
SECTION SIX: APPENDICES



APPENDIX A

MICHIGAN NATURAL FEATURES INVENTORY PROGRAM. REVIEW OF SPECIAL SITES IN OTTAWA COUNTY

The following is a review of the 15 sites which were identified by the Michigan Natural Features Inventory Program for Ottawa County as being of particular significance. The site reviews, as described in the Program's findings, are numbered and refer to the identified sites in Figure 3.3.

Kitchel Dunes (PNA #5)

Sec. 19, T. 8N., R.16W., Spring Lake Township. This site lies just northwest of downtown Grand Haven, across the Grand River. It is situated south of North Shore Road and east of North Shore Drive. Kitchel Dunes was determined to have three notably significant natural community occurrences: Open Dunes, Interdunal Wetland and Great Lakes Barrens.

The 94 acre dunes are dominated by Sand Cherry (Prunus pumila) and a Dunegrass (Calamovilfa longifolia). A number of artificial disturbances degrade these dunes. A road on the lakeward side of the dunes has disrupted natural excavation and deposition of sand; a sand mine is present on the north side of the site; and the west half of the dunes were planted with pines in the 1940's.

Six Interdunal Wetlands totaling 16 acres are located within the dunes. They are dominated by Twig-rush (Cladium mariscoides) and Jack Pine (Pinus banksiana). Surrounding these wetlands in sand-filled interdunal troughs are Jack pine-dominated Great Lakes Barrens totaling 40 acres. In both of these natural communities, sand deposition is believed to be occurring faster than naturally.

One population of a state threatened plant and one population of a state threatened/proposed federally threatened plant occur at this site. Ownership is by the City of Ferrysburg, Central Michigan University, the City of Grand Haven and Construction Aggregates Corporation. The majority of the area is under the first two ownerships and is protected as a natural area.

Hoffmaster State Park (PNA #7)

Sec. 1, T.8N., R.17W. and w 1/2 sec 6, T.8N., R.16W., Spring Lake Township. This site is midway between Muskegon and Grand Haven, in both Ottawa and Muskegon Counties. It was determined to have two natural communities of exceptional significance: Dry-Mesic Southern Forest and Open Dunes. In addition, populations of a state threatened and a federally threatened/state threatened plant occurs within the Ottawa County acreage of this site.

The 256 acre mature Dry-mesic Southern Forest is dominated by

Northern Red Oak, Beech and Sugar Maple. It is transitional to Mesic Northern Forest and includes a dozen 5-10 acre stands of this community type. The 116 acre dunes rise in a series of blowouts 180' above Lake Michigan. They are dominated by a Dunegrass (Calamovilfa longifolia), with either Merram Grass or Little Bluestem (Andropogon scoparius) co-dominant. Some ORV use and locally heavy foot traffic are major artificial disturbances on the dunes.

One population of a state threatened plant and one population of a state threatened/proposed federally threatened plant occur here. Ownership (within Ottawa County) is nearly all in P. J. Hoffmaster State Park, with only a few acres owned by Construction Aggregates Corporation. The majority of the natural quality acreage in the park is designated as Hoffmaster Natural Area.

South Lloyd Island (PNA #10):

S 1/2, SE 1/4, sec. 22, N 1/2, NE 1/4, sec 27; and NW 1/4, NW 1/4, NW 1/4, sec. 26, T.8N., R.16W., Spring Lake Township. This 31 acre marsh is approximately one mile due south of Spring Lake and is one in a series of natural-quality marshes found on islands within the Grand River. Natural-quality marsh, in contrast to previously cultivated (or otherwise disturbed) land, occupies approximately one-half of the island which is owned by Twin Lakes Farms, Incorporated.

This island is a mosaic of Southern Wet Meadow and Emergent Marsh (including tall emergent, broad-leaved emergent, and floating-leaved zones), with Submergent Marsh (dominated by Coontail (Ceratophyllum demersum) and Water-milfoil (Myriophyllum sp.)) restricted to the small protected bayous. The meadow is dominated by Blue-joint (Calamagrostis canadensis) and Reed Canary-grass (Phalaris arundinacea), and occupies the south, southeast, southwest and west sides of the island. These areas appeared to be heavily disturbed in 1938 aerial photographs, perhaps the result of either agriculture and/or use as river dredging spoil sites. In addition to the meadows, Willows (Salix sp.) and Purple loosestrife are locally dominant here. The Emergent Marsh is of natural quality and was locally dominated by either Hybrid Cat-tail (Typha X glauca), Pickeral-weed or Arrow-arum. The substrate is a deep silt, generally under 1-2 feet of water in 1988.

This island is the site for one state threatened plant population. No other Special Plants or Special Animals are known from, or were encountered while surveying this marsh. This marsh was determined to be a notably significant Great Lakes Marsh occurrence.

Pottawattomie Bayou (PNA #11)

SW 1/4; W 1/4, SE 1/4; SW 1/4, NW 1/4; W 1/2, SE 1/4, NW 1/4, sec. 2; N 1/2, NW 1/4, W 1/2, NW 1/4, NE 1/4, sec. 11; NE 1/4, NE

1/4, NE 1/4, sec. 10; E 1/2, sec. 3, T.7N, R. 16W., Grand Haven Township; and SE 1/4, SE 1/4, sec. 34, T.8N., R.16W., Spring Lake Township. This 122 acre marsh lies approximately 3 miles south south-east of Grand Haven. It is locally known as Hofma Park and is accessible from a boardwalk near the east end of Sleeper Street, 0.75 miles east of 168th Avenue. The majority of the site is owned and protected by the Township of Grand Haven, with significant additional unprotected acreage in Pitcher Investment company, Ester D. Witteveen, McBeath & Kule, and Nicholas Wolf.

Highly diverse Emergent and Southern Wet Meadow communities dominate most of the area, with moderately diverse Submergent Marsh (dominated by Coontail and Greater Duckweed (Spiroldela polyrhiza)) restricted to the main channel and the deeper, northern portions of the marsh. The Emergent Marsh is dominated by Arrow-arum and Pond-lily and gradually grades into atypical Southern Wet Meadow community (dominated by either Sedge (Carex aquatilis) or Swamp Loosestrife (Decodon verticillata) and Beggar-ticks (Ridens cernua) as the floating peat mat becomes more stable. Meadows on unstable mats are rarely encountered in Great Lakes Marshes. A narrow zone of Southern Shrub-Carr (dominated by Red-osier (Cornus stolonifera), Speckled Alder (Alnus rugosa), and Rice Cut-Grass (Leersia oryzoides) occurs at the base of the uplands. The only major disturbance to this marsh is a former railroad right-of-way which crosses through the center of the site. It is now occupied by an elevated boardwalk which allows for a natural hydrologic regime.

This site was determined to be exceptionally significant as a Great Lakes Marsh. It is the highest quality estuary-type marsh in the southern half of Michigan's Lower Peninsula. In addition, it has a population of a state threatened plant species. No Special Animals are known from this marsh.

Derma Island (PNA #14)

S 1/2, SE 1/4, NW 1/4; S 1/2, NE 1/4; NE 1/4, SE 1/4, sec. 26, T.8N., R.16W., Spring Lake township. This 88 acre marsh lies approximately two miles east of Grand Haven and is one in a series of natural marshes on islands within the Grand River. Approximately one-half of this island was determined to be natural quality Great Lakes marsh, with the remainder (at the north and south ends of the island) as former agricultural land and/or river dredge spoil sites. These latter areas are dominated by Hybrid Cat-tail, Willows, Reed Canary-grass and Purple Loosestrife. The island is owned by the State of Michigan and is part of the Grand Haven State Game Area.

The essentially undisturbed marsh, on the south and west sides of the island, consists of a mixture of Southern Wet Meadow, Emergent Marsh (including tall emergent, broad-leaved emergent, and floating-leaved zones), and Submergent Marsh. A Bulrush (Scirpus fluviatilis), locally dominant within the Emergent Marsh, is uncommon in other marshes along the Grand River.

A portion of this island was determined to be notably significant Great Lakes Marsh occurrence. No Special Plants or Special Animals are known from this island.

Indian Channel (PNA #15)

Sec. 36, T.8N., R.16W., Spring Lake Township; NE 1/4; NE 1/4, NE 1/4, NW 1/4 sec. 1, T.7N., R.16W. Spring Lake Township; NW 1/4, sec. 6, T.7N., R.15W., Robinson Township; and S 1/2, sec. 31, T.8N., R.15W., Robinson Township. This 503 acre marsh lies 3 miles southeast of Grand Haven and is situated alongside and within the Grand River. The site consists of three adjacent marshes including an island west and south of Indian Channel, the wetland portion of a peninsula immediately east of the channel, and marsh east of these areas and immediately south of the main channel of the Grand River. The entire wetland acreage north of the Grand River was determined to be a Great Lakes Marsh of natural quality. The site south of the river is natural quality except immediately alongside the river, where dredging spoils may have been deposited. The majority of the area is within Grand Haven State Game Area. Significant private tracts include Felix Pytlinske, Marc Leona Crum, and Walter Maciejewski.

The island west of Indian Channel consisted of either Hybrid Cat-tails on exposed, sandy ground, or Arrow-arum on deep, unstable muck. High recent water levels have significantly lowered plant diversity at this site. The area east of the channel was primarily Arrow-arum, with Coontail and Greater Duckweed in the Submergent Marsh. The marsh south of the Grand River is dominated by three floating-leaved Emergent Marsh species: Water Lily, Pond-lily, and a Pondweed (Potamogeton nodosus). This plant community exists where water depths exceed three feet. The emergent-leaved plant community of Hybrid Cat-tail, Bur-reed (Sparganium eurycarpum), and Softstem Bulrush (Scirpus validus) occurs on slightly more elevated sites (0.5 to 2.5 feet of water depth). In between these two zones (in depths from 2.5 to 3 feet) are Pickerel-weed and Arrow-arum. A submergent zone was found in deeper water throughout the area and is dominated by Star Duckweed (Lemna trisulca), Waterweed (Elodia nuttallii), and Coontail.

This site was determined to be a notably significant Great Lakes Marsh occurrence. One state threatened animal is known from the Indian Channel of the Grand River. While no other Special Animals or Special Plants are known from the area, there is a likelihood of a state threatened plant occurring here.

Millhouse Bayou (PNA #16)

SW 1/4, sec. 1 and W 1/2, NE 1/4; E 1/2, NE 1/4, NW 1/4, sec. 12, T.7N., R.16W., Grand Haven Township. This 57 acre marsh lies approximately four miles southeast of Grand Haven, on a tributary of the Grand River. The vegetation is similar to Potawattomie

Bayou (PNA #11) one mile west, but the zonation is much narrower due to the smaller size of the bayou. The exotic weed Purple Loosestrife is abundant in localized areas in this marsh, which makes this a lower quality community than Potawattomie Bayou, despite less artificial disturbance. This site is owned by Floyd Payne, Ruth Kube, George Unger, and Martin Zimonick.

This site was determined to be a notably significant Great Lakes Marsh occurrence. A population of a state threatened plant occurs here. No other Special Plants or Special Animals are known from this marsh.

Vincent Creek Woods (PNA #19)

N 1/2, NE 1/4, sec. 6, T.8N., R.15W., Crockery Township. This site miles 1.5 miles southeast of Fruitport, 0.25 miles due south of the I-96/Fruitport Road interchange. It is characterized by a 65 acre notably significant Mesic Northern Forest, locally dominated by either Hemlock with White and Black Oak or Northern Red Oak and Sugar Maple. It represents the only natural quality example of a Hemlock forest type that was once widespread in the western part of the county. While many Hemlock and White Pine stumps are present from logging in the 1890's, some remain and there is reproduction of these species.

The two tracts comprising this site are owned by C. Jesiek and Don Jablonski. Moderate to locally heavy logging took place in 1987 to a mature to old second growth White Oak stand immediately west of Vincent Creek Woods. There are no Special Animals or Special Plants known from this site.

Bruce Bayou (PNA #20)

N 1/4, sec. 32; N 1/4, sec. 33; S 1/2, SE 1/4, SW 1/4; S 1/4, SE 1/4, sec. 29; SW 1/4; SW 1/4, SE 1/4, sec. 28, T.8N., R. 15W., Crockery Township. This 379 acre marsh lies along the Grand River, 3.5 miles southwest of Nunica. The majority of the site is within the boundaries of the Grand Haven State Game Area, with private ownerships in Spoonville Gun Club, John Leavitt, Clinton Peterson, and Arn. Johnson.

This site is characterized by an extensive Emergent Marsh dominated by Arrow-arum and Water-lily on 3.5 to 6 feet of unstable muck. It is mostly undisturbed, with the exception of a long, shallow ditch through the northeast part of the site. Submergent Marsh is restricted to protected embayments and is dominated by Coontail. Southern Wet Meadow is found where muck depth is less than 3.5 feet and underlain by sand. These meadows are dominated by Reed Canary-grass and Willow-weed (Polygonum lapathifolium).

This site was determined to be a notably significant Great Lakes Marsh occurrence. A population of a state threatened plant was found here. No other Special Plants or Special Animals are known

to occur in this marsh.

Stearns Bayou (PNA #22)

S 1/2, Sw 1/4; W 1/2, SW 1/4, SE 1/4, sec. 5 and NE 1/4; E 1/2, NE 1/4, NW 1/4, sec. 8, T.7N., R.15W., Robinson Township. This site was determined to be non-qualifying as a Great Lakes Marsh based on a field evaluation. However, a state threatened plant population occurs here. Ownership of the threatened plant habitat is by Chester Stolarz.

Grand Valley Ravines (PNA #26)

W 1/2, sec. 29; E 1/2, SE 1/4; SE 1/4, NE 1/4, sec. 30; E 1/2, NE 1/4; NE 1/4; SE 1/4 sec. 31; and NW 1/4, sec. 32, T.7N., R.13W., Tallmadge Township. This site lies six miles north of Hudsonville, along the west banks of the Grand River at Grand Valley State college. It extends from 0.2 to 1.3 miles south of the M-45 bridge over the Grand River. The 170 acre Mesic Southern Forest was determined to be notably significant. It is a diverse mature to old-growth woods dominated by Sugar Maple, Beech and Northern Red Oak. Included in this acreage are small areas of Dry-Mesic Southern Forest (Oak-Maple) and a Red Ash-Sugar Maple Southern Floodplain Forest, neither of which are large enough to be recognized as element occurrences.

Grand Valley Ravines was a historic locality for a state threatened plant, as well as being adjacent to more recent occurrences for a state threatened plant and a special concern plant. Ownership is by Grand Valley State College, Grand Valley State College Faculty Club and Calvin Aldrink.

Aman Park (PNA #31)

Sec. 22, T.7N., R.13W., Tallmadge Township. This site is located about six miles northwest of Grandville, two miles east of Grand Valley on M-45. It lies in the northwest part of a park owned by the City of Grand Rapids. This 23 acre Dry-Mesic Southern Forest was determined to be notably significant. It lies atop a 40-50' escarpment and is dominated by Northern Red Oak and White Oak. Historic fires probably maintained on Oak Opening natural community in presettlement times. Presently, the forest canopy has closed in and the woods are undergoing succession to a Beech-Sugar Maple stand due to lack of fire.

No Special Plants or Special Animals are known from within the natural community, although two plants inhabit the floodplain forest downslope.

South Grand Valley Ravine (PNA #32)

SE 1/4, sec. 32, T.7N., R.13W., Tallmadge Township and sec. 5, T.6N., R.13W., Georgetown Township. This site lies five miles north of Hudsonville, on the south bank of the Grand River. It

was determined to be a notably significant Mesic Southern Forest dominated by Sugar Maple and Beech. While old growth trees still remain, many of the oaks and beech were cut 20-24 years ago. This 47 acre forest contains small acreages of Dry-Mesic Southern Forest and Southern Floodplain Forest, which individually do not qualify as natural community occurrences. The site is owned by Ricardo Meana. There are Special Plants or Special Animals reported from the site.

Marne Bog (PNA #33)

E 1/2, sec. 36, T.8N., R.13W., Wright Township. This site lies 1.5 miles east of Marne, between Garfield and Hayes Streets. It was determined to be a notably significant, 25 acre Bog dominated by Cat-tails, Sphagnum and a Sedge (Carex stricta). The Bog lies in the center of a shallow depression on glacial outwash, surrounded by Relict Conifer Swamp and Southern Swamp. While the former is of high natural quality, it is not large enough to be a natural community occurrence.

This site is owned by Henry Kaptein. There are no Special Plants or Special Animals reported from here.

Stafford Lake (PNA #36)

Sec. 25 and 36, T.N., R.13W., Tallmadge Township. This site lies approximately four miles north of Grandville, 0.2 miles northwest of the junction of Fennessy Drive and 2nd Avenue. It was determined to be a notably significant Bog (11 acres) and Emergent Marsh (22 acres). The Bog is locally dominated by Cat-tails and a Spike-rush (Eleocharis sp.) and is essentially undisturbed. The Emergent Marsh is dominated by Water Lily and is also essentially undisturbed. However, both of these communities are of rather low diversity.

A historical record for a population of a state threatened/federal candidate plant is known from this site. It was not possible to verify the occurrence of this species at the site since permission for access to its appropriate habitat was denied by the landowner. The site is under multiple ownership, including: Jack Goodale, Ruth Densel, Teresa Kasperlik, Richard Bjork and Consumers Power Company.

APPENDIX B
OTTAWA COUNTY CAMPGROUNDS

Name	Phone	2003 sites
Baldwin Oaks 4700 Baldwin Hudsonville, MI 49426	669-1600	126 sites not on water, heated pool, store, game room, laundry, fire pits, playground, Sunday worship, concerts
Camper's Paradise 800 Robbins Road Grand Haven, MI 49417	846-1460	107 sites not on water, heated pool, playground, rec room, store, pets allowed
Chapel in the Pines 6915 64 th Avenue Hudsonville, MI 49426	875-8928	102 sites on manmade lake, gospel nights, worship service, drive-in church, semipublic, fishing, swimming, volleyball, laundry, basketball
Conestoga Trailer & Campground 9720 Oriole Drive Coopersville, MI 49404	837-6323	81 sites on the Grand River, laundry, store, beach, fishing, boat ramp, swimming pool, pets allowed
Drew's Country Camping 12850 Ransom Street Holland, MI 49424	399-1886	86 sites, heated pool, rec room, stores, laundry
Dutch Treat Camping & Recreation 10300 Gorton Zeeland, MI 49464	772-4303	105 sites, hay rides, fishing, worship services, rental trailers, modern bathhouse, laundry, rec room, playground, heated pool, basketball, volleyball, game room
Grand Haven State Park 1001 S. Harbor Drive Grand Haven, MI 49417	847-1309	174 sites on Lake Michigan, beach, pier fishing, pets allowed, concessions
Holland State Park 2215 Ottawa Beach Road Holland, MI 49424	339-9390	309 sites on Lake Michigan, beach, sand dunes, fishing, boat launch, concession store
North Shore RV Park 17900 North Shore Road Ferrysburg, MI 49409	846-6461	29 sites on the Grand River, campgrounds (RV), boat ramp, laundry, adults only, senior age group

Oak Grove Campgrounds Resort 2011 Ottawa Beach Road Holland, MI 49424	399-9230	135 sites, store, game room, full hookups, pool, whirl pool, laundry, 5 cabins within walking distance to Lake Michigan & Lake Macatawa beaches
River Pines Campground 8275 Warner Road Allendale, MI 49401	895-6601	114 sites on a small lake, outlet to Grand River, launch for small boats, pool, laundry, showers, playground
Spring Lake Tourist Park 312 W. Exchange Street Spring Lake, MI 49456	842-1393	38 sites on the Grand River, seasonal rentals only
Yogi Bear's Jellystone Park 10990 U.S. 31 Grand Haven, MI 49417	842-9395	256 modern sites not on water, full hookups, 50 amp service, mini golf, heated pool, rec room

APPENDIX C
OTTAWA COUNTY MARINAS

Grand River	Phone	# Slips/in & out?/launch?
Dick's Landing 10367 N. Cedar Drive Grand Haven, MI 49417	842-1078	78 / yes / yes
Felix's 14023 Green Street Grand Haven, MI 49417	842-3680	50 / no / yes
Grand Haven Municipal Marina 101 N. Harbor Drive Grand Haven, MI 49417	847-3478	54 Transient + 16 Charter / no / yes
Grand Haven Yacht Club 501-½ N. 3 rd Street Grand Haven, MI 49417	846-6679	
Grand Isle Marina 1 Grand Isle Drive Grand Haven, MI 49417	842-9330	368 / yes / no
Grand Valley Marina II 1211 Jackson Street Grand Haven, MI 49417	842-4670	40 / yes / no
Holiday Isle Marina 940 W. Savidge Street Spring Lake, MI 49456	850-1434	55 / no / no
Hall's Sport Center 4 Grand Isle Drive Grand Haven, MI 49417	847-1455	10 / no / yes Both private
Keenan Marina 526 Pine Street Ferrysburg, MI 49409	846-3830	170 / yes / yes Private Launch
Lighthouse Cove 15078 120 th Avenue Nunica, MI 49448	837-0859	150 / yes / yes Private
North Shore Marina 18275 Berwyck	842-1788	206 / yes / yes Private Launch

Grand Haven, MI 49417

River Haven Marina
15006 120th Avenue
Grand Haven, MI 49417

842-2458

90 / no / no

Rycenga Marina
1053 Jackson Street
Grand Haven, MI 49417

842-5600

53 / no / no

Village Cove Marina
900 W. Savidge Street
Spring Lake, MI 49456

Jim 402-5653

53 / yes / no

The Wharf Marina
501 N. 3rd Street
Grand Haven, MI 49417

842-5370

198 / yes / no

Spring Lake

Barrett Boat Works
821 W. Savidge Street
Spring Lake, MI 49456

842-1202

150 / no / no

Herm's Boat Livery
18825 W. Spring Lake Road
Spring Lake, MI 49456

842-6543

72 / no / yes

Lake Macatawa

Anchorage Marina
1800 Ottawa Beach Road
Holland, MI 49424

399-1802

189 / no / no
Seasonal

Barney's Marina
1653 S. Shore Drive
Holland, MI 49423

22 / no / no

Bayshore Yacht Club
1862 Ottawa Beach Road
Holland, MI 49424

399-9844

300 / yes / no

Crescent Shores Marina
545 Crescent Drive
Holland, MI 49423

392-9915

125 / yes / no
Seasonal
23 condo slips

Macatawa Bay Yacht Club
2157 S. Shore Drive

355-5815

75 / yes / yes

Holland, MI 49423

Northside Landing
2272 Ottawa Beach Road
Holland, MI 49424

23 / no / no

Parkside Marina
2314 Ottawa Beach Road
Holland, MI 49424

399-2020

86 / yes / no

Surfside Marina
2278 Ottawa Beach Road
Holland, MI 49424

16 / no / no

Yacht Basin Marina
1862 Ottawa Beach Road
Holland, MI 49424

APPENDIX D
OTTAWA COUNTY GOLF COURSES

Name	Phone	2003 holes
Crestview Golf Course, Olive Twp 6279 96 th Avenue Zeeland, MI 49464	875-8101	18 holes, public, 120 acres
Evergreen Golf Course, Robinson Twp 10125 Osborn Grand Haven, MI 49417	296-1200	18 holes, public
Gleneagle Golf Club, Georgetown Twp 6150 14 th Avenue Hudsonville, MI 49426	457-3680	18 holes, public
Grand Haven Golf Club, Grand Haven Twp 17000 Lincoln Grand Haven, MI 49417	842-4040	18 holes, public and private, cross country skiing with fees
Holland Country Club, Holland Twp 51 Country Club Road Holland, MI 49423	396-1255	18 holes, private, 115-120 acres
The Meadows Golf Club at GVSU, Allendale Twp 4645 W. Campus Drive Allendale, MI 49401	895-1000	18 holes, public
The Pheasant Run Golf Course, Olive Twp 9837 Port Sheldon Road Zeeland, MI 49464	875-4653	9 holes, public
Pigeon Creek Golf Course, Robinson Twp 10195 120 th Avenue West Olive, MI 49460	875-4300	18 holes, public
Sand Creek Golf Course, Tallmadge Twp 1831 Johnson Road Marne, MI 49435	677-3379	9 holes, public
Spring Lake Country Club, Spring Lake Twp 17496 N. Fruitport Road Spring Lake, MI 49456	842-4200	18 holes, private, cross country skiing with no fees

Summergreen Golf Links, City of Hudsonville 3441 New Holland Hudsonville, MI 49426	669-0950	18 holes, public, 31 acres, cross country skiing with no fees
Sunnybrook Country Club, Georgetown Twp 0-624 Port Sheldon Road Grandville, MI 49418	457-1100	18 holes, private
Terra Verde Golf Club, Crockery Twp 11741 Leonard Nunica, MI 49448	837-8249	18 holes, public
Wallinwood Springs Golf Club, Georgetown Twp 8152 Weatherwax Drive Jenison, MI 49428	457-9920	18 holes, public
West Ottawa Golf Club, Port Sheldon Twp 6045 136 th Avenue Holland, MI 49424	399-1678	27 holes, public, 160 acres
Western Greens Country Club, Tallmadge Twp 2475 Johnson Road Marne, MI 49435	677-3677	18 holes, public
Wuskowhan Players Club, Port Sheldon Twp 16111 Blair West Olive, MI 49460	738-6000	18 holes, private

APPENDIX E

Community Workshop Results Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission Workshop Held November 30, 2004

On Tuesday, November 30, 2004 at 7:00 P.M., the Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission held a public workshop at the Fillmore Complex County Offices. The purpose of the meeting was to gather informal input from residents concerning the future development and use of the County Parks. The meeting was attended by approximately twenty five citizens. The meeting was facilitated by John Scholtz, Parks Manager, Jonathan Nagle, Park Planner, and Pam Blough of P.M. Blough, Inc.

The meeting began with introductions and an overview, and proceeded to the community workshop. The participants gathered around four tables within the room. Specific questions were asked regarding future development. Each table group had an opportunity to respond to each question as the questions rotated from table to table. Ideas were added to large sheets of paper that had a question listed at the top. Once each question was reviewed by each table group, the sheets were posted on the wall for all to review.

In order to identify ideas that were of greater priority to the individuals, each person assisted in the prioritization. Individuals were given ten small stars to place at their highest ten priorities, and one large sticker to place on their single highest priority. Although this is not meant as a formal voting, the placement of the stickers does provide an indication of the thoughts of the individual attendees.

The ideas, information, and priorities gathered at the meeting, is tabulated below.

Question: What would be your top priorities for spending future millage funds?

<u>Ideas</u>	<u>Small Stickers</u>	<u>Large Stickers</u>
Balance of unimproved/rustic trails and areas without board-walk/gravel	9	2
Acquiring new lands	15	1
Connecting parks; Greenway/bike paths	10	0
Maintenance of existing facilities & equipment	0	0
Expand variety of activity/uses. i.e.: Horse camping, Mtn. biking, paint ball, dirt jump/vertical park	3	0

No not any of above	1	0
Make camping areas available, (Back Country-bike, hike, ski, ride in)	8	1
Base line natural inventory for all new Purchases	5	1
Toilets in winter	2	0

What types of new facilities should be developed in the County Parks?

<u>Ideas</u>	<u>Small Stickers</u>	<u>Large Stickers</u>
Schools and Townships, not County, should provide sport facilities & playing fields	0	0
Low-impact trails & facilities and Minimal environmental impact	7	1
Low visibility facilities to blend into the Natural environment	1	0
Nature Center?	2	0
Kids fishing, dirt jump/vert/skate/park /archery	3	0
More hunting areas	1	1
Mountain biking single track, but not on sand but w/hills	9	3
Camping/horse & rustic	1	0
More inland swimming	2	0
Canoe and kayak launch sites on Lake Michigan and the rivers (promote inter-county paddling)	2	0
Dog Parks	5	0
4 WD/ATV Vehicle	0	0

If additional park lands are purchased, where do you think these parks should be located?

<u>Idea</u>	<u>Small Stickers</u>	<u>Large Stickers</u>
Along Musketawa Trail	1	0
Upper Macatawa Area-super high priority	7	5
Northeast portion of County	0	0
Along Lakeshore (continue efforts)	0	0
Along River Greenways (continue efforts) Crockery more	1	1

Special beauty spots	0	0
Boundary potentials with adjacent counties? (Patterson County Park?)	0	0
Closer to metropolitan area	4	0
Special Habitat Areas	1	0
Complete corridor system linking major nodes	4	0
Increase existing land holdings-islands don't work-adjacent to state/city land. I.e.: by Port Sheldon & 96th	7	3
Convert "Riley Trails" to official Conservation area. (dump)	1	0
Preserve natural areas that can not be purchased via education for the land owners	1	0
Native landscaping & backyard wildlife habitat program	0	0

What types of programs should be offered by the County Parks and Recreation Commission?

<u>Idea</u>	<u>Small Stickers</u>	<u>Large Stickers</u>
Encourage bike helmet use	2	0
Interpretive markers on natural trails	0	0
Increase/continue current nature programs	5	0
Program to bring underprivileged kids to hiking & biking trails	2	0
Like Matthei Gardens does	1	0
Hands-on programs for kids (schools) Coordinate with other nature centers	3	0
Another groomed XC ski trail & rentals	4	0
Promotion of existing program-link with retailers	1	0
Kayak, canoe, paddle boat rental	3	0
Horse back riding lessons	1	0
Snowmobile facilities	1	0
Nature programs that accommodate Younger children, accompanied	2	0
Paddling eco-tourism	2	0
More snowshoes to rent	0	0

Are there specific maintenance concerns or existing facilities that need improvements?

<u>Idea</u>	<u>Small Stickers</u>	<u>Large Stickers</u>
Continue good practices	0	0
Be careful of over-reliance on paved trails that needs intensive maintenance and upkeep	2	0
Better prohibition on ATV/Dirt Bike access to parklands	0	0
Minimize damage from bicycles. Design trails properly	3	0
North Shore Park is a living dune! Let it move	0	0
Stop encroachment from neighbors into parks -leaf disposal, alien plants. Define boundaries.	3	0
Control over parking and overcrowding	0	0
Wax rental ski/update?	1	0
Accessibility to maps or signage solutions	3	0

Are there parks and recreation facilities or activities that you would like to see offered in the area by local governments other than the County?

<u>Item</u>	<u>Special Stickers</u>	<u>Large Stickers</u>
Soccer complexes	0	0
Pickup ball fields	0	0
Dog Parks	1	0
RC Airplane fields	0	0
Non-resource based recreation	0	0
Fishing holes	3	0
Mountain bike trails	6	1
Kayak/canoe launch sites	1	0
Paintball	1	0
Disc Golf or regular golf	1	0
Skateboard/rollerblade/vert ram/dirt jump		
Bike park	2	0
Hiking trails	1	0
4 WD/ATV Venue	0	0
Connector hike/bike paths esp. GR to Zeeland	3	0
Expand Muskatawa rail/trail to GR (inter county)	0	0
Greenways	0	0
City/County Road Commission bike lanes (4' shoulders)	0	0

APPENDIX F

Excerpts from the January 4, 2006 and February 8, 2006 Meeting Minutes of the
Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission

Annual Meeting of the Parks and Recreation Commission

Proposed Minutes

Date: January 4, 2006

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Place: Conference Room D, Fillmore St. Complex

Present: Betty Gajewski, Russell V. Brown, Jr., Ted Bosgraaf, Paul Geerlings, Bobbi Jones Sabine, Roger E. Jonas and Crystal Unema

Absent: Joyce Kortman, Mark Oppenhuizen and Phil Kuyers

Staff: John A. Scholtz, Manager; Curt TerHaar, Coordinator of Park Planning & Development; Dave Mazurek, Park Operations Superintendent; and Diane L. Huhn, Parks Secretary

Guests: Charles & Kathy Bibart and Press

(Meeting Items omitted)

Other Items Discussed:

(Meeting Items omitted)

Bosgraaf called for a presentation of the 2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan to be followed by public comment and questions. Scholtz reviewed the plan document and summarized recommendations included in the plan. Bosgraaf asked whether there were any Commission members with questions or questions from the public. Sabine commented parks staff did an excellent job in drafting the plan, noting she has read every word since she assisted staff in editing the plan. Scholtz thanked Sabine for her efforts which were instrumental in improving the draft. Bosgraaf encouraged all Park Commission members to review the plan closely and get comments to staff with the intention of having a revised plan ready for approval on February 8.

The Parks Commission went into Closed Session to discuss property matters.

Meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Parks and Recreation Commission

Proposed Minutes

- Date:** February 8, 2006
- Time:** 4:00 p.m.
- Place:** Conference Room D, Fillmore St. Complex
- Present:** Betty Gajewski, Russell V. Brown, Jr., Ted Bosgraaf, Paul Geerlings, Bobbi Jones Sabine, Roger E. Jonas, Crystal Unema, Joyce Kortman, Mark Oppenhuizen and Phil Kuyers
- Absent:** None
- Staff:** John A. Scholtz, Manager; Curt TerHaar, Coordinator of Park Planning & Development; Dave Mazurek, Park Operations Superintendent; and Diane L. Huhn, Parks Secretary
- Guests:** William Kishkorn, Claire Schwartz, Pam Blough, Ron Waybrant and Press

(Meeting Items omitted)

Subject: 2006 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan

- PR 06-009 **Motion:** To approve the resolution of the “2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan” and present it to the Board of Commissioners for approval.
- Moved by:** Sabine Supported by: Bosgraaf Unanimous

(Meeting Items omitted)

Other Items Discussed:

(Meeting Items omitted)

Oppenhuizen called for discussion and presentation of the “2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan”. Scholtz explained this is the fifth opportunity for public input and review into the plan draft. In addition to the Commission’s January meeting, there were three public meetings held in various locations including Holland, Spring Lake and Georgetown Township. Reports of these meetings are included in the Commission’s packet. Scholtz reviewed the various items which have been added to the plan or revised since the distribution of the draft plan to the Commission in January. Scholtz briefly reviewed the millage accomplishments, appendix and other revised items including a new ten year millage budget. Scholtz explained the millage budget has been revised to include a \$100,000 per year commitment towards the farm park begin-

ning in 2009. Following further discussion and an opportunity for public input the Parks Commission approved the “2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan” to be forwarded to the Board of Commissioners.

Commission members discussed proposed ballot language for the parks millage renewal and a recommendation to the County Board of Commissioners to place the question on the August 8, 2006 primary election ballot. Jonas pointed out that $1/3$ and .33 are not equal and the ballot language should be revised to use 0.33 as the precise amount of the proposed millage. Significant concern was expressed over the use of the word of “lifting” in the ballot language. Geerlings felt the language would be confusing to voters with use of the word “lifting” to describe the effect on County taxes. Other Commission members felt the overall effect of the ballot language as presented is positive and the use of the word “renew” should have a positive effect on the success of the vote. Gajewski suggested the ballot language be placed in front of a focus group to get a better sense of how people will react to the language. Scholtz indicated he will be working with our attorneys to get final ballot language approved and he cannot guarantee focus groups will be part of the process. Ultimately it is the Board of Commissioners that makes the decision to approve final ballot language.

The Parks Commission went into Closed Session to discuss property matters.

Meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

APPENDIX G

**Park User Survey
for
Ottawa County Parks**

July, 2001

Conducted by:

**Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission
and the
Carl Frost Center for Social Science Research
of Hope College**

Introduction

This study was performed by the Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission in conjunction with the Carl Frost Center for Social Science Research of Hope College. The goal of the project is to aid planning for the present and future needs of those who use the County Parks. Information gathered in the survey will be compared to results from 1988 and 1993 to better understand the ongoing attitudes of park users.

The intent of this survey is to provide a snapshot of park use at a given point in time. Mid-summer was selected because it is typically a high use period for many parks. It should be recognized, however, that different parks are busy at different times of the year. For example, Pigeon Creek Park is busiest during the prime, snow season, while the lakeshore parks receive their highest use during the summer months. No one time can possibly capture all users, which is an inherent weakness in the survey design.

Methods

The survey of park users was conducted during the week of July 15 - 21, 2001 and the weekend of July 28 - 29, 2001. The second weekend was deemed necessary to ensure that all ten county parks would be surveyed for the same amount of time. The survey instrument was developed as a questionnaire with 12 questions and a brief comment/suggestion section at the end. The 12 questions consisted of a mixture of open-ended and closed-ended questions and was patterned closely after the survey instruments used in 1988 and 1993 for comparison purposes.

The ten parks were split into two groups in order to simplify staffing needs. Deer Creek Park, Grose Park, Kirk Park, North Beach Park, and Riverside Park were all surveyed on the Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday of that week. Grand River Park, Hager Park, Pigeon Creek Park, Spring Grove Park, and Tunnel Park were surveyed on that Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday. The two parks requiring an extra weekend to complete the survey were, Riverside Park, which was surveyed on Saturday, July 28 and Deer Creek Park, which was surveyed on Sunday, July 29.

Park user interviews were conducted at the exit of each park. Interviews were conducted at all ten Ottawa County Parks during the hours of 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. It was hoped that this time frame would give a good sample of the population using each park. The interviewers were

13 students hired by the Frost Center at Hope College and one Ottawa County Parks seasonal employee. The interviewers were stationed at various parks on a rotating schedule developed by Laurie Van Ark of the Frost Center. A large sign was used to direct park users to the survey at all of the parks. The interviewers were also given Ottawa County Parks T-shirts to wear while conducting the survey so that they would look more "official" to park users. Supervision and training for the project were provided by Scott Vanderstoep of the Frost Center and Jennifer Jones, a summer intern with the Ottawa County Parks Department.

Users of the parks were interviewed mainly in their cars, however, some users entered and left the parks via other modes of transportation, such as walking, biking, and rollerblading. The data that was gathered by the student interviewers was then entered into a spreadsheet format. Analysis was done on the data using the Windows version of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (S.P.S.S.). This enabled the calculation of frequencies, some descriptive statistics, and cross tabulation of certain data.

Results

The results can be found below mainly in a tabular format. The total number of surveys completed was 578. The number of refusals and cars waved by due to lineups is unknown. Table one shows the number of people surveyed per park.

Table 1. Number of persons surveyed per park

Park	People Surveyed	Percent of Total
Deer Creek	30	5%
Grand River	44	7%
Grose Park	70	12%
Hager	98	17%
Kirk	85	15%
North Beach	119	21%
Pigeon Creek	5	1%
Riverside	32	6%
Spring Grove	39	7%
Tunnel	56	9%
Total	578	100%

According to table above, the majority of respondents were surveyed at North Beach Park, with Hager Park and Kirk Park having the second and third most respondents respectively. Table 2 shows the breakdown of the number of times the respondents used the park that they were interviewed at this year using frequencies, percents, and totals.

Table 2. Number of times park used this summer

Park	Number of Visits				Total
	Once	2 to 4	5 to 9	10 or more	
Deer Creek	11 37%	13 43%	2 7%	4 13%	30 5%
Grand River	12 27%	14 32%	5 11%	13 30%	44 8%
Grose	20 29%	19 27%	11 16%	20 29%	70 12%
Hager	25 26%	29 30%	12 12%	32 33%	98 17%
Kirk	46 54%	26 31%	7 8%	6 7%	85 15%
North Beach	34 29%	42 36%	19 16%	23 19%	118* 20%
Pigeon Creek	1 20%	1 20%		3 60%	5 1%
Riverside	10 31%	8 25%	7 22%	7 22%	32 6%
Spring Grove	23 59%	5 13%	4 10%	7 18%	39 7%
Tunnel	17 30%	13 23%	17 30%	9 16%	56 10%
Column total	199	170	84	124	577
Column %	35%	29%	15%	21%	100%

*one missing case

From Table 2, a majority of those who were surveyed at the various parks, were using the park for the first time (35%). This is followed by people who have used the park between two and four times this summer (29%). It is interesting to note people who have used the park they were interviewed at ten or more times this summer is the third most frequent result. When a closer look is taken at the table, it can be seen that at Hager Park a majority of the respondents have used the park ten or more times this summer. This is also the case with Grose Park. This

usage pattern could be due to the fact that a large number of respondents live quite close to these parks and these parks also have a more "neighborhood park" type of feel to them.

Table 3 below, shows the total number of people that were in a car that was stopped for an interview. The results are broken down by park and the size of the group. Frequencies, percents, and totals are given.

Table 3. Total number of people in vehicle by park

Park	Number of Persons in Vehicle				Total
	1 person	2 to 3 people	4 to 5 people	6 or more	
Deer Creek	10	18	2		30
	33%	60%	7%		5%
Grand River	23	19	1	1	44
	52%	43%	2%	2%	8%
Grose	18	33	11	7	69*
	26%	48%	16%	10%	12%
Hager	32	43	18	5	98
	33%	44%	18%	5%	17%
Kirk	21	46	13	5	85
	25%	54%	15%	6%	15%
North Beach	38	51	23	6	118*
	32%	43%	20%	5%	21%
Pigeon Creek	5				5
	100%				1%
Riverside	11	17	3	1	32
	34%	53%	9%	3%	6%
Spring Grove	16	19	4		39
	41%	49%	10%		7%
Tunnel	16	22	17	1	56
	29%	39%	30%	2%	10%
Column total	190	268	92	26	576
Column %	33%	47%	16%	5%	100%

*two missing cases

From the data presented in this table, the majority of park users traveled to the parks in a group of two to three people. The second largest group of people, traveled to the parks alone. Large groups of people (greater than 5 people) were represented in the sampled population, but were not common.

In table 4, it is noted that 64% of the park users were Ottawa County residents, while 32% of users were from other areas of Michigan. Out-of-state visitors comprise the remaining 4% of the sampled population.

Table 4. Residency of park users by park

Park	Resident	MI Resident	Out-of-State	Total
Deer Creek	19	10	1	30
	63%	33%	3%	
Grand River	36	8		44
	82%	18%		
Grose	35	34	1	70
	50%	49%	1%	
Hager	71	24	3	98
	72%	25%	3%	
Kirk	39	38	8	85
	46%	45%	9%	
North Beach	77	36	5	118*
	65%	31%	4%	
Pigeon Creek	5			5
	100%			
Riverside	25	6	1	32
	78%	19%	3%	
Spring Grove	24	12	3	39
	62%	31%	8%	
Tunnel	39	16	1	56
	70%	29%	2%	
Column total	370	184	23	577
Column percent	64%	32%	4%	100%

*one missing case

As mentioned above, the majority of users at each park were Ottawa County residents. The exception is at Kirk Park, where there were more non-residents (combined 54%) using the park than residents. Also, at Grose Park, it is interesting to note that there were just as many non-residents as residents.

In table 5, there is a broader breakdown of the above table. This table shows Ottawa, Muskegon, and Kent Counties with the number of park users from those counties, as well as users from other Michigan counties and other states. Again, it is seen that the majority of users are

residents of Ottawa County, while Kent County residents make up the second largest group using the Ottawa County Parks.

Table 5. Home County of park users by park

Park	Home County of Park Users					Total
	Ottawa	Kent	Muskegon	Other MI Counties	Out - of- State	
Deer Creek	19	7	1	2	1	30
	63%	23%	3%	7%	3%	
Grand River	33	5	1	4		43*
	77%	12%	2%	9%		
Grose	34	23	10	2	1	70
	49%	33%	14%	3%	1%	
Hager	71	19		5	3	98
	72%	19%		5%	3%	
Kirk	33	23		10	8	74*
	45%	31%		14%	10%	
North Beach	78	27	2	6	5	118*
	66%	23%	2%	5%	4%	
Pigeon Creek	5					5
	100%					
Riverside	25	3	1	2	1	32
	78%	9%	3%	6%	3%	
Spring Grove	24	8		4	3	39
	62%	21%		10%	7%	
Tunnel	39	7		9	1	56
	70%	13%		16%	2%	
Column total	361	122	15	44	23	565
Column %	64%	22%	3%	8%	4%	100%

*13 missing cases

One of the questions on the survey asked respondents if they had used any other Ottawa County Parks this summer. Table 6 shows that most people did not use any other Ottawa County parks this summer. It is interesting to note here, that many respondents listed Grand Haven, Holland, and Hoffmaster State Parks as an answer to this question quite frequently. Many local

parcs were also listed as having been used as an answer to this question. Table 6 gives the accurate number of respondents who did and did not use other Ottawa County Parks.

Table 6. Usage of other Ottawa County Parks this summer by park of interview

Park	Yes responses	No responses	Total
Deer Creek	11 37%	19 63%	30
Grand River	21 48%	23 53%	44
Grose	8 12%	61 88%	69*
Hager	30 31%	68 69%	98
Kirk	17 20%	68 80%	85
North Beach	22 19%	95 81%	117*
Pigeon Creek	2 40%	3 60%	5
Riverside	10 31%	22 69%	32
Spring Grove	19 31%	20 51%	39
Tunnel	11 20%	44 80%	55*
Column total	151	423	574
Column percent	26%	74%	100%

*4 missing cases

To get an idea of what parks are the most popular with survey respondents, table 7 shows the park most often mentioned by respondents at the park in which they were interviewed. In order to get the whole chart to appear on the page, an abbreviation system was used. The abbreviations are as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Deer Creek Park - DC | North Beach Park - NB |
| Grand River Park - GR | Pigeon Creek Park - PC |
| Grose Park - GP | Riverside Park - RV |
| Hager Park - HP | Spring Grove Park - SG |
| Kirk Park - KP | Tunnel Park - TP |

Table 7. Park most often mentioned by respondents at the park of interview

Park	DC	GR	GP	HP	KP	NB	PC	RV	SG	TP	Total
DC		1	2	6	3	2	3	5	3	3	28
GR	2		1	11	9	4	2	3		3	35
GP	1	1		2	3	4	1	1	1	3	17
HP		4	2		14	8	1	1	1	10	41
KP	1			4		3	3	1	1	12	25
NB		2			13		1			8	24
PC	1	1	1		3	1		1		1	9
RV	2	2			3		3			3	13
SG	2	3		11	3	1	1	3		6	30
TP					7	1			2		10
Total	9	14	6	34	58	24	15	15	8	49	232
%	4%	6%	3%	15%	25%	10%	6%	6%	3%	21%	99%

Only 40% of those interviewed had an answer for this question. Kirk Park (25%) was the park most often mentioned by all respondents who gave an answer to this question. Tunnel Park was the second most mentioned park (21%) followed by Hager Park (15%). These percentages lend some credit to the notion that the lakeshore parks are the most popular parks with the public. It is not surprising that Hager Park was mentioned more often than North Beach Park, simply due to the fact that the playground at Hager is a very popular destination point for families with younger children. It should also be noted that on the 1993 survey performed by Grand Valley State University, Kirk Park was listed as the most mentioned park then as well.

Table 8 gives a glimpse of whether or not park users feel that the entrance fees that are currently being charged at the lakeshore parks are reasonable. Currently, it costs residents \$3 and non-residents \$5 per day to enter the lakeshore parks (Kirk, North Beach, and Tunnel).

Table 8. User opinion on how reasonable the current entrance fees are

Residency of User	Reasonable	Not Reasonable	Total
County Resident	147 96%	6 4%	153
Non-resident	88 88%	12 12%	100

From the table, it seems that the vast majority of county and out-of-county residents feel that the current fees charged to use the lakeshore parks are reasonable. County residents on the

whole seem to feel that the current fees are reasonable. It is also interesting to see that a majority of non-residents feel that the fees are reasonable as well. In contrast to this, when a question regarding what users felt an acceptable fee would be at parks that currently do not have use fees, almost all users wanted the parks to remain free of charge. Most respondents stated that they would stop using the parks if there were to be a use fee.

A question specifically addressed to County residents asked if they were aware of the parks millage that was passed and whether or not they supported it. Only thirty-six percent of the County residents surveyed were aware of the millage. When the respondents were told what the millage was and what it has done for Ottawa County, ninety percent of them supported it.

The following section details the aspects liked best and least, the primary activities of users, what park users feel needs improvement, suggested additional facilities, and feelings on current fees for each park. In many cases, the respondents answered these questions with more than one response. This has led to total percentages being less or more than one hundred percent for many of tables.

BREAKDOWNS OF INDIVIDUAL PARKS NOT INCLUDED
CONTACT PARKS OFFICE FOR DETAILED BREAKDOWNS OF SURVEY
RESULTS BY PARK

Summary

This section is meant to summarize the findings of the results section above, such as the primary activity of park users, the aspects liked best and least, any improvements or added facilities, what a reasonable entrance fee would be, and whether or not current entrance fees were acceptable.

The main activity of Deer Creek Park users was fishing (30%). Thirty-seven percent of respondents liked the quiet, peaceful, and private nature of the park. Thirty percent of respondents found that there was nothing they disliked about the park, while twenty-eight percent of the users disliked other aspects of the park such as, the parks small size, the bathrooms, and the bugs. By far, the most often mentioned improvement users want to see at Deer Creek Park is dredging the river due to extremely low water levels this summer. Thirty-two percent of Deer Creek Park users feel the park is fine in its current state, while twenty-six percent feel that bathrooms should be added. Forty-seven percent of users feel that this park is too small and lacks any facilities to warrant charging a use fee.

The two most common reasons people came to Grand River Park were for fishing (23%) and to exercise their dogs (21%). The aspect liked the best about Grand River Park was its trails (15%). Fifty-seven percent of Grand River Park users felt there was nothing they disliked about the park, while other aspects such as the gravel entrance road and the river level were disliked by seventeen percent of the users. Sixty-nine percent of respondents felt there weren't any improvements to be made to this park. A combined sixty-four percent of park users felt that the park was fine as is and nothing in the way of new facilities should be added. Thirty percent of respondents felt they would use a \$10 annual pass for park usage, and there was a split between twenty-eight percent of the respondents feeling \$1 per day was an acceptable use fee and twenty-eight percent of them feeling that there should be no use fee at all.

The majority of Grose Park users went to the park to swim (47%). The aspects liked the best were the beach and the lake (24%), followed by the cleanliness of the park (20%). Forty-seven percent of Grose Park users disliked nothing about the park. Forty-five percent of respondents said there was nothing that needed improvement, while twenty-three percent listed other areas that needed improvement, such as painting railings and adding a concession stand or vending machine. Thirty-five percent of respondents combined stated that the park was fine as is

and needed no additional facilities. Thirty-three percent said if a fee were to be charged, they would opt for a \$10 annual pass, while twenty-five percent of users feel there should be no fee at this park.

Thirty-eight percent of those surveyed at Hager Park were there to use the playground. The playground was also the aspect liked the best about the park by thirty percent of the respondents. Forty-nine percent of Hager Park users disliked nothing about the park while twenty-four percent of users disliked the bathrooms, especially the Port-O-Jons near the playground. Thirty-four percent of respondents felt that there weren't any improvements to be made to the park, while thirty-two percent cited the bathrooms as needing improvement. Fifty percent of Hager Park users felt that the park was fine as is, with twenty-one percent feeling more bathrooms should be added. Thirty-four percent of respondents felt that a \$2 to \$3 per day user fee would be reasonable.

The main activity of those surveyed at Kirk Park was swimming (67%). The features liked best about Kirk Park were the beach and the lake (23%). Forty-two percent of respondents disliked nothing. Forty-one percent of Kirk Park users stated that there was nothing that needed improvement. Twenty-eight percent of respondents felt that the park was fine as is. Ninety-two percent of users felt that the current fee charged to use the park was reasonable.

At North Beach Park, thirty-two percent of those surveyed came to the park to swim. The aspects liked the most about the park were the beach and the lake (21%), with fourteen percent liking the family-oriented atmosphere. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents disliked nothing about the park, while eighteen percent didn't like the bathrooms. Twenty-eight percent of North Beach Park users feel nothing needs improvement, whereas twenty-five percent feel that the parking situation needs improvement. Forty-six percent of respondents feel the park is fine as is, however, twenty percent think that a concession stand would be a welcome addition. Ninety-three percent of North Beach Park users feel that the current fee charged to use the park is reasonable.

During the week of the survey, the main activity of Pigeon Creek Park users was a daycamp being held at the park (38%). This is followed by twenty-five percent of the respondents using the park for hiking. Twenty-five percent of Pigeon Creek Park users like the quiet, isolated nature of the park the best. Seventy-five percent of respondents disliked aspects of the park such

as the flies and not enough trash barrels. Picnic areas were cited by fifty percent of respondents as needing improvement and thirty-three percent of users thought that more pavilions would be a nice addition. Fifty percent of Pigeon Creek Park users felt that they would prefer to get a \$10 annual pass if a use fee were to be charged at this park.

The primary activities of Riverside Park users were boating and fishing (36% each). There were many different aspects that accounted for what users liked the best about the park (28%) which is followed by the boat launch (10%). Forty-one percent of park users disliked various aspects about the park. The bathrooms were cited by thirty percent of users as needing improvement and by twenty-eight percent of users as needing to be an added facility. A \$10 annual pass was most frequently mentioned as being a reasonable option should a use fee be charged at the park by forty-seven percent of respondents.

The main activity cited by those using Spring Grove Park was a family reunion (33%). Twenty-three percent of respondents listed the scenery and atmosphere as the aspects they liked best about the park. Sixty-seven percent of Spring Grove Park users disliked nothing about the park. Over half of Spring Grove Park users (55%) felt that nothing needed improvement at the park. Thirty-four percent of respondents stated that the park was fine as is and needed no improvements. Ninety-two percent of Spring Grove users stated that there should not be a use fee charged at this park.

At Tunnel Park, the primary activity was swimming (68%). Twenty-eight percent of Tunnel Park users cited the beach and lake as the most liked aspects of the park. Thirty-two percent listed a number of aspects they disliked, such as poison ivy, the popularity of the park, and the fact that there are no concession stands. Thirty-one percent of respondents said nothing needs improvement, while twenty-six percent cited the bathrooms as needing improvement. Thirty-nine percent of Tunnel Park users feel the park is fine as is, however, sixteen percent feel that a concession stand should be added. Ninety-three percent of respondents stated that the current use fee charged at Tunnel Park was reasonable.

Conclusions

In keeping with the results of the 1993 survey, Ottawa County residents comprised the majority of park users. However, the number of County residents using the parks has risen twenty percent since the 1993 survey. In 1993, forty-four percent of park users were County residents. This summer, sixty-four percent of users were County residents. Kent County residents and residents of other Michigan counties comprised the second and third largest groups of users (22% and 44% respectively). Again, this is similar to the results from 1993, with Kent County residents making up thirty percent and residents of other Michigan counties comprising seventeen percent of park users.

It is possible to see from this data as well that use of the parks by County residents has increased overall since 1993. In contrast to the 1993 survey, it is the number of residents and non-residents that use each park that has changed a great deal. In 1993, Kent County users accounted for the majority of users at Deer Creek Park, Grose Park, North Beach Park, and Spring Grove Park. This year, with the exception of Grose Park and Kirk Park, the majority of park users were Ottawa County residents. As noted earlier, at Grose Park, the number of non-residents matched the number of resident users, and at Kirk Park, the majority of users were not County residents.

As was noted in the 1993 survey, those using the lakeshore parks (Kirk, North Beach, and Tunnel) thought that the fees that are charged were reasonable. This is still the case, with over ninety percent of the users at each of those parks still finding the fees reasonable. Interestingly, it seems that a majority of those surveyed at the rest of the parks where there is currently no charge to use the park, feel that the \$10 annual pass is the most reasonable option, should a fee be charged. However, it was noted in the comments received from the survey that at the parks that currently have no use fee, should a fee be charged, most people would stop using the County parks.

It is interesting to see that the main reasons people come to use the parks have changed slightly since the 1993 survey. At Deer Creek Park, the main reason users came to the park in 1993 was for relaxation. This year, the main activity was fishing. At Riverside Park, the activities of users in 1993 were water-related and this appears to still be the case. North Beach Park users went to the park to use the lake and beach in 1993. This summer, North Beach Park users were

there for the beach and lake as well. Kirk Park has shown a shift from picnicking in 1993 to swimming this year (probably due to the weather). Tunnel Park is still being used mainly for swimming and the beach. At Grose Park the main activity is now swimming, rather than picnicking. The playground and picnics are still the most popular activities at Hager Park, and family reunions are still the main reason people were using Spring Grove Park.

As expressed in the 1993 survey, most users were very satisfied with the County parks, listing that there was nothing they disliked about the parks and suggestions about added facilities were very few. This is apparently still the trend. People seem as pleased and as satisfied with the parks now as they were then. Perhaps even more so, due to many of the improvements that have been implemented at several of the parks.

From the results of the survey this year, it seems that users of Tunnel, North Beach, Grose, and Hager Parks want a concession stand or some type of vending machine to enhance their enjoyment of the park. Perhaps the reason there was so much clamor for this addition this summer is the weather. During the week of this survey, the temperatures ranged from 80 to 87 degrees with a fair amount of humidity, and only one day of rain. The other addition that users want to see are bathrooms. In particular, larger bathrooms with changing areas and showers.

Aside from the clamor for concession stands and bathrooms, most respondents seem very satisfied with the County Parks. The feeling from the comments received from the various parks is one of satisfaction. It should also be mentioned that at the parks where there have been improvements made, they have been met with great enthusiasm. It appears that park users are having a positive experience and taking a sense of pride in the County Parks.

**SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION
ABOUT OTTAWA COUNTY PARKS**

Report Submitted to Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Department

October 2004

Prepared by:

Dr. Charles K. Atkin

Communication Research Institute

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
311 Kensington Road
East Lansing, MI 48823

SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT OTTAWA COUNTY PARKS

Dr. Charles Atkin, Communication Research Institute

A telephone survey was conducted to measure the opinions of Ottawa County citizens relating to parks and recreation in Ottawa County. A total of N=400 individuals were interviewed between September 20- October 12, 2004. The survey was performed by Dr. Charles Atkin of the Communication Research Institute, using a telephone interviewing facility on the Michigan State University campus.

The basic sample frame is a representative cross-section of all Ottawa County adults. Interviewers called from a list of countywide telephone numbers supplied by Survey Sampling Inc. of Fairfield, Connecticut. Both directory-listed and unlisted numbers were called to ensure appropriate odds of reaching all citizens.

The opening portion of the interview sought to secure cooperation, briefly identify the subject matter, and screen to ensure that respondents are adult county residents; each interview began with following introduction:

Hello, this is _____ calling from the Communication Research Institute in East Lansing. We're conducting a research study to measure citizen's opinions about Ottawa County Parks and recreation facilities. How many years have you lived in Ottawa County? Are you age 18 or older?

Interviewers calling from a centralized phone bank facility contacted a total of N = 671 households with qualifying individuals; of these, N=400 agreed to be interviewed, a success rate of 60%. On the other hand, 39% declined to be interviewed and 1% discontinued the lengthy interview partway through the questions. This completion rate is comparable to current telephone survey standards.

Based on the sample size of N=400, the figures in this report can be extrapolated to the overall county population within a sampling error range of approximately 4 percentage points above or below the true percentage. For example, consider the finding that 75% of this sample favors the current parks millage; this percent can be projected to an actual population figure ranging between 71% to 79% (with a very high 95% level of confidence that the projected percentage is accurate). Indeed, it is probable that the error is much smaller than plus or minus 4 points; the odds are two-to-one that it falls within 2 percentage points (range of 73% - 77%).

The respondents in the sample can be profiled in terms of six demographic characteristics: the median age is 47 years old; the median length of residency in Ottawa County is 20 years; 94% are Caucasian; 54% are female; 91% own rather than rent their residence; the average household size is 2.5 people; 40% have children under 18; the largest proportions in Georgetown Township, Holland Township, and Holland city.

The survey was composed primarily of close-end items, with two open-end questions. This report presents each item wording and set of responses, usually in percentage terms. The report also presents cross-tabulation results comparing the responses of the following demographic and

geographic subgroups: males vs. females, older vs. younger, higher vs. lower education, shorter vs. long-term residents, and residents of the West corridor vs. East and Rural areas of the county:

West Corridor: Grand Haven, Grand Haven Twp, Holland, Holland Twp, Ferrysburg, Park Twp, Port Sheldon Twp, Spring Lake Twp, Spring Lake Village, Zeeland, Zeeland Twp

East & Rural: Georgetown Twp, Hudsonville, Jamestown Twp, Tallmidge Twp, Chester Twp, Wright Twp, Polkton Twp, Coopersville, Allendale Twp, Blendon Twp, Crockery Twp, Robinson Twp, Olive Twp

The findings will be presented in seven sections, describing responses to the questions in the order covered in the questionnaire. The appendices present cross-tabulations and open-end comments, as well as pertinent findings from a 2002 survey of Ottawa residents. These are major topical sections of the report:

- (1) Desirability of Ottawa County Park Facilities
- (2) Opinions about Issues Facing Parks Commission
- (3) Awareness and Visits to County Parks
- (4) Satisfaction and Value Evaluations of County Parks
- (5) Preferences for Park Land Acquisition
- (6) Millage Awareness and Favorability
- (7) Demographic Profile of Sample

(1) Desirability of Ottawa County Park Facilities

Early in the interview, the respondents were asked about the desirability of 18 types of current and future park and recreation facilities in Ottawa County. As the interviewer read each statement, the residents indicated whether each feature was “very” or “moderately” or “not very” desirable. The results below are presented in order of percentage saying “very desirable”.

“We want your opinion about current and future park and recreation facilities in Ottawa County. For each one I list, please indicate whether it’s very desirable, moderately desirable, or not very desirable for you.”

Beaches

65% VERY DESIRABLE
25% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
10% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Paths for biking & rollerblading

50% VERY DESIRABLE
32% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
18% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Picnic facilities

48% VERY DESIRABLE
45% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
7% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Nature education programs

47% VERY DESIRABLE
33% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
20% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Hiking

46% VERY DESIRABLE
34% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
20% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Camping facilities

44% VERY DESIRABLE
25% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
31% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Nature center

43% VERY DESIRABLE
38% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
19% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Fishing

42% VERY DESIRABLE
30% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
28% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Boat launches

33% VERY DESIRABLE
26% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
41% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Sledding

31% VERY DESIRABLE
36% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
33% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Golf

31% VERY DESIRABLE

29% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
40% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Public marinas

28% VERY DESIRABLE
25% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
47% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Cross-country skiing

25% VERY DESIRABLE
26% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
49% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Canoeing and kayaking

25% VERY DESIRABLE
25% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
50% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Horseback riding

24% VERY DESIRABLE
28% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
48% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Dog parks

23% VERY DESIRABLE
30% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
47% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Hunting

20% VERY DESIRABLE
19% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
61% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

Snowmobile areas

14% VERY DESIRABLE
18% MODERATELY DESIRABLE
68% NOT VERY DESIRABLE

The beaches are considered to be the most desirable park and recreation facilities in the county, with almost two-thirds saying “very desirable”. About one-half give the high desirability rating to biking/rollerblading paths, picnic areas, and nature education programs. By contrast, less than

one-third give a high rating to facilities for snowmobiles, hunting, dog parks, horseback riding, canoeing, cross-country skiing, marinas, golf, and sledding.

It is also instructive to identify the facilities cited as “not very desirable” by a majority or near-majority of the respondents: 68% Snowmobiling, 61% Hunting, 50% Canoeing, 49% Skiing, 48% Riding horseback, 47% Marinas, and 47% Dog parks.

Comparisons of the demographic subgroups (Appendix A) show many sizable differences. Those living in the west corridor of the county tend to regard cross-country skiing, a nature center, and beaches as very desirable; the east/rural residents tend to prefer hunting, snowmobiling, nature education programs, and fishing. Residents who are younger and who have children at home cite the desirability of biking/rollerblading, sledding, camping and hunting; the older residents more often cite picnic facilities. Females emphasize the desirability of sledding, picnicking, and nature programs, while males prefer hiking and boat launching.

(2) Opinions about Issues Facing Parks Commission

A total of nine issues pertinent to the Ottawa County Parks Commission were identified and posed to the respondents. In each case, the interviewer read a statement and asked the respondent to express agreement or disagreement, and indicate whether their opinion was held strongly or moderately. The results below are presented in order of percentage who agree (strong + moderate)

“We want to ask how you feel about issues facing the county Parks Commission. Tell me if you agree or disagree with each statement.

IF AGREE: Do you agree strongly or moderately?

IF DISAGREE: Do you disagree strongly or moderately?”

Protection of Ottawa County’s best remaining natural areas should be a high priority for future park land acquisition.

31% AGREE STRONGLY
57% AGREE MODERATELY
8% NEUTRAL
4% DISAGREE MODERATELY
0% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Significant portions of parks should be kept in a natural and undisturbed state for preservation purposes.

34% AGREE STRONGLY
53% AGREE MODERATELY
4% NEUTRAL
8% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Ottawa County should support a regional trail system linking different communities for walkers bicyclists, and roller-bladers.

33% AGREE STRONGLY

52% AGREE MODERATELY
7% NEUTRAL
7% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

The Parks Commission should acquire additional park land for future public use because of the growth in Ottawa County.

24% AGREE STRONGLY
56% AGREE MODERATELY
8% NEUTRAL
12% DISAGREE MODERATELY
0% DISAGREE STRONGLY

The County should consider the needs of tourists when planning future park facilities.

19% AGREE STRONGLY
60% AGREE MODERATELY
8% NEUTRAL
11% DISAGREE MODERATELY
2% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Overnight camping opportunities should be provided in selected County parks.

19% AGREE STRONGLY
59% AGREE MODERATELY
11% NEUTRAL
10% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Ottawa County should develop a nature center building on park land to provide outdoor education for all age groups.

18% AGREE STRONGLY
55% AGREE MODERATELY
14% NEUTRAL
12% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

The county should develop revenue-producing facilities such as campgrounds, golf courses or marinas to help finance the park system.

13% AGREE STRONGLY
53% AGREE MODERATELY
10% NEUTRAL
20% DISAGREE MODERATELY
4% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Hunting should be allowed in unimproved portions of county parks and open space lands.

- 6% AGREE STRONGLY
- 23% AGREE MODERATELY
- 15% NEUTRAL
- 43% DISAGREE MODERATELY
- 13% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Combining the “agree strongly” and “agree moderately”, large majorities of more than three-quarters of Ottawa County residents favor six initiatives: protect remaining natural areas (88%), keep portions in natural/undisturbed state (87%), create regional trail system (85%), acquire additional park land for future growth (80%), consider the needs of tourists (79%), and provide overnight camping (78%). There is also substantial support for developing a nature center building (73%) and revenue-producing facilities such as golf (66%). On the other hand, only 29% say that the county should allow hunting in unimproved areas.

With the exception of hunting, there is little opposition to these initiatives; less than one-quarter disagree with any of the other eight ideas.

Examining the comparisons of subgroups in Appendix A, west county residents prioritize the needs of tourists, a regional trail system, and a nature center building; those in the eastern and rural areas more often seek camping in parks. Younger adults/parents support revenue-producing facilities, hunting, and a trail system, while older people want to protect remaining natural areas. Males and females differ little, with women preferring natural/undisturbed parks and males wanting hunting to be allowed.

(3) Awareness and Visits to County Parks

To measure top-of-mind awareness of various Ottawa County parks, the residents were asked an open-end question about park names. After naming the parks that they could recall, respondents then reported which parks they had visited; for this section of the survey, the interviewer read a list of names of parks in order to trigger remembering.

“Can you name any Ottawa County parks? Which ones?”

% NAMING PARK

- 34% Kirk Park
- 31% Tunnel Park
- 17% Hager Park
- 14% Pigeon Creek Park
- 14% Rosy Mound Natural Area
- 8% North Beach Park

- 6% Deer Creek Park
- 6% Grand River Park
- 5% Riverside Park
- 4% Hemlock Crossing/Pine Bend
- 3% Spring Grove Park
- 2% Grose Park
- 1% Musketawa Trail
- 20% *Other*

About one-third of the sample was able to name Kirk Park and Tunnel Park, which have the most widespread familiarity. The three other sites named by more than one-tenth of the residents are Hager, Pigeon Creek, and Rosy Mound. Fully 66% of the respondents could name at least one park; 40% identified two or more parks, 19% identified at least three. The “other” category primarily includes state parks (such as Holland and Grand Haven) that respondents either mistakenly associated with the county park system or misunderstood the question as referring to “parks in Ottawa County” rather than “Ottawa County parks”.

In the past year, did you visit any of the following Ottawa County parks?

% YES

- 58% Tunnel Park
- 57% Kirk Park
- 44% Hager Park
- 39% Pigeon Creek Park
- 28% Rosy Mound Natural Area
- 26% North Beach Park
- 25% Riverside Park
- 22% Grand River Park
- 20% Musketawa Trail
- 12% Hemlock Crossing/Pine Bend
- 12% Spring Grove Park
- 13% Deer Creek Park
- 11% Grose Park
- 26% *Other*

Fully 92% of the respondents report that they visited a county park in the past year, and the average number of parks visited is 3.6 parks. Approximately half of the respondents say they visited the three most popular parks: Tunnel, Kirk, and Hager. It is likely that these figures are inflated, for several reasons: people may be recalling visits occurring over a longer period than one year, they may be reporting visits by other household members rather than themselves personally, and the sample of people who agreed to be interviewed may be disproportionately park users (i.e., persons who seldom visit parks may be more likely to say they're too busy to answer questions about the subject of parks).

There are only small demographic differences in awareness of parks, and no regional difference in number of parks visited. Males and those who are younger and parents visit parks somewhat more often.

(4) Satisfaction and Value Evaluations of County Parks

Two basic questions were posed to assess the residents' evaluations of county parks. The first item, measuring satisfaction, was posed after respondents described their visits to parks. The value item was posed later in the survey, after respondents had been informed about the cost of the parks millage.

"In general, how satisfied are you with the Ottawa County parks? Would you say very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied."

45% VERY SATISFIED
50% SATISFIED
3% NEUTRAL
2% DISSATISFIED
0% VERY DISSATISFIED

"Overall, would you say that the Ottawa County Parks are an excellent value, a good value, a fair value, or poor value?"

50% EXCELLENT
43% GOOD
6% FAIR
1% POOR

The results of these two questions are quite similar. Examining the fundamental positive vs. negative dichotomy in each case, more than nine out of ten hold a favorable view. On the other hand, the positive residents are fairly evenly split between the strong response ("very" and "excellent") and the less intense level of favorability ("satisfied" and "good"). The vast majority give a positive assessment, but not everyone is highly enthusiastic. Only a tiny segment of residents register a critical viewpoint (2% "dissatisfied" and 1% "poor").

As shown in appendix A, there are only minor differences in satisfaction and value ratings by age and gender. A larger proportion of west county residents say the parks are an excellent value, and they are slightly more likely to be satisfied.

(5) Preferences for Park Land Acquisition

The residents were also queried about the types of land acquisitions that the county should be considering. Five dimensions of expansion were listed; in each case, the respondents expressed agreement or disagreement. The findings are presented in order of highest proportion agreeing.

“Next, we want to ask if you think Ottawa County should expand its park system by acquiring the following types of land. In each case, indicate if you agree or disagree with each type of new park land.

IF AGREE: Do you agree strongly or moderately?

IF DISAGREE: Do you disagree strongly or moderately?”

Land and easements for trails and bikepaths

26% AGREE STRONGLY
55% AGREE MODERATELY
6% NEUTRAL
13% DISAGREE MODERATELY
0% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Unique environmental areas such as wetlands, sand dunes, mature woodlands and wildlife areas

21% AGREE STRONGLY
59% AGREE MODERATELY
6% NEUTRAL
13% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Lands along major rivers and streams

14% AGREE STRONGLY
62% AGREE MODERATELY
10% NEUTRAL
13% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Additional Lake Michigan access

22% AGREE STRONGLY
52% AGREE MODERATELY

8% NEUTRAL
17% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

Historic sites

18% AGREE STRONGLY
51% AGREE MODERATELY
17% NEUTRAL
13% DISAGREE MODERATELY
1% DISAGREE STRONGLY

On all five of these proposed types of acquisitions, there is a solid majority of more than two-thirds who support expansion. The percentage who strongly or moderately agree is highest for land/easements for trails (81%) and unique environmental areas (80%), followed closely by lands along rivers/streams (76%), Lake Michigan access (74%), and historic sites (69%).

Preferences for park land acquisition differs little according to demographic subgroup. Younger adults more often seek acquiring land for trails; females favor acquiring historic sites.

(6) Millage Awareness and Favorability

After answering the sets of questions about desirability, issues, visits, satisfaction, and acquisitions, respondents were asked about the special parks millage. The interviewer used this transition: “The next questions deal with funding Ottawa County parks”; respondents were then asked about awareness and favorability:

“Are you aware that there is currently a special millage in the amount of 1/3 of a mill, to help fund Ottawa County parks?”

27% YES
73% NO

“This 1/3 of a mill amounts to \$25.00 per year for a house worth \$150,000. Do you favor or oppose the current parks millage?”

75% FAVOR
16% OPPOSE
9% *NOT SURE*

“In the election next year, do you think you will vote in favor of renewing the county parks millage for an additional 10 years?”

79% YES
13% NO
8% *NOT SURE*

Only one-quarter of the sample say that they are aware of the current special millage that was passed in 1996. When the mill amount was described, three-quarters express a favorable attitude

toward the current parks millage, and a slightly higher percentage say they intend to vote in favor of renewing the millage. Those who replied that they would not vote in favor were asked a follow-up question: “What would be your primary reason for voting no?” The answers are listed in Appendix B. The key reasons are that the respondent doesn’t personally use county parks, that user fees should generate revenue, that taxes are already too high, and that the respondent can’t afford to pay taxes.

Males and older residents have greater awareness of the current millage. Favorability toward the current millage differs little across subgroups. Support for renewing the millage does not differ significantly, although there is slightly greater intent to vote in favor among males and those who are younger and parents.

(7) Demographic Profile of Sample

At the end of the survey, interviewers asked the respondents to describe their characteristics in terms of gender, age, household size, number of children, ethnicity, length of residence, and geographical locale in the county.

Gender:

46% MALE
54% FEMALE

Housing:

91% OWN HOME
9% RENTAL

Age:

10% AGE 18-29
17% THIRTIES
22% FORTIES
20% FIFTIES
18% SIXTIES
13% OLDER

Household size:

14% ONE PERSON
37% TWO PEOPLE
17% THREE PEOPLE
20% FOUR PEOPLE
8% FIVE PEOPLE
4% SIX OR MORE

Number of children:

60% NO CHILDREN
13% ONE CHILD
19% TWO CHILDREN
6% THREE CHILDREN
2% FOUR OR MORE

Ethnic background:

94% CAUCASIAN
1% AFRICAN-AMERICAN
2% ASIAN-AMERICAN
3% HISPANIC

Years lived in Ottawa County:

7% ONE -THREE YEARS
5% FOUR-FIVE YEARS
12% SIX-TEN YEARS
9% ELEVEN-FIFTEEN YEARS
13% SIXTEEN-TWENTY YEARS
16% TWENTY ONE-THIRTY
38% LONGER

Locale:

3% ALLENDALE Twp
3% BLENDON Twp
2% COOPERSVILLE
1% CROCKERY Twp
1% FERRYSBURG
14% GEORGETOWN Twp
5% GRAND HAVEN
7% GRAND HAVEN Twp
10% HOLLAND
11% HOLLAND Twp
3% HUDSONVILLE
3% JAMESTOWN Twp
1% OLIVE Twp
10% PARK Twp
2% POLKTON Twp
1% PORT SHELDON Twp
3% ROBINSON Twp
3% SPRING LAKE Twp
4% SPRING LAKE Village
3% TALLMIDGE Twp
1% WRIGHT Twp
4% ZEELAND
5% ZEELAND Twp

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE COMMENT CARD



VISITOR COMMENTS

OTTAWA COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

We value your opinion. Please make comments or suggestions regarding your park visit/experience below.

COMMENT/SUGGESTIONS: _____

Are you an Ottawa
County Resident?
 Yes No

Would you like to
receive the Ottawa
County Parks Newsletter?
 Yes No

Optional Information

Name: _____

Street: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Thank you for your comments! Please mail this self-addressed card (or return to Parks Staff).

Executive Summary

Ottawa County is growing fast. From 1990, the county's population grew from 187,000 to 238,000, making it the fourth fastest-growing county in the state in terms of population. Much of the development is suburban expansion of the Grand Rapids area. An important asset in any community is recreational opportunities, including bicycle and walking paths. Recreational opportunities are equally important in Ottawa County because of tourism, which generates nearly \$80 million annually. As the county expands and there is increased pressure to improve roads to carry more traffic, and as residences and businesses develop in rural areas, the ability to develop safe bicycle and walking paths will be constrained. The Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathways Plan has been developed to provide a vision for a countywide non-motorized pathway system that will benefit residents, tourists, and the businesses in this community.

If this non-motorized pathway system was in place, Ottawa County would have one of the most sophisticated non-motorized pathway networks in the state. This system, combined with Lake Michigan, can make Ottawa County a "destination location."

The goal of the Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathways Study is to provide information that will assist local units of government to develop an interconnected non-motorized transportation network throughout the county. This network will be accessed and used by children on bicycles, recreational and family-oriented users, walkers and joggers, rollerbladers, and more serious touring and competitive cyclists. People will use the network for work and recreation. The network will support people wanting to commute to work and help reduce dependence on an use of the automobile. Ultimately, the vision can help realize an enhanced quality of life for residents of Ottawa County and visitors to the county.



Local units of government in Ottawa County have developed bike lanes and separated pathways in communities such as Grand Haven (above), Spring Lake, Coopersville, Allendale, Hudsonville, Georgetown Township, and Holland.



As people move outside the towns and cities, the shoulders of county roads become recreational pathways. Many of the road shoulders are not paved and are not suitable for bicycling.

Non-motorized pathways (also commonly referred to as bikepaths, trails, and rail-trails) generally refer to a physical facility such as a separated path that can be used by pedestrians, cyclists, joggers, and rollerbladers; widened road shoulders for use by cyclists; and, greenway trails along natural features such as rivers.

Currently, separated pathways along roadways are the most common types of non-motorized pathways in Ottawa County. These can be found in Holland, Grand Haven, Spring Lake, Coopersville, Allendale, Georgetown Township, and Hudsonville. The Musketawa Rail-Trail in the northern part of the county is a rail trail that was developed in the late 1990s by the State of Michigan along an abandoned railroad line. There are also signed bike lanes, which can be found in Grand Haven and a limited number of paved road shoulders.

A key reason for conducting this study is the strong support expressed by the public for bicycle and non-motorized trails in surveys conducted by the Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission. In a 1999 County Resident Survey conducted by Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission, "paths for biking and rollerblading" were identified as one of the most desirable of a range of recreational resources and opportunities trailing only picnicking and beaches and "tied" with nature centers and programs and hiking. At a general level, the demand for these facilities can be assessed by observing high levels of use on existing trails and summer events in the county focusing on bicycling, rollerblading, and other trail activities. Meeting the demand for expansion and development of new trails must address three particular user groups:

- Those persons who use the trails as functional linkages between two points
- Those persons who use the trails for fitness, health and general enjoyment reasons
- Those persons who may use the trails as a recreation destination

Each user group has its own needs, but the non-motorized pathway concept can support the demands and needs of the people in all three groups. In addition, the development of an enhanced non-motorized network can increase the county's attractiveness for tourism and provide additional opportunities for tourists already coming to the area for its beaches and parks.

Improving development of non-motorized pathways in Ottawa County will best be accomplished by a cooperative effort involving all levels of government. Most trails in existence today have been initiated by local units of government and funded primarily by local millages. Ottawa County can provide support to the local units of government by providing leadership, expertise, and coordination in the development and expansion of the non-motorized pathway network.



The Musketawa Rail-Trail in northeastern Ottawa County was developed by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and is maintained by Ottawa County.

The conceptual non-motorized pathway system identified in this report (Figure S-1) focuses primarily on development of regional linkages in Ottawa County that connect the existing pathways. The conceptual network includes paved road shoulders and off-street pathways, representing 178 miles of new facilities. Paved road shoulders identified as part of the network will be a minimum four-foot width consistent with nationally accepted standards while separated pathways are recommended to be from eight- to 14- feet wide, depending on anticipated usage. The widened paved road shoulders identified in the plan should be considered for signing and striping as bike lanes.



Bicycling in Ottawa County provides opportunities for recreation and exercise for residents and tourists.

The Conceptual Network

Tables S-1 and S-2 present the conceptual pathway system. Table S-1 presents the conceptual improvements suggested for each area of the county as well as the cost and priority as defined in this plan. Table S-2 separates the new pathways by local unit of government.

The total construction cost for the Ottawa County non-motorized pathway network is approximately \$23 million. Engineering costs, including contingency, are typically 15 to 20 percent over and above the total project construction cost. Right-of-way acquisition can range from 0 percent to 10 percent over and above the total project construction cost.

As noted above, Table S-1 identifies a prioritization for each conceptual pathway. This prioritization was based on:

- Connections to activity centers
- Scenic/recreational opportunities
- Provides linkage to a gap in the network
- Capacity
- Cost/ease of implementation

The intent of prioritizing each conceptual pathway is to identify those paths whose completion would provide immediate community benefits. A local unit of government can certainly elevate a "long-range" priority project in its jurisdiction to a higher priority.

Table S-1
Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathway Study
Conceptual Pathway Summary

Pathway Description	Length (miles)	Construction Cost ¹	Priority ²
Lakeshore Avenue Paved Shoulder	19.05	\$ 1,042,500	Mid-range
Riley Street Paved Shoulder	11.5	\$ 1,150,000	Long-range
Chicago Drive Paved Shoulder	7.75	\$ 775,000	Mid-range
Macatawa River Greenway/ Byron Road Connector	18.5	\$ 2,930,400	Short-range
Stanton/Taylor/Bauer Separated Pathway	18.75	\$ 2,970,000	Short-range
96th Avenue Separated Pathway	15	\$ 2,376,000	Mid-range
Grand River Greenway	26.3	\$ 4,165,920	Short-range
Luce Street Separated Pathway	5	\$ 792,000	Mid-range
Leonard/Cleveland Street East-West Separated Pathway	14.75	\$ 2,336,400	Mid-range
Leonard Street Paved Shoulder	25.35	\$ 2,535,000	Short-range
Segment 1 - Grand Haven Trail Linkage	0.4	\$ 63,360	Short-range
Segment 2 - Mercury Drive Connector	1.6	\$ 253,440	Mid-range
Segment 3 - Olive Shore Avenue Paved Shoulder	1	\$ 100,000	Long-range
Segment 4 - Greenly Street Separated Pathway	0.5	\$ 79,200	Mid-range
Segment 5 - Angling Road/ Barry Street Connector Separated Pathway	3.5	\$ 554,400	Long-range
Segment 6 - Lake Michigan Drive Paved Shoulder	2	\$ 200,000	Short-range
Segment 7 - 120th Avenue Connector	1	\$ 158,400	Long-range
Segment 8 - Musketawa Rail-Trail Connector	1.75	\$ 277,200	Short-range
Segment 9 - Tyler Street Connector Paved Shoulder	0.25	\$ 25,000	Mid-range
Segment 10 - 32nd Street Paved Shoulder	2	\$ 200,000	Mid-range
Segment 11 - Port Sheldon Street/ 28th Avenue Separated Pathway	2	\$ 316,800	Mid-range
TOTAL	177.95	\$ 23,301,020	

¹ Engineering and contingency costs typically range from 15 percent to 20 percent over and above construction costs. Right-of-way acquisition can range from 0 percent to 10 percent over and above total construction costs.

² Short-range projects would be programmed and/or built in the first five years of the plan; mid-range projects in years 5-10; and long-range projects in 10+ years.

Source: The Corradino Group

Table S-2
Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathway Study
Conceptual Pathway System By Local Unit of Government

Unit of Government	Length of Pathway (miles)		Construction Cost ²
	4-Foot Paved Shoulder	Multi-Use Separated	
Chester Township			\$ -
Ferrysburg			\$ -
Spring Lake Village	1.6		\$ 160,000
Spring Lake Township	2.5		\$ 250,000
Crockery Township	7		\$ 700,000
Crockery Township		8	\$ 1,267,200
Palkton Township	7		\$ 700,000
Palkton Township		3.5	\$ 554,400
Coopersville		0.75	\$ 118,800
Wright Township		5	\$ 792,000
City of Grand Haven		2	\$ 316,800
Grand Haven Charter Township	9		\$ 375,000
Robinson Township		12.8	\$ 2,027,520
Allendale Township		11.5	\$ 1,821,600
Tallmadge Township	7.25		\$ 725,000
Tallmadge Township		5.25	\$ 831,600
Port Sheldon Township	7.75		\$ 437,500
Port Sheldon Township		4	\$ 633,600
Olive Township		6	\$ 950,400
Blendon Township		12.5	\$ 1,980,000
Georgetown Township	1		\$ 100,000
Georgetown Township		15	\$ 2,376,000
City of Hudsonville	2		\$ 200,000
City of Hudsonville		0.25	\$ 39,600
Jamestown Township		5	\$ 792,000
Jamestown Township	0.75		\$ 75,000
Subtotal	45.85	91.55	\$ 18,224,020
MACC¹			
Park Township	8.8		\$ 880,000
Holland Charter Township		5.5	\$ 871,200
Holland Charter Township	6		\$ 600,000
City of Holland		1	\$ 158,400
City of Zeeland	0.25		\$ 25,000
Zeeland Charter Township	8		\$ 800,000
Zeeland Charter Township		11	\$ 1,742,400
Subtotal	23.05	17.5	\$ 5,077,000
TOTAL	68.9	109.05	\$ 23,301,020

¹ The Macatawa Area Coordinating Council (MACC) is conducting its own non-motorized pathways study. The information presented in this report is intended only to provide a vision for the entire county.

² Engineering and contingency costs typically range from 15 percent to 20 percent over and above construction costs. Right-of-way acquisition can range from 0 percent to 10 percent over and above total construction costs.

Source: The Corradino Group

Implementation

The goal of this plan is to provide an interconnected non-motorized network in Ottawa County. Coordinating the efforts of local units of government will be key. A countywide committee such as "Friends of Ottawa County Bikepaths" or a more formal entity such as an authority are options. A funding base that can be used by local units of government to build and maintain regional pathways and leverage additional grant funds should be identified. One option would be a countywide millage with funds appropriated to building and maintaining the regional network.

Economic Benefit

The economic effects of a comprehensive non-motorized pathway system will principally be associated with expenditures by residents and tourists connected to their use of the system. And, while, admittedly, the data available upon which to measure these economic effects are limited, indications are that the trail/pathway system that currently exists in Ottawa County, is generating \$1.7 to \$6.8 million per year in direct, indirect and induced economic effects. Today, the amount of economic stimulus of tourists' use of the current trail system is considered quite limited. However, if the system as now proposed is completed, the additional annual economic effect associated with it could range from \$2 million to \$4 million per year (direct, indirect and induced effects). The latter could stimulate 20 to 40 net new jobs in the economy. And, while the tax revenues generated locally from these tourist-related activities are unknown, it is clear that generating \$2 million to \$4 million per year in new economic activity over the life of the trailway system (10 years before major rebuilding) would be a boost that allows the trailway system to be recognized as not only a quality-of-life enhancer but an economically viable public works project.

Recommendations of the Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathways Study

The following initial recommendations have been developed to support the realization of the Non-Motorized Pathways Plan.

- An organizational mechanism should be formed. This should be developed as a "Friends" group to work with local government.
- Coordination with bicycle store owners, bicycle and jogging clubs, tourist organizations, etc. should be facilitated to generate support for the plan.
- A countywide non-motorized millage should be considered to create a funding base that can be used to build, maintain, and replace regional pathways and also to leverage government grants and funds from foundations.
- The non-motorized plan being developed by the Macatawa Area Coordination Council (MACC) for the Holland-Zeeland area should be incorporated into the County plan.
- The Ottawa County Road Commission and County Transportation Planner should be encouraged to add paved shoulders on all new construction in the county.
- The Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathway Plan and the existing and future network should be considered as an integral element of the county transportation network. The transit systems in Holland and Grand Haven should be encouraged to explore acquisition of bike racks for their buses. Grants should be sought on the basis of the non-motorized network to have congestion-mitigation and air quality benefits. As the non-motorized network is developed and marketed, its applicability as a commuter system as well as a recreational system should be emphasized.

- All local, county and state projects, particularly those on roads identified in this plan as having four-foot paved shoulders, should be reviewed for the possibility of including non-motorized considerations.
- It is important that as the non-motorized network is developed, the following issues are addressed:
 - Connecting the urbanized areas in the western part of the county with the urbanized areas in the east, including Grand Valley State University;
 - Developing where possible in natural commuter corridors (for example, along Chicago Drive from Hudsonville to the Holland/Zealand area).
 - Working to make Ottawa County a showplace for bicycle and pedestrian activity.
- Minimum design standards should be established. These include:
 - Paved shoulders should be a minimum of four feet in width if they are designated as pathways in the conceptual plan. Those shoulders identified as pathways in the plan should be considered for signing and striping as bike lanes.
 - Separated pathways should be designed to range from 8 to 12 or even 14 feet in width depending on the project use, available right-of-way, and the design of connecting trails.
- Staging areas should be identified as the non-motorized system is developed. Formal staging areas would be developed at major trailheads on the major separated pathways. Along the separated pathways, particularly destination facilities such as the Musketawa Trail, there should be restrooms and drinking water every three to five miles, parking and information every five to ten miles, signage from the roadway network to the staging areas, and telephone, covered shelters, benches and other amenities where desirable.
- Signage for the non-motorized pathway system should be consistent with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Guidance for bicycle operation on roadways and shared use paths. In addition, it is important that signage directing people to major destination trails be placed on major entry points into Ottawa County.
- Maintenance activities will typically be the responsibility of the local unit of government. As the countywide multi-jurisdictional network expands, it will be important to develop a coordinated approach to maintaining, repaving and replacement of the pathway network. This would be a good focal point for the "Friends" organization in the near-term.
- Local units of government should be encouraged to consider development of separated pathways and/or paved shoulders as opposed to sidewalks in ordinances regarding new development in suburban areas. Sidewalks would be appropriate for areas that are primarily residential but non-motorized pathways would be better suited for commercial and retail areas.

APPENDIX K
Geocaching

General Guidelines:

- Participants must comply with all Geocaching and Michigan Geocaching Organization Guidelines. Visit www.geocaching.com and www.mi-geocaching.org for guidelines.
- Participants must abide by Ottawa County Parks Rules and Regulations. Rules and regulations are posted at all parks or may be obtained at the Park office.
- Ottawa County Parks and Recreation has the ability at anytime to revoke and remove the Geocache at any time without notification.

Searching for Geocaches:

- Those searching for caches must respect the surrounding environment and not disturb it in any way.
- Caches should be placed no more than 20 feet away from the designated trail.
- No new trails should be created in the event of searching for a cache.

Geocache Placement Rules:

1. To place a Geocache on Ottawa County Parks land one must first obtain a permit from the Parks office. Permits are of no cost and must be submitted to the Parks office prior to any placement of caches.
 - a. Process for placing a Geocache:
 - i. Complete a Parks Geocache permit and register with Ottawa Co. Parks and Recreation.
 - ii. Place our Parks sticker on the container.
 - iii. Abide by Ottawa Co. Parks rules and regulations and guidelines for Geocaching found at www.geocaching.com
 - iv. Post the Geocache online and have it approved by www.geocaching.com.
2. Containers must clearly be labeled "Geocache" and containers must also have Ottawa County Parks sticker affixed to the outside.
3. No offensive, illegal or dangerous items are allowed in the caches. Food is not to be placed in a cache to avoid attracting native wildlife.
4. When placing a cache do not disturb the natural surroundings. There is no need to dig holes, cut vegetation, or harm the environment when placing a cache.
5. Geocaches must be placed no more than 20 feet away from the marked trail. Caches will not be permitted in sensitive areas (i.e. fragile dunes, protected areas)
6. When placing a cache be considerate of the seekers and their safety. Do not place in an area that is harmful or dangerous to others.
7. Caches should not in anyway promote commercial, religious or political agendas.
8. Caches must be reevaluated and a permit must be resubmitted each year.

Note: Ottawa Co. Parks and Recreation has the right to limit number of caches per site.

Non-motorized pathways (also commonly referred to as bikepaths, trails, and rail-trails) generally refer to a physical facility such as a separated path that can be used by pedestrians, cyclists, joggers, and rollerbladers; widened road shoulders for use by cyclists; and, greenway trails along natural features such as rivers.

Currently, separated pathways along roadways are the most common types of non-motorized pathways in Ottawa County. These can be found in Holland, Grand Haven, Spring Lake, Coopersville, Allendale, Georgetown Township, and Hudsonville. The Musketawa Rail-Trail in the northern part of the county is a rail trail that was developed in the late 1990s by the State of Michigan along an abandoned railroad line. There are also signed bike lanes, which can be found in Grand Haven and a limited number of paved road shoulders.

A key reason for conducting this study is the strong support expressed by the public for bicycle and non-motorized trails in surveys conducted by the Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission. In a 1999 County Resident Survey conducted by Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission, "paths for biking and rollerblading" were identified as one of the most desirable of a range of recreational resources and opportunities trailing only picnicking and beaches and "tied" with nature centers and programs and hiking. At a general level, the demand for these facilities can be assessed by observing high levels of use on existing trails and summer events in the county focusing on bicycling, rollerblading, and other trail activities. Meeting the demand for expansion and development of new trails must address three particular user groups:

- Those persons who use the trails as functional linkages between two points
- Those persons who use the trails for fitness, health and general enjoyment reasons
- Those persons who may use the trails as a recreation destination

Each user group has its own needs, but the non-motorized pathway concept can support the demands and needs of the people in all three groups. In addition, the development of an enhanced non-motorized network can increase the county's attractiveness for tourism and provide additional opportunities for tourists already coming to the area for its beaches and parks.

Improving development of non-motorized pathways in Ottawa County will best be accomplished by a cooperative effort involving all levels of government. Most trails in existence today have been initiated by local units of government and funded primarily by local millages. Ottawa County can provide support to the local units of government by providing leadership, expertise, and coordination in the development and expansion of the non-motorized pathway network.



The Musketawa Rail-Trail in northeastern Ottawa County was developed by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and is maintained by Ottawa County.

The conceptual non-motorized pathway system identified in this report (Figure S-1) focuses primarily on development of regional linkages in Ottawa County that connect the existing pathways. The conceptual network includes paved road shoulders and off-street pathways, representing 178 miles of new facilities. Paved road shoulders identified as part of the network will be a minimum four-foot width consistent with nationally accepted standards while separated pathways are recommended to be from eight- to 14- feet wide, depending on anticipated usage. The widened paved road shoulders identified in the plan should be considered for signing and striping as bike lanes.



Bicycling in Ottawa County provides opportunities for recreation and exercise for residents and tourists.

The Conceptual Network

Tables S-1 and S-2 present the conceptual pathway system. Table S-1 presents the conceptual improvements suggested for each area of the county as well as the cost and priority as defined in this plan. Table S-2 separates the new pathways by local unit of government.

The total construction cost for the Ottawa County non-motorized pathway network is approximately \$23 million. Engineering costs, including contingency, are typically 15 to 20 percent over and above the total project construction cost. Right-of-way acquisition can range from 0 percent to 10 percent over and above the total project construction cost.

As noted above, Table S-1 identifies a prioritization for each conceptual pathway. This prioritization was based on:

- Connections to activity centers
- Scenic/recreational opportunities
- Provides linkage to a gap in the network
- Capacity
- Cost/ease of implementation

The intent of prioritizing each conceptual pathway is to identify those paths whose completion would provide immediate community benefits. A local unit of government can certainly elevate a "long-range" priority project in its jurisdiction to a higher priority.

Table S-1
Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathway Study
Conceptual Pathway Summary

Pathway Description	Length (miles)	Construction Cost ¹	Priority ²
Lakeshore Avenue Paved Shoulder	19.05	\$ 1,042,500	Mid-range
Riley Street Paved Shoulder	11.5	\$ 1,150,000	Long-range
Chicago Drive Paved Shoulder	7.75	\$ 775,000	Mid-range
Macatawa River Greenway/ Byron Road Connector	18.5	\$ 2,930,400	Short-range
Stanton/Taylor/Bauer Separated Pathway	18.75	\$ 2,970,000	Short-range
96th Avenue Separated Pathway	15	\$ 2,376,000	Mid-range
Grand River Greenway	26.3	\$ 4,165,920	Short-range
Luce Street Separated Pathway	5	\$ 792,000	Mid-range
Leonard/Cleveland Street East-West Separated Pathway	14.75	\$ 2,336,400	Mid-range
Leonard Street Paved Shoulder	25.35	\$ 2,535,000	Short-range
Segment 1 - Grand Haven Trail Linkage	0.4	\$ 63,360	Short-range
Segment 2 - Mercury Drive Connector	1.6	\$ 253,440	Mid-range
Segment 3 - Olive Shore Avenue Paved Shoulder	1	\$ 100,000	Long-range
Segment 4 - Greenly Street Separated Pathway	0.5	\$ 79,200	Mid-range
Segment 5 - Angling Road/ Barry Street Connector Separated Pathway	3.5	\$ 554,400	Long-range
Segment 6 - Lake Michigan Drive Paved Shoulder	2	\$ 200,000	Short-range
Segment 7 - 120th Avenue Connector	1	\$ 158,400	Long-range
Segment 8 - Musketawa Rail-Trail Connector	1.75	\$ 277,200	Short-range
Segment 9 - Tyler Street Connector Paved Shoulder	0.25	\$ 25,000	Mid-range
Segment 10 - 32nd Street Paved Shoulder	2	\$ 200,000	Mid-range
Segment 11 - Port Sheldon Street/ 28th Avenue Separated Pathway	2	\$ 316,800	Mid-range
TOTAL	177.95	\$ 23,301,020	

¹ Engineering and contingency costs typically range from 15 percent to 20 percent over and above construction costs. Right-of-way acquisition can range from 0 percent to 10 percent over and above total construction costs.

² Short-range projects would be programmed and/or built in the first five years of the plan; mid-range projects in years 5-10; and long-range projects in 10+ years.

Source: The Corradino Group

Table S-2
Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathway Study
Conceptual Pathway System By Local Unit of Government

Unit of Government	Length of Pathway (miles)		Construction Cost ²
	4-Foot Paved Shoulder	Multi-Use Separated	
Chester Township			\$ -
Ferrysburg			\$ -
Spring Lake Village	1.6		\$ 160,000
Spring Lake Township	2.5		\$ 250,000
Crockery Township	7		\$ 700,000
Crockery Township		8	\$ 1,267,200
Palkton Township	7		\$ 700,000
Palkton Township		3.5	\$ 554,400
Coopersville		0.75	\$ 118,800
Wright Township		5	\$ 792,000
City of Grand Haven		2	\$ 316,800
Grand Haven Charter Township	9		\$ 375,000
Robinson Township		12.8	\$ 2,027,520
Allendale Township		11.5	\$ 1,821,600
Tallmadge Township	7.25		\$ 725,000
Tallmadge Township		5.25	\$ 831,600
Port Sheldon Township	7.75		\$ 437,500
Port Sheldon Township		4	\$ 633,600
Olive Township		6	\$ 950,400
Blendon Township		12.5	\$ 1,980,000
Georgetown Township	1		\$ 100,000
Georgetown Township		15	\$ 2,376,000
City of Hudsonville	2		\$ 200,000
City of Hudsonville		0.25	\$ 39,600
Jamestown Township		5	\$ 792,000
Jamestown Township	0.75		\$ 75,000
Subtotal	45.85	91.55	\$ 18,224,020
MACC¹			
Park Township	8.8		\$ 880,000
Holland Charter Township		5.5	\$ 871,200
Holland Charter Township	6		\$ 600,000
City of Holland		1	\$ 158,400
City of Zeeland	0.25		\$ 25,000
Zeeland Charter Township	8		\$ 800,000
Zeeland Charter Township		11	\$ 1,742,400
Subtotal	23.05	17.5	\$ 5,077,000
TOTAL	68.9	109.05	\$ 23,301,020

¹ The Macatawa Area Coordinating Council (MACC) is conducting its own non-motorized pathways study. The information presented in this report is intended only to provide a vision for the entire county.

² Engineering and contingency costs typically range from 15 percent to 20 percent over and above construction costs. Right-of-way acquisition can range from 0 percent to 10 percent over and above total construction costs.

Source: The Corradino Group

Implementation

The goal of this plan is to provide an interconnected non-motorized network in Ottawa County. Coordinating the efforts of local units of government will be key. A countywide committee such as "Friends of Ottawa County Bikepaths" or a more formal entity such as an authority are options. A funding base that can be used by local units of government to build and maintain regional pathways and leverage additional grant funds should be identified. One option would be a countywide millage with funds appropriated to building and maintaining the regional network.

Economic Benefit

The economic effects of a comprehensive non-motorized pathway system will principally be associated with expenditures by residents and tourists connected to their use of the system. And, while, admittedly, the data available upon which to measure these economic effects are limited, indications are that the trail/pathway system that currently exists in Ottawa County, is generating \$1.7 to \$6.8 million per year in direct, indirect and induced economic effects. Today, the amount of economic stimulus of tourists' use of the current trail system is considered quite limited. However, if the system as now proposed is completed, the additional annual economic effect associated with it could range from \$2 million to \$4 million per year (direct, indirect and induced effects). The latter could stimulate 20 to 40 net new jobs in the economy. And, while the tax revenues generated locally from these tourist-related activities are unknown, it is clear that generating \$2 million to \$4 million per year in new economic activity over the life of the trailway system (10 years before major rebuilding) would be a boost that allows the trailway system to be recognized as not only a quality-of-life enhancer but an economically viable public works project.

Recommendations of the Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathways Study

The following initial recommendations have been developed to support the realization of the Non-Motorized Pathways Plan.

- An organizational mechanism should be formed. This should be developed as a "Friends" group to work with local government.
- Coordination with bicycle store owners, bicycle and jogging clubs, tourist organizations, etc. should be facilitated to generate support for the plan.
- A countywide non-motorized millage should be considered to create a funding base that can be used to build, maintain, and replace regional pathways and also to leverage government grants and funds from foundations.
- The non-motorized plan being developed by the Macatawa Area Coordination Council (MACC) for the Holland-Zeeland area should be incorporated into the County plan.
- The Ottawa County Road Commission and County Transportation Planner should be encouraged to add paved shoulders on all new construction in the county.
- The Ottawa County Non-Motorized Pathway Plan and the existing and future network should be considered as an integral element of the county transportation network. The transit systems in Holland and Grand Haven should be encouraged to explore acquisition of bike racks for their buses. Grants should be sought on the basis of the non-motorized network to have congestion-mitigation and air quality benefits. As the non-motorized network is developed and marketed, its applicability as a commuter system as well as a recreational system should be emphasized.

- All local, county and state projects, particularly those on roads identified in this plan as having four-foot paved shoulders, should be reviewed for the possibility of including non-motorized considerations.
- It is important that as the non-motorized network is developed, the following issues are addressed:
 - Connecting the urbanized areas in the western part of the county with the urbanized areas in the east, including Grand Valley State University;
 - Developing where possible in natural commuter corridors (for example, along Chicago Drive from Hudsonville to the Holland/Zealand area).
 - Working to make Ottawa County a showplace for bicycle and pedestrian activity.
- Minimum design standards should be established. These include:
 - Paved shoulders should be a minimum of four feet in width if they are designated as pathways in the conceptual plan. Those shoulders identified as pathways in the plan should be considered for signing and striping as bike lanes.
 - Separated pathways should be designed to range from 8 to 12 or even 14 feet in width depending on the project use, available right-of-way, and the design of connecting trails.
- Staging areas should be identified as the non-motorized system is developed. Formal staging areas would be developed at major trailheads on the major separated pathways. Along the separated pathways, particularly destination facilities such as the Musketawa Trail, there should be restrooms and drinking water every three to five miles, parking and information every five to ten miles, signage from the roadway network to the staging areas, and telephone, covered shelters, benches and other amenities where desirable.
- Signage for the non-motorized pathway system should be consistent with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Guidance for bicycle operation on roadways and shared use paths. In addition, it is important that signage directing people to major destination trails be placed on major entry points into Ottawa County.
- Maintenance activities will typically be the responsibility of the local unit of government. As the countywide multi-jurisdictional network expands, it will be important to develop a coordinated approach to maintaining, repaving and replacement of the pathway network. This would be a good focal point for the "Friends" organization in the near-term.
- Local units of government should be encouraged to consider development of separated pathways and/or paved shoulders as opposed to sidewalks in ordinances regarding new development in suburban areas. Sidewalks would be appropriate for areas that are primarily residential but non-motorized pathways would be better suited for commercial and retail areas.

**WORKSHEET
PROPERTY ACQUISITION CRITERIA
Ottawa County Parks and Recreation Commission**

Property Location:	Owner's Name	Parcel #	# of acres
CRITERIA		NOTES	RANKING (Rank 1 - 5 with 5 highest)
NATURAL FEATURES			
Presence of a unique or rare type of ecological association, natural community or species that could be protected and sustained in a park setting.			
Occurrence of unique or dramatic geological or topographical features (e.g. ravines, glacial landforms, barrier dunes, steep slopes, gravel pit, lakes, etc.)			
Presence of water related natural features. Examples include Lake Michigan shoreline, riparian lands (i.e. riverfront or lakefront), wetlands, etc.			
SOCIAL-ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES			
Recreation value in terms of type, uniqueness and quality of recreational use anticipated at the site. Also consider factors such as appropriateness of the site for the uses intended, the general attractiveness of the site and its surroundings, the suitability of the site for recreation development and meeting needs of special populations and the impact the proposed recreation development would have on the natural environment.			
Historical importance of the site. Does the site offer the opportunity to protect significant historical features? Do opportunities exist for historical interpretation to the public?			
Size of overall acquisition project. Park plan guidelines require 100-500 acres to fit definition of an areawide or regional park with larger sites receiving higher priority. Size is less important when evaluating lands as part of recreation corridors, (e.g. greenways).			

CRITERIA	NOTES	RANKING (Rank 1 - 5 with 5 highest)
<p>Location of site. Consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is part of a recreation corridor linking other public/natural lands; is part of an identified greenway project. b) Is contiguous with or complementary to existing park or open space areas. c) Provides access to park or open space areas. d) Is located in a highly populated area or a high growth portion of Ottawa County. (See Ottawa County Development Plan - Policy Tiers.) e) Compatibility with adjacent land uses. 		
<p>Potential for adverse development (e.g. higher importance given to sites where threat of development is imminent).</p>		
<p>Lands possessing outstanding scenic qualities visible to the general public from highways, public waterways or park areas.</p>		
ECONOMIC FACTORS		
<p>Is the property available for sale with a willing seller?</p>		
<p>Sale price.</p>		
<p>Revenue production potential.</p>		
<p>Environmental and development issues related to the property. What developmental limitations exist? Are high maintenance costs anticipated? Is environmental restoration required?</p>		
<p>The project will provide significant economic benefits to the County. The project has significant potential to attract tourists or enhance the attractiveness of the County as a place to locate employment producing enterprises.</p>		
OVERALL SITE RANKING		

APPENDIX M

2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation & Opens Space Plan

Public Meeting
Herrick District Library - Holland, Michigan
7:00 pm, January 18, 2006

Attendees:

Approximately 10 to 15 members of the general public attended the meeting. Specific individuals recorded were as follows:

Joyce Smith	2291 Black Lake Walk, Holland, MI 49424
Robert VanderKamp	62 West 11 th ST., Holland, MI 49423
Sara Leeland	1982-2 South Shore Drive, Holland, MI 494223
Edward Davidson	1993 Harbor Inn, Holland, MI 49424
Glenn Houting	15 W. Lakewood, Holland, MI 49424
Gene Picciotti	2394 Sunset Bluff Dr., Holland, MI 49424
Greg Holcomb	
Brian Stauffer	

Park Staff and Friends:

John Sholtz
Curt TerHaar
Crystal Unema

Comments/Discussion:

- In reference to a previous plan workshop at which the viewpoint was expressed that some park managed lands should be left unimproved, the question was asked whether the new parks plan as drafted responds to this request. Scholtz recalled that there had been some discussion focused on the Rosy Mound Natural Area – with some suggesting there are too many boardwalks and stairs. Scholtz justified the level of improvements at Rosy Mound by saying the large number of people desiring to take a direct route to access the lakeshore over very the fragile dune environment led to the need to create a stable route to the beach. Future improvements at North Ottawa Dunes, in contrast, are envisioned to be minimal because use will be more dispersed throughout the 500 acre site. TerHaar added that the philosophy behind Open Space lands is to provide opportunities for public access in less developed natural environments. Therefore a large amount of acreage in the county park and open space system will remain unimproved.
- Strong support was expressed throughout the meeting for land acquisition and many were complimentary to the Parks Commission for its success in acquiring land. The viewpoint was also expressed that the focus should remain on land acquisition in

coming years since it is key to get the land while there is still time. Improvements can be made later.

- Questions were asked about the Park 12 project and the timing for future improvements. Support was expressed for implementing the park master plan in a timely manner.

Other Issues/questions:

Several other questions were asked and addressed regarding the following topics:

- Overcrowding at Tunnel Park
- What is the relationship between the Ottawa County Parks and the Macatawa Greenway Partnership
- North Ottawa Dunes – views of lake vs. actual lake frontage?
- Park 12 – Power lines desired to be underground
- The Friends group – Was it in response to organized opposition to the millage?
- Staffing – Needed additions included in plan projections?
- Open Space acreage guidelines – Where do they come from?
- Differences in focus between local and county park systems
- Recreation millage – Is ours unique? Typical?
- Park 12 – Mt. Pisgah is not owned by the State Park
- Park 12 – Parking – Overflow for State Park? What will be the policy?

2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation & Opens Space Plan

Public Meeting Hager Park - Vanderlaan Room 7:00 pm, January 25, 2006

Attendees:

Approximately 8 to 10 members of the general public attended the meeting. Specific individuals recorded were as follows:

Mr. & Mrs. David E. Bower	2369 Oak Hollow Dr., Jenison, MI 49428
Karen Wedeven	2478 Basswood, Jenison, MI 49428
Scott Brower	Treasurer – Jamestown Township PO Box 88, Jamestown, MI 49427
Susanna Shepard-Karbowski	7247 Iron Dr., Hudsonville, MI 49426 And 11549 VanLopik, Grand Haven
John VanderKooi	10610 Pierce ST., Zeeland, MI 49464
Harv DeRidder	7647 136 th Ave., Holland, MI 49424

Park Staff and Friends:

John Sholtz
Curt TerHaar
Alice Hoban
Bill DeVries

Comments/Questions:

- Pigeon Creek Park can be very busy with cars parking on the street.
- West Olive Christian Reformed Church owns 20 acres across the road east of the Port Sheldon Lake Michigan property. They want to know what the County is going to do near their property. It was noted that this owner has access rights to Lake Michigan through the Siedman Trust property.
- How many townships have their own parks?
- Concern about loss of property tax base, but others noted that housing costs more than farmland or open space if you consider the cost of schools, police, fire, utilities, etc.
- How big of a bureaucracy will there be with this plan? Response: additional staffing is shown in the capital outlay schedule.
- How will the parks be used if the economy is poor? Response: economy likely will rebound and people may utilize local parks more if they are not traveling due to economic conditions.

- 1700 homes are for sale by contractors; 300 homes pending foreclosure. The economy is not as rosy as people think.
- Complaint about tactics used by parks to acquire land (not giving fair market value, using regulatory power to force people out, etc.) were voiced and letter previously sent to Parks Commission read. This person is not supporting millage because it is not fiscally responsible given other needs. Response: Parks Commission has not been involved in her particular dispute and only buys land from willing sellers at a fair price. Some think commission pays too much, not too little.
- Where will the trail along the Grand River be?
- Who is in charge of the bike paths? There is no safe place to ride in Georgetown. Response: Parks has limited role, but does hope to work on a path along the river in Georgetown. Most paths are township funded and developed.
- Park security at Hager Park. One woman did not feel safe in Hager Park if she is alone. Another noted several issues she has observed (overnight camping, problems in restrooms, teenagers in playground in late afternoon) but still feels safe. Could there be a neighborhood watch program for the park? Is there drug use in the park? There was a request for press releases to highlight park rules and regulations.
- Millage renewal at the same rate? What if it fails?
- One man stated that a lot of people he has contact with are unhappy with land purchases, but he doesn't know what will happen with the millage proposal. Why? Money should be spent in other places like schools.
- Buying more land is insane. "Buy, buy, buy" is "fiscally irresponsible."
- Wyoming City would go bankrupt if a big industry left.
- Why is development and building going on farmland when so many houses are empty?
- Farmers can't make enough to live on – that's why they are selling to developers.
- Sewage from Grand Rapids-how much of a problem is it for county parks? Sediments stay for years. Response: problem is being studied by researchers from Michigan State University.
- Are gulls a source of e-coli at beaches? Some groups want to protect all wildlife, but wildlife can be a problem that needs to be dealt with.
- How is insurance liability handled for Ottawa County Parks? How much does it cost parks?
- Are there fees at all county boat launches?
- People should pay for what they use. Another response was that free parks are a great blessing if you don't have very much money. It is great that there is not an entrance fee at parks like Hager.

2006 Ottawa County Parks, Recreation & Opens Space Plan

Public Meeting
Spring Lake District Library
7:00 pm, February 1, 2006

Attendees:

Approximately 25 members of the general public attended the meeting. Specific individuals recorded were as follows:

Tami & Ed Vroma	7493 Osborn, Allendale, MI 49401
Jim & Karen Moore	12205 Buchanan Str., Grand Haven, MI 49417
Ted Albrecht	6607 Roosevelt St., Coopersville, MI 49404
Field Reichart	Box 659, Grand Haven, MI 49417
Arlan Meekhof	9128 Oak Creek Ln., West Olive, MI 49406
Lou Draeger	736 Fall St., Spring Lake, MI 49456
Mike Meleske	10120 Oriole Dr., Coopersville, MI 49404
Doug & Bev Hehl	9201 Leonard, Coopersville, MI 49404
Diane Veneklasen	407 Sand St., Grand Haven, MI 49417
Justin Buck	761 143 rd Ave. Caledonia, MI 49316 (Michigan Deputy Ranger Patrol)
Randy LaRoehm Wilson	4165 Radstock, Dorr, MI 49323 (Michigan Deputy Ranger Patrol)
Sara Leeland	1982-2 So. Shore Dr., Holland, MI 49423
Kevin Smith	14377 128 th Ave., Grand Haven, MI 49417
Kathy Richard	14075 Lake Michigan Dr., West Olive, MI 49460
Kevin Schueler	12903 TenBrink Ave., Grand Haven, MI 49417
Barb Duffey	6899 Windwater Ct., Northon Shores, MI 49441
Christie Walker	
Jen Sniderman	

Park Staff, Commissioners, and Friends:

John Sholtz
Curt TerHaar
Russell Brown
Roger Jonas
Jean Laug-Carroll

Comments/Questions:

- Why only look forward to the year 2020? Should we look further ahead? When does the millage end? Is there a reason it is only to be renewed for 10 years?
- Concerned with plans effect on property values.
- Where did the land acquisition standard of 20 acres per 1000 population come from?
- Equestrian use is great at Community Haven. Is there anything the trail riders can do to help? Is there a possibility of equestrian uses at other park properties?
- Is there a possibility of linking the Bass River Recreation Area with the Eastmanville Bayou property for equestrians? Has heard of an equestrian subdivision development and believes this will be a growth activity in this area.
- Grose Park improvements are “awesome.”
- There are some areas of the North Ottawa Dunes property that are suitable for equestrians, and there is a history of horseback riding there.
- Would like to see a bike path in Olive Township to connect lakeshore to Pigeon Creek Park. Would like cooperation between local governments and county to get it done.
- East side of North Ottawa Dunes should have been left open for development. We need to be careful not to compete with private enterprise. Buying greenway land is good if it is floodplain or wetland, but we should stay away from developable land.
- There was a request to leave a copy of the plan in the library.

Park 12 Master Plan – Executive Summary

<i>Defining Features</i>	<i>Concerns</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>
Parks 1 and 2 - Mature Forest		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secondary dune with steep slopes protected by mature forest of mixed hardwoods and conifers - Outstanding spring wildflower display - Probable habitat for woodland and "edge-sensitive" species and staging area for migratory birds - Slopes range from 10 to 60% plus. - Existing footpath primarily confined to ridge - Buffers residential area - Adjacent to state park land to the east - Private property to the north 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Larger area without a lot of human intrusion - Fragile area with sensitive natural features - Encroachments include drives, yard debris, plantings, walkways and parking areas 	<p>"Limited Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserve as green space, natural buffer and habitat - Monitor existing footpath and improve where needed to protect resource or user safety - Limit to foot traffic and low impact use - Provide minimal signage - Link trails to state park trails - Monitor to ensure buffer and habitat maintained - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)
Park 3 (A) - Lake Michigan Beach		
<i>Park 3 divided into 3 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 700+ feet of Lake Michigan beach - Adjacent to State Park beach and day-use area - Bordering residential areas - Potential habitat for Pitcher's thistle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Informal trails with pedestrian traffic and dune erosion - Walkways of various widths and types - Management of winter sand - Encroachments include fire pits, platforms, plantings, storage, etc. 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain natural buffer and preserve fragile areas - Limit to foot traffic and designated beach uses - Explore possible management by state park - Control access - Monitor to ensure buffer and habitat maintained - Recognize importance of beach access through the "gap", allow continued access - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)
Park 3 (B) – Foredunes		
<i>Park 3 divided into 3 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Includes foredunes to elevated plateau - Dune vegetation, trees, possible wetlands - Potential habitat for Pitcher's thistle - Adjacent to State Park day-use area and cottages - Series of footpaths, walkways & animal trails link beach, campgrounds, residences and Mt. Pisgah - Views of Lake Michigan and Lake Macatawa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uncontrolled access of pedestrian traffic causes erosion, diminishes habitat - Invasive species, e.g. garlic mustard - Walkways of various widths and types - Encroachments include vehicle parking, yard debris, rubbish, and residential construction access 	<p>"Limited Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain natural buffer and preserve fragile areas - Abandon footpaths, control access, re-direct use - Restore eroded areas and habitat - Monitor to ensure buffer and habitat maintained - Evaluate status and condition of walkways - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Former hotel annex location - Includes part of a primary cottage owner parking area 		
<p>Park 3 (C) - Ottawa Beach Rd Frontage <i>Park 3 divided into 3 distinct areas</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-motorized pathway along OBR connects users from several access points to State Park - Two isolated islands of private property - Park 12 located across OBR - Possible wetlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-motorized pathway along OBR with many users - Safety of users as extension of road with white line separates user from traffic - Walkways of various widths and types - Walks used as roads - Concrete slabs (possible hotel remnants) incongruent with character of area - Unauthorized tree trimming and cutting 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain natural buffer and preserve fragile areas - Eliminate undesigned footpaths, control access, re-direct use - Evaluate status and condition of walkways - Connect north OBR pathway with Park 12 pathway and accommodate travel to various destinations - Monitor to ensure buffer and habitat maintained - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)
<p>Parks 4 and 5 - Green Space Buffer</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small parcels inserted between residential areas on north, east and south and Park 3 in west - Continues dune vegetation - Concrete walkway separates Parks 4 and 5 - Buffers residential areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fragile area, habitat - Invasive species, e.g. garlic mustard - Encroachments include drives, parking, storage, yard debris, plantings, and fire pit - Lack of vegetative buffers 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No recreational use proposed - Preserve natural state, maintain landscaping as buffer, and restore as needed - Review snow removal/storage needs - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)
<p>Parks 6, 7, and 8 - Mt. Pisgah</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 185-foot high open parabolic blowout sand dune - Contains forested slopes (60%), dune grass and open sand (forests on north slopes like Parks 1 + 2) - Vistas of Lake Michigan and Lake Macatawa at top - Established trail winds along northern ridge west of dune and culminates at summit - Adjacent to Park 1 on NW with State Park property on north and east and cottages on south (separated from Park 3 in SW by boardwalk) - Drops steeply into ravine and ascends to backyards - Natural buffer between houses and Mt. Pisgah - Includes part of a primary cottage owner parking area in Park 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant attraction vulnerable to degradation and impairment - Steep slopes and degraded vegetation result in fragile area - Multiple footpaths access slopes - Active erosion occurring for decades (dune migrating north and east about 12" /year) - Public access into neighborhood and along upper and lower walks, on to Lake Michigan beach and sidewalk that traverses Park 3 - Existing barriers (snow fence, retaining wall) are ineffective in impeding foot traffic - Invasive plant species, e.g. garlic mustard - Encroachments include parking, storage, waste container, and yard debris 	<p>"Controlled Use", "Green Space/Natural Buffer"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preserve sensitive natural features - Stabilize erosion by planting dune grass, etc. - Limit circulation to foot traffic - Control access and use - In blow-out area, develop boardwalk and stairs to viewing platform with interpretive displays. Connect platform with western trail to protect dune, but de-emphasize by design to limit use - Prohibit foot traffic except where designated - Use techniques to discourage users from leaving stairs and boardwalks. - Provide signs to direct use and interpret natural features - Route access from north and east (re-directed away from Park 3) without interfering with private parcels - Develop parking area and allow public

		<p>access in east from State Park HQ without interfering with campground and maintenance activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)
Park 9 - Auburn Street Buffer		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Narrow site heavily forested with slopes dropping into ravine and ascending into backyards. - Forests similar to Parks 1 and 2, although trees younger and under-story heavier - Auburn street on north side with corner of Park 10 on east - Surrounded by residential properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wildlife paths - Invasive plant species - Encroachment includes invisible fence, structures, yard debris, vehicle parking and storage 	<p>"Green Space / Natural Buffer"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No recreational use proposed - Preserve natural state, maintain landscaping as buffer, and restore as needed - Initiate encroachment procedure (see page 11)
Parks 10 and 11 - Gateway		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic marker describes Ottawa Beach area. - Provides buffer to residential areas - Contains mature conifers, lawn, and garden with peach tree. <p>Bordered by Auburn street in north, OBR on south, with Park 9 in northwest corner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprised of sand and gravel with weedy grass perimeter and large white pine - Sidewalk connects neighborhood with OBR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unofficial entrance to Ottawa Beach area - Concrete sidewalk in disrepair connecting east and west pedestrian traffic. - Placement of historic sign - Invasive plant species - Encroachments include parking, driveways, fence, and plantings 	<p>"Limited Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop "Gateway" Park 10 plus portion of Park 11 along OBR - Create more inviting interpretive area - Include welcome & interpretive signs with county park logo - Consider placement of historic marker + other signs - Improve landscaping - Realign and repair walks to direct pedestrian traffic - Initiate encroachment procedures (see page 11).
Parks 11 + 12 - Macatawa Waterfront <i>Overview of Parks 11 + 12</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connected to State Park and follows along OBR (except for Black Lake Road on east) - Largest consolidated public area along Lake Macatawa shoreline excluding State Park - Fringe areas of wetlands, none large - Marina facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complex area - Lack of public access to Lake Macatawa shoreline - Various encroachments - Limited parking infrastructure - Current low lake level with exposed lake bottom - Compatibility of recreational developments - Appropriate commercial activities - Lacks safe pedestrian circulation 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Renew Lake Macatawa shoreline - Create more park-like setting - Establish open green areas - Limit light pollution. - Recognize historic landmarks - Evaluate impact of fluctuating water levels - Divide into 5 distinct interrelated areas (see below) - Initiate encroachment procedures (see page 11)
Park 12 (A) - Waterfront Pathway <i>Park 12 divided into 5 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lake Macatawa shoreline with Lake Michigan channel (total 2,117 feet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Types of walkways plus pedestrian safety - Sloping concrete and irregular embankment make pathway difficult 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construct pathway length of waterfront with viewing areas, benches, beneficial landscaping, and interpretive displays - Create access to fishing and lakeshore

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viewing - Coordinate with pathway north side of OBR (Park 3) - Consider OBR crosswalks to allow safe travel from north and south - Review speed limits - Define pathway use and construction feasibility
Parks 11 & 12 (B) – Fishing Access <i>Park12 divided into 5 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accessible shoreline - Adjacent to Coast Guard station 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of adequate shoreline fishing access to Lake Macatawa - Lack of parking 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Combine with Park 11 if Black Lake Ave. realigned - Provide parking area and landscaping to buffer park uses - Create small plaza for displays, boardwalks, seating, shelters, fishing pier and viewing platform - Improve beach (no swimming) and viewing/fishing deck. Isolate from residential use - Allow small watercraft access (canoe/kayak)
Park 12 (C) – Historic Pump House <i>Park12 divided into 5 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic Pump House structure - Mature "landmark tree" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Feasible uses of historic building - Corner of building located on OBR SE ROW - Protect landmark tree - Encroachments include docks and supporting structures 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create pedestrian plaza along pathway - Install outdoor interpretive historic displays. - Conduct additional study on possible future use - Seek collaboration and partnerships with interested organizations - Allow for vehicular deliveries
Park 12 (D) – Marina <i>Park12 divided into 5 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Established docks and supporting structures - Includes a private residence related to existing marina 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued opportunities for boating, including access for small watercraft - Existing marina lease - Structure west of the marina 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consolidate boating activities along waterfront - Assess boating and mooring needs and markets - Review effect of federal and state requirements on use of "bottomlands" - Beneficial landscaping to separate from OBR and incongruent uses - Initiate encroachment procedures (see page 11)
Park 12 (E) – The Cove <i>Park12 divided into 5 distinct areas</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small sheltered bay (cove) - Directly adjacent to State Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Buried cable, trees, etc. may affect proposed uses 	<p>"Controlled Use"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide wading beach, wildlife habitat,

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Popular fishing area - Historic Ottawa Hotel site - Trees and natural area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hotel site remnants identification - Encroachments include residential uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> parking, landscaped interpretation plaza, and viewing/fishing platforms - Link boardwalk with hotel site and state park - Rip rap along shoreline to reinforce erosion controls
<u>Additional Recommendations</u>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advisory Committee Encroachment Procedure Parking Areas Stewardship Historic Preservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing communication - Incorporate stewardship practices - Establish encroachment procedure - Promote non-motorized access to area - Evaluate specific parking needs by area - Review existing roads and walkways
<u>Ongoing Communication</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing interest in status of master plan implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Availability of accurate, up-to-date information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish method to provide interested stakeholders access to current information on Park 12 activities and projects, e.g. utilizing website, email, or newsletter
<u>Advisory Committee</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considerable interest in development of area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure continued input from stakeholders on development, maintenance, and other issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Form stakeholders advisory group - Define purpose - Identify issues - Determine committee size - Create guidelines on meetings
<u>Boundary Survey</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twelve park parcels interspersed with other public and private properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Essential in establishing encroachment procedures, alignments, parking problems, and effectively managing park parcels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establish and delineate property lines of each Park parcel
<u>Encroachment Procedure</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encroach: to intrude gradually on the possessions or rights of another; trespass 	<p>Examples of encroachments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking and drives - Pathways and sidewalks - Storage of vehicles, boats, etc. - Fire pits - Platforms, decks, and other structures - Plantings - Debris, rubbish, and other discards - Vehicle use of walkways - Residential construction access - Unauthorized tree trimming and other landscaping - Invisible fence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and inventory encroachments - Review legal issues - Determine whether to continue, modify, condition, or eliminate use - Consider limited use agreements - Establish procedures to eliminate encroachments - Identify appropriate restoration objectives - Consider barriers to reinforce property limits - Develop enforceable policies & procedures - Determine ongoing maintenance requirements - Implement awareness campaign

Parking Areas		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking issues identified in most parcels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vehicle access to many Ottawa Beach properties is very limited - Congestion peaks during summer - Need for orderly parking system for both residents and visitors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Study parking needs and options while recognizing cottage owners needs - Identify parking areas (public and private) - Use design to discourage unauthorized parking - Establish procedures - regulating time, vehicles allowed, specific uses intended, permits etc. - Develop operation and enforcement procedures - Create landscaping plan - Conduct follow-up study on parking
Stewardship		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The unique natural features and inherent values associated with these features contribute significantly to the character of Park 12 parcels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protect and restore natural resource values by adopting practices that eliminate or reduce negative environmental impacts both within the Ottawa Beach area as well as within the larger global context 	<p>Examples of stewardship practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Optimize site design - Design for ease of maintenance - Specify energy-efficient and water conservation - Anticipate and account for all energy use - Maximize use of natural light - Minimize impervious surfaces. - Utilize existing site drainage patterns - Reduce earth moving changes - Provide on-site storm water retention or detention - Compare environmental attributes - Reuse existing materials - Recycle waste - Promote the use of pedestrian networks - Complement natural, historic and cultural context - Use natural areas as buffers - Utilize low impact development - Protect wildlife habitats and preserve vegetation - Landscape with native plants where appropriate - Routine ongoing monitoring of natural features - Facilitate community composting - Control invasive plant species - Participate in voluntary stewardship initiatives

Preservation of Historic Character		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ottawa Beach Historic Committee formed in 1988 and gained designation of Ottawa Beach on National Register of Historic Places in 1995 and Michigan Historic Site in 2002 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historic areas and structures (e.g. Pump House, hotel and annex sites, and cottages) - Level of historic interpretation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and work with interested groups - Review community legacy goals plus implications of historic designations - Identify projects with best potential - Define need for and level of historic interpretation - Develop interpretive displays in selected areas

APPENDIX O
PREVIOUS DNR GRANT PROJECTS

DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS		
GRANT NUMBER & PARK NAME	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONDITION
LWCF 26-01468 KIRK PARK	PHASE 1 PARK IMPROVEMENTS PARKING AREAS, PLAY AREAS, TRAILS, STAIRWAYS, VIEWING PLATFORMS, INTERPRETIVE DISPLAYS, RESTROOMS, CONCESSIONS, PICNIC SHELTER AND FACILITIES, HORSHOE PITS, VOLLEYBALL COURT AND LODGE BUILDING.	GOOD BUT SHOWING AGE, IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULED FOR 2006
LWCF 26-01482 KIRK PARK	PHASE 2 PARK IMPROVEMENTS TRAILS, INTERPRETIVE PANELS, ACTIVE DAY-USE AREA DUNE GRASS AND TREE PLANTINGS, RESTROOM RENOVATION, AND PICNIC DECK ON LODGE	GOOD BUT SHOWING AGE, IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULED FOR 2006
LWCF 26-01474 TUNNEL PARK	PHASE 1 IMPROVEMENTS ENTRANCE DRIVE, PARKING AREA, TOT LOT, DUNE CLIMB, STAIRWAY, DECK, SHELTER / PICNIC AREA, BALLFIELD, VOLLEYBALL COURTS, PAVED WAKWAYS, PICNIC EQUIPMENT, SIGNS, AND LANDSCAPING	GOOD, RESTROOM IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULED FOR 2006
BF 92-234 TUNNEL PARK	PHASE 2 IMPROVEMENTS TRAILS, TRAIL STAIRS, DUNE BOARDWALK W/ BENCHES, OVERLOOK DECK, DRINKING FOUNTAIN, PARKING EXPANSION, PICNIC SHELTER, TABLES, AND GRILLS, DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE, LANDSCAPING, AND IRRIGATION	GOOD, RESTROOM IMPROVEMENTS SCHEDULED FOR 2006
TF 95-208 NORTH BEACH PARK	PARK IMPROVEMENTS CONCRETE WALKS, NEW PARKING AREA, ASPHALT RESURFACING, PARKING GUARDRAILS, BARRIER-FREE PICNIC AREA, PLAY EQUIPMENT, SITE FURNITURE, BEACH RAMP, AND LANDSCAPING	GOOD, ADDITIONAL DUNE STAIRS AND OVERLOOK SCHEDULED FOR 2006
TF 01-158 ROSY MOUND NATURAL AREA	PARK IMPROVEMENTS PARK SIGN, ENTRY DRIVE, PARKING AREA, GATES, BIKE PATH, RESTROOM BULDING, SITE LIGHTING, BARRIER- FREE TRAIL, RETAINING WALLS, WOODEN STAIRS, BOARDWALKS, BEACH RESTROOMS AND DECK, SIGNS, INTERPRETIVE DISPLAYS, TRAIL HEAD, SITE AMENITIES, AND LANDSCAPING	EXCELLENT

DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

GRANT NUMBER & PARK NAME	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONDITION
<p align="center">TF 01-159 HEMLOCK CROSSING AND PINE BEND PARKS</p>	<p align="center">PIGEON RIVER GREENWAY IMPROVEMENTS PARK SIGN, PARKING LOTS, GATES, ASPHALT PATHS, TRAILS, RESTROOM BUILDING, PICNIC SHELTERS, SITE LIGHTING, CANOE / KAYAK LAUNCH DECK, BOARDWALKS, OVERLOOK DECKS, PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE, SIGNS AND INTERPRETIVE DISPLAYS, TRAIL HEAD, SITE AMENITIES, AND LANDSCAPING</p>	<p align="center">EXCELLENT</p>
<p align="center">TF 98-052 GROSE PARK</p>	<p align="center">PARK IMPROVEMENTS PARK SIGN, ENTRANCE DRIVE, GATES, PARKING AREAS, PAVED PATHS, BOARDWALKS, BARRIER-FREE RAMP, BEACH ACCESS STAIRS, NATURE TRAIL, TRAIL HEAD, INTERPRETIVE SIGNS, BEACH AREA PLAZA AND IMPROVEMENTS, PICNIC SHELTER, RESTROOM BUILDING, PLAY AREA, FISHING DOCK, VOLLEYBALL COURTS, SOFTBALL FIELD, LANDSCAPING, AND PERIMETER BOLLARD AND CABLE</p>	<p align="center">VERY GOOD, BEACH MODIFICATIONS SCHEDULED FOR 2006</p>
<p align="center">TF 93-106 PIGEON CREEK PARK</p>	<p align="center">PARK IMPROVEMENTS PARK SIGN, PARK ENTRANCE, GATES, TRAILS, BOARDWALKS, CAMPING AREA, INTERPRETIVE DISPLAY, SLEDDING HILL, LODGE BUILDING, ACCESS DRIVE TO LODGE</p>	<p align="center">VERY GOOD</p>
<p align="center">BF 89-474 HAGER PARK</p>	<p align="center">PHASE 1 PARK IMPROVEMENTS PARK SIGN, PARKING AREA, GATES, SITE LIGHTING, PLAY AREA, PICNIC SHELTER, PICNIC TABLES, GRILLS, VISITOR CENTER IMPROVEMENTS, STORM DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS, PAVED WALKS, TRAILS, SITE AMENITIES, AND LANDSCAPING</p>	<p align="center">EXCELLENT, ADDITIONAL IMPROVEMENTS ADDED IN 2003</p>

ACQUISITION PROJECTS		
GRANT NUMBER & PARK NAME	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	CONDITION
TF 97-242 HEMLOCK CROSSING AND PINE BEND PARKS	FIRST PHASE ACQUISITION OF 90 ACRES OF GREENWAY LAND. DEVELOPED AS COUNTY PARK. (SEE TF 01-159 ABOVE)	EXCELLENT
TF 98-285 HEMLOCK CROSSING AND PINE BEND PARKS	SECOND PHASE ACQUISITION OF 61 ACRES OF GREENWAY LAND. DEVELOPED AS COUNTY PARK. (SEE TF 01-159 ABOVE)	EXCELLENT
TF 03-146 CONNOR BAYOU PROPERTY	ACQUISITION OF 95 ACRES OF LAND ON THE GRAND RIVER. CURRENTLY UNIMPROVED.	NO RECREATION FACILITIES EXIST
TF-99-235 CROCKERY CREEK PROPERTY	ACQUISITION OF 248 ACRES WITH FRONTAGE ON THE GRAND RIVER AND CROCKERY CREEK. USED FOR HIKING AND CONTROLLED, PERMIT-ONLY ARCHERY HUNTING.	NO RECREATION FACILITIES EXIST
TF 91-051 RIVERSIDE PARK	ACQUISITION OF 6 ACRES OF LAND ADJACENT TO RIVERSIDE PARK. USED AS PARK EXPANSION. IMPROVEMENTS ON MASTER PLAN.	NO RECREATION FACILITIES EXIST ON ACQUIRED PROPERTY.
TF 89-232 PIGEON CREEK PARK	ACQUISITION OF 90 ACRES OF GREENWAY LAND. DEVELOPED AS COUNTY PARK. (SEE TF 93-106 ABOVE)	VERY GOOD
TF 04-108 NORTH OTTAWA DUNES PROPERTY	ACQUISITION OF 500 ACRES OF PRISTINE LAKE MICHIGAN DUNE PROPERTY	NO RECREATION FACILITIES EXIST

Appendix P

Millage Accomplishments

Since approval of the dedicated millage (1/3 mill) in 1996, the Parks & Recreation Commission has accomplished the following:

- Millage funds were effectively used to match grants and donations for park land acquisition and improvements. This leveraged an additional \$11 million (\$11,000,000) in funding for the park system.
- To uphold high quality standards in the parks system, operations were expanded for maintenance and management of park lands and facilities including additional staff and equipment.
- Hired a full-time Naturalist/Information Specialist to develop year 'round interpretive programs and to manage interpretive features in the parks system including signs, brochures and trail design.
- Completed improvements to many new properties and to previously existing parks.
- Completed key planning initiatives that lay the groundwork for future parks.
- Acquired 2,811 acres of parks and open space lands throughout Ottawa County as detailed below.

Lake Michigan Coastal Greenway

- Acquisition of 164 acre Rosy Mound Natural Area with over 3,400 feet of Lake Michigan frontage and implementation of park improvements including parking, restrooms, walkways, trails, beach access and scenic overlook decks.
- Acquisition of eight (8) acres in Port Sheldon Township with 200 feet of frontage for a future Lake Michigan park.
- Purchase of the 500 acre North Ottawa Dunes property with two miles of pristine wooded dunes linking county, state and local parks. Funds in place for trail connection to North Beach Park in 2006 including dune stairs and viewing deck.
- Created master plan for Park 12 properties near Holland State Park calling for expanded Lake Macatawa and Lake Michigan access with waterfront boardwalks, fishing opportunities, historical interpretation, dune stairways and viewing decks. Plans in place for first phase implementation in 2006.
- Plans and funding in place for major upgrade to Tunnel Park restrooms in early 2006.

Grand River Greenway

- Acquisition of 142 acre Connor Bayou property with over 4,000 feet of scenic riverfront for future county park with camping, fishing, trails and other opportunities.
- Acquisition of 306 acre Crockery Creek property for county park - prime natural land with one-half mile of Grand River frontage and over two (2) miles on Crockery Creek. Trailhead and trails to be completed in 2006.

- Dedication of the 229 acre Community Haven property for county park use with plans for equestrian trails, farm education opportunities and large group use.
- Purchase of the 97 acre Jubb Bayou property with extensive frontage on the Grand River and Jubb Bayou.
- Acquisition of 161 acres of natural land encompassing Ripps Bayou – a scenic one mile linear bayou – and including over a mile of Grand River frontage.
- Purchase of 129 acres of unique natural land on the Eastmanville Bayou at two sites with over a mile of Grand River frontage as well as bayou access.
- Acquisition of the Timmer Farm property, a 68 acre site with wooded ravines within the Grand River corridor.
- Accepted donation of the 162 acre Grand River Park and completed extensive park improvements to this high quality natural site with one-half mile of Grand River frontage.
- Established master plan for future 500 acre park in eastern Ottawa County to feature swimming and other water-based recreation opportunities.

Pigeon River Greenway

- Acquisition of 247 acres of scenic natural land stretching over one and one-half miles along the Pigeon River. Extensive improvements were completed creating two new parks known as Hemlock Crossing and Pine Bend featuring seven miles of scenic trails with boardwalks, overlook decks and bridges.
- Restoration of historic Weaver House at Pine Bend for program use and public functions.
- Improvements to Pigeon Creek Park including lighted ski trails, parking lot expansion and trail improvements.

Macatawa River Greenway

- Purchase of 549 acres with over two and one-half miles of Macatawa River frontage featuring steep wooded ravines and expansive views. Implementation of extensive habitat restoration and wetland creation to improve water quality and expand wildlife habitat. Creation of master plan for the site calling for extensive trails, swimming, wildlife viewing and many other activities. Plans and funds are in place for first phase improvements in 2006.
- Purchase of 10 acre access site on Macatawa River for fishing, kayak launch and picnicking with construction of parking and other improvements scheduled for 2006.

General Parks and Open Space Lands

- Took responsibility for management of a 10 mile segment of the Musketawa Trail and upgraded trail maintenance.

- Completed significant improvements to Spring Grove Park including extensive landscaping, addition of a wedding trellis, barrier free trail and access to artesian spring.
- Major renovation to Grose Park including upgrade of all park facilities, addition of trails, new picnic shelter and play area and improvements to beach area.
- Upgrades to Hager Park including new restrooms and plaza, installation of bike paths, visitor center improvements and creek restoration project to protect natural area and improve water quality.
- Plans on drawing boards for expanded parking and access to Open Space lands.