



Rochester Hills Master Report

1000 Rochester Hills
Drive
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4660
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

File Number: 2005-0281

File Number: 2005-0281	File Type: Policy	Status: Consent Agenda
Version: 4	Reference: N/A	Controlling Body: City Council Regular Meeting
Requester: Planning/Development	Cost:	Introduced: 01/24/2005
File Name: Parks and Recreation Master Plan - Five Year Plan	Final Action:	

Title: Adoption of Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update for 2006 to 2010

Notes: Also see: 2004-0671 - Purchase increase for \$25,000.00: McKenna Associates, Inc. as Consultants for Parks and Recreation Master Plan as well as Master Land Use Plan.

Code Sections:

Agenda Date:

Indexes: Consultant, Parks, Policy, Master Land Use Plan, Parks & Recreation Master Plan

Agenda Number:

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: Agenda Summary.pdf, 041805 LAC Resolution of Support.pdf

Enactment Number:

History of Legislative File

Ver- sion:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
1	Leisure Activities Committee	01/24/2005	Discussed				
	Notes: <i>Mr. Hartner briefly discussed the upcoming review process of the Master Land Use Plan which is handled by the Planning Department every five (5) year. The following points were made:</i>						
	<i>* The Planning Department will advertise the dates of their public meetings that will be held to review the Master Land Use Plan during 2005.</i>						
	<i>* As part of the process, the Leisure Activities Committee will be invited to examine and update the Recreation Master Plan, which is a component of the Master Land Use Plan.</i>						
	<i>* The Recreation Master Plan is a guide for decisions regarding the City's parks for the next five (5) years. It also serves as a useful vehicle for grant applications.</i>						
	<i>* A major task will be for the Committee to decide if the community center, which has been an item in the Master Land Use Plan for the past fifteen (15) years, should remain an item or be deleted from the Plan.</i>						
1	Leisure Activities Committee	04/18/2005	Approved and Referred	City Council Regular Meeting			Pass
	Notes: <i>Committee members discussed Parks & Recreation Master Plan noting the following:</i>						
	<i>* The request is to have McKenna and Associates to be the Consultants for the Parks & Recreation Master Plan in conjunction with the Master Land Use Plan.</i>						

- * Cost of the Parks & Recreation Master Plan is an additional \$25,000.
- * McKenna and Associates will be helping with public work shops, surveys and focus groups.
- * McKenna and Associates will help facilitate setting goals and objectives for the next five (5) years.

Aye: Duistermars, Swann and White
Absent: Dalton and Robbins

1 Leisure Activities Committee 07/18/2005 Discussed

Notes: *Mike Hartner, Director of Parks and Forestry, stated that McKenna and Associates are helping with the Master Plan with short telephone surveys and by gathering information through workshops, the Hills Herald and public meetings.*

Master Plan is projected to be completed by April 2006 due to that being the time to apply for State grants.

2 Planning Commission 01/31/2006 Discussed

Notes: *Mr. Hooper explained the procedure for public commenting, and advised that anyone wishing to speak would be required to fill out a card. He noted that all comments should be specific to the Master Plan Agenda items, and that questions should be directed to the Chair to be answered at the end of the comments.*

Present for the discussion were Terry Croad and Heather McPhail, McKenna Associates, Inc., 235 East Main Street, Suite 105, Northville, MI 48167, and Michael Hartner, the City's Director of Parks and Forestry.

Mr. Hartner related that comments would be taken into advisement and incorporated into future drafts in the next few weeks. He advised that the Plan had been put on the City's web site recently, which would give the public a chance to comment, and that people were encouraged to give input. He further advised that a Public Hearing would be scheduled for February 21, 2006 for Planning Commission review and hopefully, approval.

Mr. Hartner stated that the Recreation Master Plan was updated every five years, and was primarily used for grants administered by the DNR, who asked for very specific criteria. In the past, the document served as the benchmark for acquisition or development of the parks system. He continued that the current update was a refinement of the existing, and that there were not a lot of material changes, but there were significant accomplishments. The City was able to acquire property for historical resources and environmental facilities, for example. He advised that the document would be taken to City Council before the Public Hearing for additional publicity.

Mr. Croad reiterated that the document was required for the City to be eligible for State and Federal grants. It was also a good exercise for communities as they partnered with private and other business organizations. The main component of the Plan was an inventory and analysis of the existing facilities. They looked at acreage of parks per population and at future growth, and where the parks were located to make sure they were serving the community. They also looked at the number of ball fields, their conditions, how accessible they were and if they were fulfilling the needs and desires of the citizenry. They noted demographic changes, especially the number of younger retirees, and the desire for health and fitness and recreation facilities. He found that the younger generations wanted walkable communities with varied recreation. People were interested in natural features, and McKenna tried to incorporate the Natural Features study into the Recreation Plan. There was an interest in tying recreation with economic development and tourism.

In answer to Mr. Hooper's question about the progression of the project, Mr. Croad advised that he met with Mr. Hartner in the spring of 2005. They visited all the facilities and did a windshield survey and inventory and started to look at the previous Recreation and Master Land Use Plans. Throughout the summer they incorporated the Natural Features Inventory and other demographic information with the Master Plan and in the fall, they held a community-wide workshop to find out what people felt about the community's recreation and what areas might need work. They looked at the undeveloped parks - Riverbend, Nowicki and Tienken Road - and drew up conceptual plans. They received dozens of emails through the fall from citizens. In October and November, he conducted telephone surveys with key stakeholders active in recreation. They used that information to guide them to understand the community and in what direction the citizens would like to go. They modified the previous goals and objectives and tied that in with the Capital Improvement Plan. He explained that the State looked for justification for prioritization and where the funding dollars went, and at public input supporting those priorities.

Mr. Croad stated that they looked at the population and inventory, and it showed that the City needed nine basketball courts, but they knew that those facilities were being provided at schools, multiple-family dwellings, private recreation places and places like Lifetime Fitness. Also according to the numbers, the City had a surplus of 21 soccer fields, which was definitely not true for the City. They needed to provide more fields and better way-finding or access. The City had a great pathway system, which was actively used, and people would like that improved. People would like access to water recreation. They found that people were very concerned about the environment and living in a green environment, and that they wanted to see continued protection and promotion of open spaces. People would like to see more passive than active recreation, although the youth asked for more soccer fields. There should be a better place for teenagers, such as a teen

center. They received a lot of public comment about developing a community center. People would like activities geared to families, including outdoor summer programs in the parks. He stated that the goal was to get as much input from the public regarding the draft Plan. They would like it adopted by March 1, because it was due to the State prior to April 1, 2006.

Mr. Anzek noted that when the RFP was being put together for the Master Land Use Plan, they realized that the Parks and Recreation Plan would be done shortly afterwards. Rather than having a lot of duplication, they thought they could get an economy of scale by using applicable data generated for both Plans.

Ms. Hardenburg referred to page Table 11 on page 31, (Recreation Facilities Evaluation) and noted that it included the school facilities. She asked about the intent, foreseeing that including the schools could harm the effort.

Mr. Croad indicated that it was just a starting point. It was shown that one playground was needed for every 3,000 people (9 total), and that the current need was 23. If they did not include the school facilities as supplemental, it would seem that there was a deficit of 14 play structures. Ms. Hardenburg stated that the City had no football fields, and when the Commission reviewed the CIP last year, a request for football fields was one of the proposed projects. However, in the Recreation Plan, the schools had six football facilities listed. If someone looked at that, they would question whether more fields needed to be constructed.

Mr. Hartner advised that the report went to the DNR, which also looked at national standards. Various areas around the country recreated completely differently, so the DNR looked at public input more than how standards for the whole country were met. The school facilities were being used at the same time the football fields were needed. The information had to be included for the DNR, but they gave more weight to public input, which was how the City realized it needed more football fields. Mr. Croad mentioned that he worked for many communities, and sometime the charts would say a certain city needed more soccer fields when that sport was not prevalent at all. He stressed that the DNR looked at that.

Mr. Hooper presumed it was a regional issue, as opposed to one just for the City. He knew, for example, that the softball fields were constantly in use, but the Plan showed that the City had a surplus. Mr. Hartner agreed that the City's demand was a lot higher than the national standards, and he indicated that was how it would be presented.

Mr. Hartner brought up that the Plan showed over 1,200 acres of open space in the City and that people might question why an Open Space millage was needed. He reminded that a lot of the newer subs were developed using the open space concept, and that it privatized neighborhood playgrounds. It made the City look like it had more parkland than the national average.

Mr. Hooper referred to page 31 and noted that the City of Rochester had the Onyx Ice Rink, and correspondingly, that Rochester Hills did not really have a need for an ice rink. He referred to page 16, Map 2 (the private, existing parks in light green), and noted that the Cemetery at Hamlin and John R was shown as a park. He asked if that was appropriate.

Mr. Croad explained that they received the files from the City's GIS program, which categorized the land use survey. He acknowledged they might have misinterpreted it when they incorporated it into the Plan, and advised that they would revisit those types of issues to appropriately classify areas.

Mr. Hooper mentioned that there was a lot of open space shown at Oakland University, and contemplated how that should be treated.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked what plan the City had to acquire more park property, or if there was a detailed description of what was being considered for the future.

Mr. Hartner advised that the Green Space Advisory Board recently had a second meeting. The first was to organize, and the second was to begin the education of their charge. They would be reviewing the Natural Features Inventory, what Oakland County had done, the greenways, linkages and other tools available. They were charged with looking at open spaces still remaining in Rochester Hills and to come up with proposals, which would be a long process.

Mr. Kaltsounis asked if the Parks Department had looked at property they would like for parks. Mr. Hartner advised that there were several undeveloped parcels, including Nowicki and Riverbend parks, that they would very much like to see developed. He noted that in this year's budget there were initial dollars to begin concept plans and maps. Mr. Kaltsounis asked if there was new land under consideration. Mr. Hartner said he wanted to concentrate on the parcels they had before considering strictly parkland acquisition. The open space component could include adjacent parcels or linkages to the park systems.

Mr. Kaltsounis pointed out that a lot of subdivisions had open space areas that could be developed. In his sub, for example, they wanted to put in some trees along the road. They called Forestry, and they offered a deal on trees because of their buying power. He asked if Parks had resources to go to subdivision communities to start turning that open space into parks. Mr. Hartner commented that the associations were able to do that themselves.

Mr. Anzek acknowledged that there were private open spaces within neighborhood subs, but cautioned that the City should not encourage citizen use of conservation areas. Mr. Kaltsounis realized there were conservation areas, but he wondered if the City could offer citizens such options as buying

park benches and installing pathways. Mr. Hartner asked if he wanted the City to partner in the purchases. Mr. Kaltsounis said that could be an idea, or using the Forestry's help to install trees. He wondered if the City had the buying power and resources to work with the subdivision communities. Mr. Hartner said they had brought playground vendors to Homeowner Association meetings, but the Association would fund the equipment. Costs to plant trees in the right-of-way were shared with the City because they were a benefit to all.

Mr. Hooper reminded that there was a liability with playgrounds, and if they were on private property and encouraged for everyone's use and someone got hurt, there could be legal issues. Mr. Kaltsounis agreed he would be leery of playground equipment, but he thought they could use help designing a plan with park benches or similar items. He viewed the green space on the map as potential park areas, and if the subdivisions were given direction and opportunities to turn their areas into parks, they would be free to use. Mr. Hartner said the City would not want to be required to put in parking areas for the general public. Mr. Kaltsounis explained they would just be open parks that people could walk to. Mr. Hartner indicated that the City would offer expertise if they could, but they could not offer funding for private property. Mr. Kaltsounis added that he was not asking for money, just direction.

Ms. Holder asked if Nowicki Park's 35 acres included the recently acquired ten acres. Mr. Hartner said it did, but Mr. Anzek advised that the map did not show it.

Mr. Hooper said that all the churches were indicated as public or semi-public. Mr. Croad said that typically, churches were listed as quasi-public in land use surveys so that was probably why they were identified as such. He agreed they should not be shown as parkland.

Mr. Hooper opened the public comments at 7:55 p.m.

Scott Stokfisz, 3441 Charlwood, Rochester Hills, MI 48306. Mr. Stokfisz stated that he was a ten-year resident of Rochester Hills who was fortunate to live in Thornridge Subdivision on a park. He commended the City for its efforts to try to develop open spaces over the years. He said that the Master Plan draft had targeted the three undeveloped parks, but that the studies would not be completed until 2008. He asked if it would be more appropriate to move the date up, in light of the Open Space Millage, to understand earlier what the plans would be.

Mr. Hooper closed the public comments. In answer to the above question, he stated that it was CIP-driven. Mr. Hartner agreed, and added that it was also budget-driven. Nowicki Park was in the 2006 budget for concept planning and preliminary design. Mr. Hooper advised that City Council had the final say about what did or did not get funded.

Mr. Hartner reiterated that the Planning Commission was the adopting body, and announced that a Public Hearing was scheduled for February 21. The Plan could be adopted at that time, or there could be an additional meeting, if needed, before it had to be to the DNR.

3 Planning Commission 02/21/2006 Approved

Pass

Notes: (Reference: Memo prepared by Michael Harter, dated February 17, 2006 had been placed on file and by reference became part of the record thereof.)

Present for the matter were Michael Hartner, Director of the Parks and Forestry Department; and Terry Croad, McKenna Associates, Inc., 235 East Main Street, Suite 105, Northville, MI 48167.

Mr. Hartner stated that the update of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan had been in process for about a year. He explained the process included seeking input from the residents on what they would like to see in their parks over the next five years, noting there had been a number of public meetings, discussions, and articles in the Hills Herald and on the City's website seeking input. He remarked there had not been much input since the City Council meeting; however, he had received one email that would be read into the record during the Public Hearing. He added that the plan was nearing the completion point.

Vice Chairperson Boswell requested a brief summary of any changes made to the Plan since the January 31, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Hartner stated that most of the changes had been housekeeping-type changes, such as correcting acreage amounts for some of the parks. He explained there were some instances where the mileage or acreage was not consistent on a table or a graph.

Mr. Croad advised that some of the land use categories had been eliminated, such as those that were identified as church or cemetery.

Mr. Hartner referred to Page 45, under "Existing Facilities" and noted that one swimming pool had been added to the underserved listing.

Mr. Hartner stated that no substantial changes had been made from the version of the Plan reviewed by the Planning Commission on January 31st. He indicated that he had received an email from Melinda Hill suggesting some changes that would be more reflective of what had been done in the past, such as ADA Compliance and partnership with other agencies. He explained that the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) did not want to see what had happened in the past, but rather what future plans were. He stated that any proposal considered by the DNR would not be judged on what had been done previously, but rather what agencies would be involved in any proposal or how much public support there was for any proposal. He noted it would be a matter of personal choice to beef up the plan with past accomplishments, and he did not feel this was the point to begin a rewrite of

the plan to include that type of information.

Ms. Holder asked if Map 2 (Existing Parks) had been changed to accurately reflect the Eugene S. Nowicki Park, which extended further north. Mr. Croad verified that the dimensions of the park had been corrected on the map.

Vice Chairperson Boswell clarified that the version of the map that the Planning Commission had received for the meeting was still the same as the version reviewed at the January 31st meeting. Ms. Holder stated that was the reason she had asked whether the parcel had been corrected on the map. Mr. Croad said he would make a note to verify the change had been made. Vice Chairperson Boswell noted that Figure 8 was correct; however, Map 2 needed to be corrected.

Vice Chairperson Boswell opened the Public Hearing at 7:48 PM, and called for anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Dan Keifer, 719 Fieldstone, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Mr. Keifer thanked the Commission for providing the public with an opportunity to speak about the Plan, noting it was a wonderful asset and deserved more public attention and input than it had received. He felt the Plan provided an opportunity to look forward, although he thought the Plan did not look forward enough. He acknowledged that he did not know the specific requirements the Plan needed to respond to in terms of the Trust Fund and DNR Grants, but noted the Plan had focused more on the traditional "box" parks. He believed the goals and visioning should have included such items as the role of open space, green space and the trails, and the natural features, as part of the whole infrastructure. He stated the Plan spoke more to the "rectangular" parks, and he did not see the Clinton River or Paint Creek Trail. He thought all of those were important parts of the recreation infrastructure, although they might not fit in the Plan in a traditional way. He believed the overall emphasis of the Plan leaned toward the direction of traditional parks, such as soccer fields and playgrounds, but felt there was a great opportunity in terms of what the broader recreation infrastructure could provide the City.

Mr. Keifer asked if the Greenspace Millage could be reflected as part of the Recreation Plan and what that meant in terms of what the Community was trying to accomplish. He emphasized the potential of the Community and its assets in terms of tourism. He pointed out that the Community had some unbelievable assets that went beyond the needs of the residents. He felt there was real opportunity in terms of economic and business development of what the trails, rivers and streams could bring. He advised that the DNR had just completed a census on the Clinton River and cited the fact that there were 15,000 angler hours put in every March and April in the Community for steelhead fishing. He pointed out that the Paint Creek was a designated trout stream and was regarded as the best trout stream in Southeast Michigan. He stated it was incredible what other regions did in terms of this type of tourism/recreation development. He referred to the Grand River

located near Woodstock, Ontario, where the Bed and Breakfast waiting lists were one year in advance for the fishing. He left a couple issues of Rails to Trails which could provide a sense of the tourism potential, as well as a recent article about the regional trail network around Atlanta, Georgia, and what it meant in terms of tourism. (The documents had been placed on file, and by reference became a part of the record thereof).

Beth Tilove, 769 Snowmass, Rochester Hills, MI 48309 Ms. Tilove stated that she wanted to better understand the relationship between the Plan and the new open space tax. She recalled that a couple years ago she was told that whatever property the open space tax paid for would not be parkland. She asked if the Plan had any impact on the types of property that the open space millage would purchase, or if the Plan helped the City obtain funds from the DNR, if those monies could be added to the open space money to purchase more property.

Mr. Hartner stated he had received an email from **Debbie Geen, 3090 Kenwood Drive, Rochester Hills, MI 48309** to be read into the record, as she was unable to attend the meeting. (A copy of the email had been placed on file, and by reference became a part of the record thereof). She stated that the City already had many existing baseball and soccer fields, basketball courts, swimming pools and tennis courts through facilities such as the high schools, private schools and universities, the Older Persons' Commission (OPC), Lifetime Fitness, the YMCA, swim and tennis clubs, and Dinosaur Hill Nature Preserve. She felt the City currently provided ample recreation programs for adults and youth through RARA, OPC, EEC, public libraries, public and private schools, YMCA, Rochester Youth Soccer League, North Oakland Baseball Federation, and the Rochester Hills Little League. She expressed concern with the increased cost for City services such as police, fire and maintenance to cover the cost of operation of a teen center, pool or additional sports fields. She expressed concern over the traffic increase from sports teams outside the City and the impact on neighboring subdivisions. She felt that the current recreation facilities and programs provided ample options for adults and youth, and questioned whether fountains, dog parks and mazes were necessary when the City lacked sufficient funds to provide snow plowing and road services for the safety of the public. She stated the City must provide basic City services prior to expenditures duplicating existing services already provided in the area.

There being no further persons wishing to speak on this matter, Vice Chairperson Boswell closed the Public Hearing at 7:56 PM.

Mr. Hartner responded to some of the questions asked during the Public Hearing. He stated that a very large part of the Plan included incorporating recreation into the existing plans. He explained that the Plan was designed to work with the roads, infrastructure and other planning issues, and very strongly incorporated the Natural Features Inventory information contained in the Master Land Use Plan. It was one of the three major goals of the Parks

Department to ensure the conservation of highly sensitive woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitats within the City. He referred to Page 58 of the Plan, which outlined the policies in support of those goals, which would preserve significant natural features located in the City, and integrate the natural features preservation into land use and recreation decisions. He stated the Plan was unique because it included a comprehensive storm water management program and how those decisions would impact wildlife and access to opportunities from a recreation point of view. He stated the new millage was identified as a funding source, which would be available for open space purchases to meet some of those goals.

Mr. Hartner stated that over the next ten years, the City would be following the Plan's goals and objectives through the implementation of policies and Ordinance amendments or discussions regarding water and storm water issues and how they related to parks, passive recreation, and the clean water of the Clinton River. He stressed that all decisions made regarding the parks and developed properties would consider the impact on the Clinton River. He noted that the Clinton River and Paint Creek Trails were identified as major recreation features in the Plan, and identified as significant elements that preserved and protected passive outdoor recreation.

Mr. Hartner explained the Plan was a guide that would be used to help strengthen all of the decisions that would be made.

Vice Chairperson Boswell noted the Plan would be used as a source for obtaining funds from the state and federal governments, and asked what role the national standards played in obtaining those funds. He stated it appeared it would be hard to obtain any funding because the City already had more than the national standards.

Mr. Croad responded that the national and federal standards were used as a baseline. He stated it was through the public comment period that the national standards were tailored to determine whether the Plan contained bonuses or deficiencies. He explained that the national standards were very generic, and were based on the number of facilities per population. He noted that current population and projected population had to be considered, and a baseline was developed within that. He stated that most Oakland County Communities could not get enough field usage and field play on soccer fields because of the high demand. He indicated the State would look at the national standards, but would also look more closely at the public input process, and the prioritization of those needs and desires in the five-year plan when making funding decisions. He stated once the Plan was adopted, the Community would become eligible for state and federal funds; however, another process had to take place, including additional advertised public hearings regarding the specific grant requests. He explained the State would then consider the details and justification of the grant request based on the foundation of the Master Plan and the additional public hearings.

Mr. Croad stated that the standard included a minimum of a twenty-five percent match. He explained the State normally received more requests than what money was available, and communities that could justify in their plan that the request was a high priority based on public input and comment, and that were willing to put in additional dollars, would score higher. He noted the State had high priorities such as the acquisition and protection of environmentally sensitive land and access to water. A grant request that included those priorities, therefore, would score better than a routine facility request.

Mr. Hartner stated that the DNR staff realized that the standards were inadequate for most communities because they were twenty years old. He explained that although the standards were reflective of the National Recreation and Parks Association numbers, those numbers were put together over twenty years ago and had not been updated. He noted, as Mr. Croad stated, that the DNR was more interested in hearing what the Community wanted to see, and whether it was supported by multiple service clubs or user groups; whether it was presented at a well-attended meeting and what comments were made; whether there was opposition, and about the vote of the Council. He indicated that the State was not looking for a plan for a specific parcel or land or a specific wetland or activity. He noted the Plan dealt with things such as wetlands, connectivity, wildlife corridors, and passive recreation. He explained that as long as the Plan generally reflected the proposed request, the State would score the proposal on its merits. He stated that recently, requests including trails received more points at the time of scoring because they met one of the state's initiatives. He noted that one of the state's initiatives this year was gun ranges, although the City had not proposed any gun ranges in its Plan as it did not make sense for the Community; however, the national standards indicated the community should have a gun range.

Ms. Hardenburg stated she had attended an open space meeting the previous week and was impressed with the capability of the City's software used during the presentation. She indicated the County also had a presentation and the County had commented that they would review the City's Master Plan to see how it coordinated with the County's Master Plan.

Mr. Hartner stated that the County actually took the City's data from the Natural Features Inventory prepared by Steve Niswander of Niswander Environmental, and incorporated it into their overall plan.

Ms. Hardenburg asked if that would help with requests reviewed by the DNR to show that the City coordinated with the County. Mr. Hartner responded that was correct, and noted that he had just heard about an exciting possibility that the trails in Oakland County would be pulling together and creating a regional master plan of all the existing trails. He stated the greenways participants were interested in preparing this as a gift to all the trails, looking at how all the individual trails linked together. He explained

that when the Community sought grant funding, they could be shown as part of the overall plan to provide continuity. He stated the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) preferred to see groups come together and develop a regional approach rather than individual projects, because they felt the money was more justified.

Ms. Hardenburg noted that the City's Master Land Use Plan was forecast as a twenty-year plan, but was updated every five years. She asked if the Parks and Recreation Master Plan was prepared in the same manner. Mr. Croad stated the Recreation Plan was specifically a five-year plan. He noted in the past the comprehensive land use plans had been forecast every ten to twenty years; however, within the past two years, the State required communities to update their plans every five years. He explained this was because things changed so quickly, and the State was encouraging the communities to conduct a thorough review every five years.

Mr. Dettloff asked if foundation funding played a role in the Plan, noting he had not seen anything specific under funding sources. Mr. Hartner stated that the Greenways Foundation had been a huge player over the past five years, especially in trailway development, as a source for matching funds. He advised that the City had received a grant through Greenways from the Southeast Michigan Foundation for the Clinton River Trail Master Plan. He stated it was hard to obtain grant dollars from some of the more traditional foundations, such as Kresge and Mott.

Mr. Reece congratulated Mr. Hartner and his staff on a job well done, noting the effort that went into the Plan. He referred to Page 13, the Annual Budget Summaries, and commented that the 2006 Adopted Budget was only a 1.6% increase over last year, which did not even keep up with the rate of inflation. He suggested that critics regarding city services needed to take a hard look and realize that number was about half of what it should be just to keep up with inflation in the State of Michigan, and the Metropolitan Area. Mr. Hartner pointed out that the 2003 Actual Budget was \$600 less than the 2006 Adopted Budget. Mr. Reece commented that people needed to get their facts straight.

Mr. Reece referred to "Other Services" and asked what was expected for the amount budgeted for that item in the budget. Mr. Hartner explained that Other Services included all other line items other than personnel or supplies for a program, such as direct costs for the City's Internal Services charges, fleet services, vehicles, and the operating expenses such as grass seed, park maintenance, fertilizer, as well as any professional services or contractual services.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the City did snowplowing in the parks. Mr. Hartner noted that the City did their own parks, although the bike paths were not completed until after the major roads were done.

Vice Chairperson Boswell asked if the Commission was ready to proceed with a motion. Mr. Schroeder stated he would move the motion contained in the packet information. Ms. Hardenburg stated she would second that proposed motion.

Vice Chairperson Boswell called for discussion on the proposed motion on the floor, which was a motion to adopt the 2006-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan as presented.

Mr. Hartner requested the proposed motion include a notice of the Commission's approval of the Plan be forwarded to City Council. Vice Chairperson Boswell suggested that the last paragraph of the motion be revised to read as follows:

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills, in keeping with and as an element of the Master Land Use Plan, does adopt the Rochester Hills 2006-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan and directs that this Plan, along with a copy of this Resolution, shall be forwarded to Rochester Hills City Council, and shall be filed with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), and the Oakland County Planning Commission..

Mr. Schroeder and Ms. Hardenburg, as the motion maker and seconder, agreed to the revised paragraph. Vice Chairperson Boswell called for any further discussion regarding the proposed motion on the floor. Upon hearing none, he called for a voice vote.

MOTION by Schroeder, seconded by Hardenburg, that the Planning Commission hereby **adopts** the 2006-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update as presented at the Planning Commission meeting held on February 21, 2006 with the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Good planning for future recreational development in this community requires a firm plan of action based on a combination of expert advice, community input, analysis of the needs and desires of the population, and the opportunity to budget necessary funding and apply for available grants; and

WHEREAS, In addition, the City sponsored a public Visioning Workshop on September 20, 2005; key recreation provider stakeholders were contacted by telephone; the City's website and the 2005 Fall/Winter Hills Herald publication encouraged email comments and letters, which were incorporated into the plan; presentations were made to the Planning Commission on January 31, 2006 and the City Council on February 15, 2006; and a public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on February 21, 2006 seeking further public input on the proposed plan; and

WHEREAS, *The Parks and Forestry Department of the City of Rochester Hills, with assistance from Consultant McKenna Associates, Inc. has developed a proposed Rochester Hills 5-year Parks and Recreation Master Plan which includes all of the factors mentioned above; and*

WHEREAS, *This plan meets the requirements of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources as the document which must be filed with that agency if the City is to be eligible for state and federal recreation grants; and*

WHEREAS, *The Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills has reviewed the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and finds itself in accord with the basic plans and strategies outlined in that document; and*

RESOLVED, *that the Planning Commission of the City of Rochester Hills, in keeping with and as an element of the Master Land Use Plan, does adopt the Rochester Hills 2006-2010 Parks and Recreation Master Plan and directs that this Plan, along with a copy of this Resolution, shall be forwarded to Rochester Hills City Council, and shall be filed with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), and the Oakland County Planning Commission.*

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: Hooper, Kaltsounis **MOTION CARRIED**

Aye: Boswell, Brnabic, Dettloff, Hardenburg, Holder, Reece and Schroeder

Absent: Hooper and Kaltsounis

Text of Legislative File 2005-0281

..Title

Adoption of Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update for 2006 to 2010

..Body

Whereas, the Parks & Forestry Department of the City of Rochester Hills has undertaken a five-year Parks and Recreation Plan update that describes the physical features, existing recreation facilities, and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain recreation facilities during the period between 2006 and 2010; and

Whereas, multiple opportunities for public comment were made available, suggestions were solicited, and a public hearing was held on February 21, 2006 at the City of Rochester Hills municipal building to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Recreation Plan; and

Whereas, the City's Parks & Forestry Department, with the assistance of McKenna and Associates,

Inc., has developed the plan for the benefit of the entire community and will use this document to assist in meeting the recreation needs of the community; and

Whereas, after the public meeting, the Rochester Hills Planning Commission voted to adopt said Recreation Plan.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby adopts the Rochester Hills Parks & Recreation Master Plan 2006-2010 as a guideline for improving recreation for the residents of the City of Rochester Hills and directs that this plan, along with a copy of this Resolution, be filed with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), and the Oakland County Planning Commission.