11
- Other: $3

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q19. Households’ Preferred Trail and Pathway Use

by percentage of respondents

- Recreation usage/wellness and fitness: 75%
- Frequent transportation to a specific destination: 12%
- Not provided: 11%
- Other: 2%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q20. Activities That Households Would Participate in at Proposed Trails and Pathways in Oakland Township
by percentage of respondents (multiple choices could be made)

- Walking: 86%
- Family Bicycling: 65%
- Nature Observation: 48%
- Running/Jogging: 38%
- Recreational/Transportation Biking: 27%
- Mountain Bicycling: 25%
- Horseback Riding: 5%
- Other: 5%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q21. Destinations That Would Be Most Important to Access from Proposed Trails and Pathways in Oakland Township
by percentage of respondent households that selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Paint Creek Trail: 54%
- Parks/Natural Areas: 41%
- Urban Areas: 28%
- Residential Neighborhoods: 25%
- Shopping/Commercial Areas: 22%
- Schools: 20%
- Other: 3%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q22. Greatest Needs That Households Have for Trail/Pathway Amenities
by percentage of respondent households that selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Restrooms: 35%
- Drinking fountains: 30%
- Bike racks: 27%
- Trash receptacles: 25%
- Directional signage: 21%
- Mile markers: 20%
- Roadway crossings: 19%
- Trailhead information kiosks: 19%
- Benches: 7%
- Other: 5%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q23. Type of Trail Treatment That Households Most Prefer
by percentage of respondents

- Crushed Stone Trail: 52%
- Rustic Trails: 20%
- 19% Trails adhering to ADA accessibility guidelines
- Not provided: 9%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q24. Demographics: Number of People in Household
by percentage of respondents

- One: 7%
- Two: 37%
- Three: 16%
- Four: 21%
- Five+: 19%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q25. Demographics: Ages of People in Household
by percentage of household occupants

- Under 5 years: 5%
- 5-9 years: 9%
- 10-14 years: 8%
- 15-19 years: 9%
- 20-24 years: 6%
- 25-34 years: 4%
- 35-44 years: 14%
- 45-54 years: 19%
- 55-64 years: 15%
- 65-74 years: 8%
- 75+ years: 3%
- 10-14 years: 8%
- Under 5 years: 5%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Q26. Demographics: Age of Respondents
by percentage of respondents

- Under 35: 6%
- 35-44 years: 24%
- 45-54 years: 29%
- 55-64 years: 23%
- 65+ years: 18%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)

Q27. Demographics: Gender
by percentage of respondents

- Male: 50%
- Female: 50%

Source: Leisure Vision/ETC Institute (September 2009)
Survey Instrument
Community Interest and Opinion Survey: *Let your voice be heard today!*

The Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department would value your input to help determine park and recreation priorities for our community. When you are finished, please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid, return-reply envelope. We greatly appreciate your time.

Do you live within Oakland Township?  
____(1) Yes [please continue with the survey]  
____(2) No [please discontinue the survey]

1. From the following list of Oakland Township parks and trails please check ALL the PARKS and TRAILS you and members of your household have used during the past year.
   - (01) Bear Creek Nature Park
   - (02) Blue Heron Environmental Area
   - (03) Charles Ilsley Park
   - (04) Cranberry Lake Park, including Historic District
   - (05) Gallagher Creek Park
   - (06) Lost Lake Nature Park
   - (07) Marsh View Park
   - (08) Mill Race Trail, including Historic District
   - (09) Paint Creek Heritage Area-Wet Prairie
   - (10) Paint Creek Trail
   - (11) Draper Twin Lake Park
   - (12) Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park
   - (13) None

2. Which THREE of the PARKS or TRAILS from the list in Question #1 have you and members of your household used the most during the past year? [Using the numbers in Question #1 above, please write in the numbers for the parks you use most.]
   1st:____  2nd:____  3rd:____

3. Please CHECK ALL the reasons that prevent you or other members of your household from visiting parks or trails of the Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department more often.
   - (01) Parks are not well maintained
   - (02) Facilities/amenities not available
   - (03) Parks lack the right equipment
   - (04) Safety concerns
   - (05) Lack of parking
   - (06) Rustic trails are difficult to use
   - (07) Use park facilities in other communities
   - (08) Lack of walking/biking access to parks
   - (09) Insufficient staffing or services
   - (10) I do not know locations of parks
   - (11) Not accessible for people with disabilities
   - (12) I’m not familiar with the park system
   - (13) Lack of leisure time
   - (14) Not interested in using parks
   - (15) Appreciate open space without using a park
   - (16) Other: ________________________

4. Listed below are potential improvements that could be made to Oakland Township parks. Please check ALL the improvements you would most like to have made to Oakland Township parks.
   - (01) Parking
   - (02) Hard surface trails
   - (03) Drinking fountains
   - (04) Restrooms
   - (05) Restoration of natural areas
   - (06) Portable soccer goals
   - (07) Volleyball nets
   - (08) Bike racks
   - (09) Picnic tables/benches
   - (10) Well defined trail access points
   - (11) Road signs directing to parks
   - (12) Informational/Interpretive signs within parks
   - (13) Signs directing within parks
   - (14) Grooming park trails for cross-country skiing
   - (15) Lawn area for croquet and bocce
   - (16) Winter sports equipment rental
   - (17) Handicap accessibility (parking, trails)
   - (18) Sand volleyball courts
   - (19) Badminton/pickle-ball courts
   - (20) Horseshoe pits
   - (21) Other: ________________________
5. Please indicate if you or any member of your household has participated in any recreation programs or special events offered by the Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department during the past 12 months.

If YES your household participates, please indicate how you would rate the overall quality of the Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department programs and special events by circling the corresponding number to the right of the program/special event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Special Event</th>
<th>Does Your Household Participate in this Program/Special Event?</th>
<th>If YES you participate, how would you rate the overall quality of the program/special event?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.  Nature Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.  Natural Area Stewardship Workdays</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.  Summer Concerts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.  Goodison Good Tyme</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.  Curamus Terram Races</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.  Winter Carnival</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please CHECK ALL the reasons that prevent you or other members of your household from attending programs or special events of the Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department more often.

   ____ (1) Program or special event not offered
   ____ (2) Participate in programs in other communities
   ____ (3) Insufficient staffing or services
   ____ (4) I do not know locations of parks
   ____ (5) Not accessible for people with disabilities
   ____ (6) I do not know what is being offered
   ____ (7) Lack of leisure time
   ____ (8) Not interested in attending programs/events
   ____ (9) Other: ________________________

7. Exclusive of significant natural areas, Oakland Township CURRENTLY owns some parkland that could be developed for active recreation (e.g. baseball, soccer). Which one of the following is your preferred option regarding FUTURE USE of parkland?

   ____ (1) Develop some parkland for active recreation
   ____ (2) Don’t develop any parkland for active recreation
   ____ (3) Don’t Know

8. Oakland Township currently owns 1,100 acres dedicated to active and passive park use and natural area protection. Oakland Township also has some options regarding the FUTURE ACQUISITION of parkland and significant natural areas. From the following list, please check no more than TWO land acquisition options that you and members of your household would support the most.

   ____ (1) Land should be acquired mainly for natural area protection, (devoting finances to actively manage and maintain the integrity of natural resources)
   ____ (2) Land should be acquired mainly for passive recreation usage, e.g. trails, picnicking, shelters
   ____ (3) Land should be acquired mainly for active youth and adult recreation, e.g. baseball, soccer
   ____ (4) Land should be acquired for a combination of passive usage, active recreation, and natural area protection
   ____ (5) No new land should be acquired
9. Please indicate if YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD has a need for each of the parks and recreation facilities listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the park/facility.

If YES, please rate ALL the following parks and recreation FACILITIES of this type in Oakland Township or within a 5 mile radius of Oakland Township on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means “100% Meets Needs” and 1 means “Does Not Meet Needs” of your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Do You Have a Need for this Facility?</th>
<th>If YES You Have a Need, How Well Are Your Needs Being Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Walking and biking trails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Nature center and trails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Archery Range</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Horse trails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Small neighborhood parks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Large community parks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Off-leash dog park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Playground structures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Disc golf</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Skateboarding park</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Greenspace and natural areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Youth baseball and softball fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Youth soccer/lacrosse fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Adult softball fields</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Canoe/kayak launch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Swimming pools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Picnic shelters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Tennis courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fitness trails</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Outdoor basketball courts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Splash parks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Fishing/Observation dock</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Adult soccer/lacrosse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Outdoor ice skating rink</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Primitive camping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Winter sledding hills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other:---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Which FOUR of the facilities from the list in Question #9 are most important to your household that you think Oakland Township should provide? [Using the letters and/or numbers in the left hand column of Question #9 above, please write in the letters and/or numbers below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.]

1st: _____ 2nd:_____ 3rd:_____ 4th:_____ NONE
11. Please indicate if YOU or any member of your HOUSEHOLD has a need for each of the nature, sports and recreation programs listed below by circling the YES or NO next to the program.

If YES, please rate the following recreation PROGRAMS of this type in Oakland Township or within a 5 mile radius of Oakland Township on a scale of 5 to 1, where 5 means “100% Meets Needs” and 1 means “Does Not Meet Needs” of your household.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Do You Have a Need for this Program?</th>
<th>If YES You Have a Need, How Well Are Your Needs Being Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Special events, i.e. concerts, festivals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Nature programs/environmental education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Walking, hiking, and running clubs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Preschool programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. After school programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Youth summer day camp programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Youth sports programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Youth fine arts and performing arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Teen oriented programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Adult fitness and wellness programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Adult fine arts and performing arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Adult programs for 50 years and older</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Programs for persons with special needs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other:__________________________________________________</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which FOUR of the programs from the list in Question #11 are most important to your household that you think Oakland Township should provide? [Using the letters in Question #11 above, please write in the letters below for your 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices, or circle ‘NONE’.

1st: _____ 2nd:_____ 3rd: _____ 4th: _____ NONE

13. From the following list, please check ALL the organizations that you or members of your household have used for indoor and outdoor recreation activities during the last 12 months.

- (01) School District facilities
- (02) Churches
- (03) Private youth sports leagues
- (04) YMCA
- (05) Oakland Township Parks/Rec
- (06) Nature Centers
- (07) College recreation facilities
- (08) RARA
- (09) Older Persons Commission
- (10) Private clubs (tennis, health, fitness, golf, swim)
- (11) Recreation facilities in other communities
- (12) Homeowners associations
- (13) Huron Clinton Metroparks (e.g. Stony Creek)
- (14) State of Michigan Parks (e.g. Bald Mountain)
- (15) Oakland County Parks (e.g. Addison Oaks)
- (16) Other: _________________________
- (17) None

14. Which TWO of the organizations from the list in Question #13 do you and members of your household use the most? [Using the numbers in Question #13 above, please write in the numbers below for your 1st and 2nd choices, or circle ‘NONE’.

1st: _____ 2nd:_____ NONE
15. Please check ALL the ways you learn about Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Department programs and activities.

---

____(01) Parks and Recreation newsletter
____(02) Oakland Township Web site
____(03) Newspaper articles
____(04) Special event postcards
____(05) Cable access television
____(06) Flyers/posters at Parks/Rec. facilities
____(07) From family, friends and neighbors
____(08) Flyers distributed at school & local businesses
____(09) Conversations with Parks/Rec staff and Commissioners
____(10) Oakland Township Government
____(11) Other agency sources

---

16. Oakland Township does not currently charge residents any user fees to help pay for parks and recreation program costs. Please indicate the portion of costs of providing the following types of programs you think should be paid for by user fees by circling the corresponding percentage for the programs.

NOTE: The remainder of any program costs not paid through user fees would be primarily paid through the existing park millage.

Circle Portion of Costs that Should Be Covered by User Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>Children's programs (ages 0-7 years)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>Youth programs (ages 8-13 years)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>Teen programs (ages 14-18 years)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>Adult programs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>Senior adult programs (ages 55 and older)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>Programs for persons with disabilities</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>Community-wide special events for families</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Thinking about ALL the parks and recreation facilities and programs operated by Oakland Township, which ONE of the following indicates how you feel new outdoor parks, recreation facilities and programs should be funded?

---

____(1) 100% from user fees
____(2) Mostly from user fees and some tax dollars
____(3) Mostly from tax dollars and some user fees
____(4) 100% from tax dollars
____(5) Not sure

18. If an additional $100 were available for Oakland Township parks, trails, sports, and recreation facilities, how would you allocate the funds among the categories of funding listed below? [Please be sure your total adds up to $100.]

$_____ Improvements/maintenance of existing parks (playgrounds, picnic shelters, docks, historic districts, etc.)
$_____ Acquisition of new parkland and natural areas
$_____ Construction of new sports fields (softball, soccer, baseball, etc.)
$_____ Acquisition and development of walking, biking, and horse trails
$_____ Development of new specialized facilities (splash park, dog park, archery range, etc.)
$_____ Stewardship of natural areas (natural area restoration and invasive plant management)
$_____ Other: ____________________________________________________

$ 100 TOTAL
The following five questions pertain to the Oakland Township Trails and Pathways Vision to add non-motorized trail and pathway CONNECTIONS to a variety of areas across Oakland Township including parks, schools and residential neighborhoods.

19. Please indicate the ONE preferred trail and pathway use for you and members of your household.
   ___(1) Frequent transportation to a specific destination
   ___(2) Recreation usage/wellness and fitness
   ___(3) Other: _________________________________

20. From the following list, please check ALL the activities that would apply to your use of proposed trails and pathways in Oakland Township.
   ___(1) Walking
   ___(2) Nature Observation
   ___(3) Running/Jogging
   ___(4) Family Bicycling
   ___(5) Recreational/Transportation Biking
   ___(6) Mountain Bicycling
   ___(7) Horseback Riding
   ___(8) Other: _________________________________

21. From the list below, please indicate the THREE destinations that would be most important for you and members of your household to access from proposed trails and pathways in Oakland Township. [Please write in the letters in the spaces below ranking your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices]

   1st Choice  2nd Choice  3rd Choice
   (A) Paint Creek Trail  (E) Urban Areas (Rochester, Lake Orion, Romeo)
   (B) Parks/Natural Areas  (F) Residential Neighborhoods
   (C) Schools  (G) Other: _________________________________
   (D) Shopping/Commercial Areas

22. From the list below, please indicate the THREE greatest needs that you and members of your household have for trail/pathway amenities. [Please write in the letters in the spaces below ranking your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choices]

   1st Choice  2nd Choice  3rd Choice
   (A) Drinking fountains  (F) Trailhead information kiosks
   (B) Restrooms  (G) Benches
   (C) Roadway Crossings using crosswalks and/or median refuge islands  (H) Bike racks
   (D) Directional signage  (I) Trash receptacles
   (E) Mile markers
   (J) Other ___________

23. This question refers ONLY to trails which are located away from the road right-of-way. From the following list, please indicate the ONE type of trail treatment that is most preferred by you and members of your household.
   ___(1) Rustic Trails (woodchip or mowed or packed dirt surface with narrow width)
   ___(2) Crushed Stone Trail (similar to Paint Creek Trail surface)
   ___(3) Trails adhering to ADA accessibility guidelines (asphalt or concrete surface with wider width)
Demographics

24. Counting yourself, how many people live in your household? ______________

25. Counting yourself, how many people in your household are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under age 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 5-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 10-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 15-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 20-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 35-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 45-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 55-64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 65-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 75+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. What is your age? ______

27. Your gender:   ____(1) Male      ____(2) Female

This concludes the survey. Thank you for your time.

Please Return Your Completed Survey in the Enclosed Postage-Paid Envelope Addressed to:
ETC Institute, 725 W. Frontier Circle, Olathe, KS 66061

Your response will remain completely confidential.
The address information on the sticker to the right will
ONLY be used to help identify areas with special interests.
Community Master Plan Open House Comments
November 4, 2009

- A park where dogs can run off leash. I am willing to muzzle mine even though they are two friendly labs. I used to hike Bear Creek, but now I must use Bald Mountain. Some subdivision have Township easements – could walking trails be developed on these?

- I love the Dinosaur Hill programs.

- Thanks for the great work!! Will horses be allowed on all pathways and trails?? If we can’t ride on pathways and trails, we can’t go around the Township on the loop, and we can’t get from one park to another without being on pavement and in traffic. The increased speed limit on dirt road is a problem.

- After viewing and enjoying many “Music in the Meadow” concerts it would be a shame if the architectural rendering of unsightly metal hand rails were installed on the porch step in front of the front door. All the charm would be diminished….please advise the appropriate person of this concern. Thank you.

- Way to go Oakland Township Parks!

- Marsh View connector to Marsh View Park and to include Bald Mountain Park is a priority to have a trail. Watershed View Park entrance should be only on Buell Rd. near the shed. These are the two issues that we are interested in.

- This (Paint Creek Cider Mill) is a beautiful building and should be utilized more. Would gladly pay a nominal fee to rent it for a gathering I would like to host. Overall, I am pleased with the efforts of the Parks Commission. Keep up the good work!

- Regarding P4-02 Adams – Delta Kelly to Paint Creek. There might be a more cost effective method of getting Cairn Cross, to Paint Creek. Contact the Archers directly. If you run the trail on the side and put up the fence they may agree to it.

- Love the plans. We’ll look forward to its completion!

- Wonderful display and kudos for all the work and planning. Makes me happy to pay taxes. Two suggestions: (1) Put these wonderfully detailed maps on the website, available for downloading. Keep sizes large so details won’t be lost (portions could be downloaded instead of the full map, perhaps); (2) Include trails/parks etc. that are accessible to horseback riders on the park legends so riders will know where they can and cannot ride. Thanks again!

- Keep our parks passive. The majority prefer it this way. Resist the few who may insist the majority want active facilities.
There is an existing walkway / trail around the west half of Section 32. It is used by many people. The biggest problem is the trail is incomplete just south of Silver Bell on Brewster. It is necessary to walk in the roadway. Traffic is surprisingly heavy on Brewster, and there is nowhere for a pedestrian in the roadway to go if two cars are coming in opposite directions. The pedestrian must stop and direct traffic if it is by a hill. The roadway is depressed in some area and there is no escape for a pedestrian or bike. It is great to have this trail, but the Township needs to fill in the missing sections, including the east side of Adams south of Silver Bell, but especially Beach Road. I would think that if the Township approached those 3 or 4 homeowners, and offer plantings, tax breaks, etc., they would see that completing the trail would be in their best interests, as well as that of the homeowners in the area. If I can help, call me. Jerry Young, 248.651.5076, 2939 Addison Circle North

• We love Oakland Township and all the parks and program. The Blue Heron Area and Walk plus the Winter Carnival are two of my favorites because of all the fun and great activities.

• Thank you very much for presenting this VERY VALUABLE information to the residents of our community. We are so glad to know Oakland Township as a whole is concerned about preserving our precious natural resources and sharing them as much as possible with the human population!

• A very well thought out plan. With all the park properties owned by the Township, I am very anxious to see this development take place with the parks and trails. The trail and pathway strategy really incorporates and will encourage the park usage. The popularity of the paint creek trail should be enough evidence that the residents want trails. Great job!

• It would be nice to know on your map “Where We Are”! Wonderful project!

• I (and many neighbors) object to the proposed parking lot for Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park off of Knob Creek Drive. The parking lot should be placed off of Snell Road.

• I am a co-owner (with my neighbors) of the 2751 W. Predmore Road property. The historic house is only 39 feet from the road. We absolutely do not want a path in out front yard, for privacy sake, and also because Bald Mountain Recreation Area has nice paths to the west of us and across Predmore Road to the north. Please reassure me that we are safe.
November 30, 2009

Dear Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission,

I am writing in response to the 2010-2014 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails posted on your website. I was disappointed to see that there is no plan for Oakland Township to participate in supporting RARA and all the wonderful programs that they provide for our community. Despite the fact that I’ve been a resident of Oakland Township for fourteen years, I’ve always considered our family a part of the Rochester Community. My thirteen year old daughter has been involved with the dance program provided by RARA since she was 4 years old and my eight year old daughter has been dancing in the program since she was 3 years old. Not only have we enjoyed the dance program for it’s feeling of community and quality teachers, but also we’ve enjoyed the camps and other outstanding activities provided by RARA over the past nine years. Although I’m very grateful for the trails and parks that Oakland Township provides that is where our recreation choices begin and end. RARA provides an irreplaceable service to my family that Oakland Township had not been able to provide. Unfortunately, RARA is no longer willing/able to allow non residents to sign up for their programs on a first come first serve bases leaving my family and other Oakland Township residents with a minimum class selection if anything at all. Please consider supporting RARA in your new Master Plan so that Oakland Township residents have a full array of choices regarding their recreational needs and can continue carry on the family traditions that have been enriching our children’s lives for the past 40 years.

Sincerely,

Kelly Stechschulte
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Appendix F- Park Concept Plans

BEAR CREEK NATURE PARK
Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission

LEGEND
- 8' WIDE LIMESTONE TRAIL (ADA ACCESSIBLE)
- 5' WIDE LIMESTONE TRAIL
- 3' WIDE WOODCHIP TRAIL
- OPEN FIELD MOWED TRAIL
- PARK BOUNDARY
- EDGE OF WOODS
- WETLAND

NORTH

Charter Township of Oakland
Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan
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marsh view park
preliminary site development plan
oakland township, michigan

charter township of oakland parks and recreation commission
february 2005
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Appendix G – Funding Sources

There are several potential funding sources currently being utilized and many that are available for parks and recreation projects such as parkland improvements and facility upgrades as described below.

**General Funding Sources**

**Millage**
A property tax millage can be used to finance specific park and recreation projects or to operate recreation facilities. A millage is an effective way to divide costs over time among all of the taxpayers in the Township to provide matching grant funds or finance entire projects. A millage allows more flexibility with how the money is allocated than with a bond. The Township currently

The majority of funding to support the Township's parks and recreation system comes from two millages, the park millage (Park Fund) and the land preservation millage (Land Preservation Fund). The park millage was recently approved in 2006 for another 10-year period. The land preservation millage, initiated in 2001 for a 10-year period as well, was extended 10 more years through an early renewal in 2006. Both millages began as 0.75 mills each, but have been annually rolled back as required by state law. Each fund has different obligations and two separate budgets. A third source of funding, the trails millage (Trails Improvement Fund) at .25 mills, was initially approved in 2006 for a 10-year period and is intended to implement the Oakland Township Trails and Pathways Master Plan.

**User Fees**
The Township can charge reasonable fees to the users of specific recreation facilities and for enrollment in recreation programs. User fees can provide substantial support for park and recreation facilities and programs. Other Michigan communities have established user fees for the use of swimming pools, tennis courts, lighted athletic fields, and indoor facilities. The Township is a position to begin considering the implementation of user fees with their new active recreation facilities coming on-line soon.

**Recreation Bonds**
A number of bond programs can be used to finance construction of parks and recreation facilities. *General Obligation Bonds* are issued for specific community projects and may not be used for other purposes. These bonds are usually paid for with property tax revenues. *Revenue Bonds* are issued for construction of public projects that generate revenue. The bonds are then retired by using income generated by the project.

**Conservation Easements**
A conservation easement is a method of preserving open space that is guaranteed through formal documentation. This technique can also be used to preserve open space if it is not feasible or practical for the Township to acquire the land. Rather than obtaining fee simple,
or complete ownership, an organization or community can purchase or acquire by gift an easement to the property.

Oakland Township is the first community in Oakland County to establish conservation easements within public park land. The Six Rivers Regional Land Conservancy holds and monitors four easements – Bear Creek Nature Park (47 acres), Blue Heron Environmental Area (139 acres), Cranberry Lake Park (52 acres), and Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park (36 acres). These easements support the continued use of these Township parks as public recreation areas while at the same time prohibiting uses that would impair or interfere with the purposes of the agreement. In addition, Oakland Township holds two easements on private property, the Hirt Easement and the Kamin Easement.

**Public-Private or Public-Public Partnerships**
Reduced funding for the public and private sector has created a need for various partnerships between public and private entities as well as between two or more public entities to accommodate specialized large-scale recreation demands. The Township should seek partnerships where available and beneficial.

**Donations**
Businesses, corporations, private clubs, community organizations, and individuals will often contribute to recreation and other improvement programs to benefit communities in which they are located. Private sector contributions may be in the form of monetary contributions, the donation of land, the provision of volunteer services, or the contribution of equipment or facilities.

The Township has been very fortunate to receive generous land donations over the years and should continue to seek opportunities for additional donations in the future.

**Foundations**
A foundation is a special non-profit legal entity that is established as a mechanism through which land, cash, and securities can be donated for the benefit of parks and recreation services. The assets are disbursed by the foundation board of directors according to a predetermined plan.

**Specific Funding Programs**

**Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund (MNRTF)**
Oakland Township has received over $5 million in funding from the MNRTF for acquisition and development of parks in the Township. MNRTF provides funding assistance for the purchase and development of land for public outdoor recreation and natural resource protection. This fund is directed at creating and improving outdoor recreational opportunities and providing protection to valuable natural resources. The available development grants are between $15,000 and $500,000 and there is no limit on the amount for acquisition projects because they depend upon the value of the property. A local minimum match of 25% is required for all projects. Applications must be postmarked by
April 1st for both acquisition and development projects and August 1st for acquisition projects only.

Each year the Trust Fund Board of Trustees decides on priority project types on which proposals will receive special attention. The special initiatives for 2009 include:

1. Acquisition of land or development of trailways that provide linkages to recreation opportunities. Projects that contribute to the state trailway system will be given higher priority.
2. Acquisition of land open to hunting or development of hunting-related recreation facilities, such as shooting ranges. Specific seasons in which hunting will be allowed must be identified. Highest priority will be given to land in the southern Lower Peninsula, land that will be open for all DNR-established hunting seasons, and shooting ranges.
3. Acquisition of DNR-established winter deer yard, or acquisition of land that connects or provides a buffer area to land that is already protected and that provides critical wildlife habitat or is of high ecological value.
4. Acquisition of land or development of facilities in urban areas.
5. Development of projects that provide universally accessible outdoor recreation opportunities. Highest priority will be given to projects that provide natural resource-based recreation opportunities.
6. Fees charged to enter the proposed project site. Highest priority will be given to applications for projects for which no fee will be charged to enter the site.

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). LWCF provides funding assistance for communities to acquire and develop land for public outdoor recreation. This fund is directed at community recreation and trailway improvements that preserve natural resources. A local match of 50% required for all projects, and the minimum request amount is $30,000 and the maximum is $75,000. Projects are evaluated based on project need, applicant history, site and project quality, and alignment with the state’s recreation plan (2008-2012 Michigan Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan). The fourth criterion is determined to be primarily trails, community outdoor recreation, green technology in outdoor recreation, universal access, and coordination and cooperation among recreation providers. The MDNR makes recommendations to the National Park Service (NPS) on which applications to fund, and the NPS grants the final approval. Applications are due March 1st for grants.

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program. The TE program was originally established with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991, the reauthorization of the TEA-21 program in 1998, and finally the authorization of SAFETEA-LU in 2005 authorizing highway safety, transit and other surface transportation programs, including regional pathways and trailway systems. The TE program is a 10 percent set-aside of Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds that are administered by the MDOT Office of Economic Development. Eligible activities include those related to non-motorized transportation, transportation aesthetics, historic preservation, and water quality and wildlife. TE funding requires matching funds of at least 20% of the project cost and must be related to surface transporation.
Urban and Community Forestry Program – Community Forestry Grants. This program provides funds for projects that address the urban forestry needs of municipal governments, schools, nonprofit organizations, and volunteer groups throughout Michigan. These projects may include tree inventories, management plans, tree planting educational workshops and trailing materials, and other maintenance activities. Projects that develop or enhance urban and community forestry resources, such as management and planning, education and training, tree planting, and library resources, are looked upon highly. Applications are due each summer with maximum grant requests of $20,000.
Appendix H – Resolutions of Approval

Oakland Township Board of Trustees Resolution
December 8, 2009

STATE OF MICHIGAN

COUNTY OF OAKLAND

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND

RESOLUTION FOR ADOPTION OF
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND
2010 – 2014 MASTER PLAN FOR PARKS,
RECREATION, LAND PRESERVATION, AND TRAILS

RESOLUTION NO. 09-12

At a regular meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Board of Trustees held on Tuesday December 8, 2009 the following Resolution was moved by Trustee © BAILEY ©©©©©©© and seconded by Trustee © HICKAY ©©©©©©;

WHEREAS, the Charter Township of Oakland has undertaken a Five Year Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Plan which describes the physical and social features, existing parks, existing recreation facilities and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain parks and recreation facilities during the period between 2010 and 2014, and

WHEREAS, public comment which was incorporated into the master plan was obtained through a variety of methods and events including a trail and pathways open house held June 11; focus groups and interviews with key individuals in the community held June 24, June 25, July 7, and July 8; additional focus groups with similar provider groups held August 11 and 12; focus groups for school district representatives and teens held September 17; a community survey conducted by Leisure Vision/ETC Institute to gather input from community residents in August and September 2009; the 30-day public review period from October 30, 2009 – November 30, 2009; and a community master plan open house held November 4; and

WHEREAS, public comment sessions were held at the November 18, 2009 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting at 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306 and at the December 2, 2009 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting at 4480 Orion Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306 to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails plan, and

WHEREAS, the Charter Township of Oakland has developed the plan for the benefit of the entire community and to adopt the plan as a document to assist in meeting the parks, recreation, land preservation and trail needs of the community, and

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Commission has reviewed the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan and finds itself in accord with the basic plans and strategies outlined in this document; and
WHEREAS, after the public hearing and meeting on December 2, 2009, the Parks and Recreation Commission recommended adoption of the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the Charter Township of Oakland Board of Trustees hereby adopts the Charter Township of Oakland 2010 – 2014 Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails Master Plan as a guideline for improving parks and recreation for the residents of the Charter Township of Oakland.

AYES: ALL PRESENT
NAYS: NONE
PRESENT: FOGLER, WORKINGS, CREPS, BAILEY, EDWARDS, MCKAY, THOMAS
ABSENT: NONE

CERTIFICATION

I, Judy Workings, the duly authorized Clerk of the Charter Township of Oakland, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of resolution 09-12 adopted by the Oakland Township Board of Trustees of Oakland County, Michigan, at a meeting of the Board duly called on the 8th day of December, 2009.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND

By: Judy Workings, Clerk
Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission Resolution  
December 2, 2009

RESOLUTION 09-01
Parks and Recreation Commission of the Charter Township of Oakland
Recommendation for Adoption of Charter Township of Oakland
2010 – 2014 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails

At a regular meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission held on Wednesday December 2, 2009 the following Resolution was moved by Commissioner Tomboulian and seconded by Commissioner Whitman:

WHEREAS, the Charter Township of Oakland has undertaken a Five Year Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Plan which describes the physical and social features, existing parks, existing recreation facilities and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain parks and recreation facilities during the period between 2010 and 2014, and

WHEREAS, public comment which was incorporated into the master plan was obtained through a variety of methods and events including a trail and pathways open house held June 11; focus groups and interviews with key individuals in the community held June 24, June 25, July 7, and July 8; additional focus groups with similar provider groups held August 11 and 12; focus groups for school district representatives and teens held September 17; a community survey conducted by Leisure Vision/ETC Institute to gather input from community residents in August and September 2009; the 30-day public review period from October 30, 2009 – November 30, 2009; and a community master plan open house held November 4; and

WHEREAS, public comment sessions were held at the November 18, 2009 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting at 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306 and at the December 2, 2009 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting at 4480 Orion Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306 to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails plan, and

WHEREAS, the Charter Township of Oakland has developed the plan for the benefit of the entire community and to adopt the plan as a document to assist in meeting the parks, recreation, land preservation and trail needs of the community, and

WHEREAS, the Parks and Recreation Commission has reviewed the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan and finds itself in accord with the basic plans and strategies outlined in this document; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the Charter Township of Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission hereby recommends adoption of the Charter Township of Oakland 2010 – 2014 Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails Master Plan as a
guideline for improving parks and recreation for the residents of the Charter Township of Oakland.

Ayes: MACKLEY, TOMBOULIAN, PERUZZI, BARKHAM, WHITMAN, MAMMEN, MANGIAPANE

Nays: NONE

Absent: NONE

I, Judy Workings, Charter Township of Oakland Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and original copy of a resolution offered and adopted by the Parks and Recreation Commission of the Charter Township of Oakland at a Regular meeting held on December 2, 2009 at 7:00 pm in the Oakland Township Paint Creek Cider Mill, 4480 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306, with a quorum present.

Judy Workings, Charter Township of Oakland Clerk
Oakland Township Planning Commission Resolution
December 1, 2009

RESOLUTION 09-01
Planning Commission of the Charter Township of Oakland
Support for Adoption of Charter Township of Oakland
2010 – 2014 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails

At a regular meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Planning Commission held on Tuesday December 1, 2009 the following Resolution was moved by Commissioner Wolak and seconded by Commissioner Stanley:

WHEREAS, the Charter Township of Oakland has undertaken a Five Year Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Plan which describes the physical and social features, existing parks, existing recreation facilities and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain parks and recreation facilities during the period between 2010 and 2014.

WHEREAS, public comment which was incorporated into the master plan was obtained through a variety of methods and events including a trail and pathways open house held June 11; focus groups and interviews with key individuals in the community held June 24, June 25, July 7, and July 8; additional focus groups with similar provider groups held August 11 and 12; focus groups for school district representatives and teens held September 17; a community survey conducted by Leisure Vision/ETC Institute to gather input from community residents in August and September 2009; the 30-day public review period from October 30, 2009 – November 30, 2009; and a community master plan open house held November 4; and

WHEREAS, a public comment session was held at the November 18, 2009 Parks and Recreation Commission meeting at 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306 to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails plan, and

WHEREAS, the Charter Township of Oakland has developed the plan for the benefit of the entire community and to adopt the plan as a document to assist in meeting the parks, recreation, land preservation and trail needs of the community, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed the Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan and finds itself in accord with the basic plans and strategies outlined in this document; and

Ayes: FOULKROD, SAPUTO, CARTER, STANLEY, WOLAK, GODIN
Nays: NONE
Absent: EDWARDS

I, Judy Workings, Charter Township of Oakland Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and original copy of a resolution offered and adopted by the Planning Commission of the Charter Township of Oakland at a Regular meeting held on December 1, 2009 at 7:00 pm in the Oakland Township Hall, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306, with a quorum present.

Judy Workings, Charter Township of Oakland Clerk

Dated: December 1, 2009
Appendix I – Notices and Meeting Minutes

Trails and Pathways Open House

It’s a drop-in event, so you can come whenever you want during the afternoon or evening sessions, and stay as long as you like!

Township planners, officials, staff and residents will be available to provide information, answer your questions and take your input concerning plans for our Township’s trail and pathway system.

Please come to speak with us if you are interested in:

- Cycling
- Running
- Walking
- Hiking
- Horseback riding, or Cross-country skiing
- Neighborhoods
- Parks
- Trails
- Natural areas
- Schools
- & Shopping areas!

There will be displays and hand-outs concerning the future trails and pathways system. We want to hear your comments on these proposals:

- Vision, goals and objectives
- Proposed trails and pathways routes
- Trail and pathway segment evaluation and prioritization
- 2009/2010 High Priority Trail and Path Segments

Oakland Township’s 0.25 mill voted trail millage will fund the acquisition of property and the construction and maintenance of the safety path and trail network. This network should provide users of all ages, abilities and interests with safe non-motorized routes for nearby recreation, nature study and transportation opportunities.

A committee composed of Township staff and officials, as well as a Citizen Task Force, have studied pedestrian systems in nearby communities, proposed best locations for Township trails and pathways, and established criteria for their evaluation and prioritization.

If you have questions prior to the open house please contact Mindy Milos-Dale, Parks and Trails Planner, at mmdale@oaklandtownship.org or (248) 651-7810 ext. 402.
MEDIA ALERT FROM OAKLAND TOWNSHIP PARKS AND RECREATION FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

By: Carol Kasprzak, Admin. Assistant, Oakland Township Parks and Recreation
TEL 248-651-7810, EMAIL ckasprzak@oaklandtownship.org

Contacts: Mindy Milos-Dale, Parks and Trails Planner, Oakland Township
TEL 248-651-7810, ext 402, EMAIL mmdale@oaklandtownship.org

Heather L. McPhail, Senior Planner, McKenna Associates,
TEL (248) 596-0920 Ext. 230, EMAIL hmcphail@mcka.com

Courtney R. Piotrowski, Director of Design, McKenna Associates
TEL (248) 596-0920, EMAIL cpiotrowski@mcka.com

Colleen Barkham, Oakland Township Historical Society
TEL 248-652-0712, EMAIL THSBarkham@hotmail.com

November 4th Oakland Township Open House at Paint Creek Cider Mill
Presents Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan
Oakland Township- Michigan

Oakland Township will host two drop-in, Open Houses on Wednesday, November 4, 2009 for the community to review and comment upon the 2010-2014 Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan.

2pm-4pm in the afternoon and 6-8pm in the evening
at the Paint Creek Cider Mill
4480 Orion Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306

Cider and doughnuts will be provided as guests stroll through the various displays and chat with Township officials, staff, and consultants. Supervision will be available for children free of charge. Before or after participating in the open house guests are also invited to enjoy:

Guided Historical Tours of the Paint Creek Cider Mill
by the Oakland Township Historical Society

Starting October 30th the draft master plan document will be available for public review on the Oakland Township website at www.oaklandtownship.org, at the reference desk of the Rochester Hills Public Library, at the Parks and Recreation Offices at the Paint Creek Cider Mill, and at the Oakland Township Hall, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, MI 48306.

Those unable to attend can email comments to parksplanning@oaklandtownship.org or send written comments to the Parks and Trails Planner, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, MI 48306.
November 4th Community Open House
Presents Parks and Trails Master Plan

You may have heard that Oakland Township has been working to create a new and historic vision for the Township’s Parks and Trails Systems and Recreation Programming. This collaborative process will set the future for recreation and land preservation in the Township, from deciding how to use new park land, to establishing new trail locations and determining program and event offerings.

Now Oakland Township is inviting the community to see first-hand this vision: the 2010-2015 Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan, which has been created with citizen input through focus groups, interviews, questionnaires, workshops and surveys. On November 4th the Township will host two drop-in, Open Houses that will allow attendees to visit at any time during the afternoon or evening and stay as long as desired. Cider and doughnuts will be provided as guests stroll through the various displays and chat about our future with Township officials, staff, and consultants. Supervision and activities will be available for children free of charge - so participants of all ages are welcome!

Wednesday, November 4, 2009
2pm-4pm in the afternoon and 6-8pm in the evening
Paint Creek Cider Mill
4480 Orion Road, Rochester, Michigan 48306

October 28, 2004 Open House
Chairman Mackley called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Mackley stated all Commissioners are present, and led the PRC, staff, and guests in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Chairman David Mackley, Vice-Chairperson Alice Tomboulian, Secretary Colleen Barkham, Treasurer Joseph Peruzzi, Commissioner Dirk Mammen, Commissioner Lana Mangiapane, Commissioner Maryann Whitman

STAFF PRESENT: Becky McLogan, Parks Director
Mindy Milos-Dale, Parks and Trails Planner

GUESTS PRESENT: Courtney R. Piotrowski, RLA, ASLA, Director of Design, McKenna Associates, Inc.
Heather McPhail, Senior Planner, McKenna Associates, Inc.
Leon Younger, President, Pros Consulting, LLC
Allen Mullins, CPA, Vice-President – Principal, Pros Consulting, LLC
Bob Kranken and son, Rochester Residents, Visiting Public

6. FOR DISCUSSION: DRAFT STRATEGIC/MASTER PLAN (Pros Consulting and McKenna Associates in Attendance)


Ms. McPhail presented highlights of the Land and Amenity Standards Overview. Vice Chairperson Tomboulian questioned using "another outdoor rink" under 'Amenity Standards, sub-heading: 'Outdoor Skating Rink,' stating that there is only an outdoor skating pond or area at BCNP, which is not maintained. Ms. McPhail stated that this will be changed to “another outdoor skating area.” Vice-Chairperson requested that the language under the
sub-heading of 'Trails' be clarified so that the language clearly differentiates between trails within OT parks versus trails in the overall Township Trails and Pathway Master Plan. Ms. Piotrowski stated that she will clarify this language.

Ms. McPhail reviewed the amenity standards that 'should be continually evaluated on a long-term basis,' i.e. splash park, baseball field(s), and soccer field(s).

Ms. McPhail presented highlights of the Action Plan, including the following sub-headings under 'System Wide Recommendations:' Operational, Programs, Land Acquisition, Facilities, and Strategic Partnerships.

Ms. Piotrowski presented highlights of the Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), including 'Trails Projects' and 'System-Wide' improvements. Vice-Chairperson Tomboulian stated that the (Year 1 – 2010) item: 'SCRNP: Acquire land for south parking area' is actually for park access, not just parking, and requested that this item be re-worded as follows: 'SCRNP: Acquire land for improved access.' The PRC and Mindy Milos-Dale agreed with this request. Ms. Piotrowski stated that she will re-word this item as requested.

The PRC discussed the concept of designating future use of areas in OT Parks. Vice-Chairperson Tomboulian suggested that a plan of future use designations in OT parks could be added as an amendment. The PRC and Ms. Piotrowski supported this suggestion.

The (Year 5 – 2014) item: 'Trails Project - a pedestrian bridge to connect the Paint Creek Trailway to the Cider Mill support facilities' was discussed. Comments included Vice-Chairperson Tomboulian stated that provision of a safe pedestrian connection is an important part of this item. Chairman Mackley stated that connecting the Paint Creek Trailway to the Cider Mill building parking lot would be important. Ms. Piotrowski stated that she will clarify the wording of this item to include a safe pedestrian connection, as requested.

The use of 'System Wide' and 'Trails Project' for CIP headings was discussed briefly. Ms. Piotrowski stated that she will clarify this language.

Ms. Piotrowski presented graphics of concept plans for LLNP and SCRNP. Discussion followed regarding the location of barrier free trail(s) on the SCRNP graphic. Ms. Piotrowski stated that she can adjust the trail layout, and incorporate 'Phases' of development into the graphic.

Discussion took place regarding the Open House scheduled for November 4, 2009.

Mr. Allen Mullins, Pros Consulting, presented the Financial Model.

Mr. Leon Younger, Pros Consulting, presented the Strategic Plan - Action Strategy Matrix. Some topics of Mr. Younger's presentation included Maximizing Resources, Managing and Understanding Costs, Creating a Business Management Model, Adopting and Setting Strategies and Policies. Ms. Milos-Dale requested assistance from Mr. Younger on the prioritization of the strategies within the Strategy Matrix. Mr. Younger stated that he will edit the strategy matrix into a Gantt chart format, and send to Mindy Milos-Dale. Mindy
Milos-Dale will forward to the PRC for their comments. The PRC and Mr. Younger agreed to meet to discuss the strategy matrix at 6:00 p.m. on November 18th, 2009.

MOVED: TOMBOULIAN SECONDED: MANGIAPANE

That the PRC meeting scheduled for November 18, 2009, start at 6:00 p.m. to discuss the Strategy Matrix with Mr. Leon Younger, Pros Consulting, LLC.

Motion Carried. Unanimous.
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Charter Township of Oakland Parks and Recreation Commission will hold two public hearings to receive citizen input on the review of the 2010 – 2014 Oakland Township Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails Master Plan:

WEDNESDAY, November 18, 2009, 7:00 pm at Oakland Township Hall, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, MI.

WEDNESDAY, December 2, 2009, 7:00 pm at the Paint Creek Cider Mill, 4480 Orion Road, Rochester, MI.

Starting October 30, 2009 the draft master plan document will be available for public review on the Oakland Township website at www.oaklandtownship.org, at the reference desk of the Rochester Hills Public Library, at the Parks and Recreation Offices at the Paint Creek Cider Mill, and at the Oakland Township Hall, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, MI 48306. Comments regarding the plan may be emailed to parksplanning@oaklandtownship.org or mailed to the Parks and Trails Planner, 4393 Collins Road, Rochester, MI 48306.

David Mackley, Chairperson, Oakland Township Parks and Recreation Commission

Published: Rochester Post: October 29, 2009
Chairman Mackley called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.

ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Mackley stated all present and led the PRC, staff, and guests in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Chairman David Mackley, Vice-Chairperson Alice Tomboulian, Secretary Colleen Barkham, Treasurer Joseph Peruzzi, Commissioner Dirk Mammen, Commissioner Lana Mangiapane, Commissioner Maryann Whitman

STAFF PRESENT: Jim Creech, OT Manager
Becky McLogan, Parks Director
Mindy Milos-Dale, Parks and Trails Planner

GUESTS PRESENT: Courtney R. Piotrowski, RLA, ASLA, Director of Design, McKenna Associates, Inc.
Leon Younger, President, Pros Consulting, LLC
Martin McClure, 920 E. Snell Rd., OT
Jim Gerometta, 808 Lake George Rd., OT
Margaret Gerometta, 808 Lake George Rd., OT
Lance and Linda Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd., OT
Maria Kwaiser, 3661 Windy Knoll Drive, OT
Becky Medina, 2631 W. Predmore Rd., OT
Gwen Matheys, 1980 W. Predmore Rd., OT
Doug Pettypiece, 1980 W. Predmore Rd., OT
John Harris, 5845 Winkler Mill Rd., OT
Dustin Currie and Kim Currie, 1653 Longfellow Rd.
Gerald Young, 2939 Addison Circle North, OT

2. STRATEGIC PLAN WORKSHOP – (PROS CONSULTING IN ATTENDANCE)

Mr. Leon Younger, Pros Consulting, LLC stated that the latest draft of the Strategy Matrix Plan has been re-formatted in order of priority. Mr. Younger stated that a 'Natural Areas Stewardship' category has been added. Mr. Younger highlighted some 'Vision for Natural
Areas Stewardship’ items from the Strategy Matrix in sequential order. Parks and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale stated that the timeline for the Natural Areas Stewardship items has been taken from recommendations made by Dave Mindell, PlantWise, Inc. Director McLogan stated that some re-prioritization may have to take place, especially in the first year. Commissioner Peruzzi questioned if the sequence of items is valid. Director McLogan stated that yes, the sequence is valid. Mr. Younger suggested that the Action Strategy Matrix is a working document that will continually be adjusted over the next five and possibly ten years, and that the strategy matrix will tie in with the Master Plan. Mr. Younger stated that Parks and Trails Planner Milos-Dale has suggested that he schedule a work session with the PRC. Ms. Milos-Dale requested that the Strategy Matrix be put into a Gantt chart format, with groupings by responsible position. The PRC and Mr. Younger, Pros Consulting, LLC, agreed to meet on December 2, 2009 at 3:00 p.m. Ms. Milos-Dale stated that The PRC will be approving the strategic plan at their January 13, 2010, meeting. Commissioner Tomboulian questioned the numbering of the items. Mr. Younger stated that he will re-number the items.

7. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

**OAKLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP 2010-2014**

**MASTER PLAN FOR PARKS, RECREATION, LAND PRESERVATION AND TRAILS**

Chairman Mackley opened the Public Hearing. Courtney R. Piotrowski, RLA, ASLA, Director of Design, McKenna Associates, Inc. provided a brief summary of the master plan process, noting that the focus was on arriving at a list of Capital Improvement Programs, meeting grant requirements at LLNP and SCRNP, and that the plan includes items such as signage programs, which are tie-ins to the strategic plan.

**Gwen Matheys, 2751 W. Predmore Rd.:** I'm sorry I didn't make it to the Open House, but I have a question. I'm looking at the map. We have property at 2751 W. Predmore Rd., which has Bald Mountain Recreation Area to the West, and across Predmore Rd. to the North. And there is a nice bike path - on both sides. And, I'm looking at the map here and you've got the 'dot dot dot' right down the middle of Predmore Road. People have said, 'oh no, their planning on putting a bike path right in your yard,' even though the house is thirty-nine feet from the road. And, I'm thinking well, why would they do that if there's a bike path across the road? So I would like clarification. Are you going to move the bike path out of Bald Mountain Recreation Area and put it in my historic home's thirty-nine foot yard?

**Park and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale:** I'm Mindy Milos-Dale and I've been doing the trail planning work. The trail plan that you're looking at is a conceptual plan, because as we go through and implement various segments of the plan we're going to have to look at each segment in detail from an engineering standpoint and take into account issues just like you brought up. It's impossible to do a conceptual plan and take into account every single parcel's issues. That's why we show these proposed paths going down the middle of the road because at this point, until we do the detailed study in the future, we don't know the best location of the path – which side of the road it's going to be on in some cases, such as yours. So we know that for that particular area we would like to have the opportunity to offer pedestrian transportation opportunities to people there; we're just not quite sure yet
exactly where it's going to go. If your house is thirty-nine feet from the edge of the road, it sounds very likely that there will be something else going on there instead of having it go right in front of your house.

Gwen Matheys: Is there a reason that they did not consider the dirt road as a bike path?

Park and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale (MMD): Well, there are all different types of uses and levels of users; and I would say that probably for an experienced biker who's an adult, yeah, they probably don't mind using dirt roads- like I don't for example, but if you're talking about a family with little kids that want to get from Point A to Point B, that is not a safe and appropriate way for them.

Gwen Matheys: So, we're talking about paved paths?

MMD: The bike paths will be asphalt paved paths. They will be similar to the bike paths in the SW area of the Township.

Citizen: We're in the rural part of the Township.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: That's what... We're trying to... What I'm getting at, see, you've got it going down Predmore and Lake George Roads, how come you don't follow the existing trail in the state land?

MMD: You mean using the trails within the state lands? The trail standards in Bald Mountain, if you've ever used those trails, they're dirt, they're very narrow – they're totally the opposite of the standards for multiple use type paths and trails, that are typically at least eight feet wide, typically accessible, paved surface, whether it's asphalt or packed limestone, for example, to accommodate bikers, walkers, etc. so it's totally different.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: You've got it going right now down Predmore and Lake George. You must have some idea what side.

MMD: I really; we really don't.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: Well, we're just real concerned – we've got acreage out there, as everybody else does, we're in the North part of OT; we moved there for privacy; I don't want to sound selfish – but I think the rest of our neighbors feel the same way – that we pay a premium because we have a lot of property out there – as far as taxes, and everything else, and we like our privacy out there. We're just trying to find out what side of that road it's going to be on, I guess. Because on Lake George Road going north, you've got residential on one side and you've got no houses on the West side; and the same with Predmore Road.

Mr. Robinson presented a petition signed by 24 residents opposing the proposed trail along Lake George Road to the PRC. (See attached.)
MMD: Well, let me just say where all of these proposed paths are located on this map, we'll be talking with every landowner before anything.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: So, this is not set?

MMD: No, No, No. And the area you're speaking of – if you look at - we have maps where we've started to prioritize what we're going to be doing first and that particular area is not at the top of the list – you know, not surprisingly the first things that are going to be done are probably going to be done in the SW area of OT, where there is a denser population.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: Well, that's what we're here for- to find out.

Chairman Mackley: Let me just say that when there is a plan that looks like something they want to do, there will be public hearings and you will know before anything is finalized.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: I really don't pay attention to your newsletter, or I would have been here earlier. We're just real concerned with our rural Northern area of the Township.

Courtney R. Piotrowski, RLA, ASLA, Director of Design, McKenna Associates, Inc. commented regarding the trails and pathway plan, stating that it is conceptual, stating, 'for example, we don't have survey information, we don't know where the utilities are. These are all things that will heavily impact decisions down the road.' Ms. Piotrowski further stated that there will be other opportunities to be involved as these projects arise.

Lance Robinson, 205 Lake George Rd.: Well, this is where we start.

Doug Pettypiece, 1980 W. Predmore Rd.: You're talking about a bike trail and I don't think I see 2 or 3 bikers a week go by there. And they are always adults. I've never seen a child go by our place.

MMD: There may be a reason.

Doug Pettypiece: Well, the reason is that there are bike trails throughout the rest of Southern OT and elsewhere. We're a rural area. We get the occasional biker who enjoys Bald Mountain Park for sports biking, and even that can be a problem if you've ever tried to walk in there. But the other thing is it seems a little ridiculous that you're talking about putting in bike trails and you've got a school sitting there, and I see kids trying to get from that school, down to the trailer park where everyday at 2:30 there are 2 or 3 kids who have to walk up on the side of the steep bank along Lake George and Predmore Roads. There are kids that can't get to their houses, and you're spending money on other things and it doesn't make sense.

MMD: There is a path in the plan for those kids. If you look at it, that's one of the paths to connect the school over to the mobile home community because that is important.

Courtney R. Piotrowski: Let me just clarify, the trails are 'multi-use trails.'
Doug Pettypiece: They are multi-use trails for people who aren't there. I'm sure there are lots of areas that could use a trail. Our area is a rural area, and we prefer to keep it a rural area. I don't see why you're even considering a bike trail out in a rural area. It's just that the people that do ride out our way are experienced bikers.

Lance Robinson: I think most of the people that I see out there are the guys that are dressed in the suits and the helmets. I don't think they're from OT, to be honest with you, I think they're from maybe Troy, or Rochester.

MMD: We're here to take your comments but if you've been to any of the other meetings regarding the trails, one of the things we've explained to people is this is a thirty-year plan. While OT looks a certain way at this point, I mean we've seen what's happening as far as development in the Northeastern area of the Township. Thirty years from now it's very likely that this is going to be a very different place in some respects.

Lance Robinson: I'll differ with you because we have state land across the street.

MMD: I'm saying in general, and I think that we're trying to have a vision and look towards the future. I really doubt that the area of the Township that you're very concerned about is going to be a high priority on this trail and path development plan.

Doug Pettypiece: I don't follow policy. I'm sorry I work hard and I get home and I don't want to come down to your meetings. I was amazed that you were putting in sports courts in at MVP. It was my understanding that this was going to be a nature park/center, and I drove by and said, 'well I must have missed that.'

Chairman Mackley: That land was purchased specifically to put in some active recreation, which has been requested by many soccer families who live in OT.

Commissioner Barkham: And they drive to the south.

Doug Pettypiece: I guess I better start paying more attention because in a rural area, I've been living here for over thirty years in this area and just south of here before that, and, you know, I was amazed that ball fields are going in.

MMD: We've had people coming to us for many years. The RYSL, for example, a quarter or a half of their players are from OT, and they play everywhere but OT, and frankly these other communities can barely support their own residents, and their own residents' recreation activities, and OT has absolutely no active recreation facilities and at a minimum OT can provide a couple.

Doug Pettypiece: I want to know now what is going on with this bike trail before. . .

Lance Robinson: This trail going up Lake George Rd., you just want to hook that into Addison Oaks Park, there?
MMD: That actually- because Lake George Road is a very long connector Road, unlike a lot of roads in our Township, that is actually a major North/South connector. That actually, if you look at the County trails plan is considered a major connector for the Paint Creek Trail going up to the Polly Ann. So it's not just us coming up with this concept of putting in a safety path on Lake George Rd., this is part of a larger County-wide plan.

Lance Robinson: Unclear comment regarding Addison Township.
Mindy Milos Dale referred Mr. Robinson to the Oakland County website for a copy of their Trails Plan. Ms. Milos-Dale thanked the group for coming tonight because when they get to the point where they're looking at that area, 'it's good to know' that there is a group of people to speak with because they will be speaking to every homeowner.

Citizen: If we don't want it here are you going to put it in anyway? If we're really against it, as long as everybody else wants it?

MMD: The Township's intent is to work with the residents as much as possible.

Citizen: If we don't want it, will you not put it there?

MMD: I can't say that because that's not my decision; I'm an employee. But, all I can say is they want to work with everybody and if there is opposition to a project, well that's probably not going to be top of the list, let's say.

Lance Robinson: We're looking for an alternative through the state land, or something like that. We're not/I'm not into trails, but, we live in that rural part, and we enjoy our privacy.

MMD: And I think that the Township wants to look at all alternatives. I mean I don't think we're trying to shut anything down at this point.

Lance Robinson: Well, we're here to tell you what we think.

MMD: That's good.

Courtney R. Piotrowski: My comment would be to stay involved, and maintain communication.

Margaret Gerometta, 808 Lake George Rd: I just have a question in general about park development in the Township. Are you on the forefront of rural communities in dedicating so much time and (unclear word) towards development in a rural situation? I mean, I live in a rural area and probably won't take advantage of your wonderful park development, but I know outsiders will, and I don't know that I feel delighted about providing all of that for the general public. Do you understand where I'm going with this? Is this something that you're pursuing as a forerunner? I don't know.

MMD: It sounded like there was a question about providing access to the general public compared to providing access just to OT residents, but it also sounded like there was a question about development in general.
Margaret Gerometta: I don't know if you're aware of how threatening it feels to invite so many outsiders who have a lot of access to where we live. I listen to gunshots before dawn and it's not comfortable to have people who are not neighbors, not even part of our community, and yet they have a lot of access to where we live.

MMD: Our park system has tried to provide a balance, in that in order for us to get a lot of state funding, we are required to have our parks open to the public and frankly most communities are going that route. You find very few communities that I know of any more that restrict their parks to just residents only because frankly it's a very hard thing to even police. And – the PRC has been very careful to advertise mostly within our community. You don't see the PRC advertise region wide, we advertise mostly through the OT newsletter.

Commissioner Tomboulian: If legal hunting is occurring in your area, it's under the jurisdiction of The Department of Natural Resources, not under the jurisdiction of the Township and certainly not under the jurisdiction of this Park Commission. And if it's illegal hunting, that's something that isn't condoned by any level of government and needs to be reported and a conservation officer would be in charge. Are you talking about shooting that's going on in Bald Mountain State Recreation Area, then that's something that this Township has nothing to do with.

Margaret Gerometta: I'm just saying that we already have that kind of element there and I'm not sure I want a walking trail in front of my house.

Jim Gerometta, 808 Lake George Rd.: Mindy, you just said that you don't advertise outside of the Township, a recent article in the Rochester Post stated that the PRC wanted outside people to come in.

Commissioner Barkham: That could be that we were inviting other communities who had professionals in different areas including parks, for their input into our master plan.

Margaret Gerometta: My bottom line question is I don't know how much park development I really welcome or want in the Township. You know, getting state grants and so forth are nice and they are available to people who submit themselves to the regulations of those grants but I don't know if that – that's not my goal for the Township, but I can't speak for everyone.

Lance Robinson: I think some of the general consensus is - we're kind of wondering too - how many parks do we need in Oakland Township? It's nice to get grant money, but how far are we going? Are there any more proposals?

Commissioner Tomboulian: The People in this Township have voted by very good majorities in favor of the two park millages we have right now, and one of the lines of thinking, and I think you can understand, is, if we set aside land for parks and natural areas, we will not be seeing those lands developed into subdivisions and this commission is not at all devoted to turning every parkland into a heavily used place. Some of our lands are natural areas and they are not really intended for any sort of heavy recreation, just for walking or a picnic or something like that. So, this is a long-term vision that we won't get
caught like other communities. . . We are trying to be ahead of the game and protect land now so that we don't end up wondering where it all went and I think we're on the same page.

**Lance Robinson:** That's what we're trying to do on Lake George Rd. is protect our land.

**Gwen Matheys, 2751 W. Predmore Rd:** Any millage for open space I will vote for. I love the open space; that is what I want. My family has been here for generations.

**Gerald Young, 2939 Addison Circle North:** We have a 3-mile path around a group of subdivisions, around the west half of Section 32. And, I would recommend that you do not do their path, because they don't want it, and do ours. Because it's used everyday by a lot of people. Most from Oakland Township and probably some from Rochester Hills. On Brewster Road, south of Silverbell Rd., that's the worst one by far. It's very dangerous to walk on that road because there is a hill there. And I've stood there directing traffic when their coming both ways, you know, the one coming south can't see the one coming north and I have to direct them, and that's not good. It's a good path except for that stretch.

**MMD:** And that's exactly the types of things that we're talking about doing to start off with, filling the gaps.

**Maria Kwaiser, 3661 Windy Knoll Drive:** I have a question about what I read on-line with the master plan, and the survey. I guess I'm asking what your interpretation of the results of the survey is because it looks like a lot of people who responded to the survey wanted more amenities in the parks and wanted more things included so that they could use the parks in different ways.

**Chairman Mackley:** There is that side of these things, yes.

**Maria Kwaiser:** Right, and so, I'm not sure where the Township wants to take that. If you really want to take what the citizens are saying they want, and then you will feel that you need to develop the parks more and provide more amenities for the people. Or, are you going to just say oh it's going to be open land despite the fact that we initiated the survey, and we asked the people what they want, we're not going to go in that direction.

**Chairman Mackley:** No, the survey will be used for prioritizing.

**Courtney R. Piotrowski, McKenna Associates, Inc.:** The Capital Improvement Plan was done . . . with survey and focus group information. Also our ability to fund projects; I mean there is the 'pure wants' regardless of land available or money available to fund it, but basically what the capital improvement plan is using is the survey, looking at our budget . . . over the next five years . . .

**Maria Kwaiser:** Is there a thirty-year plan for the Parks or just the Trails and Pathways?

**Courtney R. Piotrowski, McKenna Associates, Inc.:** The master plan looks at five years. The Township is looking way beyond that- even in the master plan it talks about strategies . . . so it's very specific over the next five years . . .
**Maria Kwaiser:** I have another question specific to SCRNP. I found something very interesting in the survey and that is when you did the survey on the usage, I found it so interesting to see that SCRNP was number 3 on the list behind the Paint Creek Trail and then Bear Creek Nature Park, and I wondered if you had any theories on why that is.

**Chairman Mackley:** Yes, confusion with Stony Creek Metro Park.

Chairman Mackley stated that one of the interesting things that did come out of the survey was the need for programming for older citizens in the community. And the PRC will be looking at that type of programming, as a result of the survey.

Vice-Chairperson Tomboulian stated that it might be interesting to the guests present to see the charts explaining the percentage of people who responded to the survey in certain ways and that those are probably the most important things that the PRC looks at in trying to devise their plans. And the guests may be interested to know that the list of items which respondents would most want added to OT Parks, included: restrooms, signage, trail access, picnic tables, drinking fountains, benches, parking. Parks and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale stated that this part of the master plan is available on the Township’s website. Ms. Milos-Dale stated that there is a hard copy of the survey results also available to look at at tonight’s meeting.

**Maria Kwaiser:** Registered the following comment for the record regarding SCRNP:

Myself as well as many of my neighbors have a very strong objection to the use of our neighborhood as a traffic pattern or traffic flow to go into SCRNP. We don't feel it is appropriate for a park entrance to go through a neighborhood, we feel that is it much more appropriate for the park to have public access, at least motorized access off of Snell Rd. And I understand that, at this point in time, the Parks Department does not actually have enough land to make that driveway there, and I see, that part of the proposed plan, is to look into acquiring enough property to put an entrance off of Snell Rd., and I'm happy about that, but then I also see that there's the go-ahead with the parking lot off of Knob Creek Drive through our subdivision. And I would just register my objection for the record and then also just ask that we put off any plans for putting that parking lot off of Knob Creek Drive until we can approach the other avenue, which is to see if we can get enough land acquired off of Snell Road and really put that parking lot down there off of Snell Road which I think is much more appropriate. I had discussions with Mindy at the Open House about what the rationale for putting that parking lot off of Knob Creek Drive, which is to provide more convenient access for the fishermen who want to use the dock that is close to Knob Creek Drive, but my feeling is that these fishermen are outdoors men and they can park down by Snell and they can walk the distance to the dock. I walked that with my five-year old and it's not that big of a deal, especially once the trails go in. So I just wanted to make that objection for the record to let you all know that we're very concerned about that. We're concerned about - we understand that part of the park is not open to a lot of development – conservation; but then we also understand that part of the park is not subject to that conservation and we really would not like to see any traffic coming through our neighborhood. If it's pedestrian traffic, that's fine. If it's a trail head that starts off of our subdivision that's fine, I think maybe some of my neighbors would object to that, but our major objection is motorized access through our neighborhood.
Vice-Chairperson Tomboulian stated that the PRC was very interested in purchasing that property because it was such an interesting piece of property with the ravine going through it. The landowner was ready to move the land along out of their ownership and the PRC wanted to purchase it while it was available, which meant the PRC had to purchase it, as it was, and it doesn’t have that access off of Snell and yet the PRC did make the purchase and people's tax money was used. And therefore you see that the PRC is in the middle of a quandary also.

Maria Kwaiser: I wonder if you would be amenable to putting off the parking lot off of Knob Creek Drive until we can really try to pursue the other avenue - a land acquisition on Snell Road?

Courtney R. Piotrowski, McKenna Associates, Inc., stated that she thinks the parking lot is further out in the master plan, and that the PRC will be looking at pursuing property on Snell Rd.

John Harris, 5845 Winkler Mill Road: First I'd like to say I'm very sensitive to these folks' concerns about the bike path. If I lived where they lived and it was happening to me, I'd be concerned, too, and if at all possible, they should be accommodated and I would think that that is possible. On the other hand, I use the parks in OT a lot. I enjoy them. I'm not a biker, I'm a hiker. I love to walk in the woods. Winkler Mill Rd. is just a niche in OT, right on the border of Rochester Hills. Within three miles of our house, what used to be corn fields, what used to be apple orchards, what used to be horse farms are now condos, high density housing. The deer are being pushed back because we have the land that they once had. So, I agree with them and they should be accommodated after all it's their property, they purchased it and they're paying taxes for it. Maintaining open land is very very important. Thank you.

Linda Robinson, 265 Lake George Road: If the Parks department puts a bike path on either side of Lake George Road, it's going to totally change the landscape. Trees will have to be ripped out... We don't need bicyclists.

Chairman Mackley: We appreciate all of your comments and for coming. Thank you.

Chairman Mackley closed the public hearing at 7:50 p.m.

MOVED: BARKHAM SECONDED: WHITMAN
To close the public hearing.
Motion Carried: Unanimously.

8. FOR DISCUSSION: REVIEW OPEN HOUSE COMMENTS AND DRAFT OF PARKS, RECREATION, LAND PRESERVATION AND TRAILS MASTER PLAN

Courtney R. Piotrowski, McKenna Associates, Inc., stated that at this point the PRC would review open house comments to determine if the input which was received would change the direction of the master plan document. Commissioner Whitman stated that four people suggested that the PRC make specific plans for horse trails. Discussion followed. The PRC
agreed that one of the capital improvement items is to encourage trail use within DTLP, particularly the East side of DTLP, and having a trail connection between DTLP and Charles Ilsley Park to encourage equestrians to go to Charles Ilsley Park.

Vice-Chairperson Tomboulian questioned whether the creation of a dog park is in the master plan. Ms. Piotrowski stated that dog park was not currently in the Capital Improvement Plan, and wasn't a heavily supported item. Discussion followed. Ms. Piotrowski stated that she will add 'assess opportunities for a dog park' at the end of Chapter 4 of the Master Plan. Ms. Piotrowski stated that all open house and public hearing comments, as well as the strategy matrix will be incorporated into the master plan. Ms. Piotrowski stated that the PRC will make a resolution recommending adoption of the plan to the OT Board of Trustees at the PRC's December 2, 2009, meeting.
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 1, 2009

The December 1, 2009 regular meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Township Hall.

PRESENT:   Jim Carter  
           Barbara Wolak  
           James Foulkrod  
           Janine Saputo  
           Patricia Godin  
           Craig Stanley

ABSENT:    Marc Edwards

ALSO PRESENT:  Larry Nix, Planning Consultant  
                Mindy Milos-Dale, Parks and Trails Planner  
                Jim Creech, Township Manager

A quorum of the Planning Commission was present.

PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN PRESENTATION:
Chairman Carter introduced Parks and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale.

Planner Larry Nix gave a recap of role of the Planning Commission in this process. He indicated that their role in this case is advisory and that the presentation is basically a courtesy. Further, he said that at the conclusion of the presentation, Ms. Milos-Dale would be asking that the Planning Commission adopt a resolution of support for the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Ms. Milos-Dale began her presentation by stating that the Park and Recreation Commission (PRC) master plan process is required to be updated by every five years by State regulations. A current plan enables the Township to apply for various grants, and communicates to the public what our plans are for the next five years. She further indicated that this effort has been led by consultants contracted to do this work and members of the Planning Commission and Township Board have been involved in the process. Ms. Milos-Dale then began a power point presentation, and referred to handouts. One was a capital improvement plan, and other handouts were concept plans. Ms. Milos-Dale went on to say that the process documents the current situation in the township, current demographics and new citizen input. She stated that results did not significantly change over the past five years. The park inventory that was generated as part of the plan specified details of each of the parks and surrounding communities. Ms. Milos-Dale also indicated that the Trails and Pathways open house was a new component since the last plan. She went on to describe the individuals that participated in the focus group part of the process. Ms. Milos-Dale briefly discussed the process that the consultant employed and some of the results of the community-wide survey. She indicated results illustrated that trails, and support facilities were highest priority. She further described the PRC open house and process for the public hearing for the master plan. The master plan had been
available at the Rochester Hills Public Library. It also was publicized that it was available on the Township’s website. The public comment period ended the previous week. Hired consultants compared our park system and operation with national standards. Goals and desires continue to be for more construction of trail connections, acquiring connection areas, and protecting areas with sensitive habitats. Analysis of facilities and residents’ desires focused on improving trails within parks and connecting parks; nature center improvements that will be taking place at Lost Lake Nature Park; passive recreation amenities such as benches, picnic tables, and more active amenities such as playgrounds. One important survey priority was for signage improvements. Ms. Milos-Dale further explained the survey results, and that there are gaps in the current park system in servicing the needs of the community. These included active recreation facilities opportunities. The Commission then discussed the private opportunities for active recreation, as well as the possibility of signage that would also indicate what facilities exist in particular parks. Ms. Milos-Dale referred to a slide that depicted that the Parks and Recreation Commission had restated its vision and mission statements through this process.

Mr. Nix commented that the PRC master plan complements the Township’s strong rural character and natural preservation planning concepts.

Commissioner Saputo suggested that the description “small town” could be replaced by country or rural.

Commissioner Godin suggested that the term “quality recreation experiences” was too broad. Ms. Milos-Dale indicated that this statement for the most part referred to programming needs. This area would be addressed through the strategic planning process, though those future efforts would be tempered by decreasing tax revenues.

Ms. Milos-Dale then explained the PRC capital improvement program (CIP). The CIP is a list of projects that the PRC would potentially do over the next 5 years, not that they are necessarily going to do. In addition, the consultants have created a related financial modeling tool to evaluate these projects. Projects are prioritized, by different criteria. Grant obligated projects are first on the list, with the Nature Center and related improvements ranked first in 2010 at Lost Lake Nature Park. Grants for the trail construction of the Bald Mountain connection to the Paint Creek Trail are also a priority for 2011. Stony Creek Ravine Nature Park is the main focus in 2012, and Trail and active recreation components in later years. After adoption of the plan by the Township Board, it is sent on to the MDNR and SEMCOG for approval and is filed by the County. This plan would be used for grant opportunities for 2010. Ms. Milos-Dale stated that surrounding communities, and school systems were invited and most did participate in the process. Discussion also took place regarding neighboring communities and the county and state parks systems.

Commissioner Foulkrod suggested sending the complete document in hard copy or CD to the Chief Elected Official of the surrounding communities.

Commissioner Godin inquired about the Stewardship plan. Ms. Milos-Dale indicated that the Stewardship strategy component was done separately and will be a part of the final plan, and that also is the case with the Trail and Pathway strategy component.
Ms. Milos-Dale also discussed different partnership opportunities with Oakland County. She also added that with the development of the soccer fields at Marsh View Park, there are partnership opportunities with Rochester area groups, as well. The Commission complemented the PRC and the work of staff and consultants on this project.

**MOTION** by **WOLAK** and **SUPPORTED** by **STANLEY** to approve the resolution of support of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan as presented. **ALL AYES.**
Parks and Recreation Commission Public Hearing/Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2009

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND
PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 2, 2009 – 7:00 p.m.
PAINT CREEK CIDER MILL BUILDING – 1ST FLOOR MEETING ROOM
APPROVED MINUTES

ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Mackley stated all present and called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairman David Mackley, Vice-Chairperson Alice Tomboulian, Secretary Colleen Barkham, Treasurer Joseph Peruzzi, Commissioner Dirk Mammen, Commissioner Lana Mangiapane, Commissioner Maryann Whitman

STAFF PRESENT: Becky McLogan, Parks Director
Mindy Milos-Dale, Parks and Trails Planner

GUESTS PRESENT: Heather McPhail, Senior Planner, McKenna Associates, Inc.
John Harris, 5845 Winkler Mill Rd., OT
Craig Blust, 2222 W. Buell Road, OT

4. PUBLIC HEARING – OAKLAND CHARTER TOWNSHIP 2010 – 2014 MASTER PLAN FOR PARKS, RECREATION, LAND PRESERVATION AND TRAILS

Chairman Mackley opened the public hearing at 7:14 p.m.

Ms. Heather McPhail, Senior Planner, McKenna Associates, Inc. provided an overview of highlights and updates to the latest version of the Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation and Trails, which the PRC will be recommending to the OT Board of Trustees for approval. Parks and Trails Planner Mindy Milos-Dale noted that the land standard statistic is incorrect and needs to be updated or taken out of the plan. Ms. McPhail stated that the plan will be presented to the OT Board of Trustees at their December 8, 2009, meeting by Parks and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale. Ms. McPhail stated that copies of the plan will be sent to SEMCOG, MDNR, and Oakland County for their records and certification.

OT Citizen, Mr. John Harris, provided the following comment:

My name is John Harris and I'm very very appreciative of what you folks are doing, preserving the lands and the green spaces. Someone once said: ‘that you should plant trees under whose shade you
should never expect to sit.’ Our children, our childrens’ children, will show their gratitude, and I'm one happy resident. Thank you.
The PRC thanked Mr. Harris for his attendance at tonight's meeting, and for his comment.

Chairman Mackley closed the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

MOTION: WHITMAN SECONDED: MANGIAPANE
To close the public hearing.
Motion Carried Unanimously.

5. FOR APPROVAL: RESOLUTION 09-01 RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND 2010 -2014 MASTER PLAN FOR PARKS, RECREATION, LAND PRESERVATION AND TRAILS

Parks and Trails Planner, Mindy Milos-Dale, stated that some data corrections have been provided by the OT Planning Commission, and these corrections, additional trail and pathway data, and the corrected acreage (land standard) statistic will be included in the latest draft of the master plan before presenting to the OT Board of Trustees.

MOTION: TOMBOULIAN SECONDED: WHITMAN

Resolution 09-01, attached. That the PRC recommends to the OT Board of Trustees, adoption of the Charter Township of Oakland 2010 – 2014 Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails Master Plan, as a guideline for improving parks and recreation for the residents of the Charter Township of Oakland, with data corrections and additions as discussed.

Motion Carried Unanimously.
Township Board Meeting Minutes
December 8, 2009

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SUMMARY

December 8, 2009

The December 8, 2009, meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Board of Trustees was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Township Hall.

PRESENT: Joan Fogler, Judy Workings, Sharon Creps, Michael Bailey, Marc Edwards, Sharon McKay, Kathrine Thomas

ABSENT: None

The following motions were passed:

1. To approve the minutes of the November 24, 2009, meeting as presented.

2. To approve the agenda as presented.

3. To adopt Resolution 09-12, a Resolution for Adoption of Charter Township of Oakland 2010-2014 Master Plan for Parks, Recreation, Land Preservation, and Trails.

4. To adopt Resolution 09-13, a Resolution Regarding Flexible Benefit Plan.

5. To adopt Resolution 09-14, a Resolution Regarding Amendment to Flexible Benefit Plan.

6. To approve the 2009-2010 budget amendments as reflected in Manager Creech’s memorandum of December 1, 2009.

7. To approve payment of the invoices as presented.

The following items were discussed:

1. The Board agreed to cancel the December 22nd meeting if there is no business that they need to address at that time.

2. There was a printing error on some of the winter tax bills for properties in the Rochester school district. These tax bills reflect the correct amount but do not include an itemization for the Zoo Authority millage. Oakland County will correct the error, re-print the affected tax bills, and they will be sent with a note explaining the error.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.
The foregoing is a summary of proposed minutes. Complete proceedings of these minutes are available at the Township Hall, 4393 Collins Road, during regular business hours, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. weekdays.
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A number of documents have been completed over the years to not only better understand the natural features in the Township but to guide acquisition, management, and use of properties. These documents include:

- Oakland Township Parks: Rapid Site Assessment and Initial Management Recommendations, 2009, David Mindell
- Amphibian and Reptile Surveys of Bear Creek Nature Park, Cranberry Lake Park and Marsh View Park in Oakland Township, Michigan, 2008, Matthew W. H. Chatfield
- Bear Creek Nature Park Management Plan, 2008, Six Rivers Regional Land Conservancy
- Macro-moths of the Paint Creek Heritage Area Wet Prairie, 2008, Dwayne R. Badgero
- Sedimentation in Paint Creek, 2008, Mike Losey
- The Insects of Oakland Township Parks: An Entomological Survey, 2008, Vincent Belill
- Stony Creek Corridor Park Acquisition – Ecological Assessment August 2005, Weatherbee’s Botanical Survey
- 2004 Natural Features Assessment Map, Tilton & Associates
- 2004 Critical Habitat Areas, Williams & Works
- 2004 Greenways Vision, Tilton & Associates and Williams & Works
- Oakland County Potential Conservation/Natural Areas Report 2002
- Recreation Visioning and Preliminary Site Development Plan – Ecological Assessment May 2000 and March 2002 Addendum, Weatherbee’s Botanical Survey
- Lost Lake Park – Ecological Assessment July 2001, Weatherbee’s Botanical Survey
- An Update of Critical Natural Areas in Oakland Township, 1997, Paul Thompson
- Blue Heron Environmental Area Preservation Plan 1994
- Blue Heron Environmental Area Natural Inventory Report 1978
- Natural History Survey Bear Creek Nature Park 1976
- Oakland Township Ecological Survey 1974, Paul Thompson
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