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Introduction

This chapter details the planning process used by Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission (OCPRC) to make decisions regarding the provision of parkland, natural resource areas, and recreation services and provides detailed descriptions of the major planning products that result from the process. The chapter then compares the OCPRC Planning Process to planning standards on the national level. The various planning resources that are used in the OCPRC Planning Process are described. The remaining sections of the chapter are dedicated to exploring planning resources for specific demographic groups, recreation types and facility types.

Overview of the Planning Process

The OCPRC Planning Process is a system of interrelated organizational, park, facility and project planning. The decision to fund and implement a specific project does not occur in isolation. The foundation for funding and implementation decisions is laid by the planning that is done on a county-wide and organizational basis. Use of this integrated planning process will ensure that each action approved by the Parks Commission will be well-grounded in the strategic vision and goals of OCPRC; informed by public input; and designed to make a positive contribution to the financial, social, and environmental sustainability of both OCPRC and the communities it serves.

Figure A: OCPRC Planning Process
Inventory of Planning Products

Planning at the Park System Level

Ten-Year Strategic Plan: In 2007 the Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission began a strategic planning process with the purposes of defining the role of Oakland County Parks as a recreation provider, and establishing a roadmap for the future operation and management of the park system to meet this goal in a fiscally-sustainable manner. The OCPRC Strategic Plan was adopted by the Parks Commission in May 2008. This document was developed through an open process that invited and integrated public input to identify the recreation and open-space values of the County. Our mission statement expresses the Commission’s vision for the future of parks and recreation activities in Oakland County: “The Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission is dedicated to providing quality recreation experiences that encourage healthy lifestyles, support economic prosperity, and promote the protection of natural resources.”

Five-Year Recreation Plan: This Recreation Plan provides strategic goals and objectives, a detailed action plan, and an evaluation program, which will guide staff and decision-makers over a five-year period in providing park and recreation services to the residents of Oakland County. Development of the Recreation Plan is guided by the community’s need for park and recreation services as expressed in community recreational needs surveys; is created in consideration of other regional and community planning efforts; and incorporates an understanding of future population growth, population demographics, planned transportation systems and other land use planning. The Recreation Plan and its approval by Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)¹ are necessary for OCPRC to apply for funding from the MDNR Recreation Grants program (MDNR n.d.). The Recreation Plan is created in accordance with MDNR’s Guidelines for the Development of Community Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Plans (MDNR 2012).

Service Portfolio: The Service Portfolio refers to the mix of park and recreation services provided by OCPRC. In addition to providing a detailed inventory of services, the Service Portfolio will establish a model for determining cost recovery goals and a philosophy for how OCPRC allocates the resources from tax revenue. The project will help OCPRC create a foundation for development of strong, sustainable financial management strategies. Development of the Service Portfolio is occurring in 2013, with consultant assistance. Future updates to the Service Portfolio will be conducted on the same five-year schedule as the Recreation Plan. Please see Chapter 4: Budget and Finance pp. 12-13 for more details on the Service Portfolio and cost recovery.
Planning at the Park Level

The Ten-Year Park Vision and Facility Concepts is the guiding document for the future of an individual park and is the result of the 9-step Park Master Planning Process\(^2\). In addition to the planning inputs required by the OCPRC Planning Process, the Park Master Planning also is guided by a set of Park Master Planning Guiding Principles\(^3\). By approving the Park Vision and Facility Concepts, the Commission approves the following:

- Vision for the park – how OCPRC will use the park to meet the recreational needs of Oakland County residents
- Overall business strategy – how we will make the park sustainable
- Concepts for individual facilities – how we propose to use each facility and how each facility will contribute to the sustainability of the park

In addition, the Park Master Planning Process also results in a set of supporting documents that will guide staff in the implementation of the Park Vision and Facility Concepts. Supporting documents include: Community Context, Site Analysis, Historical Resources, Facility Analyses and additional items as needed.

Planning at the Facility Level

Approval of the Park Vision and Facility Concepts does not obligate the Commission to specific staff recommendations for facility development, programs, and business practices. All implementation actions will be associated with the results of a facility planning process. The products of facility planning will vary from case to case. The process for conducting facility planning, including a protocol for selecting a specific planning product, is currently under development. Facility planning products may include the following:

- Park-wide facilities implementation planning coordinated with the park master planning process
- Facility plans specific to one facility within an individual park – i.e. trails
- Facility plans specific to one type of facility within multiple parks – i.e. dog parks, golf courses and waterparks
- Feasibility studies for proposed new facilities or facility types
- Design studies for improvements indicated through the park master planning process
- Natural resource management plans

Planning at the Project or Recreational Experience Level

Planning documents at this level that require Parks Commission approval and at least some level of public input include:

- Maintenance and Operating Budgets: for an overview of the budget process for OCPRC, please see Chapter 4: Budget and Finance, pp. ____.  
- Capital Improvement Budget: The current year capital improvement budget is approved as part of the annual budget process. 15-year forecasts are made for capital improvements and major maintenance and updated annually.  
- Grant and Funding Proposals  
- Budgeted Projects at $100,000 or Over Budget: Projects over $100,000 that are approved in the annual budget process require Commission approval before the expenditure is made. Projects that are budgeted for under $100,000 that are running over budget also require additional Commission approval.
Demographic Trends

Population data are supplied by the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG). These include both data from the 2010 Census (SEMCOG 2011) and SEMCOG’s 2040 Forecast (SEMCOG 2012).

In general, Oakland County’s demographic trends mimic that of the southeast Michigan region. Based on the 2010 U.S. Census data and the SEMCOG 2040 Forecast, it is anticipated that population and households will continue to increase slightly over time. Oakland County’s population is forecasted to gradually grow from 1,202,362 in 2010 to 1,246,863 by 2040, an increase of 3.7 percent. While the number of households is forecasted to grow by 5.5 percent between 2010 and 2040, the average household size will decrease by 1.7 percent to 2.42 persons per household. This reflects a greater number of households with seniors over age 65, households with people living alone, and an increase in two or more persons in a household without children.

Public Engagement

Public participation has generally been a feature of OCPRC planning. In past years, public participation has tended to focus on open house-type public meetings and public hearings until 2006 when OCPRC conducted its first county-wide recreational needs survey. The next step for OCPRC is to support an integrated public engagement program that incorporates the periodic recreation needs survey, park- and facility-specific surveys and focus groups, along with the stakeholder and community engagement that occurs at every level of planning.

Oakland County Community Survey

OCPRC engages the public on a regular basis to invite input on parks and recreation planning, including park master planning public engagement and the county-wide Community Survey that gathers information on the recreational needs of Oakland County residents. The 2010 Community Survey was consulted in preparation of this chapter. The survey results are based on a total of 602 telephone surveys of Oakland County households. The major survey findings include (Leisure Vision 2010):

- Recreation facilities used by the highest percentage of households at Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission parks during the past 12 months are: walking, hiking, and biking trails (40%), picnicking areas (25%), nature trails (19%), swimming beaches and areas (19%), waterparks and waterslides (18%), and 18-hole golf courses (18%).
- Ninety-five percent (95%) of households that have visited Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission parks and recreation sites rated the physical condition of the sites as either excellent (39%) or good (56%). In addition, 4% of households rated the Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission parks and recreation sites as fair, and only 1% rated them as poor.
Fifty-one percent (51%) of respondents feel there are sufficient parks and green space areas within walking distance of their residence. In addition, 42% of respondents do not feel there are sufficient parks and green space areas within walking distance of their residence, and 7% indicated “not sure”.

Based on the sum of their top two choices, the open space options that households most support are: “open space should be acquired and improved for passive use” (40%), “open space should be acquired and left undeveloped for e generations” (39%), and “open space should be acquired and improved for passive and active use” (37%).

The parks and recreation facilities indicated that households have a need for are: walking, hiking and nature trails (66%), picnicking areas and shelters (51%), hard surface trails (42%), and indoor fitness and exercise facilities (37%).

The parks and recreation facilities rated by households as the most important are: walking, hiking and nature trails (50%), picnicking areas and shelters (19%), hard surface trails (19%), and 18 and 9-hole golf courses (17%).

The facilities that households participate in most often at Oakland County parks and recreation facilities are: walking, hiking and nature trails (42%), picnicking areas and shelters (17%), 18 and 9-hole golf courses (16%), and children’s playgrounds (14%).

The recreation programs/activities indicated that households have a need for are: special events/festivals (38%), adult fitness and wellness programs (29%), nature and wildlife interpretive programs (25%), and family recreation programs (24%).

The recreation programs/activities that households rated as the most important are: special events/festivals (22%), adult fitness and wellness programs (21%), nature and wildlife interpretive programs (13%), and 50+ years’ active programs (12%).

Based on the sum of their top four choices, the actions that respondents are most willing to fund with their County parks and recreation tax dollars are: fix-up/repair older park buildings/shelters/playgrounds (35%), purchase land to preserve open space and protect the environment (31%), purchase land to develop walking and hiking trails (27%), and develop new hard surface walking and biking trails that connect to regional trails (22%).

The most frequently mentioned ways that respondents learn about Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission programs and activities are: from friends and neighbors (38%), Oakland County Parks Brochure (36%), newspaper articles (35%), and Parks Website (26%).

Fifty-seven percent (57%) of respondents are either very satisfied (29%) or somewhat satisfied (28%) with the overall value their household receives from the Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission. Only 8% of respondents are either somewhat dissatisfied (5%) or very dissatisfied (3%) with the Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission. In addition, 26% of respondents rated the Parks and Recreation Commission as “neutral”, and 9% indicated “don’t know”.

Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority Survey
Additional public input data are available from a survey conducted by the Huron-Clinton Metropolitan Authority (Public Sector Consultants 2012). A total of 2,400 surveys were collected, including 500 surveys in Oakland County. Three Metroparks are located in Oakland County (out of the 13 Metroparks in Southeast Michigan). Among the 500 Oakland County respondents, 339 indicated they were Metropark visitors and 161 indicated they were non-visitors. The survey provides valuable insights into the needs and preferences of Oakland County and Southeast Michigan residents. Some key findings most relevant to OCPRC include:
- Metropark visitation is highest among visitors from within the county in which the Metropark is located. Oakland County respondents indicated that close to my home/work was the highest rated reason for visiting Metroparks (53.0% among Metropark visitors) or other parks (67.8% among non-visitors). The leading reason cited by Oakland County respondents for not visiting a Metropark was time (22.6%), followed by location is not convenient, I use other parks or rec facilities (17.4%).
- The four most common outdoor activities among Oakland County respondents (both Metropark visitors and non-visitors) are indicated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Activity Metropark Visitors</th>
<th>Activity Non-Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Walking (29.6%)</td>
<td>Walking (37.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Picnicking, Barbecue (24.1%)</td>
<td>Field Sports (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hiking (22.2%)</td>
<td>Biking (road) (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swimming at beach or lake (20.5%)</td>
<td>Fishing (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Public Sector Consultants 2012)

- The primary reasons cited by Oakland County respondents for participating in outdoor activities are family togetherness (26.1% among Metropark visitors and 23.5% among non-visitors), exercise (20.9% among Metropark visitors and 23% among non-visitors), and fun and enjoyment (16.8% among Metropark visitors and 16.4% among non-visitors).
- About two-thirds of both visitors (64%) and non-visitors (67%) in the five-county area feel it is very important to preserve large tracts of open space. In all, just 2 percent of adult residents in the five counties felt there should be fewer natural areas or less open space.

**State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan**

As part of the developing the 2013-2018 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP), the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) conducted a statewide telephone survey of Michigan residents to help understand residents’ preferences, use of, and satisfaction with outdoor recreation opportunities. The survey was conducted in April 2012 and collected a total of 400 responses from residents across Michigan. Some key findings relevant to OCPRC include (Public Sector Consultants 2012):

- Nearly 84% of Michigan residents feel that outdoor recreation is very important or moderately important to their household.
- Walking outdoors, including dog walking, was identified by 29% of users as the most important outdoor activity to them.
- Almost two thirds (65%) of Michigan outdoor recreation users went outside 50 or more days in the year for outdoor recreation of any type (with about half doing so for more than 100 days). Nationwide, the average number of outdoor outings per adult aged 25 and older is just over 79 outings per year.
- Only about 24% of respondents felt that the children in their household participate less in outdoor recreation than they did as a child.
Recreation Trends

Outdoor Recreation Participation Report

Recreational trend data is drawn from many sources, including articles in professional journals and research by recreational consultants. These sources are referenced in individual sections throughout this Recreation Plan. A major source of recreational trend data is the 2012 Outdoor Recreation Participation Report produced annually by The Outdoor Foundation. This report tracks American participation trends in outdoor recreation, based on an on-line survey capturing responses from over 40,000 Americans ages six and older and covers 114 different activities. The most current study cites the following key findings (Outdoor Foundation 2012):

- Nearly 50% of Americans ages six and older participated in outdoor recreation in 2011. That equates to a total of 141.1 million Americans.
- Outdoor recreation reached the highest participation level in five years. Outdoor recreation added three million participants in 2011 — a significant improvement over the past few years when participation either dropped or remained stagnant.
- In 2011, outdoor participants made 11.5 billion outings — that is 1.4 billion more outings than 2010.
- Freestyle skiing participation grew 59 percent over the past three years.
- Almost 60 percent of stand-up paddling participants tried the activity for the first time in 2011.
- Almost half of all outdoor enthusiasts participate in outdoor activities at least once per week.
- Participants in gateway activities are more likely to enjoy multiple outdoor activities, rather than just one. In fact, 87 percent of hikers participate in one or more other outdoor activities.
- For the first time since 2006, participation in outdoor recreation among young boys reversed its downward trend and added participants. The participation rate among female teenagers also grew, reaching the highest rate recorded in this report.
- Although participation rates among youth ages six to 17 are up, average annual outings are down from 98 outings per participant in 2010 to 81 outings in 2011.
- Youth who do not participate in outdoor activities say they are not interested in the outdoors. For young adults, lack of time is a bigger barrier than lack of interest.
- Introducing outdoor recreation and physical activities early in life has a lasting effect. Among adults who are current outdoor participants, 82 percent report having a physical education class between the ages of six and 12. Forty-five percent of adult outdoor participants took part in outdoor activities from age six to 12.
- As seen in previous reports, participation in outdoor activities is significantly higher among Caucasians than any other ethnicity and lowest among African Americans.
- Although Hispanic Americans have one of the lowest overall outdoor participation rates, those who so participate go outside most often.
Other Planning Resources

Geographic and Physical Information
Knowledge of the location and physical characteristics of park resources is enhanced by the use of Geographic Information System (GIS) and accessing Oakland County databases.

Physical Information
Site visits, staff interviews and design documents will be important in evaluating the age and condition of facilities, buildings, and other elements of the built environment. All geographic and physical factors should be considered within the context of the characteristics of surrounding communities, such as urban/rural characteristics and local recreational resources; and regional features, such as watersheds and transportation systems.

Historical Information
Knowledge of the history of OCPRC parks, facilities and programs is an important element of the baseline information that should be collected in advance of planning activities. Historical information should be collected within the context of the history of the surrounding communities and the park system as a whole. Oakland County Planning and Economic Development Services, local community histories, local and county historical societies, staff interviews, and park system files are all potential resources for historical information.

Operational Information
Operations and maintenance staff make an important contribution by providing an in-depth understanding of current and past operations and by proposing and helping to evaluate future actions that are site-appropriate. Continued collaboration with all staff is essential throughout the planning process to ensure that resulting plans are embraced by the individuals who will be responsible for implementation and evaluation.

OCPRC Plans, Budgets and Policies
Review of existing planning and policy documents is an essential component of developing the baseline knowledge that is the foundation of planning. These documents are referred continually as the planning process continues.

Community Plans
The planning process acknowledges that Oakland County Parks is part of a larger system of parks, recreation and open space and seeks to collaborate with the planning efforts that occur on the local, county, multi-county, state and national level.

County, State and Federal Initiatives
Implementation of the Recreation Plan will contribute to initiatives that address childhood obesity, food security, watershed protection, pollution prevention, and other issues. By linking goals and objectives to relevant initiatives on the county, state and federal level, OCPRC has the opportunity to be effective on a broader scale and to access resource materials, training programs, and funding sources.

Park and Recreation Literature
Professional literature provides current information about innovative practices, recreational trends, and best management practices. The publications of National Recreation and Park Association and other professional organizations, as well as the publications of advocacy organizations, such as the Trust for Public Land, provide excellent resources.
Comparison to National Planning Standards

The park and recreation profession is multi-disciplinary and the professional standards of specific disciplines will come into play as this Recreation Plan is implemented. Examples include professional standards for landscape architecture, natural resource stewardship, land conservation, and nature education. This section focuses on standards for planning.

National Recreation and Parks Association

OCPRC’s planning and public input methods are comparable to the planning approach described in the most recent edition of the *Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines* (Mertes and Hall 1996) published by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA)\(^5\). The systems approach to planning described by Mertes and Hall focuses on “creating a comprehensive and interrelated system of parks, recreation, open spaces and pathways that: respond to locally-based needs, values and conditions; provide an appealing and harmonious environment; and protect the integrity and quality of the surrounding natural systems” (Mertes and Hall 1996, 16). The OCPRC Planning Process uses similar components to the NRPA Guidelines. However, many of those components have been adapted to specifically fit OCPRC or are updated to methods that have been developed since the *Guidelines* were published in 1995. Additionally, OCPRC Planning Process requires the identification and systematic evaluation of performance metrics that is not a consideration of the NRPA Guidelines.

Commission on the Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies

OCPRC has begun preparation to apply for accreditation through the Commission on Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA)\(^6\). CAPRA provides a set of *National Accreditation Standards* (CAPRA 2009) which includes standards for planning. As indicated in Table 1, the majority of the CAPRA planning standards (and the three required fundamental standards) are being met by the OCPRC Planning Process. Detailed documentation of compliance with *National Accreditation Standards* is underway and formal application for national accreditation is targeted for 2015.

Table 2: Compliance of OCPRC Planning Process with CAPRA Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPRA STANDARD</th>
<th>OCPRC COMPLIANCE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Overall Planning Function within Agency</strong></td>
<td>OCPRC’s Planning unit is staffed by 3 full-time and 2 part-time employees that are responsible for comprehensive planning, park master planning, conservation planning, trail and recreation resource planning, and education resource specialist. The Resource Development staff (1 full-time and 2 part-time) are responsible for business and cost-recovery planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Involvement in Local Planning</strong>*</td>
<td>OCPRC provides ongoing communication with all Oakland County communities via the quarterly Community Connections newsletter. Staff meets with local planning departments and boards regarding developing recreational facilities in those communities. The Recreation Programs and Services (RPS) unit works with local communities to identify programming needs and provide partnership and assistance through the Recreation Assistance Partnership Program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Oakland County Parks**
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### CAPRA STANDARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>OCPRC COMPLIANCE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Planning with Regional, State, Federal and Non-government Agencies</td>
<td>Standard: The public park and recreation agency should have a working relationship with regional, state, and federal agencies as well as non-governmental service providers that impact the services within their jurisdiction. Evidence: Definition of role, personnel involved, and documentation of involvement. OCPRC collaborates planning on multiple levels. Examples of partnerships include SEMCOG, MDNR, MDEQ, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Non-government agency partnerships are numerous and include land conservation and education agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan*</td>
<td>Standard: There shall be a comprehensive park and recreation system plan, which is basically an inventory of existing conditions and recommendations for future programs and services, acquisition and development of areas and facilities, and administration. The plan shall be officially adopted by the appropriate governing body, updated regularly, be linked with a capital improvement budget and a phased development. Evidence: Current plan, with date of official approval; description of linkage to capital improvement budget and a phased development. The Five-Year Recreation Plan is OCPRC’s comprehensive park and recreation system plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Trends Analysis</td>
<td>Standard: There shall be a system in place to assess societal and local trends over time. Evidence: Trends analysis documentation. Trends analysis is included in the Recreation Plan and is part of the park master planning and facility planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Community Assessment</td>
<td>Standard: A comprehensive community study based on population shifts and changing social and economic conditions shall be conducted regularly. Evidence: Latest community assessment and indication of its use in park and recreation agency planning. An analysis of regional demographic trends and economic conditions is conducted as part of the Five-Year Recreation Plan development process. Local community analysis is conducted as part of the Park Master Planning Process. Both are related to the provision of park and recreation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>Community Inventory</td>
<td>Standard: There should be a compiled, complete and current inventory of all agency used and/or managed areas, facilities, programs and services, as well as, alternative providers of such. Evidence: Inventory of programs and services and the physical resources of the community, demonstrating how the agency utilizes information in the planning process. Community inventory is included in the Recreation Plan and is part of the park master planning and facility planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4</td>
<td>Needs Index</td>
<td>Standard: A needs index for determining priorities for development of services within the community should be established within the comprehensive plan. Evidence: Provide the needs index within the comprehensive plan. Needs index is developed through an integrated public input process that includes a community recreational needs assessment. The results of public input are integrated into the Recreation Plan and the park master planning and facility planning processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>Standard: Feasibility studies shall be conducted to determine the feasibility of proposed facilities. Evidence: Provide examples of recent feasibility studies. Feasibility studies are conducted as part of a comprehensive facility planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*OCPRC: Oakland County Parks and Recreation Commission*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPRA STANDARD</th>
<th>OCPRC COMPLIANCE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6 Strategic Plan</strong>*</td>
<td>OCPRC’s Strategic Plan was approved by the Parks Commission in April 2008. A report on the implementation of the 2008 Strategic Plan is provided in Appendix __: Implementation Report. Continued review and progress reporting will occur through the Dashboard process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard:** An agency shall have a strategic plan, approved by the approving authority, stating how the agency will achieve its mission, goals and objectives. The strategic plan shall be reviewed annually

**Evidence:** Strategic plan, date of approval by approving authority, and indication of implementation progress

| 2.7 Site Plans | The Facilities Analysis that is conducted as part of the Park Master Planning Process provides additional detail. The Facility Concepts that are approved by the Parks Commission as part of the Park Master Planning Process provides guidance on the future use and development of each park and its facilities. More in-depth site plans are developed through the facility planning and design processes. |

**Standard:** There should be site plans to guide the use of existing and the development of future areas and facilities

**Evidence:** Representative sampling of the agency’s areas and facilities site plans

| 2.8 Historical, Cultural and Natural Resource Management Plan | OCPRC’s natural resource management philosophy is addressed in Appendix __: Implementation Report. Historical, cultural and natural resources are addressed within the Park Master Planning Process. The development of park-specific natural resource management plans is under development. |

**Standard:** A historical, cultural and natural resource management plan(s) should address all resource-based areas

**Evidence:** Provide the historical, cultural and natural resource management plan(s)

* Standards marked with an asterisk are fundamental standards and are required
The Principles of Recreation Resource Planning (SORP 2009) were developed by the Society of Outdoor Recreation Professionals (SORP) to provide a foundation for making decisions about the future management of recreation resources and recreation opportunities that are “more effective, efficient, fair, reasoned, and defensible”. SORP Principles are intended to help clarify institutional values and perspectives and help to provide a common understanding and nomenclature for professionals and interested stakeholders, and to help deter “arbitrary and capricious decision making”. The 37 principles provide planning standards at a greater level of detail than those provided by CAPRA national accreditation standards and include: General Precepts (1-19), Principles for the Planning Process (20-30); Principles for the Plan (31-33); and Principles for Implementation (34-37). All of the Principles should be consulted for future planning and as this plan is implemented. The Principles for the Plan and Principles for Implementation are of particular interest as OCPRC moves forward to implement this Recreation Plan and are quoted below:

**Principles for the Plan (SORP 2009)**

31. **The Document**: The effectiveness and utility of a plan is in part a function of its clarity, brevity, layout, and design. Materials used in the planning process should be retained in the administrative record, but the final approved document should be a valuable desktop working document.

32. **Resource Management Prescription**: The output of a recreation resource planning process is a management prescription for an area that includes such information as goals, objectives, desired future conditions, desired recreation experiences, facilities, management strategies and actions, quality standards, visitor capacities, a monitoring program, and budgetary needs.

33. **Budgetary Tool**: An effective recreation plan should include the projected budgetary needs to implement the plan. In this way the plan is a tool to prepare and justify annual budgets, for allocating budgets, and to guide annual work priorities, and facilitate the scheduling and sequencing of projects.

**Principles for Implementation (SORP 2009)**

34. **Implementing Partnerships**: The successful implementation of a plan should involve collaboration with stakeholders, government agencies, partnerships, and alliances with communities, special interests groups, and the private sector.

35. **Institutional Accountability**: The responsible official charged with implementing the plan should periodically evaluate and report to the public on progress and accomplishments to date, factors affecting the plan’s implementation, and changes pending or made to the approved plan.

36. **Plan Adaptability**: A recreation resource plan should be adaptive to new science, information, uses, technology, trends, conditions, and other circumstances of importance. Any proposed change should be subject to the same level of deliberate analysis and public collaboration as went into the original decision.

37. **Review and Revision**: Given the significant and ongoing changes in our society and the recreation industry, it would be reasonable that recreation plans be formally reviewed and updated every 5-10 years.
International Association for Public Participation

The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2)\(^8\) has developed the IAP2 Core Values of Public Participation (IAP2 2007) for use in the development and implementation of public participation processes. The purpose of the Core Values is to “identify those aspects of public participation which cross national, cultural, and religious boundaries” and “help make better decisions which reflect the interests and concerns of potentially affected people and entities”. Ongoing public participation is a key element of the future implementation of this Recreation Plan and is an area where staff will need to build their skills and understanding. The Core Values, provided below, provide an opportunity for OCPRC to plan more thoughtfully and to evaluate each occasion when input is requested from the public, partners, staff, or decision-makers.

Core Values for the Practice of Public Participation (IAP2 2007)

1. Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process
2. Public participation includes the promise that the public’s contribution will influence the decision
3. Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision makers
4. Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision
5. Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate
6. Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way
7. Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision
**Economic Factors**

According to National Bureau of Economic Research, the recent recession\(^9\) began in December 2007 and a trough occurred in June 2009, marking the beginning of an expansion. The trough marks the end of the recession that began in December 2007 and the beginning of an expansion. The recession lasted 18 months, which makes it the longest of any recession since World War II (NBER 2010).

OCPRC has been impacted by the recession in several ways, most notably in decline of property tax millage revenue and decreases in participation due to financial pressures on Oakland County families. According to economists Carmen M. Reinhart and Kenneth S. Rogoff, the recent recession can be termed a ‘systemic’ recession based on systemic bank failure and to differentiate it from smaller recessions that are part of the business cycle, and can be expected to have a more gradual recovery than other recessions since the Great Depression (Reinhart and Rogoff 2012).

42% of outdoor participants say the economy impacts how often they participate in outdoor activities. The 2012 Outdoor Recreation Participation Report notes that 34% of outdoor participants live in households with incomes of $75,000 or more and 79% are either employed full-time or part-time or are students. Only 4% are unemployed. The study indicates that Americans are still being affected in their spending on outdoor recreation by the economic downturn. Few outdoor participants report that they spent more on outdoor goods and services from 2010 to 2011 and few plan to increase spending in 2012 (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 15-17).

U.S. Census data indicates that in Oakland County, an estimated 8.7% of persons are in poverty\(^{10}\) (SEMCOG 2012). Strong contrasts exist, such as the City of Pontiac where poverty levels of 75% and above are seen and household incomes fall below $25,000 per year (see Figure A).

**Recreational Need**

Certain areas of Oakland County may be in greater need of recreational assistance than others, such as: areas with a below-median household income; areas with a larger minority make-up; areas with declining populations; and areas with disproportionate numbers of children or the elderly. A community with any one of these factors is not more likely than another community to be considered in need, but possessing several of these characteristics can indicate a need for recreational opportunities.

**Recreational Resources**

Initiated in 1982, OCPRC’s Recreational Assistance Partnership Program (RAPP) grants recreation opportunities and experiences including outreach programs and bus transportation. RAPP is an element of the parks system’s evolving Strategic Master Plan to serve all areas and citizens of the County of Oakland, and to create community through people, parks and programs.

RAPP offers support in outreach programming to cities, villages and townships; community parks and recreation departments; schools; downtown development authorities; non-profit organizations; and underserved populations. Each group is eligible for three outreach programs plus one bus trip. In 2012, RAPP offered Get Outside! programs including GO!Cache and GO!Fish Clinics, Festival II, Bouncer and Mini Festival units, Retro Games, bus transportation, and community and recreation collaborations.
Figure B: Persons in Poverty in Southeast Michigan, 2010
Source: (SEMCOG 2012)

Persons in Poverty, 2010
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey.
Figure C: Median household income in Southeast Michigan, 2010
Source: (SEMCOG 2012)
Economic Value of Parks and Open Space

The Michigan State Parks and Outdoor Recreation Blue Ribbon Panel, in its report to Governor Rick Snyder in 2012, affirmed that the value of Michigan’s parks and recreation spaces with the following statement: “The Panel reaffirms their economic value, but recognizes their value also lies in experience, feeling, affinity, care, and stewardship. It lies in the social and cultural ties and understanding that are derived from experiencing these places. It comes from the deep and abiding desire for place and for belonging. And it ultimately lies in our memory and in our heart. These are the feelings that bind people and families together and to their place, that strengthen community, and that forge and nurture citizenship. Our important places, some of which we call parks, serve all of these purposes and because of that, serve all of us, whether we set foot in them or not. They are of our place and our people, and thus are of all of us. This is the ethic that formed the parks and that still forms the basis of their enduring value” (State of Michigan 2012). This statement emphasizes the intrinsic values, such as sense of place, which parks and open space provide to a community – values that are difficult to quantify or cannot be quantified.

Communities and park agencies are often called upon, however, to quantify the value of recreational resources. Justification for public funding of parks may be one reason to quantify the value of parks and open space. Calculation of a monetary value of the benefits provided by a park will also enable decision-makers to compare a park development with other types of development. Efforts to calculate the economic value of parks are showing that there are measures that can help demonstrate positive economic impacts of parks to the community.

According to a study from Trust for Public Land’s Center for City Park Excellence (Harnik and Welle 2009), the increase in property value that often occurs with parks and open space provides direct income benefits to both the city (higher property tax revenue) and residents (property appreciation and tourism revenue). Parks can provide residents with direct savings through lower-cost recreational opportunities, savings in medical costs due to health benefits, and the community cohesion benefit that can result in lower crime and lower maintenance costs. Direct savings are also received through the environmental benefits of water and air pollution reduction.

OCPRC is exploring various methodologies and tools that will assess the benefits of the Oakland County Parks system to the communities served. The results of this task will assist OCPRC in demonstrating to the public that their investment in Oakland County Parks has a high rate of return. It will also assist OCPRC decision-makers to select future park development projects that have the most positive economic and social impact on the community.
Age Factors

The 2012 Outdoor Recreation Participation Report indicates that participation in team sports, outdoor recreation and indoor fitness activities varies with the age of the individual and with gender also playing a role. Outdoor activities are popular among children, but participation drops during adolescence and young adulthood. Outdoor participation increases slightly among females at age 21 to 25 and for males at ages 30 to 35 and then gradually decreases for both sexes (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 19-20).

Among American youth, participated dropped 14% between 2006 and 2008. It has stabilized in recent years and is now showing signs of recovery. Participation grew by one percentage point in 2011 for children ages 6 to 12 and adolescents age 13 to 17. Participation also increased by 1% for adults ages 18 to 24 and ages 25 to 44 (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 33).

In Michigan, only 24% of respondents indicated that they felt their children participate less or much less in outdoor recreation that they did as a child, while 35% feel their children participate in more or much more outdoor recreation (Public Sector Consultants 2012).

Recreational Need – Youth and Young Adults

It is important to understand the reasons that youth and young adults participate in recreation and the barriers that prevent them from participating. Youth cite lack of interest as the main reason that they do not participate, followed by expense and lack of time. Young adults indicate that lack of time is the main reason keeping them from participating, followed by lack of interest and not having anyone to participate with. Spending time with friends and family is the most popular reason that youth participate in outdoor recreation, followed by exercise. For young adults the leading reason is exercise, with time with family and friends coming in second. The opportunity to experience excitement and adventure ranks third among both groups (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 37-38).

OCPRC can continue to support the increase in the participation of youth and young adults by ensuring the provision of parks and facilities that support the types of activities favored by youth. Programming can provide ‘gateway’ experiences to build the skills and provide an encouraging social environment for lifelong participation.
Table 3: Highest ranked outdoor activities for youth (ages 6-17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Most Popular Activities By Participation Rate</th>
<th>Favorite Outdoor Activities By Frequency of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking 26% of American youth, 13.3 million participants</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running 82 average outings per youth / 955.9 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running 23% of American youth, 11.7 million participants</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking 64 average outings per youth / 854.4 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Car, Backyard and RV Camping 23% of American youth, 11.5 million participants</td>
<td>Skateboarding 57 average outings per youth / 211.6 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing 20% of American youth, 10.3 million participants</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing 13 average outings per youth / 138.8 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hiking 13% of American youth, 6.4 million participants</td>
<td>Camping 10 average outings per youth / 113.4 million outings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 35)

Table 4: Highest ranked outdoor activities for young adults (ages 18-24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Most Popular Activities By Participation Rate</th>
<th>Favorite Outdoor Activities By Frequency of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running 32% of young adults, 9.2 million participants</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running 95 average outings per young adult / 870.8 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Car, Backyard and RV Camping 17% of young adults, 4.9 million participants</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking 53 average outings per young adult / 221.5 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing 16% of young adults, 4.6 million participants</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing 17 average outings per young adult / 80.2 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking 14% of young adults, 4.2 million participants</td>
<td>Birdwatching / Wildlife Viewing 34 average outings per young adult / 67.5 million outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hiking 13% of young adults, 3.9 million participants</td>
<td>Hunting 34 average outings per young adult / 61.3 million outings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 36)
Figure E: Change in youth population in Southeast Michigan, 2000-2010
Source: (SEMCOG 2012)
Diversity Factors

Southeast Michigan is continuously becoming more racially diversified. SEMCOG’s 2040 Forecast predicts that the percentage of Hispanic population will double from 4% to 8% in the next 30 years. Additionally, the percent of Asians and others will almost double, growing from 6 percent to 11 percent. Meanwhile, the percent of White population will decrease from 68% to 60%; and the share of Black population will remain relatively unchanged, from 22% to 21% (SEMCOG 2012).

Oakland County became slightly more diverse in the past decade, with a decrease in White/non-Hispanic residents and small increases in Black, Asian, Multi-racial and Hispanic races (SEMCOG 2011).

Table 5: Racial demographic trends in Southeast Michigan and Oakland County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent Population by Race</th>
<th>Percent Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast Michigan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>4,833,368</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Census</td>
<td>4,704,743</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-2.70%</td>
<td>-2.10%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Oakland County** |            |                |                |               |              |
| 2000 Census        | 1,194,156  | 81.4%          | 10.0%          | 4.1%          | 2.4%         |
| 2010 Census        | 1,202,362  | 75.1%          | 13.5%          | 5.6%          | 3.5%         |
| Change             | 0.70%      | -6.30%         | 3.50%          | 1.50%         | 1.10%        |

Source: (SEMCOG 2011)

As stated in the Outdoor Foundation’s 2012 Participation Report, participation in outdoor activities is lowest among African Americans and generally highest among Caucasians. While Hispanics participate at a lower rate, those who do participate tend to do so more frequently. Participation levels among African American youth are much lower than that of other groups (Outdoor Foundation 2012).

Figure F: Participation of diverse groups in outdoor education
Source: (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 44)

Various forms of running are the most popular activities for all Americans regardless of ethnic or racial affiliation. Biking, camping and fishing are included among next top four activities for all groups.
### Table 6: Highest ranked activities among diverse groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>African Americans Age 6 and Older</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islanders Age 6 and Older</th>
<th>Caucasians Age 6 and Older</th>
<th>Hispanics Age 6 and Older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running – 16%</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running – 24%</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running – 18%</td>
<td>Running, Jogging and Trail Running – 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking – 10%</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking – 15%</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing – 18%</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking – 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing – 9%</td>
<td>Hiking – 14%</td>
<td>Car, Backyard and RV Camping – 17%</td>
<td>Car, Backyard and RV Camping – 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Car, Backyard and RV Camping – 4%</td>
<td>Car, Backyard and RV Camping – 11%</td>
<td>Road, Mountain and BMX Biking – 16%</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing – 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Birdwatching / Wildlife Viewing – 4%</td>
<td>Freshwater, Saltwater and Fly Fishing – 10%</td>
<td>Hiking – 14%</td>
<td>Hiking – 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 45)

### Recreational Need

It is important to understand the reasons that youth from diverse groups participate in recreation and the barriers that prevent them from participating. The results are similar to youth in general. Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander youth cited lack of time as the top reason they did not participate more often. African American and Caucasian youth both cited lack of interest as the main reason. All groups agreed that the top reason they did get outdoors was to get exercise (Outdoor Foundation 2012, 46).
Figure G: Gains in racial diversity in Southeast Michigan, 2000-2010
Source: (SEMCOG 2012)
Accessibility Factors

Provision of Parks
A 2012 University of Wisconsin study looks at “Access to Recreational Facilities” as a subset of the Physical Environment. “Access to Recreational Facilities” is measured as the number of facilities per 100,000 residents. Oakland County scores 14, which is above the Michigan overall score of 9. The national benchmark (which is set at the 90th percentile nationwide) is 16. The range of scores for “Access to Recreational Facilities” in Michigan is 0-26 (University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute 2012).

Proximity to Parks
Proximity to recreational opportunities is an important factor in the rate at which residents participate. The threshold for distance may vary depending on the activity. Michigan residents indicated a willingness to travel longer distances for camping and hunting/trapping activities (Public Sector Consultants 2012).

Table 7: Top 7 most important activities by longest drive Michigan respondents are willing to make
Source: (Public Sector Consultants 2012, 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking outdoors, including dog walking</th>
<th>Relaxing outdoors</th>
<th>Visiting parks or playgrounds</th>
<th>Camping</th>
<th>Gardening</th>
<th>Hunting or trapping</th>
<th>Fishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes or less</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 hour</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 2 hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 4 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 6 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michigan Department of Natural Resources. State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, Outdoor Recreational Telephone Survey, April 2012. NOTE: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

See Chapter 5: Recreational Resources, pp. 18-21 for a review of Accessibility and Universal Access issues and the status of accessibility in Oakland County Parks.
Health and Fitness Factors

Measures of Health
According to the Michigan Health Profile Chartbook, 53% of adults in the Macomb, Oakland and St. Clair counties get sufficient physical activity\(^{11}\), which is slighter higher than Michigan as a whole and has increased from 44% since 2003. (Moderate to higher levels of regular physical activity associated with lower mortality rates) (Michigan Department of Community Health 2011).

A 2012 Michigan study conducted by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, Oakland County ranks 16th out of 82 Michigan counties in terms of Health Outcomes, which is based on measures of mortality\(^{12}\) and morbidity\(^{13}\), and represents the health of the county (University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute 2012).

Health factors have been identified that influence the health of the county. These include behavioral, clinical, social and economic, and environmental factors. Behavioral factors constitute 30% of the factors. Diet and exercise is included in behavioral factors and mostly closely represents the contribution of parks and recreation to the health factors. Oakland County ranks as one of the healthiest counties in the state, ranking 6th out of 82 Michigan counties in terms of the summary rank of Health Factors. In terms of individual Health Factors, Oakland County ranks 4th in Health Behaviors, 9th in Clinical Care, 11th in Social and Economic Factors, and 49th in Physical Environment (University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute 2012).

Physical Activity
According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), only 25 percent of American adults engage in recommended levels of physical activity, and 29 percent engage in no leisure-time physical activity at all. This sedentary lifestyle is contributing to an increased incidence of obesity along with obesity-related diseases, such as high blood pressure, diabetes, congestive heart failure, and stroke. As one solution to the increased incidence of obesity, the CDC has called for more parks and playgrounds. Studies have shown that when people have access to parks, they exercise more.

53% of adults in the Macomb, Oakland and St. Clair counties get sufficient physical activity\(^{14}\), which is slighter higher than Michigan as a whole and has increased from 44% since 2003. (Moderate to higher levels of regular physical activity associated with lower mortality rates). Perhaps the most startling information is the report on physical activity for children in Michigan and the U.S. Michigan’s Health Profile Chartbook, which provides data for both adults and children (grades 9-12) in Michigan and compares these with national figures. The percentage of children in grades 9-12 in Michigan who get sufficient physical activity has markedly declined since 2003 from 65% to 25%, with the national statistics being slightly lower (Michigan Department of Community Health 2011).

Obesity
The Health Profile Chartbook for Macomb, Oakland and St. Clair counties provides data for various health statistics and compares them with the statistics for the entire state. The prevalence of overweight and obesity in adults 20 years and older is approximately 65% in those counties, slighter lower than Michigan as a whole. The chart shows a slow increase from 2001, when it was 59% (Michigan Department of Community Health 2011).
Facility-Specific Planning and Public Input

Surveys and studies of recreational trends indicate that recreation users desire certain types of facilities. These desires and trends tend to change over time. Therefore it is important to track the public’s recreational needs on a regular basis and adapt to the changing needs of Oakland County residents. This is important for the types of facilities already offered by OCPRC, such as trails, waterparks and dog parks. Changing need or changing demographics sometimes means that the demand for a certain type of facility will decline and may need to eventually be de-commissioned or adapted to another use. It is also important to remain alert for new types of facilities that are not currently offered by OCPRC. Examples may include zip lines and off-road vehicle (ORV) areas. The decision to offer a new type of facility needs to be well-tempered by good quality survey data and a thorough market analysis to ensure that OCPRC is not duplicating a service already provided locally. The following sections develop a general analysis and provide references for planning and survey documents relevant to specific types of recreational facilities. Development of facility-specific planning and public input efforts are underway.
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Notes

1 Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR): The mission statement of MDNR is its commitment to “the conservation, protection, management, use and enjoyment of the state’s natural and cultural resources for current and future generations”. The four priorities of the MDNR are: 1) renewed emphasis on customer service; 2) building strong support for the Recreation Passport; 3) increasing resident/visitor participation in Outdoor recreation and stopping the decline in hunting and fishing; and 4) fostering the growth of Michigan’s natural resource-based economy. The Grants Management section of MDNR manages three grant programs: Michigan Natural Resource Trust Fund, Land and Water Conservation Fund, and the Recreation Passport Grant Program. See www.michigan.gov/dnr.

2 9 Steps of the Park Master Planning Process:
   1. Public and Stakeholder Engagement
   2. Baseline Research
   3. Concept Development
   4. Compilation of Park Vision and Facility Concepts and Supporting Documents
   5. Review of Park Vision and Facility Concepts by Parks Commission
   6. Public Review and Comment
   7. Final Draft Preparation
   8. Parks Commission Approval of Park Vision and Facility Concepts
   9. Evaluation

3 Park Master Planning Guiding Principles: The Guiding Principles are drawn directly from a variety of sources and guide the development of concepts on the park and facility level. They ensure that park and facility concepts are consistent with the mission and goals of OCPRC and with professional standards and national initiatives that address social, environmental and fiscal sustainability.

#1 UNDERSTAND AND ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OF THE PARK
   • Reinforce the sense of place
   • Consider the needs of local residents
   • Begin with what we have

#2 PRESERVE, MAINTAIN AND CREATE NATURAL COMMUNITIES
   • Provide ecological and green infrastructure services
   • Prioritize the management of natural areas and use an adaptive approach
   • Invite the public to become stewards

#3 HELP PEOPLE BECOME HEALTHIER
   • Provide an abundant variety of park activities and programming
   • Reduce stress factors
   • Ensure that the park is well-designed and easily accessible
   • Maximize health benefits through partnerships

#4 IMPROVE ACCESS TO RECREATION
   • Welcome everyone
   • Incorporate the Principles of Universal Design
   • Maximize access within the park
   • Promote local and regional connections
   • Be a regional recreation destination

#5 DEVELOP FACILITIES THAT PROTECT AND IMPROVE THE ENVIRONMENT
   • Incorporate sustainable design practices
   • Incorporate operational practices that protect the environment
   • Understand the environmental history of the site
#6 PLAN FOR SUCCESSFUL OUTCOMES
- Maintain and promote the resources we have before adding more
- Focus on actions that maximize participation and increase cost recovery
- Increase staff effectiveness
- Increase organizational effectiveness
- Enable future decision-making with performance metrics
- Have a positive economic impact on the local economy

4 **Trust for Public Land (TPL):** The Trust for Public Land is a national nonprofit that conserves land for people to enjoy as parks, gardens, historic sites, rural lands, and other natural places. TPL is a leader in creating city parks and has the stated goal of putting a park or playground within walking distance of every American. TPL also specializes in creating public funds for conservation. Since 1972, TPL has completed more than 5,200 park and conservation projects in communities nationwide, including in Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

5 **National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA):** NRPA is the national service organization for park and recreation agencies, providing education for professionals and the public, advancing best practices and resources, and advocating for increased funding for parks and recreation. For more information, see [www.nrpa.org](http://www.nrpa.org).

6 **Commission for the Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA):** Text

7 **Society of Recreation Professionals (SORP):** Formerly known as the National Association of Recreation Resource Professionals, SORP has provided resources and services for the outdoor recreation professional since 1983. For more information, see [www.recpro.org](http://www.recpro.org).

8 **International Association for Public Participation (IAP2):** IAP2 is an international association of members who seek to promote and improve the practice of public participation in relation to individuals, governments, institutions and other entities that affect the public interest in nations throughout the world. IAP2 carries out its mission by organizing and conducting activities to:

- Serve the learning needs of members through events, publications, and communication technology;
- Advocate for public participation throughout the world;
- Promote a results-oriented research agenda and use research to support educational and advocacy goals;
- Provide technical assistance to improve public participation.

For more information, see [www.iap2.org](http://www.iap2.org).

9 **Recession:** The National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) defines a recession as a “period between a peak and a trough, and an expansion is a period between a trough and a peak”.

10 **Poverty:** Poverty areas are census tracts or block numbering areas (BNA's) where at least 20 percent of residents were below the poverty level. Poverty thresholds are used by the U.S. Census Bureau to prepare its estimates of the number of individuals and families in poverty. The poverty guidelines are a simplified version of the poverty thresholds and are used as an eligibility criterion by the Community Services Block Grant program and a number of other Federal programs. The Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services updates the poverty guidelines at least annually (HHS 2012).
### 2012 Poverty Guidelines for the 48 Contiguous States and the District of Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons in family/household</th>
<th>Poverty guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$11,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$19,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$27,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$30,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$34,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$38,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For families/households with more than 8 persons, add $3,960 for each additional person.

11 Targets for sufficient physical activity are established by the Healthy People 2020 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) recommendations for exercise. For more information, see [www.healthypeople.gov/2020](http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020).

12 Mortality: Mortality is another term for death. A mortality rate is the number of deaths due to a disease divided by the total population. If there are 25 lung cancer deaths in one year in a population of 30,000, then the mortality rate for that population is 83 per 100,000.

13 Morbidity: Morbidity is another term for illness. A person can have several co-morbidities simultaneously. So, morbidities can range from Alzheimer’s disease to cancer to traumatic brain injury. Morbidities are NOT deaths. Prevalence is a measure often used to determine the level of morbidity in a population.

14 Targets for sufficient physical activity are established by the Healthy People 2020 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services) recommendations for exercise. For more information, see [www.healthypeople.gov/2020](http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020).