



CITY OF MASON

Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan 2020-2024

Adopted February 3, 2020



OUR COMMUNITY VISION

Mason is a community founded upon a respect for our historic past, while encouraging an atmosphere that values family, business, the environment and the arts, creating a sense of place for present and future generations.

~City of Mason Master Plan 2014

Acknowledgments

Community Members of the City of Mason

Thank you for all of your energy, enthusiasm, and wonderful ideas. Your participation in this plan ensures that what is discussed in this document will serve your needs as a community.

City of Mason Planning Commission

Recommended: January 14, 2020

Received: January 10, 2020

John Sabbadin, Chairperson
Seth Waxman, Vice Chairperson
Anne Klein Barna, Secretary
Jon Droscha, Council Liaison
Mark Howe
Mitch Perrault
Scott Shattuck
John Vercher
Meg Wren

City of Mason City Council

Approved: February 3, 2020

Received: January 27, 2020

Russell Whipple, Mayor
Marlon Brown, Mayor Pro Tem
Jon Droscha
Elaine Ferris
Angela Madden
Jerry Schaffer
Rita Vogel

Contributing Staff

Deborah Stuart, City Manager
Don Hanson, Chief of Police
Don Heck, P.E., City Engineer
Elizabeth Hude, AICP, Community Development Director
Sarah Jarvis, City Clerk
Kerry Minshall, Fire Chief
Michelle Pietsch, Finance Director/Treasurer
~
Kirk Crawford, Public Works Foreman, Firefighter
Pat Hicks, Laborer, Firefighter
Levi Rice, Public Works Foreman, Firefighter
Tom Silsby, Water Treatment Superintendent
Ross Whitehead, Technician, Wolverine Engineers

Planning Consultants

Robert Ford, LA – Project Manager, LAP, Inc.
Nick Wallace – Recreation Planner, LAP, Inc.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary **v**

The City of Mason v

Purpose of this Plan v

Methodologyvii

1 - Introduction **1**

The Benefits of Parks 1

Requirement 2

Scope 2

2 - Community Description **3**

Plan Jurisdiction 3

History 4

Social Characteristics 5

3 - Administrative Structure **9**

Organization Chart 9

Funding 10

Park Funding13

System Inventory

4 - Parks and Recreation Inventory **15**

Overview15

Park Location Map17

Park Service Area Map (Vehicular Access) 18

Park Service Area Map (Non-Motorized Access) 19

<i>Play Equipment Distance Map</i>	20
<i>Existing Recreation Facilities Inventory Table</i>	21
<i>DNR Recreation Grant Inventory</i>	32
<i>Ingham County Trail Millage Grant History</i>	33
<i>Program Inventory</i>	34
<i>Rentals and Services</i>	34
<i>Regional Recreation Opportunities</i>	35
<i>Comparison to Recreation Standards</i>	36

5 - Non-Motorized Facilities 39

<i>A Case for Non-Motorized Transportation</i>	39
<i>What Makes up a Non-Motorized Transportation system (NMTS)?</i>	40
<i>Road Improvements</i>	44
<i>Related terms and definitions</i>	45
<i>Purpose</i>	47
<i>Priorities</i>	54
<i>Regional Connectivity</i>	55
<i>Transit Connections</i>	56

7 - Wayfinding 57

<i>Overview</i>	57
<i>Analysis</i>	57
<i>Sign Design Menu</i>	58

8 - The Planning Process 69

<i>Plan Development Process</i>	69
<i>Public Participation</i>	69

9 - Goals and Objectives 75

<i>Overview</i>	75
<i>City Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Goals and Objectives</i>	75

10 - The Action Plan	77
<i>Overview</i>	77
<i>Capital Improvement Projects</i>	81
<i>Capital Improvement Program Schedule</i>	85

Appendix	i
<i>Public Engagement Materials</i>	i
<i>Public Notices</i>	viii
<i>Stakeholder Interviews</i>	x
<i>Public Open Houses</i>	xxx
<i>Presentation to Planning Commission and City Council</i>	xxxii
<i>Resolution of Recommendation</i>	xliv
<i>Minutes of Public Meeting</i>	xlvi
<i>City Council Resolution</i>	xlviii
<i>Transmittal Letters to Regional Planning Agencies</i>	xlix
<i>Results of Online Survey</i>	li
<i>Additional Community Input</i>	lxxv
<i>Previous Planning Efforts</i>	lxxvi
<i>Rayner Park Playground Assessment 2019</i>	lxxvii
<i>Pavilion Rental Data</i>	lxxviii

Executive Summary

The City of Mason

Our Community Vision

In 2014, the City of Mason adopted the following vision statement – ‘Mason is a community founded upon a respect for our historic past, while encouraging an atmosphere that values family, business, the environment and the arts, creating a sense of place for present and future generations.’ Our Parks, Recreation and Non-motorized system is a treasured community asset that supports the social, economic and environmental well-being of our citizens. Planning for the future care and expansion of them is important to realize our community vision.



Purpose of this Plan

The Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan has been developed with a focus on these critical factors; to address current problems, to forecast future problems and to provide information to make sound decisions on spending and policy moving forward.

The key questions that the City of Mason seeks to answer with this plan are:

- Do we have the right types of facilities?
- Are our parks the right size - too small or too big?
- Are our parks accessible, connected and multi-generational?
- Do we have parks in the right locations?
- Do our non-motorized facilities provide safe access throughout the City?
- Does existing public parking serve the needs of our community?
- How do we pay for it all?

Do we have the right types of facilities?

The City of Mason has a diverse parks system that features a broad range of facilities that service all members of the community. In most cases the types and numbers of facilities in the Mason parks are on par or above the recommendations set forth by the National Parks and Recreation Association (NRPA). In the cases where facilities are below NRPA recommendations, facilities are available at Mason Public Schools, nearby county parks, neighboring jurisdictions or by local private providers.

The City of Mason features:

- 8 parks, totaling 92.74 acres
- 4 pavilions,
- 4 playgrounds
- 12 Sports facilities
- 38 acre Maple Grove Cemetery
- 44.26 miles of sidewalks
- 2.5 miles of shared-use path (Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail)
- 3 trailheads with dedicated parking

Are our parks the right size - too small or too big?

Mason's total park acreage is on par with NRPA recommendations. The Mason parks system is made up of six community parks and two mini parks. There are no regional parks under the City's jurisdiction, however there are several regional parks within close vicinity that Mason residents have access to. There are also no parks that are classified as neighborhood parks within Mason although many of the community parks are located within neighborhoods and serve the same purpose that a neighborhood park would for the surrounding residents.

Are our parks accessible, connected and multi-generational?

The eight parks that make up the Mason parks system have an average ADA Accessibility rating of 2.0. A rating of 2.0 means that some facilities meet ADA Standards. The goal for all public facilities is 100% ADA compliance. Some examples of items discovered to be out of compliance include paved pathways, lack of accessible parking facilities and non-accessible restroom facilities. An ADA assessment should be conducted on all park facilities and an ADA transition plan should be created to address any issues that are found.

Overall, the City of Mason has a very good sidewalk and pathway system that connects many of the City's parks. There are cases where gaps in sidewalks, and difficult crossings exist which hinder the connectivity of parks. US-127 is also a significant barrier which greatly limits the connectivity of the residents who live on the west side of US-127 to the City's parks which are all located on the east side.

Mason currently offers a wide range of facilities for all age groups. US Census age demographics show that Mason has a relatively even distribution of age in its community. Therefore it is important to consider all age groups when making future decisions about parks.

Do we have parks in the right locations?

The majority of Mason's parks are located in such a way that they serve the majority of the population however there are areas such as the northeast corner of the City and the area west of US-127 that do not have parks located in a walkable vicinity. Private parks/play areas that exist in these areas help to alleviate this disparity, however, as Mason looks to the future considerations should be made to increase connectivity or develop new parks in these areas.

Do our non-motorized facilities provide safe access throughout the City?

As previously described, the City of Mason has a strong existing non-motorized system. Filling in the gaps in sidewalks, adding additional striping and signage at crossings and adding wayfinding signage to assist in navigation will make the system even stronger.

Does existing public parking serve the needs of our community?

There are many public parking lots within the City of Mason. Areas to park include City, County and State owned lots as well as additional privately owned lots that are available to the public. Many of these lots lack proper identification so the public may not be aware that they are available. A cohesive signage system should be implemented throughout the City to improve awareness of these facilities.

How do we pay for it all?

Revenue sources such as grants are available through state and federal agencies including MDNR and MDOT. These grant programs however, typically require matching funds. Based on community input data gathered through an on-line opinion survey and various stakeholder interviews, the people of Mason are in support of additional taxation to help fund parks and recreation facilities. A millage dedicated to parks, recreation and non-motorized facilities could be considered.

Community Strategy

The City of Mason has adopted a strategy of public/private partnership. In this public/private strategy the City maintains the parks and facilities and rely on private organizations to program those facilities. The City has had great success with this strategy. One example is the ongoing partnership with the Sycamore Creek Garden Club. The Sunflower Learning Center is a nationally recognized program located within Mason's Bicentennial Park. The Learning Center is organized and operated by the Sycamore Creek Garden Club at no cost to the City of Mason.

Methodology

The five primary drivers utilized in this report for prioritizing investment in parks and non-motorized facilities are **Compliance, Condition, Capacity, Cost and Community Input (the 5Cs)**. A comprehensive inventory of the existing parks system was compiled and the results were then analyzed against the criteria of the 5Cs. A detailed description of the criteria behind each of the Cs can be found in the Action Plan section of this report.




To help us organize the priorities into plan form, the City of Mason has adopted a planning approach referred to as OGSM which stands for objectives, goals, strategies, and measures. This method will help translate the City's vision into a reality.

- **Objectives** represent the City's over-arching vision of what needs to be achieved in the long term.
- **Goals** are the stepping stones to achieving the objectives. The goals are smaller scale, more measurable and more easily achievable.
- **Strategies** are the methods that Mason will use to deploy its resources to achieve the goals.
- **Measures** are represented by numeric benchmarks or checkpoints that are used to determine if the strategies are working. Typically key performance indicators such as work fulfillment time, or resources spent are used in determining these measures.

By setting goals and objectives and distinguishing strategies to achieve them Mason is setting up a system that will help

it move forward in continual improvement and growth of its parks, recreation and non-motorized transportation. The following table provides an example of the City’s Objectives, Goals, Strategies and Measures:



1 - Introduction

The Benefits of Parks

As a society, we are becoming increasingly more aware of the many benefits provided by open space and recreation. It is the City of Mason's primary goal to actively promote these benefits for the public's well-being in the form of providing and developing recreational areas and activities. Doing this helps to increase the City of Mason's livability. However, there are many issues to consider when planning for these recreational areas and opportunities. Therefore, it is important to project the future parks and recreation needs of the City of Mason to ensure the availability of open space and recreational opportunities. To address these issues and opportunities, it is important for the city to produce a plan to guide the decision-making process. When implemented, this plan will help provide quality parks and recreation programs and facilities throughout the community.

Physical and Mental Health Benefits

As ongoing health studies show, our society is becoming more conscious of healthy living and the opportunities that recreation provides to further healthy lifestyles and improve our quality of life. Health studies also reflect the alarming need for increased physical activity for people of all ages in order to achieve these healthier lifestyles.

Economic Benefits

Improvement to a community's quality of life through recreation also has the potential to better the local economy. Numerous studies have shown that parks and open space increase the value of neighboring residential property. Growing evidence points to a similar benefit on commercial property value. Studies have shown that businesses are drawn to communities that provide quality lifestyles for prospective employees. The availability of park and recreation facilities is an important quality-of-life factor for corporations choosing where to locate facilities and for families choosing a place to live. City parks also often become important tourism draws, contributing heavily to local businesses.

Environment Benefits

Green space in urban areas provides substantial environmental benefits. Trees reduce air pollution and water pollution, green spaces keep cities cooler, and they are a more effective and less expensive way to manage stormwater runoff and flooding than building systems of concrete sewers.



Pictured: Lee Austin Park serving as stormwater storage area.

Requirement

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) requires that community recreation plans be updated every five years as criteria to receive funding from the State in the form of grants for park and open space acquisition, park development, and existing park improvements. The purpose of this procedure is to provide an opportunity to include changing needs and assets for the community. This Recreation Plan was developed by analyzing an inventory of issues and physical features for the area and tailoring development of recreation programs and facilities in a systematic manner, or plan, through the next five years; meeting the requirement (guidelines) of the MDNR.

Scope

The Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan for the City of Mason inventories existing parks and non-motorized facilities, and with this information, the needs for parks, supporting facilities and trailway/greenway systems are analyzed for the next five years. The recommendations in this plan are provided through analysis of the 5Cs as well as demographic projections, city land-use trends, natural features inventory, citizen input, past and future recreational trends, state and federal grant funding requirements, and potential land acquisition opportunities.


2 - Community Description

The 2020-2024 Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan has been developed to serve as a guide and decision making document for future recreation facilities and programs within the City of Mason. This plan focuses on parks, trails, natural areas, and non-motorized transportation. The plan includes an assessment of current facilities and programs, as well as the acquisition and development of new facilities and programs based on the current and future anticipated demands. It also considers linkages throughout the city and to other communities.

Plan Jurisdiction

This Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan covers the jurisdiction controlled by the City of Mason.

The City of Mason is located in Ingham County, approximately 12 miles southeast of the City of Lansing. The City of Mason is approximately five square miles in area. The City has easy accessibility to I-127 and M-36 (Cedar Street/Ash Street).



History

A Unique Past

Mason is a city steeped in history. In 1836 Charles Noble founded Mason Center, named after Michigan's first governor Stevens T. Mason, in hopes that it would become the state capital. He was unsuccessful in that regard, however he did manage to make Mason the county seat of Ingham County. In fact Mason is the only city in the U.S. that serves as a county seat ahead of a state capital; with the state capital, Lansing also being located in Ingham County.

Mason has several unique historical landmarks, many of which are included on the National Register of Historic Places.

Sites listed on the Historic Register include:

- Ash Street-Sycamore Creek Bridge
- Courthouse Square Historic District
- Ingham County Courthouse
- Maple Grove Cemetery
- Merrylees-Post House
- Michigan Central Railroad Mason Depot
- Philip Nice House
- John Rayner House
- Westside Neighborhood Historic District
- Downtown Historic District



Photo: Maple Grove Cemetery

Cemeteries: Some of Our First Public Parks

In 1831 with the construction of Mount Auburn Cemetery, a large burial ground in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the movement to build cemeteries in America began. The great rural cemeteries were built at a time when there weren't public parks, or art museums, or botanical gardens in American cities. You suddenly had large pieces of ground, filled with beautiful sculptures and horticultural art. People flocked to cemeteries for picnics, for hunting and shooting and carriage racing. These places became so popular that not only were guidebooks issued to guide visitors, but also rules of all kinds were posted.

The City of Mason's Maple Grove Cemetery was no exception to this national trend. The initial 1-1/2 acre portion of the cemetery was leased from Charles Noble of Monroe, Michigan in 1844. An addition was made and formally platted by Isaac B. Woodhouse, a Mason businessman, in 1873. Several additions were made to the cemetery's acreage in the nineteenth century and the cemetery was officially named "Maple Grove Cemetery" in 1897. The iconic main entryway and Romanesque Revival receiving vault were built in 1890, and the surrounding stone wall was added in 1934.

The area in the southeast corner along the Sycamore Creek is Maple Grove Park and once contained a playground. Park Street owes its name to the fact that it was the way to get to the park. At the end of the road one would walk across a bridge over the creek to get to the park.

Social Characteristics

City Population

According to the 2010 US census, the population of Mason was 8,252, comprised of 3,278 households and 2,032 families residing in the city. This represents a 23 percent increase from the 6,714 people living in the City during the 2000 census.

Chart of Population Change 2000-2010

U.S. Census		
2000	2010	% Change
6,758	8,252	22%



Photo: Sculptures at Mason City Hall

Age Structure

Age characteristics are a useful demographic indicator for recreation planning purposes as a community’s age composition helps determine the appropriate mix of needed recreation services and facilities. The types and location of recreation facilities and programs will depend, in part, upon the age structure of the population. The chart below breaks down the various age groups using data from the 2010 Census.

Mason has a relatively even distribution of age groups within its population, therefore it is important that there are evenly distributed activities for people of all ages within the parks system. The senior citizen population represents 13.46 percent, and this age group is expected to grow in size as the “baby boomer” generation matures and improvements in medical technology help people live longer. This may translate into a need for activities geared toward aging members of the community such as pickleball or a need for more passive park areas. Bicycle and walking paths provide an excellent opportunity for all ages to participate in a recreational activity. Providing greater accessibility to park facilities for senior citizens such as providing parking or drop off areas closer to fields, wayfinding, and more seating and shaded areas is also important.




Chart of Age Demographics

Persons with Disabilities

According to the 2008 – 2010 American Community Survey, approximately 9.8 percent of the City’s population aged 5 to 17 years old and about 19 percent of the population ages 17 to 64 years old had some type of physical or cognitive disability.

Age Range	Percent of Population
5 - 17 Years	9.8%
18 - 64 Years	19%
65 and over	46.9%

Chart of Disabled Population, U.S. Census 2010

Although persons with disabilities made up a small portion of the City’s population, other citizens may face some form of temporary disability or physical challenge during their lifetime. Such instances include seniors, young children, pregnant women, individuals with broken bones, and individuals using crutches.

Demographics

The City of Mason is home to a multi-cultural community. We are people from many different racial and ethnic backgrounds. The information obtained from the U.S. Census provides us with an opportunity to ensure that our planning decisions consider all perspectives. Understanding our various backgrounds can also become an opportunity for incorporating different cultural traditions into our parks and recreation system.

Chart of Population by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Census 2000	Percent of Population	Census 2010	Percent of Population	Percentage Point Change
White	6,488	96%	7,447	90%	14.78%
African American/Black	43	0.64%	483	5.85%	1023.26%
Asian	48	0.71%	73	0.88%	52.08%
Multi-Racial	98	1.45%	143	1.73%	45.92%
Other	81	1.20%	106	1.28%	30.86%
Hispanic	183	2.71%	309	3.74%	68.85%
Total	6,758	100%	8,252	100%	0%

Tree City USA

Trees play an important role in defining the character of Mason. Our tree lined streets serve as an informal 'linear park' enjoyed by our community members and visitors. In our parks they provide shade, assist in preventing soil erosion and stormwater management.

The City of Mason has been named a Tree City USA for 28 years. The Tree City USA program has been greening up cities and towns across America since 1976. It is a nationwide movement that provides the framework necessary for communities to manage and expand their public trees.

Mason has achieved Tree City USA status by meeting four core standards of sound urban forestry management: maintaining a tree board or department, having a community tree ordinance, spending at least \$2 per capita on urban forestry and celebrating Arbor Day.



Photo: Aerial of Mason, Mi

Crime Prevention

The City of Mason historically has maintained low crime rates. This is due in large part to the culture of our community – we are friends, families, and neighbors watching out for each other. It is important that as we plan for the future of our parks, recreation and non-motorized system that we preserve this system of natural surveillance in addition to investing in proper maintenance of facilities, upgrades to lighting, and improved signage and visibility. Any changes to signage, structures, restrooms, and landscaping will be reviewed to ensure the parks, recreation and non-motorized system remains safe and secure for all users.

Public Art

Mason is a community that puts a strong value on public art. Many beautiful sculptures and murals of varying sizes and styles can be seen throughout the City.

Parks and Trails offer an opportunity for outdoor art installations. The Lansing Art Trail is an excellent example of a public-private partnership between the Lansing Art Gallery and the City of Lansing Parks and Recreation to enhance the River Trail with professional art installations, some of which are available for purchase.



Photos: Examples of Artwork throughout downtown Mason

3 - Administrative Structure

Organization Chart

Figure 3.1 below shows an organizational chart for the division of labor related to parks and recreation. Maintenance of the City's parks and recreational facilities is provided by the Parks, Cemeteries and Forestry Division under the Department of Public Works (DPW). The City of Mason's Customer Service and administrative support staff from multiple departments support the operations of parks and recreation. Customer Service handles calls and general questions, user agreements, and pavilion or room reservations. The Community Development office is responsible for facilitating the development of the plan as well as maintaining records for land use, leases, and assisting with user agreements.




Figure 3.1: Organizational Chart

Funding

There are several existing or potential funding sources available for parks and recreation facility improvements. In addition to the general fund, other potential sources of funding for parks and recreation include: a detailed millage (such as a land acquisition millage), user fees, revenue bonds, the Rayner Bond Fund, donation of land and/or easements, and contractual agreements involving privatization. The following is a brief description of current funding sources and other potential sources the City may consider.

General Fund

The General Fund is the basic operating fund for the City of Mason. It is also the traditional source of operating funds for parks and recreation. General Fund revenues are derived from property taxes, state-shared revenues, federal grants, license and permit fees, charges for services, interest on investments, and court fines or forfeitures. Recreation program user fees are usually channeled through the General Fund.

Millage

A property tax millage can be used to finance specific parks and recreation projects or to operate recreation facilities. The City of Mason has millage capacity that would allow them to assess a millage without a vote of the people. Within the past ten years, a non-binding vote was placed on the City of Mason ballot to gauge voter interest in a millage for parks and recreation. At the time, approximately 60% of voters said that they would support a millage.

During the community outreach portion of this planning process, it was noted that over 90% of the opinion survey respondents who answered this question acknowledged support for a dedicated park mileage for park improvements and maintenance in addition to the current level of funding. Categorically, of those responding to the survey; (28.38%) supported \$1-50 increase, (30.67%) supported \$51-\$100 increase, (14.19%) supported \$101-\$150 increase, (7.99%) supported \$151-\$200 and (9.46%) supported over \$200 per annum increase per household. Only (9.31%) said they would not support a tax increase. This is overwhelming support from those people (622) who answered this question, which represents (7.54%) of the population. This is consistent with a polling question that was posed over a decade or so ago to citizens, when asked to increase tax revenue for a dedicated park millage. Therefore it is strongly recommend that the City of Mason raise the tax rate by 1 mil to support parks and by 2 mils should the City Council decide to decrease funding from the general fund so that there is a net gain of at least 1 mil dedicated toward park improvements and sustainable maintenance in parks and non-motorized facilities. For example, based on current property values, 1 mil equals \$220,800.

User Fees

The community can charge fees to the users of specific recreation facilities, or for enrollment in recreation programs. User fees can provide substantial support for park facilities. Other communities throughout Michigan have established user fees for tennis courts, the use of lighted athletic fields, and the use of indoor facilities. User fees are a promising source of funding in a municipality if used selectively for specific facilities and services.

Bond Programs

A number of bond programs can be used to finance construction of parks and recreation facilities:

- **General Obligation Bonds:** General obligation bonds are issued for specific community projects and may not be used

for other purposes. These bonds are usually paid off with property tax revenues.

- **Revenue Bonds:** Revenue bonds are issued for construction of public projects that generate revenues. The bonds are then retired using income generated by the project. For example, revenue bonds may be issued for construction of a concession and restroom facility at a community park.
- **Special Assessment Bonds:** Special assessment bonds are issued to pay for projects that benefit a particular segment of the population. For example, recreation improvements that benefit a defined subdivision or neighborhood could be financed using special assessment bonds, in which case the residents who receive the benefit would be assessed.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources Grants

The following is a summary of the three viable recreation grant programs now available through the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR):

Note: All MDNR Grant applications must be submitted by April 1st of the application year.

Recreation Passport Grants: PA 32 of 2010 created the Local Public Recreation Facilities Fund to be used for the development of public recreation facilities for local units of government. Money for this fund is derived from the sale of the Recreation Passport which replaced the resident Motor Vehicle Permit (MVP) — or window sticker — for state park entrance. Development grants of \$7,500 to \$45,000 are available to local governments with a focus on renovating and improving existing parks, although new parks are also eligible. The grantee must provide at least a 25% match. Projects are evaluated based on project need, site quality, project quality, applicant history, and, if two projects receive the same evaluation score, a criterion based on the project cost per capita.

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF): Eligible projects include community recreation and trailway improvements. These are grants of \$30,000 to \$100,000 to local governments for development of facilities such as athletic fields, tennis courts, playgrounds, trails, and picnic areas, including support facilities, and the renovation and retro-fitting of existing facilities to make them accessible to persons with disabilities. Funds are provided through federal appropriations from the National Park Service. The grant match basis is fifty percent (50%) MDNR grant and fifty percent (50%) local match. Projects are evaluated based on project need, applicant history, site and project quality, and a fourth criterion based on the type of proposed project.

Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund (MNRTF). Communities must have an approved recreation plan to apply for this grant. Eligible projects include acquisition of land or rights in land for recreational uses or for protection of the land because of its environmental importance or scenic beauty, including additions to existing parks, forest lands, or wildlife areas. Development of public outdoor recreation facilities is also eligible (such as picnic areas, beaches, boating access, fishing and hunting facilities, winter sports areas, playgrounds, athletic fields, tennis courts, and trails). Funds are provided through the sale of oil and mineral leases on State land. Local contributions equal to at least twenty-five percent (25%) of the project cost are required.

There is no minimum or maximum amount for land acquisition projects. The minimum allowable grant for development projects is \$15,000 and the maximum is \$300,000. There are six special initiatives approved by the Trust Fund Board of Trustees for 2013. Proposals will receive special attention if they:

- Acquire land or develop trailways that contribute to an overall state trail system; or

- Provide urban recreation opportunities; or
- Acquire lands open to hunting or development of hunting-related facilities, such as shooting ranges; or
- Acquire lands that provide for deer habitat with thermal cover; or
- Local shooting ranges or state/local shooting range partnerships; or
- Acquire projects that create, establish, and protect wildlife/ecological corridors by connecting to and/or buffering existing protected and managed state or local natural areas, forests or game area.

Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) Clean Michigan Initiative (CMI)

The CMI is created under Section 6(1) of Part 196, Clean Michigan Initiative Implementation, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended. The CMI is a general obligation bond, totaling \$675 million. Most of this money is for programs administered by the Department of Environmental Quality for various redevelopment and remediation activities, including brown-field redevelopment.

In 1998, voters approved \$100 million in bonds for parks and recreation development and renovations. \$50 million in grants to local units and development and renovation of public recreation facilities were approved, with the other \$50 million approved for extensive state park renovations. The MDNR supplements the bonds with a matching \$50 million from other funding sources, including state park user fees, the Waterways fund, the Federal Coastal Zone Management, and Land and Water Conservation Fund grants.

MDOT Grants

The following is a summary of the two viable recreation/non-motorized transportation grant programs now available through the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT):

Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is a school-based international movement to make it safe, convenient and fun for children, including those with disabilities, to bicycle and walk to school.

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

TAP is a competitive grant program that funds projects such as bike paths, streetscapes, and historic preservation of transportation facilities that enhance Michigan's intermodal transportation system, promote walkability, and improve quality of life for Michigan citizens.

Donations

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

Foundations

A foundation is a special non-profit legal entity that is established as a mechanism through which land, cash, and securities can be donated for the benefit of parks and recreation services. The foundation board of directors disburses assets according to a predetermined plan. Funding for recreation facilities through foundations is very limited.

Lease or Contractual Agreements

The City could consider contracts with private entrepreneurs to provide services at city-owned park facilities, such as recreation programming, food service, or facility maintenance. Typically, the privatization of services can increase recreation opportunities available to residents, while maintaining the City's administrative costs. Leasing land to private organizations or clubs can also be beneficial. One example where the City is already employing this strategy is with the Sycamore Creek Garden Club. When entering into these partnerships it is important to have contracts or memorandums of understanding in place to solidify the agreements and avoid future conflicts.

Public Use Conveyances

Administered by the MDNR, this program provides state and lands acquired through delinquent taxes for local government units for public use. Acceptable uses of land acquired under this program include development of local parks.

Park Funding

The City of Mason Parks and Recreation 2019-20 projected budget is \$889,895.00. The funding for parks and recreation provides for capital improvement projects, as well as park and cemetery operations and maintenance.

The largest single source of funding for Mason's Parks and Recreation comes from the City General Fund. Michigan Department of Natural Resources Grant funds have also been used for park improvements. Other sources include facility rental fees, grants, and the Rayner Bond Fund.

The following chart represents expenditures for Mason's parks and recreation system, including a projected budget for 2019-20.

	OM-CIP	Operations/Maintenance		CIP		
	<i>Grand Total</i>	<i>Parks/Ball Diamonds</i>	<i>Cemetery</i>	<i>Parks</i>	<i>Cemetery</i>	<i>Trails</i>
2017-18	\$ 755,778.00	\$181,387.00	\$190,610.00	\$310,876.00	\$47,485.00	\$25,420.00
2018-19	\$1,443,267.00	\$221,197.00	\$249,750.00	\$33,250.00	\$4,500.00	\$934,570.00
2019-20	\$889,895.00	\$249,895.00	\$280,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$160,000.00

Figure 3.2: Parks and Recreation Expenditures Chart

4 - Parks and Recreation Inventory

Overview

Purpose

The recreation inventory is an essential item, it allows the City to assess the quantity, type, and location of existing facilities. It also explains the variety of programs and events offered and where there may be opportunities for new programs and events. It serves to help identify where new facilities should be built and demonstrates where ADA upgrades are needed. The facilities inventory should be continually updated as renovations and additions occur so that the list is always up-to-date.

Park Classification

The National Recreation and Parks Association published guidelines for park classification based on size and service area. These categories were used to classify the parks of the City of Mason. The classifications used in this report are as follows:

Classification	General Description	Location Criteria	Size Criteria
Mini-Park	Used to address limited, isolated or unique recreational needs.	Less than a 1/4 mile distance in residential setting.	Between 2500 sq. ft. and one acre in size.
Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood park remains the basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreation and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on informal active and passive recreation.	1/4 to 1/2-mile distance and uninterrupted by non-residential roads and other physical barriers.	5 acres is considered minimum size. 5 to 10 acres is optimal.
School-Park	Depending on circumstances, combining parks with school sites can fulfill the space requirements for other classes of parks, such as neighborhood, community, sports complex and special use.	Determined by location of school district property.	Variable – depends on function.
Community Park	Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park (see appendix for definition of “neighborhood park”). Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces.	Determined by the quality and suitability of the site. Usually serves two or more neighborhoods and 1/2 to 3 mile distance.	As needed to accommodate desired uses. Usually between 30 and 50 acres.
Regional Park	Land set aside for preservation of natural beauty or environmental significance, recreation use or historic or cultural interest use.	Located to serve several communities within 1 hour driving time.	Optimal size is 200+ acres, size varies based on use.

Figure 4.1: Table - NRPA Recommended Classification System for Local and Regional Recreation Open Space and Trails

Accessibility Assessment

Complying with accessibility standards and planning for universal design are two extremely important efforts that a municipality must undertake in its effort to protect the health, safety, and welfare of its people. This is true not only for those disabled by birth or by accident, but also for the growing population of people entering old age who are finding normal tasks more and more challenging to do. Many able-bodied persons forget that disability is often an eventuality as one grows older. Therefore, the City of Mason should seek to improve the accessibility of its environment not simply to comply with law, but to think more broadly and take steps towards developing a compassionate, inclusive, and accessible community, unencumbered by physical barriers.


This plan rates the accessibility of its existing park facilities, both the facilities themselves (as appropriate), as well as the access routes to them. This rating system is from the Michigan DNR’s guidelines for recreation plans. It is intended to establish a baseline so that accessibility needs can be assessed and incorporated into capital improvement projects. This evaluation is not comprehensive and does not identify specific deficiencies.

The following ranking system was applied to each park:


Accessibility Grade	Definition
1	None of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines.
2	Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines.
3	Most of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines.
4	The entire park meets accessibility guidelines.
5	The entire park was developed/renovated using the principals of universal design.

Figure 4.2: Accessibility Assessment Table


Park Location Map




Park Service Area Map (Vehicular Access)



Park Service Area Map (Non-Motorized Access)




Play Equipment Distance Map



Legend

- Mason City Parks
- Private Parks
- Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail
- Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail (To be completed 2020)
- Trail Heads
- Railroads
- Water
- Schools
- Mason City Limits
- 1/2 Mile Radius -Public Park Play Equipment
- 1/2 Mile Radius - Private Parks Play Equipment



Existing Recreation Facilities Inventory Table

PARKS AND FACILITIES	ACRES	ACCESSIBILITY ASSESSMENT	PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE ACCESS	PARKING	PARKING SPACES (ADA SPACES)	SITE AMENITIES					INDOOR FACILITIES				PASSIVE FACILITIES				ACTIVE FACILITIES										NOTES						
						CONCESSIONS	BENCHES	DRINKING FOUNTAINS	GRILLS	PAVILION	PICNIC TABLES	RESTROOMS	GYMNASIUM	MEETING ROOM	MULTI-PURPOSE FACILITIES	SKATING/ICE RINK	SWIMMING POOL	FISHING DOCK	FISHING PONDS	NATURE/WALKING TRAILS (MILES)	AUDITORIUM	COMMUNITY GARDEN	SLEDDING HILL	HORSESHOES	FITNESS EQUIPMENT	PLAY EQUIPMENT	FRISBEE GOLF	BASEBALL/SOFTBALL DIAMOND		BASKETBALL COURT	FOOTBALL FIELD	RUNNING TRACK	SOCCER FIELD	TENNIS COURT	SKATE PARK
Community Parks and Natural Resource Areas																																			
Bicentennial Park	2.27	3	YES		8(0)																												Pink Schoolhouse, wellhead site, Parking on-street or in adjacent school lot		
Bond Park	5.30	1	YES	PV	92(2)	3	1	1			X												1						1	1					
Hayes Park	9.22	2	YES	PV	166(2)			1	X	11	X								X			X	1	1			1	2					Well site/wellhead on site		
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail		2	YES		27(2)										2.5																		x		
Laylin Park	7.20	2	YES	PV	40(1)	5		2	X	1	X											X											Several new improvements in 2019		
Maple Grove Park	5.20	2	YES		10(2)																												Adjacent to Maple Grove Cemetery		
Rayner Park	60.00	2	YES	PV/GR	203(1)			3	15	X	34	X			X						1	X	X	1	1			2				1	Assessment of existing playground conducted in 2019		
Total	89.19					0	8	4	19	3	46	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	2	1	1	3	1	3	2	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	1
Neighborhood and Mini Parks																																			
Lee Austin Park	0.50	1	YES	GR	0(0)	1		1	1	1												X	X											Floods regularly, parking is by easement on Consumers Energy property	
Griffin Park	0.65	2	YES	GR	14(0)	1	1	1	1	1																									
Total	1.15					0	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	

Legend: GR = Gravel, PV = Paved, W = Wood Chips, X = one or more units

Accessibility Assessment:

- 1 = none of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines
- 2 = some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines
- 3 = most of the facilities/park area meet accessibility guidelines

- 4 = the entire facility/park meets accessibility guidelines
- 5 = the entire facility/park was developed/renovated using the principals of universal design

Park Profiles

Bicentennial Park

Located at 707 W Ash St, Mason, MI 48854

This 2.27 acre community park is home to the “Pink Schoolhouse” a schoolhouse for the Mason community used in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s. The space behind the schoolhouse is home to the Sycamore Creek Garden Club who program and maintain a learning garden and outdoor classroom. The park also includes open lawn that can be used for recreational activities and community gatherings.



Statistics

Type: Community Park

Size (Acres): 2.27

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2

Existing Challenges

- The park lacks any educational materials describing the Pink Schoolhouse.
- The open space of the park lacks amenities which limits the range of activities that the park can be used for.
- No memorandum of understanding exists relating to the maintenance or operations of the pink schoolhouse.




Bond Park

Located between Randolph St. and Okemos Rd. on Columbia St.

Bond Park is intersected by the Rayner Creek Drain within Ingham County Drain District 9. The park is made up of a lighted softball field, a roller hockey rink, and a skatepark.

Existing Challenges

- No ADA accessible pathway connecting the south parking lot, the softball field, and the restroom building.
- No ADA accessible viewing areas for softball, skatepark.
- Graffiti in the skatepark. One option to resolve this issue is to create an outlet where graffiti is acceptable.
- Softball lighting is old and needs to be replaced
- Drainage issues with softball field



Statistics

Type: Community Park

Size (Acres): 5.30

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 1



Attracting skaters from throughout the region and country, Mason's Bond Skatepark is a one of a kind, fun concrete skatepark designed to include flow park elements and a mini bowl. Bond Skatepark accommodates all skill levels with beginner to advanced features skillfully packaged into a 12,000 sq. ft. state of the art facility created by world renowned skatepark builders Team Pain.

Designed by skaters, built by skaters, for skaters, team Pain owner Tim Payne has been building skate parks for over 30 years in countries all over the world. His work includes competition parks, theme parks, skateparks for movies, television, commercials, ESPN X-Games, MTV, as well as municipal parks.

Griffin Park

Located on S. Jefferson St between E. South St. and E. Cherry St.

Griffin Park is a triangular shaped park that is between S. Jefferson St. and the Railroad. It has a small gazebo, gravel parking lot, and a picnic table for smaller picnics.

Existing Challenges

- South of Griffin, across the rail line, is the Silver Respite Trailhead, there is currently a gap in the sidewalk which prevents pedestrian travel from Griffin Park to the trailhead.
- An overlook deck could be added along the west side of the park to take advantage of the views of the Sycamore Creek.
- No user agreement currently exists with the funeral home that regularly uses the parking lot.



Statistics

Type: Mini Park

Size (Acres): .65

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2



Hayes Park

Located east of US-127 on W. Columbia Rd.

This community park has a lighted softball field on the north end. South of the softball field is a soccer field, sledding hill, large play structure, and an accessible picnic pavilion with picnic tables and a grill. The south end of the park features a basketball court and two tennis courts which are regularly used for pickleball.

There is a City wellhead and wellhouse on the site just south of the tennis courts. There is an existing irrigation system in the park.



Statistics

Type: Community Park

Size (Acres): 9.22

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2



Existing Challenges

- Basketball court is in need of resurfacing.
- Tennis courts need major repair or replacement.
- The restroom building located near the ballfield should be evaluated for ADA compliance.
- Grading issues on the softball field.
- There is no ADA accessible access to the softball field and no accessible viewing areas.
- To ensure consistency among all users, process for formal agreements between the City and the athletic clubs that use the park needs to be improved.
- Significant drainage issues exist throughout the park.

Laylin Park

Located between Lawton St. and Steele St. on E. Maple St.

Laylin Park is a neighborhood park with a playground, two aerated ponds with two fishing docks each, a pavilion and restroom building, grills, benches, and picnic tables. The two ponds and the creek that runs through the park are part of the Ingham County Rayner Creek Drain.

The City of Mason is currently partnering with the Capital Area District Library to construct a "storybook walk" within Laylin Park.



Statistics

Type: Community Park

Size (Acres): 7.20

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2

Existing Challenges

- Paved walkways do not meet ADA standards.
- Safety surfacing around the playground needs to be filled in to match the grade of the sidewalk.
- Poor visibility to the restrooms is a crime and safety concern.



Lee Austin Park

Located at 320 W. Ash St, Mason, MI 48854

Lee Austin Park is a .50 acre park located on the banks of the Sycamore creek. Passing through the park is a section of the Hayhoe Riverwalk. There is a pavilion adjacent to the park on property owned by Consumers Energy. The park also has a small playground and "Health Quest" fitness equipment. The flower bed on the southwestern border of the park along S. Lansing St. is maintained by members of the Austin family

The Sycamore Creek is a state waterway under the jurisdiction of the State of Michigan. The park stores water during significant flooding events.



Statistics

Type: Mini Park

Size (Acres): .50

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 1

Existing Challenges

- Steep slope of the Hayhoe Riverwalk does not meet ADA standards.
- New safety surfacing needed under the playground/workout area.
- The drive, parking, and shelter are not on City owned property and are accessed via an easement. The current drive and parking lot is gravel but is uneven and should be resurfaced with compacted gravel or asphalt.
- The existing shelter should be evaluated for structural integrity.



Maple Grove Cemetery and Park

Located at 213 N Jefferson St, Mason, MI 48854

Maple Grove Cemetery is a 5.20 acre community cemetery and park. It is home to a section of the Hayhoe Riverwalk as well as two bridge crossings over the Sycamore Creek. One of which leads to a trailhead and community garden.

Existing Challenges

- Currently the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail in this area is a shared vehicular pathway and slopes do not meet ADA standards. Not having a separated non-motorized pathway and steep slopes lead to safety and navigability concerns.
- Restrooms are available however they cannot easily be found, are not ADA accessible, and in need of major repair or replacement.



Statistics

Type: Community Park

Size (Acres): 5.20

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2



Rayner Park

Located at 738 E Ash St, Mason, MI 48854

Purchased for \$1 in 2016, this 60 Acre park is home to soccer fields, a baseball field, a basketball court, beach volleyball, frisbee golf, horse shoes, a large wooden playground, and a plethora of picnic tables and grills. The pavilion is great for large group picnics and get-togethers with plenty of protected and accessible tables as well as two larger grills. In the south end of the park there is a winding nature trail that connects to the neighboring high school. The trail features plant identification plaques along the route to provide greater interest and education. The park also includes two ponds which connect to the Ingham County Rayner Creek Drain.



Statistics

Type: Regional Park

Size (Acres): 60

ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2



Rayner Nature Trail

The Rayner Nature Trail is a hidden gem located at the southern end of Rayner Park. This is a series of unimproved trails that wind their way through the forested area and connect to Mason High School. The trails feature educational markers which describe the various tree species found within the surrounding forest. The Mason FFA (Future Farmers of America) also use this wooded area for tapping maple trees for syrup production.



Existing Challenges

- The majority of Rayner Park's roads and sidewalks are in good condition, however vehicular circulation should be evaluated.
- No pedestrian pathways that are separated from the drive exist. This causes flow and safety concerns.
- Evaluate the restroom facilities for ADA standards.
- A professional evaluation was completed on the existing wooden play structure in 2019. The resulting determination is that the existing play structure needs to either be brought up to standards or removed and replaced.
 - Chromated copper arsenate (CCA) is a common wood preservative found in this style of playground. Studies show that CCA-treated wood is continually leaching (releasing) arsenic to the surface of the wood. Increasing concern over the use of wood treated with CCA in playground structures has arisen from potential exposure to arsenic of children playing in these playgrounds. This is something to consider when weighing the options of repairing or replacing the existing play structure.
- The disc golf course does not currently have any baskets.
- No formal agreement exists between the City and the user groups and athletic clubs that use the park.
- A condition of purchase was that appropriate areas for parking approximately 584 vehicles continue to be available for parking cars during the Ingham County Fair each year in August.

DNR Recreation Grant Inventory

The recreation grant inventory provides a chronological history of the grants that were previously awarded to the City. The MDNR requires that the grant history be included in parks and recreation plans. The grant history also provides an opportunity to reflect on these past projects. The City can analyze what worked well, what didn't, and have a better understanding of how to approach future grant projects. The City of Mason have not applied for MDNR grants since receiving the Recreation Passport grant in 2013.

MDNR Grant History - City of Mason, Ingham County, MI

Project Number*	Project Title	Project Year	Grant Amount	Project Description	Grant Status	
26-01060 B3	Mason West Side Park (Hayes Park)	1978	\$55,332.48	Ballfield, fencing, pavilion, site improvements and landscaping, two tennis courts and parking lots	Closed	
Post Completion Inspection: Improvements described in the grant application have been built, and are used regularly.						
26-00888	Mason Tennis Courts	1979	\$10,000.00	Develop less than 1 acre, for 2 lighted tennis courts, sign with public schedule, and LWCF sign NOTE: 06/07/2007	Closed	
Post Completion Inspection: Lease with school district not renewed-no longer part of post completion responsibilities.						
CM00-315	Mason Skate Park	2000	\$179,000.00	Construction of a 10,000 SF skate park to accommodate in line skating and skate-boarding, to include paved path, mogul field, "bowl", "waterfall", two bridges, and in-line hockey rink for roller hockey and free skating.	Closed	
Post Completion Inspection: Improvements described in the grant application have been built, are in good and are used regularly.						
RP13-442	Maple Grove Park Riverwalk Pedestrian Bridge and Trailhead Sign	2013	\$30,000.00	Development to include a pedestrian bridge and trailhead signage for Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	Closed	
Post Completion Inspection: Improvements described in the grant application have been built, and are used regularly.						

*The first characters of the project number indicates funding sources as follows:

26 = Land and Water Conservation Fund RP = Recreation Passport CM = Clean Michigan Initiative

**Any changes to grant funded parks or facilities require an approval process through the MDNR.

Ingham County Trail Millage Grant History

Since the voter approval of the Ingham County Trails and Parks Millage, the City of Mason has been awarded just under one million dollars in millage funds for improvements to their trail system. The various projects that the millage has helped fund are described in the chart below.

Ingham County Trails and Parks Millage Grant History - City of Mason

Project Title	Project Year	Project Funding	Project Description	Status	
Maple Grove Cemetery/ Community Garden Bridge	2013	Ingham County Trail Millage	\$16,830.56	Development to include a pedestrian bridge and trailhead signage for Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	Closed
		Dart Foundation	\$10,000.00		
		Private	\$22,000.00		
		Tri County Bike	\$10,000.00		
		State of Michigan	\$28,976.24		
		City Contribution	\$0		
Total Project Cost		\$87,806.80			
Howell Road Extension of the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail.	2019	Ingham County Trail Millage	\$801,746.00	This extension would continue from the northern end at Howell Road west to Kerns Road. This extension will also include a trailhead at the City's north Water Tower. This extension will address safety concerns along Howell where no sidewalk exists and eliminate parking on the side of the road, while adding to our linear park.	Submitting final closeout documents
		Dart Foundation	\$55,525.00		
		George and Lisa Hayhoe	\$200,000.00		
		City Contribution	\$12,040.95		
Total Project Cost		\$1,069,311.95			
Kerns Road Extension of the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail.	2020	Ingham County Trail Millage	\$153,281.00	This extension would continue from the northern end at Howell Road south to Cedar Street. This extension will address safety concerns along Kerns where no sidewalk exists and connect the trail to the business corridor.	Engineering completed with construction delayed until Spring 2020
		City Contribution	\$17,031.00		
		Total Project Cost			

Program Inventory

The City of Mason does not offer programming, however they rely on private partners to provide programming within their parks and facilities.

Activities and Events

Event Name	Private Partner	Description
Mason Spring Fling	Mason Area Chamber of Commerce	150 Vendors-shopping, food, face painting, blow up fun for the kids, and more.
Sun Dried Music Festival	Mason DDA	A free community festival that features a variety of entertainment on two stages.
Down Home Days Festival	Mason Area Chamber of Commerce	An end of summer celebration with over 100 community, commercial, and food vendors, and is fun for the whole family. Entertainment for all ages including a Ladies Night, an award-winning rodeo, The Saloon, a parade, arts and crafts on the courthouse lawn and The Frontier Market.
Mason City Open House	City of Mason	Residents are invited to a fun and informative event in which they have an opportunity to meet City Staff and learn about City Services.
Coffee & Cleanup - Mason Hayhoe Trail	Friends of the Lansing Regional Trails	Community members receive complimentary coffee. Then they head out on the trail to rake leaves, trim any overgrown brush, and make the trail more enjoyable for all.
Sunflower House	Sycamore Creek Garden Club	A youth garden club and learning center located within Bicentennial Park.

Rentals and Services

The following facilities are available for rent for a small fee. Fee structure described below.

Facility	Operations Department	Rates
Rayner Park Pavilion	City Hall	\$50 Resident; \$75 Non-resident
Griffin Park Gazebo	City Hall	\$50 Resident; \$75 Non-resident
Laylin Park Pavilion	City Hall	\$50 Resident; \$75 Non-resident
Hayes Park Pavilion	City Hall	\$50 Resident; \$75 Non-resident
Bond Park	City Hall	\$150.00
City Hall Community Room	City Hall	\$100 Resident; \$200 Non-resident
Maple Street Mall - vacant lot	City Hall	\$50.00

Regional Recreation Opportunities

Other recreation opportunities exist around the region. Below are listed some of the other private and public recreation facilities that are available within Mason or in nearby municipalities which Mason residents have access to.

Connect Sports

A faith-based youth sports organization which features archery, basketball, cheerleading, flag football and soccer.

The ministries involved include:

- Mason First Church of the Nazarene
- Eden United Brethren
- Aurelius Baptist Church
- Mason Community Church

The ROC (Recreation Outreach Center)

Built on 45 acres of property purchased by the Mason First Nazarene church opened in April of 2012. This 16,000 square foot structure includes a gym featuring a full-size basketball court, an activity room with large-screen video monitors, a kitchen, and a room designed for use as a state-of-the-art computer lab.

Ingham County Fairgrounds

The Ingham County Fair and Exposition Center hosts agricultural, educational, and entertainment events. Situated on a 72 acre, park-like setting, the Ingham County Fairgrounds and Exposition Center offer unique experiences to the Greater Lansing Community. Whether it is a wedding hosted in the newly renovated banquet facility or one of the nearly 70 events hosted on the Ingham County Fair and Exposition Center campus, there is something for everyone.

Hawk Island County Park

A 100 acre park, located on Cavanaugh Road, between Pennsylvania Avenue and Aurelius Road, in south Lansing. Hawk Island offers rowboat and pedal boat rental, a swimming beach, Splash Pad, picnic areas and shelters, sand volleyball, horseshoes, paved accessible walkways (1.5 miles) and fishing docks and a concession stand.

Burchfield County Park

With 540 acres of scenic woods, trails and beach, Burchfield Park is Ingham County's largest park. Ribboned throughout by the Grand River, this outdoor haven harbors some of the best bank and boat fishing available in Ingham County.

Burchfield Park offers a beach, bathhouse, canoe & kayak rentals and trips, cross country skiing & rental, hiking trails, horseshoe pits, two 18 hole disc golf courses, mountain biking trails, nature day camp, pedal boat rental, picnic grounds and shelters, playgrounds, sand volleyball courts, sledding hills, softball diamond, stocked fishing pond, winter snack bar, and a winter warming lodge.

Comparison to Recreation Standards

Recreation Facilities Evaluation

The following table evaluates current park facilities in the City based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations.

Type of Recreation Facility	Standard	Existing Public Facilities	Need for Existing Population	Surplus/ Deficiency	School/Non-City Owned Facilities	Combined Surplus/ Deficiency
Basketball Courts	1/5,000	2	2	0	3	3
Tennis Courts	1/2,000	2	5	-3	8	5
Volleyball	1/5,000	1	2	-1	0	-1
Ball Diamonds	1/5,000	3	2	1	8**	9
Little League Diamonds (Lighted)	1/30,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Football Fields	1/20,000	0	1	-1	3	2
Soccer Fields	1/10,000	3	1	2	10	12
Golf Courses (9 hole)	1/25,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Golf Courses (18 hole)	1/50,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Driving Range	1/50,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Swimming Pools	1/20,000	0	1	-1	2	2
Ice Rinks (Indoor)	1/100,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Running Track (1/4 mile)	1/20,000	0	1	-1	1	0
Playgrounds/Structures	1/3,000	4	3	1	4	5
Paved Trails (miles)	1 system	1	1	0	0	0

Footnotes:

- Based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations
- Based on 2010 Census Data (City of Mason's total population: 8,252)

*The City of Mason ball diamonds include:

- 2) Lighted adult softball fields that can be used for U14 baseball.
- 1) Unlit youth ballfield

**Mason Public Schools ball diamonds are all designated for use by high school age or younger.

Park Acreage Evaluation

The following table evaluates current park acreage in the City based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations. The comparisons in the chart below are based on NRPA standards, however every community is unique and many factors should be considered when evaluating deficiencies and priorities. These additional factors can include age and income distribution, neighborhood structure, and recreation interests of your community, as well as the recreation opportunities in nearby communities.

Type of Recreation Facility	Recommended Minimum Acreage per 1,000 Residents	Existing Acreage	Acreage Need for Existing Population	Surplus/ (Deficiency)
Mini Parks	0.25	1.15	2.06	-.91
Neighborhood Parks	1.0	0	8.26	-8.26
Community Parks	5.0	89.19	41.26	47.93
Regional Parks	5.0	0	41.26	-41.26
Total Park Land	11.25	90.34	92.84	-2.5
School Parks	n/a	92.6	n/a	n/a

Footnotes:

- Based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations
- Based on 2010 Census Data (City of Mason's total population: 8,252)

5 - Non-Motorized Facilities

A Case for Non-Motorized Transportation

For many decades, “mobility” was the overarching goal of the transportation industry. With the dawn of the automobile, Americans began enjoying an unprecedented level of mobility. The car opened up opportunities for economic expansion, personal recreation, and access to resources that were previously unavailable. Consider going grocery shopping without a personal vehicle. Or imagine what it was like to visit Yellowstone before the car. And imagine all of the job opportunities within a 50 mile radius that would have been unavailable to most people before the automobile. It is obvious that the automobile has transformed our society in many positive ways.

At the same time, the rise of the automobile in our society has contributed to the decline of mobility at the pedestrian scale. Vehicular dominance has resulted in spread-out developments, far-flung subdivisions isolated from community assets, and stretched out commercial corridors. It has also culminated in the preferential planning of car-centric roadways that prioritize efficient movement of vehicles with little regard for other modes of transportation. Faster, wider roads, stretching for greater distances, intersecting cities and towns, became the standard. Walking to school, your friend’s house, your community center, your community park, your grocery store, or your favorite shop has become increasingly difficult, if not impossible. With many community assets spread out, or too dangerous to get to on foot, Americans have lost personal mobility within their communities. The prioritization of vehicular mobility has resulted in communities that are no longer “walkable.”

Impact of Unwalkable communities

A community that is unwalkable can be dangerous, unwelcoming, unfriendly, and both physically and socially disconnected. In an unwalkable community there are limited opportunities for community members to interact on a day-to-day basis. People don’t feel safe allowing their children to play outside because of the threat of vehicular traffic. The costs associated with owning and operating a vehicle are forced upon residents because they have no other option. In an unwalkable community, essential services such as grocery stores, schools and medical services are either too far away to walk to, or would be too dangerous to attempt to navigate to, through the roadways and parking lots that prioritize vehicular travel. Jobs that were once within walking distance have moved to the outskirts of the cities and are no longer available to lower income community members who rely upon walking or public transit to get to work. Community health has deteriorated through the elimination of the regular physical activity that was once routine in American life, resulting in chronic diseases like obesity, and the deterioration in cardiovascular health. The impact of an unwalkable community is profound.

Impact of Walkable Communities

In a walkable community, pedestrians are given priority in neighborhood, work, school, and shopping areas. People of all ages and abilities are given access to their community’s gathering places, amenities, and resources. Walkable communities lead to more social interaction, physical fitness, and diminished social disorder such as crime. Traffic calming measures reduce vehicle speeds. Parents feel more comfortable about their children being outside in their neighborhoods with the reduced threat of motor vehicles. Children spend more time outside with

other children so they are more active, physically fit, and healthy. This leads to communities and neighborhoods that are safer, healthier, and friendlier.

A walkable community also provides non-motorized access to education and employment. Economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged students/workers who don't have access to, or can't afford a vehicle now have a means to not only improve themselves, but through being a contributing member of the workforce, help to improve the economy of the community as a whole. Walkable communities are more livable communities and lead to whole, happy, healthy lives for the people who live in them.

NON-MOTORIZED, ACTIVE, human-powered?

The terms non-motorized transportation system and active transportation system as well as human powered transportation system can be used interchangeably. However the use of negatives like the "non" in non-motorized can sometimes give a perception that the non-motorized system is fighting against the motorized or vehicular system, when in fact, if designed properly, the non-motorized and motorized systems can work together to create a unified and all-inclusive transportation system. The use of the term "active" is thought to take away this adversarial connotation and re-orient the terminology to emphasize physical activity, which is an important issue throughout the United States. More and more industry experts and agencies are using the term "active transportation" side-by-side with "non-motorized", and some entities, such as the National Parks and Recreation Association, have dropped "non-motorized" completely in favor of "active transportation".

What Makes up a Non-Motorized Transportation system (NMTS)?

A Non-Motorized Transportation System (NMTS) is made up of a network of infrastructure such as sidewalks, pathways, and bicycle lanes that connect people to places, businesses, and resources throughout the community. The NMTS works in concert with the roadway infrastructure and spans the gaps where the road network does not exist. While NMTS infrastructure may look different from community to community, there are a few basic types of infrastructure that are common to most non-motorized transportation systems.

Sidewalk



Photo 9.1: Sidewalk

A sidewalk is the portion of public right of way between the street and the adjacent properties that is paved or improved and intended for use by pedestrians (although many other types of users usually use them, too). Sidewalks have these common characteristics:

- A paved area 5 to 6 feet wide. (ADA standard is 5 feet).
- Typically concrete, though other materials may be used, such as brick or asphalt.
- Often built by developers as part of their projects, though sometimes they are built by the city or municipality. It is common to have gaps between

sections of sidewalks as a result of development occurring in a non-linear progression.

- Ordinances often place the burden of maintenance and replacement on the adjacent property owners.
- Ordinances often prohibit use of the sidewalk by anyone but pedestrians.

Bicycle Lane



Photo 9.2: Bike lane along a roadway

A bicycle lane is a designated lane of traffic within the roadway that is specifically limited to bicycle use. It is considered the preferred facility for bicycles for two primary reasons: 1) mixing fast bicyclists and slow pedestrians can result in dangerous collisions or conflicts of use, 2) bicycles are more visible to vehicles at intersections when the bicyclists ride in the road as opposed to on a pathway that is adjacent to the road. Bicycle lanes have these common characteristics:

- 5' minimum width when curb is present (AASHTO). (All Mason city streets have curbs)
- 4' minimum width with no curb (AASHTO).
- Greater than 5' is preferred depending on the context of the roadway.
- Designated with markings, arrows, and signage (AASHTO).
- Green lane coloring may be used (AASHTO).

Shared Use Path




Photo 9.3: Cross-section of a shared-use path

A shared use path is a multi-use facility for non-motorized traffic that extends the non-motorized transportation system beyond the road right of way. All types of non-motorized users, including bicyclists, rollerbladers, skateboarders, walkers, runners, and push scooters, are encouraged to share the same path. Shared use paths are commonly referred to as "trails," and are often given names with the word "Trail" in them, but they are not technically trails. Trails are typically natural, "unimproved," or unpaved pathways. Shared use paths are always paved, and have specific design criteria. Shared use paths have these common characteristics:

- The minimum recommended width (AASHTO) is 10' for two way traffic. Up to 14' wide is common.
- The minimum recommended width (AASHTO) for two way traffic with bicyclist passing in the center is 11'.
- Smaller widths to as little as 8' are allowed (AASHTO), though only in low traffic volume scenarios.
- May split the path to segregated uses (AASHTO) using a minimum of 5' for the pedestrian portion and 10' for the bicycle portion. These segregated lanes can be adjacent to each other or physically separated.
- Typically asphalt, though concrete or other materials may be used.
- Inclusion of a shared use path is complementary to bicycle lanes or other types of bicycle facilities in the road right of way and should not be considered a replacement for those facilities.

Side path




Photo 9.4: Example of side path running parallel to a roadway

A side path is like a sidewalk, but it is intended for more than pedestrians. It is found parallel to the roadway in the public right of way, but it behaves more like a shared use path. Bicyclists, rollerbladers, and other types of people are allowed to use the side path alongside pedestrians. In order to accommodate the varied uses, side paths are wider than sidewalks. Often a side path is simply a shared use path that has a portion of the path routed alongside a road. Side paths have these common characteristics:

- A two-way side path uses the same design criteria (AASHTO) as a shared use path (see Shared Use Path).
- A two way side path is typically only on one side of the road.
- A one-way side path may be smaller than the typical shared use path. Design criteria is based on the context of the site.
- One-way side paths must be placed on both sides of the road to accommodate proper traffic patterns. Signage must be present to identify one-way usage (AASHTO).
- Typically made of asphalt, though concrete or other

materials may be used.

- Inclusion of a side path is complementary to bicycle lanes or other types of bicycle facilities in the road right of way and should not be considered a replacement for those facilities.

Paved Shoulders



Photo 9.5: Paved shoulder along roadway

The “paved shoulder” is the portion of paved roadway outside of the white line on the right side of the road. Paved shoulders are not travel lanes and they are typically designed for temporary parking, emergency pullovers, and emergency access. They can be a variety of widths; some paved shoulders are only 6”, others are greater than 8’. While paved shoulders are not intended to be used as travel lanes, they can be an excellent facility for bicyclists (and sometimes pedestrians) to utilize under certain circumstances, acting as unofficial bike lanes. For paved shoulders to be used in an NMTS, they should have these common characteristics:

- 4’ minimum width when no curb is present (AASHTO).
- 5’ minimum width when curb or other vertical elements (such as guard rails) are present (AASHTO).
- On roads with speeds over 50 mph, widths greater than 5’ should be utilized (AASHTO).
- Provided on both sides of the road (AASHTO).

- 4' minimum shoulder maintained at bypass lanes (AASHTO).

to facilitate bicycle use such as: bicycle detectors at intersection signals, appropriate signal timing for bicycle speeds, storm drain modifications, and other enhancements.

Shared Lanes



Photo 9.6: Example of shared lane pavement markings

A shared lane is a lane in a road that is used by both bicyclists and automobiles. What many people don't know, however, is that all roads by default are "shared," except where prohibited by regulation or statute. Bicycles are considered legal vehicles and are allowed to utilize all lanes of traffic like a car. However, some automobile drivers don't know this and they treat bicyclists as if they belong in the ditch rather than on the road. "Shared lanes" are therefore enhanced lanes that facilitate bicycle use and promote greater awareness and respect for bicycle traffic. Enhanced "shared lanes" have these common characteristics:

- Typically only implemented on low-speed roads, 35 mph or less.
- Lane markings added to the middle of the driving lane to indicate bicycle usage is permitted and expected. Can be positioned to indicate approximate expected bicycle position within the lane to facilitate safer passing practices.
- Signage signals to drivers that bicyclists may be entering the roadway and/or that they have the right to use the entire lane.
- Additional roadway facilities may be implemented

Wayfinding



Photo 9.7: Example of a wayfinding sign

Wayfinding signs are important tools in identifying routes and helping people reach their destinations. At the pedestrian and bicycle level, these signs are small and meant to be read at lower speeds. AASHTO provides guidance on wayfinding signs for bicycle facilities that can easily be incorporated into defined bicycle routes. Signs for pedestrians are often designed by the communities based on the context of the surroundings (downtown, parks, etc) and often take on a variety of forms. It is also important to consider how to use wayfinding signs to direct vehicular traffic to certain facilities, such as parks or trail heads, in order to facilitate easy access for those who may choose to drive to a certain location along the non-motorized transportation network.

Controlled Crossings

In locations where the non-motorized transportation facilities intersect with other, certain crossings, improvements should be considered to enhance safety. All crossings should be authorized by, and coordinated with the proper transportation authority. Typical crossings include:

- **Railroad crossings:** A portion of bicycle lane or pathway that is designed to intersect railroad tracks at a 90 degree angle. This allows wheels to cross the tracks without getting caught between in the grooves. Crossing railroads at a sharper angle can trap the wheel in the track and cause the rider to lose control.
- **Mid-block crossings:** A crossing point positioned in the middle of a block rather than at an intersection. These crossings provide places to safely cross a road where traveling to the next intersection is impractical. They take on many forms and are designed to each specific situation.
- **Striped crossings:** A painted area that is typically accompanied by signage to indicate legal pedestrian crossings on roadways. Used as a low-cost first step in creating a safer controlled crossing. Often used by itself or in tandem with signalization.
- **Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacon (RRFB):** A crossing sign with pedestrian-activated, flashing lights mounted on the same post. Used to make mid-block crossings more visible where moderate traffic volumes are present. Requires traffic study to determine need.
- **HAWK or PHB crossings:** An overhead, standalone traffic light, activated by pedestrians, typically in high traffic volume situations at mid-block crossings or at roundabouts. Used to temporarily stop traffic, allowing pedestrians to cross the road safely. Requires traffic study to determine need.



Photo 9.8: Mid-block crossing with HAWK signal

Road Improvements

Retrofit

A retrofit expands the existing roadway to accommodate bike lanes or paved shoulders by adding material to the outer edges of the existing pavement. Retrofits are appropriate in situations where the road still has plenty of life left in it and can simply be modified to include bicycle facilities.

Lane Conversions

Sometimes it is possible to add bicycle facilities, such as paved shoulders or bike lanes, to existing roadways by just changing the striping on the road. It could be as simple as reducing lane widths and making room for a bike lane, or it could be more complicated like in the case of a road diet on a 4 lane road where the outer lanes are eliminated, a center turn lane is added, and the balance of roadway is used for bike lanes.




Photo 9.9: Example of lane conversion scenario

Bicycle Boulevards

A bicycle boulevard is a series of contiguous street segments that create a seamless bike thoroughfare through a particular portion of a community. The streetscape along a bicycle boulevard is modified to restrict vehicle use and slow traffic while at the same time increase bicycle transportation efficiency and safety.



Photo 9.10: Bicycle boulevard

Related terms and definitions

Easement

An interest in land owned by another that entitles its holder to a specific limited use or enjoyment. Easements may be granted by property owners to provide space to implement non-motorized transportation facilities for public use on private property.

Right-of-way

A right to make a way over a piece of land, usually to and from another piece of land. A right-of-way is a type of easement granted or reserved over the land for purposes of utilities, transportation, or other uses of public benefit. This can be for a highway, public footpath, rail transport, canal, as well as electrical transmission lines, oil, and gas pipelines. A right-of-way is reserved for the purposes of maintenance or expansion of existing services within the right-of-way. In the case of an easement, it may revert to its original owners if the facility is abandoned.

Walkable/Walkability

A measure of how friendly an area is to walking. Factors influencing walkability include the presence or absence and quality of footpaths, sidewalks or other pedestrian rights-of-way, traffic and road conditions, land use patterns, building accessibility, and safety.

- Photo 9.1: UNC-Chapel Hill Highway Safety Research Center, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin Inc. Westat. (October 2010). *Pedestrian Safety Strategic Plan: Recommendations for Research and Product Development*. page 52
- Photo 9.2: *Class II*. digital image. *Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition*. web. 10/21/2016. <https://bikesiliconvalley.org/bikeway-design/>
- Photo 9.3: AASHTO. (2012). *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities*
- Photo 9.4: AASHTO. (2012). *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities*
- Photo 9.5: *Trail/Shared Use Path (Paved)*. digital image. iowadot.gov. web. 10/21/2016. <http://www.iowadot.gov/iowabikes/bikemap/PavedShoulder.html>
- Photo 9.6: AASHTO. (2012). *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities*
- Photo 9.7: Michael Farrell, COG/TPB. (DRAFT May 15, 2007). *Best Practices in Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding in the Washington Region*. Page 6
- Photo 9.8: NACTO. (March 2014). *Urban Bikeway Design Guide, Second Edition*
- Photo 9.9: AASHTO. (2012). *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities*
- Photo 9.10: Digital Image. *tcsidewalks.blogspot.com*. web. 10/21/2016. <http://tcsidewalks.blogspot.com/2012/04/last-minute-amendment-strips-traffic.html>

Purpose

The purpose of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan is to establish a long-term vision for creating a comprehensive non-motorized transportation network. The plan describes the ultimate network layout that will eventually be built, however long it takes. When all of the infrastructure outlined in this plan has been constructed, this plan will have been fulfilled.

Recommendations for Neighborhoods

Gaps exist within the neighborhood areas that may prevent residents from accessing the broader non-motorized transportation system. It is this plan's intent to apply the following recommendations to all residential areas:

- Add sidewalks or side paths to all neighborhoods where gaps exist.
- Maintain the legal right for bicyclists to use the neighborhood roads for travel.
- Bridge gaps between neighborhood roads to provide interconnectivity throughout the neighborhoods.
- Use the "shared lane" method to implement signage and markings at neighborhood transition areas, along known bicycle routes, and in higher-traffic roadways to increase awareness to all road users of the presence and legal rights of bicyclists on the road way.
- Implement sidewalk or side path construction projects in coordination with roadway improvements.

Recommendations within the Public Right-of-way

The public right-of-way, or the area that typically contains the road and sidewalk system, is under the control of the applicable jurisdiction. The City of Mason features roads under the jurisdiction of the City of Mason, the Ingham County Road Commission (ICRC) and MDOT. All improvements shown within the right-of-way must be completed in cooperation with the applicable jurisdiction.

Recommendations for all existing bike lanes and paved shoulders

Where there are existing bike lanes and paved shoulders that do not meet AASHTO's guidelines for bicycle facilities, the City of Mason, MDOT and the ICRC should upgrade the infrastructure to meet those standards, as feasible. This means maintaining a minimum 4' width on all bike lanes and paved shoulders where there are no vertical obstructions on the side of the road (curbs, guard rails, etc.), and a minimum width of 5' where there are vertical obstructions on the side of the road. See AASHTO's guidelines for more details.


Recommendations for All Existing Sidewalks

Where there are existing sidewalks that are less than 5' wide, the City of Mason and the ICRC should upgrade the sidewalks to be at least 5' wide, as feasible. This ensures compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and provides good flow for bi-directional pedestrian traffic in low-traffic areas. It is recommended to construct sidewalks up to 8' wide in areas with higher traffic.

Recommendations on Land Not Owned by Mason


The improvements shown on this plan are not intended to indicate a forced taking of land, but rather a recommendation for optimal routing. It is understood that any land owned by private entities, utility companies, or other governmental agencies must be used with permission and by legal agreement, typically in the form of an easement.

5 - Non-Motorized Facilities




Existing Conditions Map (Study Area)

There are a number of schools, parks, neighborhoods, and commercial areas within the study area. This map shows the existing non-motorized transportation network overlaid on the area map. While there are gaps in the network, the non-motorized transportation system reaches many of the area’s neighborhoods and community resources.



Map of Sidewalk Gaps

This map identifies the gaps in the existing sidewalk system.



Preliminary Vision Map

A map of the proposed primary non-motorized routes throughout the City of Mason. The goal is to create loops of varying lengths throughout the city. These routes have been determined by analyzing current infrastructure and identifying where additional infrastructure can be easily and most cost-effectively implemented. The infrastructure making up these routes consists of sidewalks, shared-use paths, bike lanes and shared roadways.

Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail

The Hayhoe Riverwalk is a three-mile trail that goes through Mason. Taking you along Sycamore Creek as well as on some of the historic rail bed. The trail was built by the Hayhoe family of Ingham County and donated to Mason in honor of their father, the late Richard Hayhoe.

Connecting this trail to more parks in the area as well as other regional trails will increase pedestrian walkability of the Mason community as well as the surrounding areas.



- 1 Dart Foundation Trailhead
- 2 Jefferson Trailhead
- 3 Silver Respite Trailhead

Statistics
 Type: Trail
 Length (Miles): 2.5
 ADA Accessibility Assessment: 2




Photo: Pedestrian Bridge into Maple Grove Cemetery




Photo: Jefferson Trailhead Kiosk

Sidewalks

The City of Mason has a very good existing sidewalk system. A large majority of the streets within the city have associated sidewalks. The City currently operates a sidewalk maintenance program, in which the city is divided into quadrants. This program then defines which years maintenance projects are to be completed within those quadrants.

The City also ensures that any road project takes the sidewalks into account and coordinates any sidewalk projects along with the road construction.



Map of City of Mason Sidewalk Maintenance Quadrants

Existing Challenges

- No sidewalk exists at Columbia St. US-127 overpass.
- There is a gap in the sidewalk on south Jefferson, at the railroad crossing.
- No sidewalk along the north side of Kipp Rd. from Cedar St. to the US-127 overpass.
- There is currently no non-motorized connection to Meijer.
- There are no sidewalks along N. Jefferson St. and Howell Rd. heading south or west from the intersection.

Priorities

The largest gap in the City of Mason's non-motorized system is the lack of connection to the residential areas west of US-127. The number one priority for the City is making this connection. The bridge at Columbia St. is the most logical place to make this connection because it would provide direct access from the neighborhoods on the west to Hayes Park on the east. Unfortunately this bridge is in a good state of repair, so the incorporation of pedestrian/bicycle facilities as part of a bridge reconstruction/renovation project would have to be far into the future. The City can however, explore ways of incorporating pedestrian/bicycle facilities into the existing bridge width and infrastructure. One way to accomplish this would be to re-stripe vehicular lanes and add bollards or guardrails that would allow for a dedicated pedestrian/bicycle lane within the existing paved roadway.

Some other options for crossing at Columbia St. would be a freestanding pedestrian bridge or a cantilevered pedestrian bridge that would attach to the existing bridge structure. These types of improvements can however be very expensive and MDOT does not fund these items, so funding would need to come from the City, private funds or other grant programs.

A second option to provide access across US-127 is along the north side of Kipp Road. Pedestrian facilities are existing on the Kipp Road bridge, however there are currently no sidewalks linked to it. Sidewalks should be constructed from the Cedar St. intersection to the east side of the bridge. Sidewalks should also be constructed from the west side of the bridge, west along Kipp Road to the end of the residential area. There would then be opportunity to negotiate an easement agreement with private property owners to add a shared-use pathway connecting Kipp Road to the Franklin Farms neighborhood to the north.

Providing non-motorized access to the Meijer at the south end of the city is also a very high priority. There is currently no connection from the Meijer to the rest of the city. There are signalized crossings on both the east and west sides at the Jefferson St./Hull Rd. and Kipp Rd intersection and at the Cedar St. and Kipp Rd. intersection. However these crossings all lead to dead-end sidewalks. The sidewalks at the Cedar St. intersection should be continued south to connect to Meijer. The sidewalk on the west side of Hull Rd. should be continued west to Cedar St. and sidewalk on the east side of Hull Rd. should be continued south to connect to the existing sidewalk. The Gestamp facility should also be encouraged to construct a connection from their building out to the sidewalk.

Coordination with Other Projects

Mason has scheduled to perform corridor studies on the Cedar Street corridor and the Kipp Road Corridor in the near future. Throughout these studies an emphasis should be placed on non-motorized facilities.

Any project that is constructed in Mason, whether it is new development or a renovation or repair of existing facilities should be explored for opportunities to create or improve non-motorized facilities.

Both the maple Street and Ash Street bridges over the Sycamore Creek are scheduled to be renovated in the near future. These are both located on vital routes into the downtown commercial area of the city. Therefore incorporating non-motorized facilities into these projects is crucial.

Regional Connectivity

Regional connectivity is an important consideration in this transportation plan. There are regions of the City of Mason that border significant populations of people who may cross between the City and the adjacent jurisdiction. The following connections have been incorporated into the planning framework and are important considerations as the local jurisdictions choose to develop cooperative plans with the City of Mason.

Connecting North

A trail connection north to Delhi Township would allow Mason to connect not only to Delhi, but to Lansing, and East Lansing by means of Delhi's existing trail system. The 2016 Delhi Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and a recent feasibility study commissioned by the Michigan Fitness Foundation both looked at opportunities to connect Delhi Township's path network to Mason's Hayhoe Trail. There are opportunities to create that trail connection along Delhi's border at both Harper Road and along Cedar Street, but the routing into Mason is less obvious. Another option, though likely more expensive, would be to route a path up to Holt Road and enter Delhi Township from the middle of the eastern border. The major challenge will be figuring out how to effectively cross US-127. Pedestrian bridges and widening vehicular bridges are two likely options. The biggest hurdle for this connection is securing funding and establishing maintenance responsibilities. A large portion of this path will reside within Alaiedon Township, which does not have the financial resources at this time to take over the maintenance and repair of such a large piece of infrastructure, nor does it have the population to justify the implementation of such a path. There is a need for regional cooperation and funding mechanisms to make this regional trail connection possible. Delhi Township plans to continue its path south along Cedar Street in anticipation that the south eastern connection will be completed in the future.

Connecting South

The City of Jackson and Jackson County's non-motorized plans speak to a future trail connection that would connect north to the City of Leslie and eventually to the City Mason and beyond. This connection will become an important piece in creating a cohesive regional, and eventually state-wide, non-motorized system.


Transit Connections

Transit is an important piece of any non-motorized system. The Mason Planning Area is currently served by one public transportation facility, the Capital Area Transportation Authority (CATA) bus Route 46. This route provides bus service between Mason and Lansing twice daily, once in the early morning and again in the late afternoon. This route has had a steady increase in ridership since 2005, nearly doubling from 6,890 to 12,595 in 2011, an 83% increase in ridership. Use of public transportation is up all over the state. CATA reported its highest ridership year in its 39 year history in 2011.

The trend of popularity in public transportation is not limited to the greater Lansing area. Considerable funding is being spent in Michigan to improve passenger rail service. Recently a segment of the Wolverine line (Chicago-Jackson-Detroit/Pontiac) has received funding to increase this line to high-speed rail. Funding has been approved to upgrade the Jackson Intermodal Station, which is potentially the southern terminus for passenger rail service between Lansing and Jackson, with Mason being a stop between.

Currently there are no sidewalks connecting the Meijer stop to the rest of Mason. A sidewalk connection from the Cedar Street, Kipp Road intersection to the CATA stop at Meijer is of utmost importance to serve the residents of Mason.

Map of CATA Route 46



7 - Wayfinding

Overview

Wayfinding is a system of varying types of signage to help distinguish directions as well as enhancing the experience and uses of spaces. It is an integral part of city planning for both vehicular traffic as well as non-motorized transportation, and is necessary to help those that are unfamiliar with the area to more easily navigate. The purpose of this plan is to help in the decision making process of the implementation of signage and to aid in the navigation of both vehicular and non-motorized transportation through the city of Mason.

Analysis

Using aerial photography, maps, and on the ground methods, the consultants analyzed the City of Mason's destinations, gateways, transportation assets, and existing signage. The consultants then used the information to determine where gateway, destination, and directional signage should be located, as well as which destinations should be included on the proposed wayfinding signage. The destinations chosen include locations such as city-owned parks and facilities, commercial districts, county facilities, and schools.

The City of Mason currently has three gateway signs; one on N. Jefferson Street as you enter the City from the north, on Cedar Street also as you enter from the north, and one on S. Jefferson Street heading north from Kipp Road. The design style of these existing gateway signs represents the history and cultural heritage of the City of Mason. This classy, old-world style serves as the aesthetic benchmark for the proposed signage.

Implementation

Keeping with the theme of the existing gateway signs; conceptual designs have been developed for directional signs, street signs, parking signs, emergency mile marker signs, and destination signs. These conceptual designs can be seen in the following section titled Sign Design Menu. These signage designs are conceptual and the included drawings are not meant to be used as construction documents. Further detailing is needed to determine materials, content, and sizing. All signage located in road rights-of-way shall meet the applicable standards of the jurisdictional body.

Destination and gateway signs are proposed as two-post, freestanding signs. Directional signs and parking signs are designed to be either single-post, freestanding signs or mounted to existing light poles where such poles exist. A conceptual design for street name signs has also been included as a possible upgrade to the City's existing street signs. These would help tie all the City of Mason's signage together and provide a truly cohesive look.


It is important to note that the wayfinding system can be implemented in phases. This plan can become a working document and the City can construct portions as funding becomes available. It is advised that directional signage be constructed first with a focus on primary destinations. Parking signage and additional directional signage can be phased in later. Many of the destinations have existing signs so replacing these signs with the proposed signs can be a lesser priority, however these signs should be upgraded eventually to achieve a cohesive system.

Sign Design Menu

The City of Mason currently has welcome signs located at the jurisdictional city limits. The proposed wayfinding signage reflects the same theme/style of these existing welcome signs.




Figure 11.1: Existing Welcome to Mason Sign and color scheme




Street Sign

Standalone
Directional Sign

Light Pole Mounted
Directional Sign





Wayfinding Destinations Map

Inventory of Existing and Proposed Signage

EXISTING GATEWAY SIGNS						
ID	LOCATION					
1	Southwest side of N. Cedar St., West of Buhl St.					
2	West side of N. Jefferson St., South of Riverwalk Dr.					
3	East side of S. Jefferson St., South of Lansing St.					
PROPOSED GATEWAY SIGNS						
ID	LOCATION					
1	South side of W. Columbia Rd., East of Goodman St.					
2	West side of Okemos Rd., South of Howell Rd.					
3	South side of W. Kipp Rd., East of US-127 off ramp					
4	Northeast corner of S. Barnes Rd. and E. Kipp Rd.					
5	North side of W. Dansville Rd., East of W. Dexter Trail					
PROPOSED DIRECTIONAL SIGNS						
ID	LOCATION	DIRECTION 1	DIRECTION 2	DIRECTION 3	DIRECTION 4	DIRECTION 5
1	Hagadorn/ Howell NW	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Ingham County Courthouse and Administration Buildings	^ Mason High School	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	
2	Howell/ Okemos NW	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Ingham County Courthouse and Administration Buildings	^ Mason High School	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	
3	Howell/ Okemos NE	< Downtown Commercial District	< Ingham County Courthouse and Administration Buildings	< Ingham County Fairgrounds	< Mason High School	
4	Buhl/Cedar W	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	^ Mason High School	< Ingham County Jail	
5	Cedar/ Ingham Jail Service E	> Ingham County Jail				
6	Columbia/ Goodman SE	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Mason City Hall	^ County Courthouse and Administration Building		
7	Cedar/ Columbia NW	^ Harvey Education Center	^ Downtown Commercial District	> Hayes Park	< Maple Grove Cemetery	

7 - Wayfinding

8	Cedar/ Columbia NE	^ Hayes Park	< Harvey Education Center	> Ingham County Jail		
9	Cedar/ Columbia SW	> Downtown Commercial District	> Harvey Education Center	> Mason City Hall	> Mason Public Library	< Ingham County Jail
10	Cedar/ Columbia SE	< Hayes Park	> Maple Grove Cemetery			
11	Columbia/ Jefferson NW	^ Mason Public Library	^ Mason City Hall	< Bond Park		
12	Columbia/ Jefferson ENE	< Downtown Commercial District	< Mason City Hall	< Mason Public Library		
13	Jefferson/ Okemos NE	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Ingham County Courthouse and Administration Buildings	^ Mason City Hall	^ Mason Public Library	
14	Okemos/ Randolph NW	< Bond Park				
15	Barnes/ Columbia NE	< Mason High School				
16	Columbia/ Lawton NE	^ Bond Park	< Laylin Park			
17	Columbia/ Temple NE	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Mason High School	^ Ingham County Jail	< Mason Middle School	< Ingham County Fairgrounds
18	Ash/Cedar NW	< Mason City Hall	< Downtown Commercial District	< Mason Public Library	< Ingham County Fairgrounds	
19	Ash/Cedar NE	> Ingham County Jail				
20	Ash/Cedar SE	> Downtown Commercial District	> Mason City Hall	> Mason Public Library	> Ingham County Fairgrounds	
21	Ash/Jefferson NW	> Mason City Hall	> Mason Public Library	< Ingham County Fairgrounds		
22	Ash/Barnes NW	^ Mason High School	< Ingham County Fairgrounds	> Mason City Hall	> Mason Public Library	
23	Ash/Barnes NE	^ Mason City Hall	^ Mason Public Library	^ Ingham County Jail	> Bond Park	< Mason High School
24	Ash/Jefferson SE	> Ingham County Fairgrounds	< Mason City Hall	< Mason Public Library		
25	Ash/Barnes SW	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	> Mason High School	< Bond Park		

26	Ash/Barnes SE	^ Bond Park	< Mason Public Library	< Mason City Hall		
27	Ash/Steel SW	^ Rayner Park	> Steele Elementary	< Laylin Park		
28	Maple/Steel SE	> Laylin Park				
29	Ash/Steel NE	^ Mason Public Library	> Laylin Park	< Steele Elementary		
30	Lawton/Maple NW	> Laylin Park				
31	Lawton/Maple SE	< Laylin Park				
32	Ash/Washington NE	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Steele Elementary	< Rayner Park	> Laylin Park	
33	Ash/Temple NW	> Ingham County Fairgrounds	> Rayner Park	> Mason High School	> Mason Public Library	
34	Ash/Temple NE	^ Mason City Hall	^ Rayner Park	^ Mason Public Library	> Mason Middle School	
35	Dansville/Dexter NE	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	^ Ingham County Courthouse and Administration Buildings	^ Ingham County Jail	^ Downtown Commercial District	< Mason High School
36	Cedar/South SW	> Mason High School	< Downtown Commercial District	< Harvey Education Center	< Hayes Park	
37	Cedar/Kipp NW	< Mason High School				
38	W Kipp rd between US-127 and S. Cedar St	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	^ Mason High School	< Harvey Education Center	< Ingham County Jail	
39	Hull/Kipp SW	^ Mason High School	^ Ingham County Fairgrounds	< Downtown Commercial District	< Ingham County Courthouse and Administrative Buildings	< Mason Public Library
40	Hull/Kipp SE	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Ingham County Courthouse and Administration Buildings	> Mason High School	> Ingham County Fairgrounds	

7 - Wayfinding


41	Barnes/Kipp SE	^ Downtown Commercial District	^ Ingham County Courthouse and Administrative Buildings	> Ingham County Fairgrounds		
42	Dexter Trail/Kipp NW	> Mason High School				
43	Dexter Trail/Kipp SE	< Mason High School	< Ingham County Fairgrounds			

PROPOSED DESTINATION SIGNS

ID	LOCATION	DESTINATION
1	South side of W. Howell Rd., West of Raging River Rd.	Dart Foundation Trailhead
2	South side of W. Columbia Rd, West of S. Walnut Ct.	Hayes Park
3	Southeast corner of intersection of W. Columbia Rd. and N. East St.	Maple Grove Cemetery
4	West side of N. Jefferson St., North of W. Columbia St.	Mason Community Garden
5	Southeast corner of Park	Bond Park
6	South side of W. Ash St., East of Peachtree Pl.	Bicentennial Park
7	East side of S. Lansing St., between W. Maple St. and W. Ash St.	Lee Austin Park
8	West side of S. Park St., N. of W. Oak St.	Mason City Hall
9	Southeast corner of W. Ash St. and S. Park St.	Mason Public Library
10	North side of E. Maple St., between Steele St. and Lawton St.	Laylin Park
11	South side of W. Ash St., between Schaeffer Rd. and County Park Rd.	Rayner Park
12	West side of S. Jefferson St., between E. Cherry St. and E. South St.	Griffin Park
13	West side of S. Jefferson St., North of S. Lansing St.	Silver Respite Trailhead


PROPOSED PARKING SIGNS


ID	LOCATION	DESTINATION
1	Southeast corner of W. Ash St. and S. Park St.	Mason City Hall
2	East side of S. Park St., between W. Sycamore St. and W. Maple St.	Public Parking
3	Southwest corner of E. Sycamore St. and S. Barnes St.	Public Parking
4	West of S. Barnes St., between E. Ash St. and E. Maple St.	Ingham County Courthouse Parking
5	Southeast corner of S. Barnes St. and E. Sycamore St.	Public Parking



Legend:


- # Existing Gateway Signs (to remain)
- # Proposed Gateway Signs
- # Proposed Directional Signs
- # Proposed Destination Signs
- # Proposed Parking Signs






Legend:

- # Existing Gateway Signs (to remain)
- # Proposed Gateway Signs
- # Proposed Directional Signs
- # Proposed Destination Signs
- # Proposed Parking Signs







Legend:

- # Existing Gateway Signs (to remain)
- # Proposed Gateway Signs
- # Proposed Directional Signs
- # Proposed Destination Signs
- # Proposed Parking Signs

A B



7 - Wayfinding




Legend:

- # Existing Gateway Signs (to remain)
- # Proposed Gateway Signs
- # Proposed Directional Signs
- # Proposed Destination Signs
- # Proposed Parking Signs

A

B



8 - The Planning Process

Plan Development Process

The consultant reviewed the Mason Five-Year Recreation Plan 2013-2017, current demographics, current budgets and revenues, past planning efforts and perceived initial priorities. The consultant also performed an initial orientation meeting with the City's Community Development Director, Elizabeth Hude, to establish some initial study parameters and planning direction. As part of the inventory gathering process, the consultant performed physical inventories by visiting each park facility to determine current uses and conditions. The consultant also took photos of the facilities for future reference.

This information was then put through an analysis process by comparing the City of Mason's current system and suggested priorities against national recreation standards to expose any recreational deficiencies or excesses in the city. The inventories were also analyzed against 5Cs criteria; compliance, condition, capacity, cost and community input. The results of this analysis were then used to further refine the plan. The above information, combined with the key personnel interview information, was then synthesized into the proposed goals and objectives. The goals and objectives were then further refined with the assignment of strategies, measures and priority suggestions (actions), as well as estimates of probable cost (capital improvements schedule). Subsequent refinement of the plan was performed through various discussions with city officials, public comment, and investigation of funding strategies and sources to eventually produce the final Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan.

Public Participation

An effective means of obtaining public input is critical for the development of a Recreation Master Plan (RMP). Public input is also required by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources' "Guidelines for the Development of Community Park, Recreation Open Space and Greenway Plans."

For the City of Mason's RMP, several means of gaining input were used, including:

- Online opinion survey: 722 responses
- Public Meetings: 10/12,2019, 12/14/2019
- Public Updates: Planning Commission - 12/10/2019, City Council - 12/16/2019
- Public Hearing - 1/20/2020
- Stakeholder Interviews: 7 meetings with 15 organizations - November - December 2019
- One Month Review Period – posted on the city website and a hard copy at City Hall: 12/13/2019 - 1/13/2020

Summaries of the public input activities are given below. A full compilation of all survey results, input, stakeholder interviews and public comments is contained in the Appendix.

Online Survey

At the initial stage of the Recreation Master Planning process, an online survey questionnaire was developed by the consultant in partnership with the City of Mason planning team. In developing the questionnaire, the previous 5-year RMP questionnaire, and public responses to it were examined to determine which questions should be retained, which should be dropped, and what new ones should be added. The goal was to obtain the maximum amount of relevant information with the optimal number of questions.

The online survey was conducted using the web-based “SurveyMonkey” opinion survey instrument. The survey was placed online 10/12/2019 and was closed 12/31/2019. It was publicized on the City of Mason’s website and through a series of email blasts to known neighborhood groups and local organizations.

A total of 722 responses were received for the online survey. Details of responses are shown in the Appendix.




Figure 5.1: Screenshot of Online Survey

Overview of the Online Survey Results

Spending

- When asked how much money they would be willing to spend on the parks, based on an 8.75% response rate (722 respondents), 91% of respondents were willing to spend additional money. 63% were willing to spend an additional \$50 or greater. 9% of respondents were not willing to pay anything.

Safety

- Users generally feel safe in the parks; safety ratings cited by respondents include exposure to vehicular traffic and uninhibited access to water sources.
- When asked for comments regarding Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail, respondents cited poor trail maintenance, seclusion, lack of lighting, and discomfort using the park alone as factors causing 9% of respondents to feel either a little unsafe or not safe.

Improvements

- 40% of respondents want the city to improve park maintenance. Poorly maintained pavement and facilities, as well as infrequent cleaning, mowing, and plowing were cited by respondents as contributing to this sentiment.
- When asked to select parks they would most like to see improved, the top three selections were Rayner Park, the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail, and Hayes Park.
- When respondents were asked which parks they would like consistent, year-round access to, the most selected parks were Rayner Park and the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail.
- When asked what amenities respondents would use or like to see more of in parks, the highest priorities were: connections to non-motorized pathways, paved non-motorized pathways, and restrooms.

Non-motorized access

- When respondents were asked if they were interested in the development of additional non-motorized facilities (pathways, bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, road crossings) in Mason, 80% said yes.
- When respondents were asked to comment on intersections they felt were unsafe, the most frequently mentioned intersections were: Columbia & Jefferson, Ash & Cedar, and the Meijer/Kipp Road area.
- When respondents were asked about non-motorized access, the two most requested items were improvements to sidewalks, and on-road bicycle lanes.

Public Input Meetings

Two public input open houses were held on October 12, 2019 and December 14, 2019 at Mason City Hall.

These open houses were held to present materials and information relative to the 2020-2024 Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Master Plan that have been gathered to date and provide an opportunity for the public to have input as to what recreational facility improvements and programs they would like considered for the City's Park System and/or speak on issues relative to the Parks & Recreation. The plan was also presented, discussed and reviewed over the course of three public meetings; two Planning Commission meetings - December 10, 2019 and January 13, 2020, and a City Council meeting - December 16, 2019.

Public Hearing

City Council meeting - Monday, January 20, 2019.

Stakeholder Interviews

Interviews with representatives of key stakeholder groups were conducted to gain further insight on how the City of Mason interacts with the individual groups related to parks, recreation and non-motorized transportation, on the needs of the groups and their membership and on the potential for partnerships. The interviews also served the purpose of improving relationships and communication, and increasing the involvement of stakeholder groups in City of Mason parks services and initiatives.

Stakeholder groups were selected that have a special interest in the parks, recreation and non-motorized services of the City of Mason or which have a special relationship with it. The groups selected encompass a broad area of interest. Invitations were sent to key representatives of the stakeholder groups, and the groups were allowed to have as many representatives present as they wished.

Stakeholder Groups Contacted

- Sycamore Creek Garden Club
- Community Garden
- Capital Area District Library
- Mason Soccer Club
- Mason Softball Association
- Mid-Michigan Pony League
- Connect Sports
- Rotary Club of Mason
- Mason Lions Club
- Mason Kiwanis Club
- Mason Optimist Club
- Ingham County Drain Commission
- Ingham County Parks and Trails
- Anderson-Fischer Associates
- Spicer Group
- Dart Foundation
- Ingham County Parks
- Delhi Township Community Development
- Delhi Township Parks and Recreation
- Mason Public Schools
- Future Farmers of America
- Tri-County Bicycle Association
- Mason Chamber of Commerce
- Modern Woodman
- Vault Deli
- Downtown Development Authority
- Michigan Tri-County Regional Planning
- MDOT Lansing Transportation Service Center
- MDOT University Region Planning

Persons Interviewed

Group 1

- Diann Jackman - Sycamore Creek Garden Club
- Crystal Noecker - Community Garden
- Jim Evans - Community Garden
- Scott Duimstra - Historian, CADL

Group 2

- Ronald Drzewicki - Superintendent, Mason Public Schools
- Greg Lattig - Athletic Director, Mason Public Schools
- Kurt Creamer - Board President, Mason Public Schools

Group 3

- Don Johns - President, Mid-Michigan Pony League
- Ryan Davis - Secretary, Mid-Michigan Pony League
- Mike Raab - Treasurer, Mid-Michigan Pony League
- Tim Rogers - President, Mason Soccer Club
- Gary Evans - Mason Pickleball/Softball

Group 4

- Russ Whipple - League Director, Mason Softball Association

Group 5

- Micah Norwood - Transportation Engineer, MDOT Lansing TSC
- Tracy Miller - Township Manager, Delhi Township
- Mike Davis - Transportation Planner, MDOT University Region
- Miranda Spare - Cost and Scheduling Engineer, MDOT Lansing TSC
- Nicole Baumer - Deputy Director, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
- Laura Tschihart - Transportation Planner, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
- Ken Hall - Land Use Planner, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission

Group 6

- George Hayhoe - Benefactor
- John Fischer - President, Anderson Fischer & Associates, Inc.

Group 7

- Melissa Buzzard - Coordinator, Ingham County Parks and Trails
- Michael Unsworth - Advocacy Committee, Tri-County Bicycle Association
- Mark Jenks - Director, Delhi Township Parks and Recreation

Phone Interviews

- Pete Barnum - Adult Advisor, FFA
- Ed Hude - State Government Liason, CMARC
- Jason Mellema - Superintendent, ISD
- Pat Kelly - Tri-County Bicycle Association

9 - Goals and Objectives

Overview

In the broadest sense, a Parks and Recreation Plan should offer the community a series of guidelines or recommendations for making consistent and rational public decisions regarding the delivery of recreation programs and facilities. Goals and objectives, in the context of recreation and park planning, should be the guiding influence determining the nature and extent of future park acquisition, development, administrative, and programming actions. They should be idealistic to the extent that they provide a desirable condition to strive towards and be ready for opportunities that may not be evident today such as new grant programs, benefactors, donations, etc. that present themselves. However, in order to be reasonably capable of being achieved, the goals must be tempered by the recognition of financial, social, physical, and political realities. Successful policy should further recognize the evaluation of the community's recreation system and the relationship of this system to relevant demographic characteristics.

Goals should be broad, address general needs, and establish the basis for setting specific programmed objectives. Objectives are measurable results that the City can work toward accomplishing. Both offer policy direction and the framework for recreation providers. The following policy statements reflect the City's short and long-term recreation needs identified in the previous chapter. Specific methods for achieving these goals are described in the Action Program and Capital Improvement Plan in the following section (see Table 16).

City Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives provide the foundation of the City's 2020-2024 Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan, and are to be used as a framework for future implementation strategies.

Sustain Existing Facilities

- I. **Bring 100% of facilities into a good state of repair within 10 years.**
 - A. **Evaluate facilities to determine best course of action for renovation or replacement.**
 1. Perform an ADA audit of existing conditions prior to any park project, ensure any renovation or replacement meets ADA standards.
 2. Perform regular safety audits on playground facilities. Have a City of Mason staff member get certification in playground safety auditing so that audits can be performed in-house.
 - B. **Ensure that existing facilities are properly maintained so that they remain in a safe, usable condition and continue to meet an acceptable aesthetic standard.**
 1. Explore funding sources including a dedicated park millage to allow for employment of additional maintenance staff.

2. Explore funding sources for various refurbishment projects throughout the parks system.
- II. **Ensure 100% of neighborhoods have non-motorized connectivity to parks and commercial districts within 10 years.**
 - A. **Evaluate current sidewalk gaps and work to fill these gaps with new infrastructure.**
 1. Coordinate sidewalk projects with any road projects to reduce cost and increase convenience for residents.
 - B. **Create a non-motorized connection from neighborhoods west of US-127 east to Hayes Park along the Columbia Street Bridge.**
 1. Explore ways that non-motorized facilities could be implemented within the current bridge's infrastructure/width.
 2. Explore the options of constructing a freestanding pedestrian bridge or a cantilevered pathway attaching to the existing bridge infrastructure including potential funding sources.

Future Expansion of Facilities

- I. **Ensure that there is a park located within a 1/2 mile radius of all Mason residents.**
 - A. **Develop a policy requiring new development to include recreation facilities such as play structures and open space.**
 - B. **Explore parkland acquisition in under-served areas.**
- II. **Create regional non-motorized connections.**
 - A. **Create a trail connection north to Delhi/Lansing.**
 1. Coordinate with MDOT, Ingham County, Alaieton and Delhi Townships, and private organizations to acheive this connection.
 - B. **Create a trail connection south to Leslie/Jackson.**
 1. Coordinate with Vevay Township
- III. **Ensure any new facilities or enhancements are fully funded and assessed.**
 - A. **Develop a policy for accepting donated property and monetary donations for faciities that ensures that future operations and maintenace costs of the improvements are fully funded.**
- IV. **Ensure that our parks are both inclusive and multi-generational.**
 - A. **Meet the existing law for compliance with ADA. Create a transition plan to make all park facilities accessible and compliant with the Department of Justice requirements. This will ensure accessible routes of travel are available, connecting parking areas, drop off points, picnic areas, playgrounds, and other park facilities.**
 - B. **Ensure that all parks have facilities for appropriate age groups such as tot-lots for young children, and pickle ball facilities and passive recreation for older adults.**

10 - The Action Plan

Overview

As discussed throughout this plan, a variety of methods have been used to identify needs and develop priorities for projects throughout the City of Mason's parks, recreation and non-motorized system. These methods include:

- Compliance
- Condition
- Capacity
- Cost
- Community Input

Compliance

Compliance is determined by comparing Mason's park facilities to state and federal standards. As described in the Recreation Inventory section of this report, each of Mason's parks were given an accessibility rating based on the Americans with Disabilities Act prescribed rating scale. It is a goal for all public facilities in the City of Mason to meet accessibility standards. Therefore accessibility plays a key role in the prioritization of projects.

Condition

Asset Management Tables have been created to catalog Mason's current recreation assets as well as to function as an aid for prioritizing needs and projecting budgets for future maintenance requirements. The Asset Management Tables can be found in the appendix of this document. As seen in these tables, the projected useful life of each asset has been provided. This number is based on industry standards, manufacturer's recommendations and the consultants past experience. Each asset was then field inspected and given a condition rating based on a scale of 1 to 5. This rating system is based on the remaining useful life of each asset.

The rating descriptions are as follows:

Asset Condition Rating	Definition
1	0%-20% life remaining
2	20%-40% life remaining
3	40%-60% life remaining
4	60%-80% life remaining
5	80%-100% life remaining

*Projected useful lifespan is an estimation and assumes proper maintenance of the asset.

**All Projected costs of improvements or maintenance is an estimation, the estimation is made with many factors taken into account, a change in any of these factors could result in a change of the end value.

Capacity

Capacity represents community need. As previously described in the Recreation Inventory section of this report, the MDNR and the NRPA have established standards for park classification as well as standards for acreage and number of recreation facilities per a jurisdiction's population. The City of Mason's park acreage and facilities were compared to the prescribed standards and the resulting surpluses and deficiencies were factored into the project prioritization.

Community need however is not only based on whether or not a community meets the recommended standards from the MDNR and NRPA. Need is also established by what types of facilities are available, current public opinion and current community use. The online opinion survey and stakeholder interviews help us to define public opinion. Questions in the opinion survey were formatted to gain statistics on current community use. Records of facility rentals were also analyzed to determine current uses of rentable facilities.

Cost

Budget, as it is in most municipalities, is a driving force behind the decision making process in the City of Mason. Throughout the opinion survey and community input meetings the public was asked to provide their opinion on how the City should prioritize its spending. Current budget, and potential funding sources weigh heavily on the prioritization process.

Community Input

Opinion Survey

An online survey was created to gather input from the community. In the survey, respondents were asked a series of questions about specific parks and facilities as well as the recreation and non-motorized systems as a whole. The responses received from the survey play a heavy role in the development of the City's goals and objectives.

Public Input Meetings

The public was also invited to two public input open houses, where they were able to share their insight and opinions on Mason's parks, recreation, and non-motorized system. The information and opinions expressed in these meetings are compiled and taken into account throughout the planning process.

Stakeholder Meetings

Several key stakeholders were invited to take place in meetings to garner their views and opinions on the Mason parks, recreation and non-motorized system. These stakeholders included school board members, faith based groups, city officials, sports organizations, special interest groups, Ingham County officials and officials from neighboring municipalities. Their opinion and insight were also used in developing the City's goals and objectives.

Prioritization Charts

The following charts use the 5Cs criteria described above to provide a project priority rating to each of the parks within the Mason Parks System. Each category has been given a rating from 1-5. The rating scales are as follows:

- Compliance: 1 = poor accessibility, 5 = good accessibility
- Condition: 1 = poor condition, 5 = good condition
- Capacity: 1 = severely inadequate, 5 = entirely adequate
- Cost: 1 = low cost, 5 = high cost (*Precise cost estimates have not been developed for these projects, rankings are based upon consultants opinion of probable improvement costs based upon similar projects in other communities.*)
- Community Input: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority

Lee Austin Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	1	2	3	3	3	2.4
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavilion, parking and drives need repair. • need safety surfacing around exercise/play equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No facilities for children under 5 or seniors. • Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove pavilion • realign Hayhoe Trail to meet survey ADA standards • Pave parking area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on community input 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	1	2	5	3	1	2.4
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • many areas need resurfacing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities service all ages • Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resurface where needed • Improve signage system • Add additional access points along trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Bond Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	1	3	3	3	3	2.6
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skate park, parking areas are in good condition. • Restrooms, roller rink need improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide uses for children under 5 or seniors. • Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade restroom facilities • Remove roller rink • Add accessible pathways from restroom to parking • Add playground w/ tot lot 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Hayes Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	2	3	3	4	2	2.8
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basketball and tennis courts need resurfacing • Softball field needs improvements • Restrooms need upgrades • all other facilities are in good condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No facilities for children under 5 or seniors. • Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • upgrade restrooms • add tot lot • resurface tennis courts, convert to pickleball • resurface basketball court • Regrade softball field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

10 - The Action Plan

Laylin Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	2	3	5	2	2	2.8
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pavilion roof needs repair Walkways need replacement All other facilities are in good condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities service all ages Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> repair pavilion roof walkway upgrades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Rayner Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	2	2	5	5	1	3
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Playground and restrooms need replacement All other facilities are in fair condition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities service all ages Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace playground Replace restrooms Add accessible pathway from Ash Street. Add baskets for disc golf 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Griffin Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	2	4	4	2	5	3.4
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking area needs upgrades All other facilities are in good condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No facilities for young children Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pave parking area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Maple Grove Cemetery and Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	2	4	4	3	4	3.4
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trail shows signs of aging but overall all facilities are in good condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No facilities for children under 5. Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a non-motorized trail separate from the vehicular drive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Bicentennial Park						
	Compliance	Condition	Capacity (low rating = inadequate)	Cost (low rating = low cost)	Community Input (Low rating = high priority)	Priority Rating (Average of 5Cs)
Rating	2	4	4	3	5	3.6
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of facilities are in good condition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides uses for all ages Adequate size for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Accessible parking facilities Repaint schoolhouse Add accessible pathway to learning garden 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on community input survey 	
*Priority Rating Scale: 1 = high priority, 5 = low priority						

Capital Improvement Projects

Based on the prioritization charts, Lee Austin Park and the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail have been rated as the highest priorities with scores of 2.4. The lowest rated priority is Bicentennial park with a score of 3.6. These prioritization ratings have been factored into the capital improvement program schedule. It is however important to note that this is just one tool used to create the CIP schedule. Many other factors play a role as well such as available funds, information gathered from public input, interviews, demographic data, land use trends and efforts of adjacent communities. The plan covers the next five years.

Laylin Park Improvements - Phase II to 2018-2019 Project

Description: This project would consist of replacing walkways throughout the site, adding a walkway connection to Columbia street and a walkway that loops between the parking lot and pavilion building.

Justification: The phase one improvements at Laylin Park were constructed in 2019. Many of the new features that were constructed cannot be accessed by persons with disabilities because the current sidewalk system does not meet ADA standards. Throughout the community input process, the public expressed a want for a walkway connection to Columbia. The loop pathway would improve safety by eliminating any pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.

Laylin Park Signage, CADL Storybook Walk

Description: A new park entry sign and construction of a storybook walk.

Justification: The current sign is in a poor state of repair and lacks visibility. The Capital Area District Library has approached the City about implementing a storybook walk within the park. Funding for the storybook walk will be by CADL.

Lee Austin Park - Design/Plan Park Improvements

Description: Design and development of construction plans for Lee Austin Park. Planning will need to be coordinated with Consumers Energy and the railroad.

Justification: Lee Austin Park tied for the highest priority by the 5Cs parameters. It does not currently meet ADA standards and there are significant safety concerns about the trail grades and the state of the current shelter.

Rayner Park - Master Plan

Description: Development of a master plan for Rayner Park.

Justification: The playground and restroom building are in need of major repair or replacement. A master plan needs to be developed to ensure the best layout and use of space within the park while also accounting for the surrounding properties and their connectivity.

Finalize City-wide Signage Plan

Description: Taking the signage design concepts identified in this report and developing construction drawings for them. This plan would also outline dimensions, materials and exact locations for each sign.

Justification: The City of Mason is in need of a more cohesive wayfinding system. Wayfinding signage improves safety, navigability and economic growth.

Columbia Street - Design/Plan US-127 crossing

Description: Develop plan for the Columbia Street crossing over US-127.

Justification: Currently the residents that live west of US-127 have no non-motorized access across US-127. This crossing would provide access from the western neighborhoods to parks, schools, the downtown district and the rest of the city.

Jefferson Street - Railroad Crossing

Description: Coordinate with the railroad to construct a sidewalk that crosses the railroad tracks along Jefferson Street, between Griffin Park and the Silver Respite Trailhead.

Justification: Currently the sidewalk stops short of the railroad tracks on both the north and south sides. This forces pedestrians, specifically disabled persons out into the road to cross the railroad tracks. This is a serious safety concern and potential liability issue for the City.

Evaluate and Repair Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail

Description: Conduct an evaluation of the full length of the Hayhoe Trail and repair any sections deemed to be in need of repair.

Justification: The Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail tied for the highest priority by the 5Cs parameters. There are several areas along the trail that are in need of repair. According to the public opinion survey, the trail is one of Mason's most utilized assets and many respondents expressed concerns about the condition of the trail.

Lee Austin Park - Construction of Park Improvements

Description: Construction of the elements designed in the planning project.

Justification: Lee Austin Park tied for the highest priority by the 5Cs parameters. It does not currently meet ADA standards and there are significant safety concerns about the trail grades and the state of the current shelter.

Rayner Park - Construction of Phase I Improvements

Description: Repair or replace current playground structure and construct additional features outlined as Phase I in the Rayner park master plan.

Justification: The playground is in need of major repair or replacement.

Hayes Park - Design/Plan Park Improvements

Description: Design and development of construction plans for Hayes Park.

Justification: Hayes Park has several existing issues such as poor drainage, lack of restroom accessibility, and features that are in a poor state of repair. Plans need to be developed to address these issues.

Bond Park - Design/Plan Park Improvements

Description: Design and development of construction plans for Bond Park.

Justification: Bond Park has several existing issues such as lack of accessibility to and from the restrooms and parking areas, and a lack of seating. The hockey rink is also under used and in a poor state of repair. Plans need to be developed to address these issues.

Public input was received during several community events in 2018 – Spring Fling, Down Home Days and the City Open House. Neighbors adjacent to the park received information and survey questions by mail in 2018. Input included suggestions for replacing the hockey rink with a play structure, adding shade sails over the skate bowl, allowing graffiti as public art in the skate area; and, reducing the size of the park, relocating the softball field and selling outlots for residential development.

Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail - Install Trail Signage

Description: Install gateway, wayfinding and emergency mile marker signage along the Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail.

Justification: Additional signage will increase visibility, navigability and safety along the trail.

Jefferson Trailhead Improvements

Description: Construct restrooms (vault toilet), shade, drinking fountain at the Jefferson trailhead (Community Garden site)

Justification: The cemetery restrooms are difficult to find and not ADA Accessible. A drinking fountain and shade is needed for trail users and their dogs.

Sidewalks along Kipp Road and Meijer

Description: Construct sidewalks along the north side of Kipp road from Cedar St. to the US-127 overpass and construct sidewalks from the Kipp Rd. Cedar St. intersection to Meijer.

Justification: Currently there is no non-motorized connection to the businesses west of Cedar st. on Kipp Rd. or to Meijer. Meijer is where most residents purchase their groceries and therefore providing access is very important especially for those residents without vehicles.

Rayner Park - Construction of Phase II Improvements

Description: Construction of features outlined as Phase II in the Rayner park master plan.

Justification: The restroom building is in need of major repair or replacement. There is also a lack of connectivity and accessibility throughout the park. These are some of the issues that should be addressed in this phase of construction.

Griffin Park Plan

Description: Develop a plan for Griffin Park.

Justification: The future of Griffin park needs to be explored. Should Griffin Park be leased to a private entity to be used as parking, should it be converted to a natural area, or should it continue to operate as is? These are the questions that should be answered in this planning effort.

Hayes Park - Construction

Description: Construction of park improvements, including major repair/replacement of tennis courts.

Justification: Hayes Park has several existing issues such as poor drainage, lack of restroom accessibility, and features that are in a poor state of repair.

Bond Park - Construction

Description: Construction of park improvements.

Justification: Bond Park has several existing issues such as lack of accessibility to and from the restrooms and parking areas, and a lack of seating. The hockey rink is also under used and in a poor state of repair.

Parks and Recreation Plan - Five-Year Update

Description: Develop the 2025-2029 Parks and Recreation Plan.

Justification: Parks and recreation plans are developed on a five year basis. The new plan should start development in 2024 so that it can be submitted for the 2025 MDNR grant cycle.

Capital Improvement Program Schedule

Please note: The capital improvements are listed in a proposed sequential order. This order is subject to change. The matrix provides the project location, a description, an estimated range of likely costs and revenue sources. It is intended to be used as a guideline for planning.

Suggested Priority	Project Number	Project Location	Project Description	Estimated Costs	Revenue Source
In-Progress	2017-P8	Laylin Park	Laylin Park Improvements - Phase II to 2018-2019 Project, Park signage, CADL storybook walk	\$205,000	Rayner Bond/ CADL
Total 2019-2020				\$205,000.00	
1	2017-P12	Lee Austin Park	Design/plan park improvements	\$15,000	General Fund
2	2017-P12	Rayner Park	Develop master plan	\$20,000	General Fund
3		City of Mason	Finalize city-wide signage plan/ construction drawings	\$5,000	General Fund
4		Columbia Street	Design/plan US-127 crossing	\$10,000	General Fund
5		Jefferson Street	Fill sidewalk gap at railroad crossing south of Griffin Park	\$15,000	General Fund
6		Hayhoe Riverwalk	Evaluate and repair trail	\$100,000	General Fund/ Grants
Total Priority 1-6				\$160,000.00	
7	2019-P1	Lee Austin Park	Construction of park improvements	\$300,000	General Fund/ Grants/DDA
8	2017-P12	Rayner Park	Construction of Phase 1 improvements	\$350,000	Rayner Bond/ Grants
9	2017-P11	Hayes Park	Design/plan park improvements	\$20,000	General Fund
10	2017-P10	Bond Park	Design/plan park improvements	\$20,000	General Fund
11		Hayhoe Riverwalk	Construct/install trail signage	\$50,000	General Fund/ Grants
12	2019-P2	Jefferson Trailhead	Construct restrooms (vault toilet), shade, drinking fountain	\$100,000	General Fund/ Grants
13		Kipp Rd./Cedar St.	Construct sidewalks along Kipp Rd. and connecting to Meijer.	\$80,000	General Fund
Total Priority 7-13				\$920,000.00	
14	2017-P12	Rayner Park	Construction of Phase 2 improvements	TBD	Rayner Bond/ Grants

Suggested Priority	Project Number	Project Location	Project Description	Estimated Costs	Revenue Source
15	2017-P14	Griffin Park	Develop park plan	\$5,000	General Fund
16	2017-P11	Hayes Park	Construction of park improvements, including major repair/replacement of tennis courts	TBD	Rayner Bond/ Grants
17	2017-P10	Bond Park	Construction of park improvements	TBD	Rayner Bond/ Grants
18	2018-P3	All Mason recreation facilities	Planning: Parks/Recreation Plan - 5 year update	\$15,000	Rayner Bond
Total priority 14-18				TBD	

*** THIS DOCUMENT IS A LONG RANGE PLANNING DOCUMENT THAT WILL CONTINUE TO EVOLVE AND IS REVIEWED ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. ALL PROJECTS LISTED ARE SUBJECT TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDING THROUGH THE GRANT SOURCE AND THE GENERAL FUND AND THE APPROVAL OF THE CITY COUNCIL.

*** THE CITY WILL CONTINUE TO SEEK OUT OTHER SOURCES FOR GRANTS IN ADDITION TO THOSE LISTED ABOVE.

Appendix

Public Engagement Materials

Public Open House Display Boards

Welcome!

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Thank you for joining us today for a very important conversation about parks, recreation and non-motorized facilities in the City of Mason.



Please make your way through the room to review the information. Staff is available to answer questions and listen to your ideas and concerns. At the end we'd like to ask you to complete our on-line survey so that we have a clear understanding of what's important to you and your family.




1

Vision/Purpose

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Mason's community vision for the future is founded upon a respect for our historic past, while encouraging an atmosphere that values family, business, the environment and arts, creating a sense of place for present and future generations.



Our Parks, Recreation and Non-motorized System is a treasured community asset that supports the social, economic and environmental well-being of the citizens of Mason.

2

Overview

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

The City of Mason is preparing an update to the five-year Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan. We need your help to make some important decisions about the future.

- Do we have the right type of park facilities for our community members' needs?
- Are our parks accessible, inclusive and multi-generational?
- Are our parks the right size – too small or too big?
- Do we have parks in the right locations? If not, where do we need them?
- Do our non-motorized facilities provide safe access to destinations throughout the city including parks, trails, schools, and commercial areas?
- Are we utilizing existing public parking areas efficiently to serve both the recreational and commercial needs of our community?
- Where are the opportunity areas to create more parking that supports utilization by our recreation, non-motorized and commercial areas?
- How do we pay for it all?

The plan will support the necessary policy and budget decisions we need to implement the community's vision for the system. It also helps us communicate with our regional partners like the Ingham County Road Department, Michigan Department of Transportation, Michigan Department of Natural Resources so that we can coordinate projects and qualify for grants to support our decisions.

3

Parks 101

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

There are many classifications and benchmarks for parks. For the City of Mason's plan, we will be referencing those based on National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) recommendations. Here are the five types of parks we will be talking about:

Classification	General Description	Location Criteria	Size Criteria
Mini-Park	Used to address limited, isolated or unique recreational needs.	Less than a 1/4 mile distance in residential setting.	Between 2500 sq. ft. and one acre in size.
Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood park remains the basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreation and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on informal active and passive recreation.	1/4 to 1/2-mile distance and uninterrupted by non-residential roads and other physical barriers.	5 acres is considered minimum size. 5 to 10 acres is optimal.
School-Park	Depending on circumstances, combining parks with school sites can fulfill the space requirements for other classes of parks, such as neighborhood, community, sports complex and special use.	Determined by location of school district property.	Variable – depends on function.
Community Park	Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park (see appendix for definition of "neighborhood park"). Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces.	Determined by the quality and suitability of the site. Usually serves two or more neighborhoods and 1/2 to 3 mile distance.	As needed to accommodate desired uses. Usually between 30 and 50 acres.
Regional Park	Land set aside for preservation of natural beauty or environmental significance, recreation use or historic or cultural interest use.	Located to serve several communities within 1 hour driving time.	Optimal size is 200+ acres, but size varies based on accommodating the desired uses.

4

What do we have?

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Mason offers a variety of park types and facilities. Below is a chart providing a breakdown of what we have to offer:

Park Facilities

Facility	Classification	Size
Bicentennial Park (Pink Schoolhouse)	Community Park	2.27 Acres
Bond Park	Community Park	5.30 Acres
Griffin Park	Mini-Park	0.65 Acres
Hayes Park	Community Park	9.22 Acres
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	Trailway	2.5 Miles
Laylin Park	Community Park	7.2 Acres
Lee Austin Park	Neighborhood Park	0.50 Acres
Maple Grove Park	Community park	5.20 Acres
Rayner Park	Community Park	60.00 Acres

School Facilities

Facility	Classification	Size
Alaiedon Elementary	School-Park	10.00 acres
Mason Middle School	School-Park	28.00 Acres
Mason High School	School-Park	51.00 Acres
Steele Elementary	School-Park	3.60 Acres





5

What do we need?

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Overall, Mason is very close to the recommended number of parks and park facilities. When combined with those offered by other organizations in the region, we appear to be well-positioned to meet our community's needs. But as parks age, more expensive repairs to equipment, dredging of water bodies and other major repairs can be required.

Recreation Facilities Evaluation

The following table evaluates current park facilities in the City based on Michigan Department of Natural Resources recommendations.

Type of Recreation Facility	Standard	Existing Public Facilities	Need for Existing Population	Surplus/Deficiency	School/Non-City Owned Facilities	Combined Surplus/Deficiency
Basketball Courts	1/5,000	2	2	0	3	3
Tennis Courts	1/2,000	2	5	-3	8	5
Volleyball	1/5,000	1	2	-1	0	-1
Ball Diamonds	1/5,000	3	2	1	8	9
Little League Diamonds (Lighted)	1/30,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Football Fields	1/20,000	0	1	-1	3	2
Soccer Fields	1/10,000	3	1	2	10	12
Golf Courses (9 hole)	1/25,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Golf Courses (18 hole)	1/50,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Driving Range	1/50,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Swimming Pools	1/20,000	0	1	-1	2	2
Ice Rinks (Indoor)	1/100,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Running Track (1/4 mile)	1/20,000	0	1	-1	1	0
Playgrounds/Structures	1/3,000	4	3	1	4	5
Paved Trails	1 system	1	1	0	0	0

Footnotes:
 • Based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations
 • Based on 2010 Census Data (City of Mason's total population: 8,252)



Park Acreage Evaluation

The following table evaluates current park acreage in the City based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations. We have included school parks under the "neighborhood parks" category, as neighborhoods are their likely service area.

Type of Recreation Facility	Recommended Minimum Acreage per 1,000 Residents	Existing Acreage	Acreage Need for Existing Population	Surplus/Deficiency
Mini Parks	0.25	0	2.06	-2.06
Neighborhood Parks	1.0	1.15	8.26	-7.11
Community Parks	5.0	89.19	41.26	47.93
Regional Parks	5.0	0	41.26	-41.26
Total Park Land	11.25	90.34	92.84	-2.5
School Parks	n/a	92.6	n/a	n/a

Footnotes:
 • Based on National Recreation and Parks Association recommendations
 • Based on 2010 Census Data (City of Mason's total population: 8,252)

6

Which option do you prefer?

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Please place a dot in the space next to the option that you prefer.

Option 1 - No change
Do nothing different. With this option we will see our parks decline as we may not be able to support the cost of major repairs when needed.

Option 2 - Reduce facilities
Same budget – reduce facilities to reduce operations and maintenance costs, redirect money to major repairs.

Option 3 - Increase budget to maintain
Increase the budget (taxes) to cover the costs for maintaining and improving only the existing facilities.

Option 4 - Increase budget to expand
Increase the budget (taxes) to cover the existing system and expand it further.

9



Thank You!

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Thank you for your time today. Please be sure to take our on-line survey to make sure your voice is heard.

The survey can be found at:
www.mason.mi.us → City Departments → Parks → 2019 Update





Or just scan the QR code to access the survey on your smartphone.





11

Handout Flyer



Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Online Survey

The City of Mason is in process of updating the Park, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. This plan will be used to guide the improvements and activities that occur within the City's parks and non-motorized transportation system over the next five years.

Your input is important to creating this plan because it is about serving your individual and family recreation and transportation needs. Those who contribute will help determine the future for the City's park facilities, recreation programs open spaces, and non-motorized transportation. It is important that you take this survey to be heard. Please encourage others to take the survey also, including your family members, neighbors and or community organizational members. It is important that we hear from people of all ages and backgrounds so that the plan can respond to the entire community's needs and desires.

Take the survey! Our public comment period will run now through December 31. Make sure your voice is heard!

The survey can be found at:

www.surveymason.com



Or just scan the QR code to access the survey on your smartphone.



Come share your input for the future of Mason's Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation!

Public Input Open House:
 Mason City Hall
 Saturday, December 14th
 from 10am-2pm.

For more information about the plan, contact Community Development at: 517-676-9155, 201 W. Ash Street, Mason MI 48854

Yard Sign

City of Mason: Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

We Need YOUR Help to Plan for Mason's Future.

TAKE THE ONLINE SURVEY!

Our public comment period will run now through December 31. Make sure your voice is heard!

The survey can be found at:
www.surveymason.com

Or just scan the QR code to access the survey on your smartphone.



Please come to the **Public Input Open House:**
 Mason City Hall
 Saturday, December 14th
 from 10am-2pm.


Question? Call: (517) 676-9155
 email: info@mason.mi.us



Social Media Posts

City of Mason
December 4, 2019 at 1:32 PM

"Pink tire swings, slides, and rock climbing" - a few recommendations for the future of our parks from Mason's children.
Now it's your chance to weigh in. Take the Online Survey (www.surveymason.com) and attend the Community Input Open House on December 14 from 10 am to 2 pm at City Hall - 2nd Floor.
<https://www.facebook.com/events/969114730119573/>



17 2 Comments 1 Share

Like Comment Share

Most Relevant

City of Mason
December 11, 2019 at 1:34 PM

Help Mason build the path to the future . . .
Because your children and grandchildren are the ones who will walk it. Take the survey and share your input for the future of Mason's Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation. Survey: www.surveymason.com
Don't forget to attend the Community Input Open House this Saturday, December 14 from 10 am to 2 pm at City Hall - 2nd Floor.
<https://www.facebook.com/events/969114730119573/>



19 2 Shares

Like Comment Share

City of Mason
December 13, 2019 at 1:41 PM

Come to the Open House tomorrow!
- Dec. 14, 2019, 10am – 2pm, City Hall- 2nd floor
Come to the Community Input Open House and review the draft for the Parks, Recreation, and Non-motorized Plan. The draft plan may also be found here: <https://www.mason.mi.us/.../Mason%20Recreation%20Master%20Pla...>
If you haven't taken the online survey, it's still available: www.surveymason.com
We hope to see you tomorrow!



Welcome To City Of Mason, MI Welcome To City Of Mason, MI

Come to the Open House this Saturday, review the... Come to the Open House this Sa

Like Comment Share

Stakeholder Interviews

Notes from In-Person Stakeholder Interviews

MASON PARK AND RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN 2020-2025
Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: Community Garden, Sycamore Creek GC, CADL - Library

Date: November 19, 2019, 1:00 PM

Location: Oak Room, Mason City Hall

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

Jim Evans – Community Garden Club – Affiliate of the Lansing Garden Club

Crystal Noecker – Community Garden Club – Affiliate of the Lansing Garden Club

Diann Jackman – Sycamore Creek Garden Club

Scott Duimstra – CADL (Capital Area District Library)

Community Garden Club - Donated 998 pounds to the food bank. Set out tomatoes for walkers.

1. Relationships

a. CADL

i. Working on renovating Mason Library

ii. Story book walks

1. Series of signs, two pages on each sign, cover sign with donors, etc., Fitness activities on signs as well. They have a library of stories that can be interchanged. Sign pedestals match the aesthetic of the park. Laylin, Rayner and the Pink School House are potential sites.

iii. Look for things to partner on non-library things

1. Check-out bikes

b. Sycamore Garden Club

i. Member of Gardens Inc. pay dues, liability insurance covers them.

ii. 10 club members

iii. Bicentennial Park

1. Circle of sunflowers that serve as outdoor classroom walls.
2. Sunflower Learning Center
 - a. 2nd through 5th graders, 24 max students enrolled, 19 currently
 - b. Has gained State recognition
 - c. Teach kids seed to table
 - d. Educational speakers
 - e. Partner with the school district

iv. Manage historical museum garden

v. Maintain DDA planters

1. Boy scouts do the watering

vi. Maintain Veteran's memorial in cemetery

vii. Memorial garden in Rayner

viii. Would like to do something at Griffin Park

1. Would need a water source from the City

ix. Funding

1. Yearly Geranium Sale fundraiser is largest source of funding (right before Mother's Day)
2. Built and sold 150 bird houses

3. Library does an annual plant sale – offered to coordinate with geranium sale
 - x. Starting a seed bank at the library, “Library of seeds”
 - xi. City would like to create a Memo of Understanding (MOU) in 2020 between the group and the City.
- c. Community Garden
 - i. Faucet gets left on by the dog walkers and garden club has to pay for it. They would like to add a lock to the faucet. The faucet also was reported to leak.
 - ii. Currently rent plots from the City, City handles administration. 15’x15’ plots, \$15 per plot.
 - iii. City would like the Club to be more independent. 2020 transition so as the Club Just leases the space and manage themselves so City is not administering the funds.
 - iv. Affiliated with Lansing Garden Club
 - v. Need additional fencing to keep deer out.
 - vi. Table needs repair.
 - vii. Invite gardeners in the spring to fill out garden application and drop off money to City Hall.
 - viii. City would like to create a Memo of Understanding (MOU) in 2020 between the group and the City.
2. Communication and Action Items
 - a. Garden Clubs - Possibly have an end of the year summary report or sit-down to debrief with the city as to the group’s status.
 - b. Library is willing to email opinion survey info out to patrons via email blast.
 - c. Sycamore garden club will put the survey info on the Facebook page.
 - d. Make repairs on water lines and faucets
 - e. Community Garden Club will Inform the city as to the expansion of the garden plots
 - f. Create MOU’s for all the Sycamore Garden Club and the Community Garden

F:/Projets; 19013/ 04 Mtgs/ stakeholder mtgs/ #1 Garden Clubs, Library

MASON PARKS, RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN
2020-2025

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: Mason Public Schools

Date: November 19, 2019, 8:30 PM

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

Greg Lattig – Mason High School

Ron Drzewicki – Mason Public School, Superintendent

1. Regional robotics competition, high school and elementary. High school made it to nationals last year. Pick local project to problem solve.
2. Relationships:
 - a. Sharing resources, share space in office building.
 - b. Good relationships
 - c. City maintains facilities, Schools use the facilities.
 - d. Community has a high interest in sports especially baseball, softball, and soccer.
 - e. Community groups, boy scouts use school facilities
 - f. Dart uses tennis facilities
 - g. Track and tennis courts are regularly used by public
 - h. As new activities are created, facilities are available
 - i. Pool facilities, times open to the public. Schedule is on the website/facebook page.
 - j. Adult softball has been diminishing.
 - k. Have had to eliminate some soccer fields for parking lots and building expansions, etc.
 - l. 3-4 years ago schools looked at facilities, have gotten behind with updating the facilities.
 - m. Lot north of high school was sold to a private group.
 - n. Need more room for practice facilities at high school.
 - i. Would like to purchase homes on Barnes street for future expansion.
 - ii. Would like more access to Rayner/wood lot
 - o. Schools recently received \$70 million bond
 - p. Ron and Greg think people would support additional taxation for parks and rec.
 - q. Plan to replace 8 tennis courts, possibly expanding to 12. Starting 2020.
3. From the City
 - a. Possible soccer behind the pink schoolhouse
 - b. Parking issues on the north side of Harvey, how is this to be handled?
 - c. Would like to partner with schools on safe routes. Especially Columbia crossing of US-127.

Action Items:

1. Engage students to problem solve projects.
2. MOU with the FAA for using the Rayner Park wood lot

3. Explore areas for school expansions. Possible use partnership between Schools, City and County for Fairgrounds, Rayner, Highschool
4. Campaign for additional revenue, package with taxation for water improvements. Discuss how schools achieved their bond, successes/failures. Schedule meeting to discuss.
5. Provide Safe Routes info to the schools.
6. Contact ISD – superintendent, Jason

MASON PARKS, RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN
2020-2025

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: Sports Groups

Date: November 19, 2019, 10:30 PM

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

Tim Rogers – Mason Soccer Club, President
Donald Johns - Baseball/Softball Club - President
Gary Evans – Mason Pickleball, retired softball
Ryan Davis – Baseball/Softball Club - Secretary
Mike Raab - Baseball/Softball Club – Treasurer
Kurt Kramer – Mason School Board

1. Mason Soccer Club - 501C3
 - a. Rec, competitive, kindergarten, approximately 400 participants.
 - b. Club owns most of the goals and nets
 - c. Club does line painting, \$5,000-\$6,000 worth of line painting per year.
 - d. Fields at all Mason Schools, Vevay, Aurelius, ISD, Rayner Park, Hayes Park, St. James is where games are played (3 fields, controlled by the diocese). Club pays for mowing/maintenance at St. James.
 - e. Sports clubs coordinate well with scheduling, etc.
 - f. There is a desire for a soccer/softball complex.
 - g. Vevay is in process of renovating their soccer fields.
 - h. Aurelius has nice baseball fields and soccer fields
 - i. Part of Capital Area Soccer Committee (Mason has 14 travel teams)
 - j. Look at the new Delta Township complex
 - i. Different sizes and configurations
 - k. Potential sites
 - i. ROC site
 - ii. Property north of ISD
 - iii. John Fischer has expressed interest for 30 acres next to Vevay Township Hall.
2. Baseball/Softball
 - a. Run mid-michigan pony league
 - i. 275 teams in the league
 - ii. travel all over the mid-Michigan region
 - iii. about 30 Mason teams. (400 mason kids)
 - b. 4,000-5,000 kids in league 5-years to U14
 - c. Manage league, registrations, website, team photos
 - d. 7-member board of directors
 - e. Mow the grass at Rayner during the season.
 - f. Partner with Aurelius Township, Vevay

- g. Appreciate the help from the city allowing use of the facilities.
 - h. Only 1 field is useable for U14 and up. (Mason Middle School)
 - i. Would like to build a U14-U18 ballfield at Rayner.
 - j. Use Bond and Hayes fields occasionally, changes year to year.
 - k. Why did sports complex fail in the past (10 years ago)
 - i. It went out for a bond but it was only addressing Mason City taxpayers
 - ii. Can a regional authority be set up to achieve this?
 - l. Fields lost at Harvey, fields will be lost at middle school during construction for next 2-3 years minimum.
3. Athletics as a whole
- a. Clubs need space, losing soccer fields for parking and school expansions
 - b. Would like to see a master plan for Rayner/High School
 - c. Explore regional clubs
 - d. Special Olympics uses school baseball field.
 - e. The feeling is that the community is generous and be willing to donate time and money.
 - f. Next door to the middle school, property is now owned by the church, used for flag football.
4. Pickleball
- a. Can pickleball be considered when tennis courts are rebuilt.

Action Items:

1. MOUs between clubs and City for use of Mason facilities (Rayner)
2. Get registration data to display trends.
3. Have a conversation about use agreement between County, Rayner, High School

MASON PARKS, RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN
2020-2025

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: Service Clubs

Date: November 25, 2019, 8:30 AM

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

Gary Evans – Pickleball Club

Russ Whipple – Mayor, Softball Association

1. *No service club members in attendance
2. Pickleball – playing 5 mornings and 2 evenings per week.
 - a. Would like to reconfigure Hayes park for pickleball
3. Mayor's thoughts
 - a. Feels that maintenance is good at the majority of the parks
 - b. Thinks that the City maintains too many parks
 - c. Eliminate passive parks and upgrade active parks
 - i. Are some of these small parks worth the cost of maintenance?
 - d. Softball fields have not been improved since 1980s
 - e. Softball Association maintains the fields
 - f. Softball Association is 501C3
 - g. Use their own equipment for maintenance
 - h. Need at least 2 fields to continue the league
 - i. 2 lighted fields with backstops and fences
 - i. Lighting is an ongoing expense and difficult maintenance
 - ii. Ideally a two-field lighted complex in a non-residential area.
 - j. Softball participation has been decreasing
 - k. Tournaments have increased. 4 tournaments in 2019 for raising funds for charity etc.
 - l. Improvements needed
 - i. concrete pads under bleachers
 - ii. restrooms at Bond and Hayes
 - iii. trash receptacles
 - iv. grading issues, especially at Hayes
 - v. Irrigation just around infield to lessen maintenance issues.
 - vi. Went from 56 teams per year to 14 teams over the last 5 years.
 - m. Many of the other groups seem unwilling to share facilities.
 - n. 1 of 6 softball players are from Mason.
 - o. Optimist Club used to run the youth baseball/softball Club.
 - p. Need to put a plan together to make improvements possible, rather than just reacting to issues as they arise.
 - q. Each park should have a theme and a plan (what should be at these parks?)

- r. People voted on a non-binding question asking if people would be willing to tax a half mil for parks in 2010 or 2012, approved by 65%.
- s. Rayner Bond endowment, down to \$200k-\$300k
- 4. Hayhoe Trail
 - a. Lack of maintenance in the winter could cause liability.
 - b. Trail system should connect to all the parks.

MASON PARKS, RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN
2020-2025

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: County/State

Date: December 3, 2019, 10:00 AM

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

Tracy Miller - Delhi

Mike Davis - MDOT

Micah Norwood - MDOT

Laura Tschirhart – transportation/GIS coordinator

Nicole Baumer – Tri-County

Miranda Spare – TSC

Ken Hall – Tri-County

1. Multiple connections to city parks that include MDOT Roads, Columbia bridge, Cedar Street, Kipp Road
2. Connection to Delhi is currently highest priority because of Delhi’s connection to other regional areas, Lansing, East Lansing, Dewitt, Etc.
3. Has anyone looked at the feasibility of crossing US-127?
4. Mike – All of the bridges are in good condition so they will not be replaced within the next 10+ years. Cantilevered pedestrian bridges are possible but MDOT does not fund anything like that. Recommend looking closely at the width of the current bridge and try to work within it. Can look at complete streets and road diet check list.
5. Nicole – Will be looking to Mason for regional connections. Recently found out that they will be receiving federal funds. Looking at water trails. Looking at Mason as an example community of how to plan and implement, and coordinate with MDOT. There have been ways to circumvent federal levels and get things accomplished like recent signage project. Would be available to write letters of recommendation for grant applications, etc. There are state grants for fishing access. “We all want input but what we really want is informed input”
6. Miranda-TSC, Not currently much in the Mason area in the 5-year plan. Possibly in 10-years+ when intersections are reconstructed there may be funds available to include non-motorized facilities. MDOT can contribute to costs of ADA ramps, signals, etc. within ROWs. Possible “diversion diamond interchange” at US-127.
7. Micah – Try to coordinate any construction projects with proposed road construction projects.
8. Tracy – Delhi anticipate trail built to College Road by end of 2022. Aurelius and Vevay are not opposed to trails but they are not capable of implementing and maintaining. 20% of Delhi residents identify as Mason residents, use Mason Parks, kids go to Mason schools, etc. Delhi Parks are open to Mason residents. Look at overlap between parks and facilities. Can work together to share facilities. A feasibility study has been done, currently Howell Rd. was identified as the best option. County-wide trail millage needs to be looked at in terms of how funds are dispersed.

9. Elizabeth – How do we look at floodable park facilities, whether it is county drain or Sycamore creek? The cost of the grant is sometimes more than Mason can afford. If donors give money, there needs to be funds to maintain it. Will look to Tri-County and Ingham County to help out from Howell Rd. to College Rd.
10. Laura – Who will own and maintain the trail when its in?
11. Ken - Possible elderly funds from National Parks Service to fund trails and non-motorized pathways.

Include attendees on constant contact.

MASON PARKS, RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN
2020-2025

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: Hayhoe/Fischer

Date: December 25, 2019, 8:30 AM

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

George Hayhoe – Hayhoe Asphalt

John Fischer – Anderson Fischer

1. John – Lack of City athletic fields. Sporting events all using private fields. John donates services to top-dress fields.
 - a. Thinks that we need to put it on the ballot to get additional funding and people would vote it through.
 - b. Would like to see a sports complex if possible.
 - c. The user groups claim that money can be made from tournaments, etc.
 - d. Sports complex typically \$1.5 - \$2 million
 - e. If City or authority can build it, thinks that clubs would be willing to maintain it.
 - f. City owned land on the southwest part of the City, east of the fairgrounds could be a location for ballfields.
 - g. Bond probably not the best place for adult softball.
2. Bob- if an authority is created, a sports complex could be built in a neighboring jurisdiction and all of the communities involved could have a stake.
3. Elizabeth – Need to consider the cost of maintenance when constructing new projects. Endowment needs to be considered.
 - a. Bond Park – need things to do for young kids or older people, small skating area, bicycle area, etc.
4. Sycamore Creek – The section of the creek in the city is the States jurisdiction (EGLE)
5. George – Would like to see trail connect to Delhi.
 - a. Delhi is planning on completing trail to College Road, approximately 1.5 miles between there and Mason.
 - b. Need to get Dart involved. Dart already maintains 3+ miles of trails on their campus. Dart anticipates 10% of their staff would bike or walk to work daily.
 - c. Trail could run north of Howell Rd. have a loop ramp on SW corner of Howell and US-127 and then cross on south side of Howell Rd. Dart is Integral, they also own SE corner of Howell and US-127.
 - d. Need to emphasize “regionally important connector” once the trail comes south to Howell Rd.
 - e. Would like to add the trail from silver respite across John and George’s property, along the railroad row to the high school.
 - f. Section east from the water treatment to Bond.

- g. City has an easement north side of Howell to ISD, the city has a cross easement with ISD parking lot for trailhead. Road Commission says that we cannot cross Howell Rd. at grade because of a lack of site distance. There is an opening in the woods directly across from the Hayhoe trail intersection.
 - h. County would allow Mason to take over Howell Rd and would pave it before they hand it over. George has offered to build the section of trail to ISD parking lot.
 - i. Unanimous resolution was passed by Aleidon to allow the trail along Cedar but will not pay for it.
 - j. Ingham County wayfinding program – Elizabeth currently looking into this.
 - k. Friends of Ingham Regional Trails, selling attachments to signs for advertisements/sponsorships.
6. Elizabeth – restrooms at trailheads?
 - a. Library construction will be putting in exterior restrooms.
 - b. Porta-johns or pit toilets could be used at trailheads. Precast concrete pit toilets are a good, cost-effective choice.
 7. Is there a way to get from Cedar to the portion of trail connects to Kipp Road?
 8. Really need a way to get to Meijer. No existing sidewalks along Kipp.

MASON PARKS, RECREATION, NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND WAYFINDING MASTER PLAN
2020-2025

Stakeholder Meeting Notes

Stakeholder Groups: Ingham County/Delhi Parks

Date: December 25, 2019, 10:30 AM

Attendees: City Staff/Consultants: Elizabeth Hude, Bob Ford, Nick Wallace

Participants:

Mark Jenks – Delhi Parks

Melissa Buzard – Ingham County

Mike Unsworth – Tri-County Bicycle Association Advocacy Committee

Deborah Stuart – Mason

1. Mark – We are looking forward to the trail connection going south to Mason.
 - a. Delhi just passed their first millage for parks and rec. 1 mil, apx. \$800k
 - b. Want to have four projects to show over the four year millage renewal cycle.
 - c. Sold cell towers and used revenue as match funds Esker landing.
 - d. Approximately \$1.3 million total parks and rec budget.
 - e. Approximately 25,000 people.
 - f. DDA has been the catalyst for parks projects in Delhi.
 - g. Parks and rec maintains all park property, school properties, sidewalk maintenance, roadkill pickup, maintain Cedar Street corridor, library, city hall, cemetery.
 - h. Decline property regularly, if it doesn't have a public use then we don't need it.
 - i. Staff: 4 administrative, 6 full-time maintenance, 12 part-time (6 gardeners, 6 lawn maintenance). Approximately 2/3 of total budget.
 - j. In 1972 Delhi established an agreement between the school district and Parks and Rec to use all public properties at no cost. Recognized by NRPA as a good model.
 - k. Promote and maintain facilities for things like junior rams football and soccer even though Delhi doesn't receive revenues, they don't have to program those activities so it saves money overall.
 - l. Maintain areas outside of the township because they are part of Holt school district for example, some property in Dimondale.
 - m. If you can do Mutual Aid in firefighting, why not Parks and Rec?
 - n. Trail system is the best thing to ever happen to our town.
 - o. Group recreation is declining but passive recreation like trail usage is growing.
2. Melissa – Millage coordinator
 - a. Hayhoe Riverwalk is such a great amenity.
 - b. Excited for connection from Delhi to Mason. Hopeful for Ram trail to Burchfield.
 - c. Don't yet know how to cross US-127
 - d. Want to work with Mason on trail wayfinding signage.
 - i. There has been talk about a separate maintenance fund for signage.
 - ii. Going for millage renewal next year, March ballot.

- e. Now that Delhi is moving forward it is time to get the players back together to discuss Cedar St. connection.
 - f. Active member of the community garden
 - g. Walk the Rivertrail frequently, visit Laylin regularly.
3. Mike – On tri-county bicycle advocacy committee (TCBA)
- a. 1,000 members, largest numbers from Lansing, East Lansing, Meridian
 - b. Many people don't feel safe on the road. Sale of road bikes have gone down, gravel bikes have gone up.
 - c. People feel safer on trails. Trails have economic benefits and fitness benefits.
 - d. Wayfinding signs are very beneficial for cyclists.
 - e. Drain commissioner on board with the Cedar street pathway. Have discussed enclosing the drain.
 - f. Pat Kelly – President of bicycle committee
 - g. Partnering with the League of Michigan Bicyclists for a state wide educator.
 - h. Driving Change – Grand Rapids has greatly reduced safety issues of cycling.
 - i. Electric bikes are becoming very popular and are extending ride distances.
 - j. Take out one parking space and put in a bike rack for 10 bikes.
 - k. Cantilevered bridge is great way to cross rivers and roadways.
 - l. Would like to see a metro parks authority.
4. Michigan Trailways and Greenways Alliance – did the study for the regional connection.
5. Elizabeth – Number one priority for Mason is Columbia St. bridge, second is Howell Rd. connection.
6. Deb – What is happening with the southern connections?
- a. Heard that Vevay is looking for trail funding.

Notes from Stakeholder Phone Interviews

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC.

OAKLAND CENTER, 809 Center Street, Suite 1, Lansing, MI 48906
(517) 485-5500 Fax (517) 485-5576 E-mail: info@lapinc.net

MEMO

Date: 12-09-19
To: File
From: Bob Ford
Subject: FFA – Adult Advisor,

Contact: Pete Barnum
School Phone – 517-676-9055 x 2280
Email: barnump@masonk12.net

He said that he teaches a class that does the maple sap harvesting each year as a class project at the Rayner Woodlot. They also help remove fallen limbs/trees etc. to keep the path clear. He teaches silviculture to the students so they get a lot out of having that woodlot next to the school. He is going to send me some bullet points and some exhibits from his program that we can use to validate that recreational/educational use of the woodlot by the school.

He was in favor of the trail connection from Kipp road (future sidewalk) to Ash Street and connect to an overall trail system. He also thought regular use of the loop inside the woodlot was a good public use for jogging, exercise. He said the trail does need improvements beyond what they, are capable of doing such as grading the trail to an accessible ADA grade, filling in the low-lying wet areas and provide signage that educates the public about the woodlot.

All positive stuff.

From: Peter T. Barnum
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 8:20 AM
To: Bob Ford <bford@lapinc.net>
Subject: Re: Mason Recreation Plan and Rayner Park Woodlot

Good morning,

Sorry it has taken so long to get back with you. I really appreciated your phone call the other day. The woodlot at Rayner Park has played a vital role in educating our FFA members and students at Mason High School since the 1960's. As you know it is a beautiful Maple Beech Forest typical of many of the forests in Ingham County.

The maple trees specifically have provided a rich hands on learning experience for agriscience students and FFA members through the years. Students and members work to tap trees, collect sap and boil the sap to make maple syrup.

Maple syrup produced is sold and has been the primary fundraiser for our FFA chapter. Income from syrup sales greatly multiplies the learning opportunities for members as they travel to compete in leadership and ag skills contests, attend leadership development workshops and participate in planning retreats throughout the year. Of course, through this process our youth are also learning responsibility and the value of hard work.

In addition, to maple syrup production the woodlot is a great teaching resource for our classes. Students learn the fundamentals of forestry including topics such as; tree identification, timber cruising, woodlot management and compass and pacing. Many students have used those lessons learned to compete in the FFA Forestry contest. Many of our teams have won the state contest and competed in the national contest as well.

The spring offers another opportunity for learning with the emergence of beautiful wild flowers. I take advantage with another plant id lesson. It is always fun to see students start to look deeper into and more closely to the natural world that surrounds them.

If you have any questions or if there is anything else I can help with please don't hesitate.

Respectfully,

Pete Barnum

Agriscience Teacher

FFA Advisor

INSPIRE • EMPOWER • SUCCEED

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC.

OAKLAND CENTER, 809 Center Street, Suite 1, Lansing, MI 48906
(517) 485-5500 Fax (517) 485-5576 E-mail: info@lapinc.net

MEMO

Date: 12-12-19
To: File
From: Bob Ford
Subject: Central Michigan Amateur Radio Club (CMARC) and the Lansing Area/Ingham County Amateur Radio Public Service Corps (ARPSC)
Contact: Ed Hude, "State Government Liasion" for CMARC (retired Mason Police Dept.)
Phone 517-420-7550

Ed Hude indicated that the CMARC has been operating for over 90 years and has been hosting a "Field Day" the later portion of June each year at Rayner Park for many years. This event is attended by many amateur ham radio operators from across the region (Ingham/Eaton Counties). The club has over 100 members. The club members bring in generators on trailers for the weekend demonstrating their hobby to club members and the public. Many of the attendee's frequent restaurants in town and purchase supplies, etc.

CMARC occupy the southern portion of Rayner Park between the Rayner Wood Lot and the pavilion. The use the woodlot trees to hang their antenna wires to allow people to transmit radio signals for emergency testing and training. The club has been recently reaching out to area schools such as; Mason High School and to ISD to see if they can interest the younger generation in this technology. They are also working with Charlotte Schools. Ed indicated that this technology is perfectly aligned with "robotics" since it uses high wave radio bands to transmit to robots, which is of great interest to those students that attend Robotic conventions and compete on the local, state-wide and national tournaments.

The Club has also teamed with St. James Church in Mason during their annual fundraising run. The assist by monitoring distress calls, coordination of activities and helping with operations during the running event. They also provide a similar type of activity for the Veteran's Day parade in Mason and "Common Ground" in Lansing.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC.

OAKLAND CENTER, 809 Center Street, Suite 1, Lansing, MI 48906
(517) 485-5500 Fax (517) 485-5576 E-mail: info@lapinc.net

MEMO

Date: 12-09-19
To: File
From: Bob Ford
Subject: Jason Mellema, ISD Superintendent
Contact: Jason Mellema, ISD Superintendent – 517-244-1214
Email: <https://www.inghamisd.org/staff/staffdirectory/>

Jason indicated that the ISD is very interested in partnering with the City of Mason and others relative to Non-Motorized Transportation. He suggested a loop trail including Howell Road, Jefferson, Hayhoe Trail.

I mentioned the trail head located on ISD along Howell Road and the easement to the west. He would like to see those documents and/or he can research to see if those documents are in ISD's possession. Regardless he thought it was a great use to have a public trail connect to ISD so that some of their students can take advantage and learn how to use this type of trail as part of their learning objectives.

Jason also stated that the outdoor playground is designed to meet the needs of children that have disabilities and that the playground is open to the public. He would like to explore how the trail could be designed to incorporate the playground as a public destination for families with disabilities.

I asked Jason to send us a statement regarding these goals so that we could include them within the Recreation Plan. I am sending him an email to that affect.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC.

OAKLAND CENTER, 809 Center Street, Suite 1, Lansing, MI 48906
(517) 485-5500 Fax (517) 485-5576 E-mail: info@lapinc.net

MEMO

Date: 12-12-19
To: File
From: Bob Ford (phone conversation with Debra Stuart).
Subject: Downtown Development Authority
Contact: Debra Stuart, City Manager
Phone 517-676-9155
Email: Stuartd@mason.mi.us

Deb Stuart met with the DDA Wednesday 12-11-19 at their regular meeting and reported her observations to Bob Ford on 12-12-19.

Lee Austin Park is the only park in the DDA district. There is a redevelopment plan/drawing for the Lee Austin Park that LAP has not seen yet that describes terraced slopes allowing additional flood area for the Sycamore Creek at the Lee Austin Park. It would also provide a place for people to sit and enjoy river views and still contain the Hayhoe River Trail. Deb indicated that the DDA favors this proposal and is confident that they would support this type of redevelopment idea in this location. If parking could be included in this concept that would be an added benefit for the downtown area.

The library restrooms are currently being renovated to allow for outdoor access for public use. This idea tends to eliminate the need for stand-alone restrooms in Lee Austin Park since the library is within easy walking distance.

She also said that she is confident that the DDA would support the installation of new parking lot signs to identify public parking lots within the DDA.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC.

OAKLAND CENTER, 809 Center Street, Suite 1, Lansing, MI 48906
(517) 485-5500 Fax (517) 485-5576 E-mail: info@lapinc.net

MEMO

Date: 12-12-19
To: File
From: Bob Ford
Subject: Tri County Bicycle Association, Road Riding, Touring
Contact: Pat Kelly, President
Phone: 517-242-6940
Email: Kelly_Patrick@hotmail.com

Patrick Kelly, President of the TCBA said the organization started in the Lansing area but has since grown. The group represents 550 memberships which represents about 800 people. TCBA hosts the DALMAC ride from Lansing to Mackinaw 1,200 – 2,500 riders.

Pat says that he rides within the Mason to do errands etc., and uses the Hayhoe Trail and streets. He says it is easy to get around. The Hayhoe Trail needs trenching along the sides of the trail to get rid of the roots that are uplifting the trail. The Tart Trail does this regularly with great success. Pat would like to see the trail connection between Holt and Mason as soon as possible and he TCBA is willing and able to assist in lobbying for this project.

People don't like to start bicycling on main roads, Pat says. It is much better and safer to use "off-road" routes such as trails like the Hayhoe Trail. Soon people will learn how to negotiate the local roads and how to "share the country roads". Pat avoids Cedar Street at all costs due to potholes, traffic and speed that autos travel, although it is a direct route, but very hard to negotiate the right-of-way. He lives near the high-school and rides the country roads almost every day. He says this is a great place to bicycle outside the city, but the city is pretty easy to get around also.

Pat was aware of the new section of trail along Howell Road and was excited to learn that Kerns Road will be getting a new trail. TCBA would support a road diet along Cedar Street to create bicycle lanes along Cedar Street to get to restaurants. Kipp Road is a busy road but does have a wide shoulder and can be used during non-peak periods. He suggests that area be considered for bicycle friendly infrastructure as well.

Notes: Open House - December 14, 2019

Mason Open House

12/14/19

- 210 Lawton – Laylin pond dredging – NE pond wasn’t dredged deep enough
- Rayner playground needs to be fixed!
- Splash pad – Need to provide incentives to use Hawk Island; Free passes; Communicate location to residents
- Pickle Ball – would be nice to include at various parks
- Improve area west of City Hall – Fill, landscape, enhance; East side should be cleaned up also
- Laylin Park – Aeration pumps make ice weak in winter: Should post “Skate at Own Risk”: NO swimming also: Check with DPW about aeration pumps – Should not run in winter
- Dredge Rayner Ponds; Provide fishing; Ask MSU for help; Deep holes
- Living history – Shattuck 12.5 acres, work with St. James
- Benches along street – Along Maple and between Laylin and Downtown
- Outdoor game tables in parks (Backgammon/Checkers)
- Consider a skating pond for families – Rayner – Other
- Add trees to Hayes Park
- Laylin – Goose poop – 4 dozen geese
- Dispose of Lee Austin Park – Use for flood detention
- Consider – Disposing of other parks that are not used
- Relocate ballfield at Bond Park
- Sell a portion of Bond Park for residential housing
- Remove in-line skating at Bond Park – Substitute with a playground
- Laylin Park – Floodlight in parking lot is not oriented correctly
- Laylin Park – Move bathrooms on other side of restroom building
- Add six (6) pickle ball courts – anywhere – Possibly Bond, Hayes
- Rayner – Basketball used – Replace nets and upgrade court
- Hayes – Basketball used – Replace nets and upgrade court
- Wheelchair improvement throughout parks
- Wheelchair swimming pool
- Adult playgrounds – swings – Germany i.e. activities for healthy seniors
- Need better signage for rest rooms and library
- Restrooms need to be improved at all parks
- What does it cost to renovate Hayes for pickle ball – 4 courts?
- Mason Softball Association volunteered to maintain Bond/Hayes Park; Liability concerns need to be explored
- Mile markers on the Hayhoe Trail
- Trash receptacles along trail
- Incorporate kids activities at Community Garden
- Incorporate tree survey into report
- Sidewalks to Meijer
- More trail – trail extension from cemetery to Jefferson


Presentation to Planning Commission and City Council

Mason is a community founded upon a respect for our historic past, while encouraging an atmosphere that values family, business, the environment and the arts, creating a sense of place for present and future generations.

- City of Mason Master Plan 2014

CITY OF MASON

PARKS, RECREATION, AND NON-MOTORIZED PLAN



THIS PLAN SEEKS TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

- Why develop a parks, recreation, and non-motorized plan?
- Do we have the right type of facilities for our community?
- Are our parks the right size – too small or too big?
- Are our parks accessible, connected, and multi-generational?
- Do we have parks in the right locations?
- Do our non-motorized facilities provide safe access throughout the city?
- Does existing public parking serve the needs of our community?
- How do we pay for it all?

METHODOLOGY

Three primary drivers for prioritizing investments in parks

- COMPLIANCE
- CONDITION
- CAPACITY
- COST



WHY DEVELOP A PARKS, RECREATION AND NON-MOTORIZED PLAN?

- **FUTURE PLANNING**

Address current problems, anticipate future problems, and provide information to make sound decisions on spending and policy moving forward.

Updating the recreation plan provides an opportunity for the community to provide input and reflect changing needs and wants.

- **GRANT ELIGIBILITY**

Recreation and non-motorized plans allow communities to receive grants from county, state, and federal agencies such as the MDNR or MDOT.

- **PUBLIC SAFETY**

Ensure all parks are safe and provide adequate access for all citizens.

MICHIGAN DNR REQUIREMENTS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION PLANS

- Community Description
- Administrative Structure
- Inventory of Existing Parks, Natural Areas and Recreation Facilities
- Description of the Planning and Public Input Process
- Goals and Objectives
- Action Program

MASON PARKS AND NON-MOTORIZED INVENTORY

- **PARKS**
 - 8 parks
 - 92.74 total acres
- **CEMETERY**
 - Maple Grove Cemetery
 - 38 acres
- **STRUCTURES AND FACILITIES**
 - 4 Pavilions
 - 4 Playgrounds
 - 12 Sports Facilities
- **SIDEWALKS AND PATHWAYS**
 - 44.26 miles of sidewalks
 - 2.5 mile shared-use path (Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail)
 - 3 trailheads with dedicated parking lots


DO WE HAVE THE RIGHT TYPE OF PARK FACILITIES FOR OUR COMMUNITY?

Recreation Facilities Evaluation

The following table evaluates current park facilities in the City based on Michigan Department of Natural Resources recommendations.

Type of Recreation Facility	Standard	Existing Public Facilities	Need for Existing Population	Surplus/Deficiency	School/Non-City Owned Facilities	Combined Surplus/Deficiency
Basketball Courts	1/5,000	2	2	0	3	3
Tennis Courts	1/1,000	2	5	-3	8	5
Volleyball	1/5,000	1	2	-1	0	-1
Ball Diamonds	1/5,000	3	2	1	8	9
Little League Diamonds (Lighted)	1/30,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Football Fields	1/20,000	0	1	-1	3	2
Soccer Fields	1/10,000	3	1	2	10	12
Golf Courses (9 hole)	1/25,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Golf Courses (18 hole)	1/50,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Driving Range	1/50,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Swimming Pools	1/20,000	0	1	-1	2	2
Ice Rinks (Indoor)	1/100,000	0	1	-1	0	-1
Running Track (1/4 mile)	1/20,000	0	1	-1	1	0
Playgrounds/Structures	1/3,000	4	3	1	4	5
Paved Trails	1 system	1	1	0	0	0

DO WE HAVE THE RIGHT TYPE OF PARK FACILITIES FOR OUR COMMUNITY?




ARE OUR PARKS THE RIGHT SIZE - TOO SMALL OR TOO BIG?

Classification	General Description	Location Criteria	Size Criteria
Mini-Park	Used to address limited, isolated or unique recreational needs.	Less than a 1/4 mile distance in residential setting.	Between 2500 sq. ft. and one acre in size.
Neighborhood Park	Neighborhood park remains the basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreation and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on informal active and passive recreation.	1/4 to 1/2-mile distance and uninterrupted by non-residential roads and other physical barriers.	5 acres is considered minimum size, 6 to 10 acres is optimal.
School-Park	Depending on circumstances, combining parks with school sites can fulfill the space requirements for other classes of parks, such as neighborhood, community, sports complex and special use.	Determined by location of school district property.	Variable – depends on function.
Community Park	Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park (see appendix for definition of "neighborhood park"). Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces.	Determined by the quality and suitability of the site. Usually serves two or more neighborhoods and 1/2 to 3 mile distance.	As needed to accommodate desired uses. Usually between 30 and 50 acres.
Regional Park	Land set aside for preservation of natural beauty or environmental significance, recreation use or historic or cultural interest use.	Located to serve several communities within 1 hour driving time.	Optimal size is 200+ acres, but size varies based on accommodating the desired uses.




ARE OUR PARKS THE RIGHT SIZE - TOO SMALL OR TOO BIG?



ARE OUR PARKS ACCESSIBLE, CONNECTED, AND MULTI-GENERATIONAL?


Accessibility Grade	Definition
1	None of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines.
2	Some of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines.
3	Most of the facilities/park areas meet accessibility guidelines.
4	The entire park meets accessibility guidelines.
5	The entire park was developed/renovated using the principals of universal design.

The average accessibility rating for Mason's parks is **2.00**



ARE OUR PARKS ACCESSIBLE, CONNECTED, AND MULTI-GENERATIONAL?

- Mason has a relatively even distribution of age groups within its population.
- Based on these demographics the City can anticipate a similar distribution over the next five years.



ARE OUR PARKS ACCESSIBLE, CONNECTED, AND MULTI-GENERATIONAL?




MAP OF GAPS IN NON-MOTORIZED SYSTEM

Missing infrastructure:


- Sections of sidewalk
- Street crossings
- Trail connections
- Highway and Railroad Crossings
- ADA Compliance

DO WE HAVE PARKS IN THE RIGHT LOCATIONS?



Park Service Area Map (Vehicular)


DO WE HAVE PARKS IN THE RIGHT LOCATIONS?



**Park Service Area Map
(Non-Motorized)**

- The neighborhoods west of US-127 are disconnected from the park and trail system.

DO WE HAVE PARKS IN THE RIGHT LOCATIONS?



Playground Vicinity Map

DO OUR NON-MOTORIZED FACILITIES PROVIDE SAFE ACCESS THROUGHOUT THE CITY?



**Future Non-Motorized System
(Routes)**

This map shows future routes utilizing both existing and proposed infrastructure such as:

- Sidewalks
 - The Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail
 - Additional shared use path
 - Bike Lanes
 - Shared roadways
- Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail
— Proposed Routes
● Potential Regional Connection Points

DOES EXISTING PUBLIC PARKING SERVE THE NEEDS OF OUR COMMUNITY?

INADEQUATE

LEE AUSTIN PARK
(TO BE COORDINATED
WITH CONSUMER'S
ENERGY)

NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

RAYNER PARK
GRIFFIN PARK
BICENTENNIAL PARK
BOND PARK
MAPLE GROVE CEMETERY

ADEQUATE

LAYLIN PARK
HAYES PARK

Based on compliance, condition, capacity, and cost.

The 4Cs

PAVILIONS, PLAY STRUCTURES, AND FACILITIES



HAYES PARK TENNIS COURT



RAYNER PARK PLAYGROUND



LAYLIN PARK PAVILION

DOES EXISTING PUBLIC PARKING SERVE THE NEEDS OF OUR COMMUNITY?

AVAILABLE PUBLIC PARKING THAT CAN BE IDENTIFIED FOR USERS

- Parks
- Trailheads
- Public Lots
 - City
 - County
 - State
- Additional Private Parking that can be used by the public



COMMUNITY INPUT

• **STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS (NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 2019)**

Garden Clubs	Surrounding Townships
Historical Society	Mason Public Schools
Sports Clubs	Future Farmers of America (FFA)
Service Clubs	Ingham Intermediate School District (ISD)
Mason Senior Citizens	Tri-County Bicycle Association (TCBA) Advocacy Committee
Friends/Donors to Parks	
Ingham County Parks	

COMMUNITY INPUT

• **STAKEHOLDERS INVITED**

Sycamore Creek Garden Club	Ingham County Parks
Community Garden	Delhi Township Community Development
Capital Area District Library	Delhi Township Parks and Recreation
Mason Soccer Club	Mason Public Schools
Mason Softball Association	Future Farmers of America
Mid-Michigan Pony League	Tri-County Bicycle Association
Connect Sports	Mason Chamber of Commerce
Rotary Club of Mason	Modern Woodman
Mason Lions Club	Vault Deli
Mason Kiwanis Club	Central Michigan Amateur Radio Club
Mason Optimist Club	Downtown Development Authority
Ingham County Drain Commission	Michigan Tri-County Regional Planning
Ingham County Parks and Trails	MDOT Lansing Transportation Service Center
Anderson Fischer	MDOT University Region Planning
Spicer Group	Recreational Outreach Center (ROC)
Dart Foundation	

COMMUNITY INPUT

• **STAKEHOLDER MEETING ATTENDANCE**

Diann Jackman, Sycamore Creek Garden Club	Miranda Spare – Cost and Scheduling Engineer, MDOT
Crystal Noecker, Community Garden	Nicole Baumer – Deputy Director, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
Jim Evans, Community Garden	Laura Tschihart – Transportation Planner, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
Scott Duimstra – Historian, CADL	Ken Hall – Land Use Planner, Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
Ronald Drzewicki – Superintendent, Mason Public Schools	George Hayhoe – Benefactor
Greg Lattig – Athletic Director, Mason Public Schools	John Fischer – President, Anderson Fischer
Kurt Creamer – Board President, Mason Public Schools	Melissa Buzzard – Coordinator, Ingham County Parks and Trails
Don Johns – President, Mid-Michigan Pony League	Michael Unsworth – Advocacy Committee, Tri-County Bicycle Association
Ryan Davis – Secretary, Mid-Michigan Pony League	Mark Jenks – Director, Delhi Township Parks and Recreation
Mike Raab – Treasurer, Mid-Michigan Pony League	
Tim Rogers – President, Mason Soccer Club	
Gary Evans, Mason Pickleball/Softball	
Russ Whipple – League Director, Mason Softball Association	
Micah Norwood – Transportation Engineer, MDOT	
Tracy Miller – Director, Delhi Township Community Development	
Mike Davis – Transportation Planner, MDOT	



ACTION PLAN



- Operations, maintenance, and capital improvements program.
- User agreements.
- Expand local partnerships.
- Regional partnerships:
 - Trail extension north (Delhi township, Lansing)
 - Trail extensions south (Leslie, Jackson)
 - Sports Facilities (Regional Authority)
- Implement 1 mill dedicated to parks.


CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TARGET YEAR	PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED COSTS	REVENUE SOURCE
2019-2020	2017-P8	Laylin Park	Laylin Park Improvements - Phase II to 2018-2019 Project	\$200,000	Rayner Bond
2019-2020	2018-P9	Non-Motorized	Kerns Road - Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail Extension	\$160,000	Grant Funding
2020-2021	2017-P10	Blind Park	Bond Park Improvements	\$300,000	Rayner Bond/Grants
2021-2022	2017-P11	Hayes Park	Hayes Park Improvements	\$200,000	Rayner Bond/Grants
2022-2023	2018-P4	Lee Austin Park	Lee Austin Park Improvements	\$100,000	Rayner Bond/Grants
2022-2023	2017-P14	Griffin Park	Griffin Park Improvements	\$20,000	Rayner Bond/Grants
2022-2023	2019-P1	Lee Austin Park/Consumers Park	Pavillion/Parking Improvements (adjacent to Lee Austin Park)	\$50,000	TBD
2023-2024	2017-P12	Rayner Park	Rayner Park Improvements	\$150,000	Rayner Bond
2023-2024	2018-P3	All Mason recreation facilities	Planning Parks/Recreation Plan - 5 year update	\$15,000	Rayner Bond
2024-2025	2018-P15	Cemetery	Second Drive - Cemetery	\$70,000	General Fund
2024-2025	2018-P5	Non-Motorized	Hayhoe Trail: Internal Loop-South Side (Jefferson/High School/Rayner Street)	\$150,000	General Fund
2024-2025	2018-P6	Non-Motorized	Hayhoe Trail: Internal Loop North Side- (Howell/ Mason Street/Cemetery)	\$150,000	General Fund
2024-2025	2018-P7	Non-Motorized	Hayhoe Trail: Internal Loop West Side- (Columbia 127 pedestrian bridge w/mid-block crossing)	\$1,675,000	General Fund
2024-2025	2018-P8	Non-Motorized	Hayhoe Trail: Internal Loop East Side- (Rayner/Middle School/Laylin)	\$15,000	General Fund
2024-2025	2019-P2	Cemetery	Cemetery/Trailhead Restroom	\$75,000	General Fund

HOW DO WE PAY FOR IT ALL?

- **OPTION 1 – NO CHANGE**
Do nothing different. With this option we will see our parks decline as we may not be able to support the cost of major repairs when needed.

- **OPTION 2 – REDUCE FACILITIES**
Same budget – Reduce facilities to reduce operations and maintenance costs, redirect money to major repairs.

- **OPTION 3 – INCREASE BUDGET TO MAINTAIN**
Increase the budget (taxes) to cover the costs for maintaining and improving only the existing facilities.

- **OPTION 4 – INCREASE BUDGET TO EXPAND**
Do nothing different. With this option we will see our parks decline as we may not be able to support the cost of major repairs when needed.


Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

We Need YOUR Help to Plan for Mason's Future.

TAKE THE ONLINE SURVEY!


Our public comment period will run now through December 31. Make sure your voice is heard!


The survey can be found at:
www.surveymason.com
 Or just scan the QR code to access the survey on your smartphone.



Please come to the **Public Input Open House:**
 Mason City Hall
 Saturday, December 14th
 from 10am-2pm.

Questions? Call: (517) 676-8155
 email: info@mason.mi.us



Thank you for allowing
 LAP+Creative to be a part of
 your community plan!



Resolution of Recommendation

Introduced: Waxman
Second: Droscha

**CITY OF MASON
PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION No. 2020-01
A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE
CITY OF MASON PARKS, RECREATION AND NON-MOTORIZED PLAN 2020-2024**

January 14, 2020

WHEREAS, the City of Mason has prepared the City of Mason Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan which describes the physical features, existing facilities and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain recreation facilities during the planning period between 2020 and 2024, and

WHEREAS, prioritization of projects listed in the Plan is based on the overall benefit to the community, especially when improving public health, safety and welfare, and so that the most-needed projects will be accomplished first and scarce financial resources are allocated appropriately; and

WHEREAS, two community open houses were held on October 12 and December 14, 2019, at Mason City Hall to provide an opportunity for citizens to provide input regarding parks, recreation and non-motorized opportunities within the community, and

WHEREAS, citizens were provided additional opportunities for providing input through an on-line public opinion survey from October 12 through December 31, 2019, and

WHEREAS, additional public input was received through stakeholder meetings with pertinent organizations, and

WHEREAS, citizens were notified of availability of the draft plan on December 13, 2019 and afforded thirty-three days to review and provide comments on a draft of the Plan prior to the Mason City Council taking formal action to adopt the plan, and

WHEREAS, a public hearing will be held on January 20, 2020, in the Council Chambers at the Mason City Hall to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Plan, and

WHEREAS, the City of Mason has developed the Plan for the benefit of the entire community and to adopt the Plan as a document to assist in meeting the park, recreational and non-motorized needs of the community, and


NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission recommends that City Council adopts the City of Mason Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan 2020-2024 as a guideline for improving parks, recreation and non-motorized facilities for the residents of the City of Mason.

Yes (8) Barna, Droscha, Howe, Perrault, Sabbadin, Shattuck, Vercher, Waxman

No (0) None

Absent (1) Wren

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the Planning Commission at its regular meeting held January 14, 2020 the original of which is part of the Planning Commission minutes.


Sarah J. Jarvis, Clerk
City of Mason
Ingham County, Michigan

Minutes of Public Meeting

**CITY OF MASON
REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES OF JANUARY 20, 2020**

Mayor Whipple called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at 201 W. Ash Street, Mason, Michigan. Droscha led the Pledge of Allegiance and offered the invocation.

Present: Councilmembers: Brown, Droscha, Ferris, Madden Schaffer, Vogel, Whipple
Absent: None
Also present: Deborah S. Stuart, City Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Rogers of 1352 Tuttle Road spoke about Oil/Gas drilling. Informed Council of his communication with EGLE. Encouraged Council to invite them to next meeting.

Megan Short of 3755 West Howell Road spoke in opposition of oil drilling. Requested Council to adopt resolution in opposition.

Jack Carmichael of 519 South Rogers spoke in opposition of oil drilling.

Angela Moore of 2016 Hagadorn Road spoke in opposition of oil drilling. Asked Council to pass a resolution in opposition.

Lori Sealey of 424 West Columbia spoke in opposition of oil drilling.

CONSENT CALENDAR

MOTION by Droscha, second by Vogel,
to approve the Consent Calendar as presented

A. Minutes:

1. Approve Minutes of Regular Council Meeting January 6, 2020
2. Approve Minutes of Closed Session Meeting January 6, 2020 (to be provided)

B. Correspondence:

1. Receipt of City Attorney's Report Dated January 16, 2020

C. Financials:

1. Approve Bills in the Amount of \$205,080.25
2. Receipt of Monthly Revenue and Expenditure Report for Period Ending December 31, 2019
3. Receipt of Quarterly Investment Report for Period Ending December 31, 2019
4. Approve Renewal of Service Agreement with Advanced Communications & Data (ACD)
5. Authorize Necessary Budget Amendments and Change Order to the Hayhoe Riverwalk Contract with Rieth-Riley Construction Company, Inc. for Howell Road- Hayhoe Riverwalk Trailhead (CIP 2018-P1) in the Amount of \$9,163.00 to Meet the Requirements of MDOT Office of Rail
6. Adoption of the Changes to the MERS Defined Benefit Plan Adoption Agreements and Authorizing the City Manager to Execute the Necessary Agreements

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Public Hearing on the Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan 2020-2024 (CIP 2018-P2b)

Mayor Whipple opened the public hearing on the Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan 2020-2024 (CIP 2018-P2b) at 7:48 p.m.

- Gary Evans 325 Willow Street spoke in support of pickle ball.
- Celeste Hude of 411 West Maple Street spoke about park lighting concerns.

Mayor Whipple closed the Public Hearing at 7:50pm.

1. Resolution 2020-04: Adoption of Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan

MOTION by Brown, second by Ferris,
to adopt Resolution 2020-04: Adoption of Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan 2020-2024.

Discussion regarding concerns with draft plan took place.

MOTION by Brown, second by Madden,
to table the adoption of Resolution 2020-04 to next regularly scheduled meeting on February 3, 2020.

Yes (5) Brown, Madden, Schaffer, Vogel, Whipple
No (2) Droscha, Ferris

MOTION APPROVED

MOTION by Brown, second by Vogel,
to allow staff to submit draft plan if required by State.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None


COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS

- Vogel acknowledged Martin Luther King Day.
- Vogel requested Police presence at Sycamore St and Barnes St regarding a traffic issue.
- Droscha stated that the Planning Commission adopted the Park plan at its last meeting.
- Brown stated he had questions regarding the oil drilling related to the Mason Public Schools action and the hydrogen sulfide; Manager Stuart responded to those inquires.
- Whipple asked Manager Stuart to invite representatives from Jordan Development Company and EGLE to the next meeting to provide background to date, permit changes, and safety.

MANAGERS REPORT (01/17/2020)

Stuart noted that there are more requests for the MML Capital Conference than the Council has budget for. Discussion followed. Manager Stuart will bring back the item.

The meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.



Deborah Stuart, City Manager

City Council Resolution

Introduced: Brown
Second: Ferris

**CITY OF MASON
CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2020-04**

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE CITY OF MASON
PARKS, RECREATION AND NON-MOTORIZED PLAN 2020-2024**

February 3, 2020

WHEREAS, the City of Mason has prepared a City of Mason Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan (the "Plan") which describes the physical features, existing facilities and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain recreation facilities during the planning period between 2020 and 2024; and

WHEREAS, prioritization of projects listed in the plan is based on the overall benefit to the community, especially when improving public health, safety and welfare, and so that the most-needed projects will be accomplished first and scarce financial resources are allocated appropriately; and

WHEREAS, two community open houses were held on October 12 and December 14, 2019, at Mason City Hall to provide an opportunity for citizens to provide input regarding parks, recreation and non-motorized opportunities within the community; and

WHEREAS, citizens were provided additional opportunities for providing input through an on-line public opinion survey from October 12 through December 31, 2019; and

WHEREAS, additional public input was received through stakeholder meetings with pertinent organizations; and

WHEREAS, citizens were notified of availability of the draft plan on December 13, 2019 and afforded thirty-three days to review and provide comments on a draft of the Plan prior to the Mason City Council taking formal action to adopt the plan; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on January 20, 2020, at the Mason City Hall to provide an opportunity for citizens to express opinions, ask questions, and discuss all aspects of the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mason Planning Commission considered public input, has reviewed the proposed draft, and recommends (PC Resolution 2020-01) that the City Council adopt the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mason has developed the Plan for the benefit of the entire community and to adopt the Plan as a document to assist in meeting the park, recreational and non-motorized needs of the community.


NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council adopts the City of Mason Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan 2020-2024 as a guideline for improving parks, recreation and non-motorized facilities for the residents of the City of Mason.

YES: (6) Brown, Droscha, Ferris, Madden, Schaffer, Whipple

NO: (0)

ABSENT: (1) Vogel

CLERK'S CERTIFICATION: I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council at its regular meeting held Monday, February 3, 2020, the original of which is part of the City Council meeting minutes.



Sarah J. Jarvis, City Clerk
City of Mason, Ingham County

Transmittal Letters to Regional Planning Agencies



LAP + CREATIVE
Landscape Architects and Planners.

809 Center St, Suite 1 | Lansing, MI 48906 | info@lapinc.net | (ph) 517-485-5500 | (fax) 517-485-5576

February 4, 2020

Tim Dolehanty, Controller/Administrator
Ingham County
Controller's Office, Ingham County Courthouse
PO Box 319
Mason, MI 48854

RE: City of Mason - Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Plan, 2020-2025

Dear Mr. Dolehanty,

Please find, enclosed a copy of the City of Mason's Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Plan for 2020-2025. Landscape Architects and Planners, Inc. was hired by the City of Mason to develop the parks, recreation and non-motorized plan, therefore if you have any questions please contact us at (517) 485-5500 or Elizabeth Hude, AICP, Community Development Director at (517) 978-0206.

Sincerely,

Robert Ford, President
Landscape Architect



LAP + CREATIVE
Landscape Architects and Planners.

809 Center St, Suite 1 | Lansing, MI 48906 | info@lapinc.net | (ph) 517-485-5500 | (fax) 517-485-5576

February 5, 2020

Jim Snell, Executive Director
Tri-County Regional Planning Commission
3135 Pine Tree Road, Suite 2C
Lansing, MI 48911

Phone: (517) 393-0342
Fax: (517) 393-4424
E-mail: jsnell@mitcrpc.org

RE: City of Mason - Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Plan, 2020-2025

Dear Mr. Snell,

Please find, enclosed a copy of the City of Mason's Parks, Recreation, and Non-Motorized Plan for 2020-2025. Landscape Architects and Planners, Inc. was hired by the City of Mason to develop the parks, recreation and non-motorized plan, therefore if you have any questions please contact us at (517) 485-5500 or Elizabeth Hude, AICP, Community Development Director at (517) 978-0206.


Sincerely,

Robert Ford, President
Landscape Architect

Results of Online Survey

Q1 What is your age? (Check one age group)


Answered: 719 Skipped: 3



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Under 18	3.34%	24
19 to 29	7.37%	53
30 to 50	50.21%	361
51 or older	39.08%	281
TOTAL		719

Q2 What is your gender?


Answered: 719 Skipped: 3



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Female	60.08%	432
Male	39.78%	286
Other	0.14%	1
TOTAL		719

Q3 Do you work in the City of Mason?

Answered: 718 Skipped: 4




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	22.01%	158
No	77.99%	560
TOTAL		718

Q4 Please provide the name of your employer. (Optional)

Answered: 91 Skipped: 631

Q5 How do you get to work?


Answered: 159 Skipped: 563



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Drive	72.33%	115
Carpool	0.63%	1
Walk	5.03%	8
Bike	1.26%	2
A combination of two or more methods listed above	11.95%	19
Other (please specify)	8.81%	14
TOTAL		159

Q6 Do you currently live in the City of Mason?


Answered: 718 Skipped: 4




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	73.40%	527
No	26.60%	191
TOTAL		718

Q7 How long have you lived in the City of Mason?

Answered: 521 Skipped: 201




ANSWER CHOICES	AVERAGE NUMBER	TOTAL NUMBER	RESPONSES
	18	9,497	521
Total Respondents: 521			



Q8 What zone from the map above do you live in?


Answered: 515 Skipped: 207



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
1	15.53%	80
2	20.97%	108
3	45.24%	233
4	11.84%	61
Other	6.41%	33
TOTAL		515

Q9 Do you have any children under the age of 18?


Answered: 703 Skipped: 19



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	45.66%	321
No	54.34%	382
TOTAL		703


Q10 How many children, by age, currently live in your household? If you prefer not to answer, please skip this question.

Answered: 317 Skipped: 405



Q11 Please identify city-owned parks or recreation facilities you visit throughout the year. See map for park and recreation facility locations.


Answered: 697 Skipped: 25



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Rayner Park	85.94%	599
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	69.87%	487
Laylin Park	54.23%	378
Hayes Park	53.52%	373
Maple Grove Cemetery and Park	48.78%	340
Bond Park	25.25%	176
Lee Austin Park	24.25%	169
Griffin Park	15.64%	109
Bicentennial Park	4.45%	31
None	2.58%	18

Q12 How often do you visit these parks and recreation facilities?


Answered: 655 Skipped: 67



	1-6 TIMES A YEAR	6-12 TIMES A YEAR	2-3 TIMES PER MONTH	ONCE A WEEK	MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK	TOTAL
Rayner Park	43.18% 247	29.72% 170	13.99% 80	6.47% 37	6.64% 38	572
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	26.29% 122	31.03% 144	18.32% 85	10.56% 49	13.79% 64	464
Laylin Park	48.49% 177	30.14% 110	8.77% 32	6.85% 25	5.75% 21	365
Hayes Park	51.82% 185	20.45% 73	13.73% 49	5.04% 18	8.96% 32	357
Maple Grove Cemetery and Park	37.69% 124	24.92% 82	16.41% 54	9.42% 31	11.55% 38	329
Bond Park	63.86% 106	19.28% 32	8.43% 14	4.82% 8	3.61% 6	166
Lee Austin Park	57.59% 91	22.15% 35	12.66% 20	3.80% 6	3.80% 6	158
Griffin Park	66.99% 69	18.45% 19	7.77% 8	3.88% 4	2.91% 3	103
Bicentennial Park	61.54% 16	11.54% 3	7.69% 2	11.54% 3	7.69% 2	26

Q13 Why do you choose to visit these parks and recreation facilities?
Check all that apply.

Answered: 655 Skipped: 67






	CONVENIENT LOCATION	SPECIFIC AMENITY/ACTIVITY THAT CAN'T BE FOUND AT OTHER PARKS	PROGRAMMED ACTIVITIES	OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)	TOTAL RESPONDENTS
Rayner Park	66.20% 376	49.12% 279	14.08% 80	10.39% 59	568
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	65.80% 302	52.07% 239	1.31% 6	12.42% 57	459
Laylin Park	75.00% 267	34.83% 124	4.21% 15	12.64% 45	356
Hayes Park	63.94% 227	42.54% 151	14.37% 51	7.61% 27	355
Maple Grove Cemetery and Park	56.56% 181	37.19% 119	6.25% 20	26.25% 84	320
Bond Park	59.38% 95	35.00% 56	17.50% 28	11.25% 18	160
Lee Austin Park	76.47% 117	20.92% 32	6.54% 10	15.03% 23	153
Griffin Park	71.58% 68	13.68% 13	5.26% 5	21.05% 20	95
Bicentennial Park	73.91% 17	30.43% 7	17.39% 4	13.04% 3	23

Q14 How would you rate your feeling of safety at these parks/facilities?
(security, traffic speeds, vehicle/pedestrian conflicts)

Answered: 655 Skipped: 67



	VERY SAFE	COMFORTABLY SAFE	A LITTLE UNSAFE	NOT SAFE	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Rayner Park	58.33% 336	36.81% 212	4.69% 27	0.17% 1	576	1.48
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	43.35% 202	48.28% 225	7.51% 35	0.86% 4	466	1.26
Laylin Park	65.84% 239	31.13% 113	2.75% 10	0.28% 1	363	1.60
Hayes Park	54.32% 195	40.67% 146	5.01% 18	0.00% 0	359	1.44
Maple Grove Cemetery and Park	59.88% 197	36.78% 121	3.34% 11	0.00% 0	329	1.53
Bond Park	61.21% 101	32.73% 54	6.06% 10	0.00% 0	165	1.49
Lee Austin Park	62.03% 98	32.91% 52	5.06% 8	0.00% 0	158	1.52
Griffin Park	64.65% 64	32.32% 32	2.02% 2	1.01% 1	99	1.58
Bicentennial Park	84.00% 21	16.00% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	25	1.84

Q15 Overall, how much do you enjoy each of the parks and recreation facilities that you use?


Answered: 655 Skipped: 67



	LOVE IT!	LIKE IT.	ITS OK.	DISLIKE IT.	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Rayner Park	52.26% 300	39.55% 227	7.67% 44	0.52% 3	574	1.44
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	60.86% 283	33.98% 158	4.73% 22	0.43% 2	465	1.55
Laylin Park	45.88% 167	44.23% 161	9.34% 34	0.55% 2	364	1.35
Hayes Park	30.62% 109	51.12% 182	17.42% 62	0.84% 3	356	1.12
Maple Grove Cemetery and Park	53.80% 177	39.51% 130	6.69% 22	0.00% 0	329	1.47
Bond Park	22.22% 36	51.85% 84	24.07% 39	1.85% 3	162	0.94
Lee Austin Park	28.66% 45	43.31% 68	24.84% 39	3.18% 5	157	0.97
Griffin Park	20.79% 21	47.52% 48	30.69% 31	0.99% 1	101	0.88
Bicentennial Park	60.00% 15	28.00% 7	12.00% 3	0.00% 0	25	1.48

Q16 Please rate the quality of maintenance at these parks/facilities.


Answered: 655 Skipped: 67



	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR	TOTAL	WEIGHTED AVERAGE
Rayner Park	25.65% 147	51.83% 297	17.10% 98	4.01% 23	1.40% 8	573	0.96
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	29.18% 136	51.29% 239	16.95% 79	1.93% 9	0.64% 3	466	1.06
Laylin Park	30.39% 110	54.14% 196	14.64% 53	0.55% 2	0.28% 1	362	1.14
Hayes Park	24.16% 86	52.25% 186	18.54% 66	3.09% 11	1.97% 7	356	0.94
Maple Grove Cemetery and Park	49.24% 162	44.38% 146	5.78% 19	0.00% 0	0.61% 2	329	1.42
Bond Park	21.82% 36	49.09% 81	24.85% 41	3.03% 5	1.21% 2	165	0.87
Lee Austin Park	24.84% 39	47.13% 74	21.66% 34	3.82% 6	2.55% 4	157	0.88
Griffin Park	27.27% 27	48.48% 48	21.21% 21	3.03% 3	0.00% 0	99	1.00
Bicentennial Park	48.00% 12	36.00% 9	12.00% 3	0.00% 0	4.00% 1	25	1.24

Q17 Due to budgetary reasons, the City of Mason currently closes many of their parks and facilities during the winter. Which park, if any, would you most prefer remain open throughout the winter.


Answered: 635 Skipped: 87



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Rayner Park	33.86% 215
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	33.07% 210
Hayes park	14.96% 95
None	11.97% 76
Laylin park	5.04% 32
Bicentennial Park	0.47% 3
Bond Park	0.31% 2
Griffin Park	0.16% 1
Lee Austin park	0.16% 1
TOTAL	635

Q18 Do you feel like you have adequate parks or recreation facilities nearby that you can get to without driving?


Answered: 658 Skipped: 64



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	73.10%	481
No	26.90%	177
TOTAL		658

Q19 Please select locations you would like to improve non motorized access to.


Answered: 547 Skipped: 175



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I do not think any facilities need improved access	32.36%	177
South Commercial Area (Meijer)	21.57%	118
Downtown District	18.28%	100
Hayhoe Riverwalk	18.28%	100
Ingham County Fair Grounds	15.72%	86
Cedar Street Commercial Area	14.99%	82
Mason High School	13.16%	72
Rayner Park	10.42%	57
Alaiedon Elementary	9.69%	53
Wilson Talent Center	9.14%	50
North Aurelius Elementary	8.78%	48
Mason Public Library	8.59%	47
Other (please specify)	7.86%	43
James C. Harvey Education Center	7.68%	42
Mason Middle School	7.31%	40
Hayes Park	6.95%	38
Steele St. Elementary	4.39%	24
Laylin Park	2.74%	15
Maple Grove Park	2.56%	14
Bond Park	1.65%	9
Lee Austin Park	0.91%	5
Griffin Park	0.73%	4
Bicentennial Park	0.37%	2
Total Respondents: 547		


Q20 Please rate the importance of your choices (1 being most important)

Answered: 351 Skipped: 371



Q21 Are you interested in the development of more non-motorized facilities (Pathways, bike lanes, trails, sidewalks, road crossings) in Mason?


Answered: 647 Skipped: 75



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	80.06%	518
No	19.94%	129
TOTAL		647

Q22 What non-motorized facilities would you like added to Mason?


Answered: 513 Skipped: 209



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Nature Walking Trails	70.18%	360
Off Street Biking Trails	55.36%	284
Jogging/Running Trails	48.34%	248
Sidewalks	36.45%	187
On Street Bike Lanes	32.16%	165
Trail Heads (Parking)	31.77%	163
Other (please specify)	7.41%	38
Total Respondents: 513		

Q23 What non-motorized facilities would you like to see improved?


Answered: 462 Skipped: 260



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	65.58%	303
Sidewalks	45.45%	210
On-road bicycle lanes	32.25%	149
Sidewalks	0.00%	0
Nature Walking Trails	0.00%	0
Trail Heads (Parking)	0.00%	0
Other (please specify)	6.71%	31
Total Respondents:		462

Q24 Are there road crossings that you feel are unsafe or need improvements?

Answered: 494 Skipped: 228



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	51.42%	254
No	48.58%	240
TOTAL		494

Q25 What is the location of the crossing that needs to be added or improved? Please specify by typing the road to be crossed and the nearest intersection.

Answered: 239 Skipped: 483

Q26 I would use the city-owned parks and recreation facilities more often if they offered...? (either new or additional)


Answered: 641 Skipped: 81



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	Count
Restrooms	47.43%	304
Connection to Non-Motorized Pathways (Bike path, sidewalk, etc.)	36.35%	233
Paved Non-Motorized Path (bike/walk/run/etc)	34.17%	219
Dog Park	30.89%	198
Splash Pad	30.27%	194
Benches/Seating	25.74%	165
Ice Skating/Ice Rink	25.74%	165
Leisure Pool	24.96%	160
Shade	24.02%	154
Drinking Fountains	22.46%	144
Play Equipment	18.56%	119
Picnic Area	15.60%	100
Fitness Area	15.60%	100
Fishing	15.44%	99
Zipline	15.29%	98
Outdoor Art	14.51%	93
Pickleball	14.51%	93
Lap Pool	14.04%	90
Better Programming	8.42%	54
Parking	8.27%	53
Basketball	8.11%	52
Tennis	7.64%	49
Volleyball	6.55%	42
Soccer	5.93%	38
BMX Course/Pump Track	4.99%	32
Barrier-Free Access	4.84%	31
Baseball	4.84%	31
Horseshoes	4.84%	31
Softball	4.68%	30
Skate Park Facilities	3.74%	24
Football	2.50%	16
Total Respondents: 641		

Q27 Of the opportunities provided in the Mason parks, What do you use the most?


Answered: 612 Skipped: 110



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Nature Trails	31.05%	190
Playground	28.59%	175
Other (please specify)	9.80%	60
Seating	4.58%	28
Tennis Courts	4.08%	25
Baseball/Softball Diamonds	3.92%	24
Sledding Hill	3.76%	23
Picnic Tables	3.43%	21
Soccer Field	2.94%	18
Pavilion	2.45%	15
Fishing Docs	1.47%	9
Skate Park	0.82%	5
Basketball Court	0.82%	5
Drinking Fountains	0.65%	4
Fitness Equipment	0.49%	3
Roller Hockey Rink	0.33%	2
Ice Rink	0.33%	2
Volleyball Court	0.33%	2
Grills	0.16%	1
Horseshoes	0.00%	0
TOTAL		612

Q28 Which three parks or recreation facilities would you most like to see improved? (May check up to 3 parks or facilities)


Answered: 632 Skipped: 90



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Rayner Park	62.82%	397
Hayhoe Riverwalk Trail	53.32%	337
Hayes Park	33.23%	210
Laylin Park	24.68%	156
Bond Park	16.46%	104
Lee Austin Park	13.92%	88
Maple Grove Park	8.70%	55
Griffin Park	5.38%	34
Bicentennial Park	3.64%	23
Total Respondents: 632		

Q30 What would you like to see done at these facilities?


Answered: 621 Skipped: 101



ANSWER CHOICES	PERCENTAGE	RESPONSES
Better maintain the existing facilities.	40.58%	252
Add new facilities.	32.85%	204
Other (please specify)	26.57%	165
TOTAL		621

Q31 How much additional money, per year, would you be willing to spend on Parks and/or non-motorized transportation?

Answered: 613 Skipped: 109




ANSWER CHOICES	PERCENTAGE	RESPONSES
\$200+	9.46%	58
\$150-\$200	7.99%	49
\$100-\$150	14.19%	87
\$50-\$100	30.67%	188
\$0-\$50	28.38%	174
\$0	9.30%	57
TOTAL		613

Into the future, we have options.


Option 1 - No change

Do nothing different. With this option we will see our parks decline as we may not be able to support the cost of major repairs when needed.




Option 3 - Increase budget to maintain

Increase the budget (taxes) to cover the costs for maintaining and improving only the existing facilities.



Option 2 - Reduce facilities

Same budget – Reduce facilities to reduce operations and maintenance costs, redirect money to major repairs.




Option 4 - Increase budget to expand

Increase the budget (taxes) to cover the existing system and expand it further.



Q32 Mason currently has a limited budget for parks and recreation. Into the future, which of the above options do you prefer?


Answered: 615 Skipped: 107



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Option 1 - No change	5.04%	31
Option 2 - Reduce Facilities	12.85%	79
Option 3 - Increase budget to maintain	34.63%	213
Option 4 - Increase budget to expand	47.48%	292
TOTAL		615

Q33 Do you think Mason has enough parks?


Answered: 621 Skipped: 101



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	89.53%	556
No	10.47%	65
TOTAL		621

Q35 The City of Mason has a limited budget for community outreach. What method of communication do you feel would be most effective to inform you about activities and services offered by the City of Mason?

Answered: 619 Skipped: 103




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Social Media	60.58%	375
E-mail	42.33%	262
Website	40.06%	248
Newsletter (electronic)	31.50%	195
Direct mail	14.54%	90
Flyers	10.82%	67
Newspaper	9.37%	58
Newsletter (paper)	6.79%	42
Billboards	4.85%	30
Radio Commercials	4.20%	26
TV Commercials	3.39%	21
Other	1.78%	11
Total Respondents: 619		

Q36 If you have anything you'd like to add that we haven't touched on, please include your thoughts and ideas below.

Answered: 174 Skipped: 548

Q37 How did you hear about this survey?

Answered: 617 Skipped: 105



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES
Social Media	35.33% 218
Email	27.23% 168
Other (please specify)	20.58% 127
Poster	11.02% 68
Word of Mouth	9.72% 60
Handout	6.00% 37
Public Meeting	2.92% 18
Postcard	2.11% 13
Outreach Gathering	1.46% 9
Newspaper	0.65% 4
Total Respondents: 617	

Additional Community Input

City of Mason



Input 12-14-19

- The area west of City Hall, looks rough! How about all the back fill from new housing project that's coming this spring and fill in that area, landscape it up, right now a lot of standing water, brush etc. Being right next to city hall this space begins the downtown experience and I feel would enhance the fire dept, Jefferson Home along with City Hall.
- The east side of sycamore creek, between Ash St. and Elm St. could be cleared away responsibly, opening up the view of the creek. Helping habitat, the health of the creek and beautifying the creek adjacent to the river walk!
- Digging or dredging of Rayner Ponds, helping that park, providing positive fishing experiences for the youth. Perhaps contact MSU dept. of wild life, and work in conjunction with them, perhaps a doctoral project with some students.
- The Shattuck 12 and ½ acres! Possible working with St. James and having a park on both sides of the creek! Also, having a living history community using a portion of the land, with an old church, one room school house, perhaps a log cabin, country store, acreage for farming, perhaps working with the FFA at the high school to provide projects etc. Eaton Rapids has one, Meridian Township, Vicksburg Mi. They are common and this site would be ideal for that setting!
- This thought probably needs much more investigation to the law regarding streams. However, working with the DNR and having 3 or 4 spots on the creek dug deeper in areas that would naturally support a greater depth so that the fish population could survive greater than 1 year. The species need some deeper holes to survive the hot summers and the freeze during the winter!
- Lastly, I would think we could find some middle ground, with safety first, liability covered, where we could provide skating for families! With restrictions, times, etc. Our youth has become more sedentary and I'd like to see a real effort to get them out side. The rinks provided are a nice thought; however they really don't provide the experience of skating on a pond!



Previous Planning Efforts

Materials from Bond and Laylin Park Community Input meetings, 2018



Rayner Park Playground Assessment 2019

Cover Sheet of Rayner Park Playground Assessment (Full Report available upon request)



Assessment Report - Mason, Michigan

Inspection Date

06-20-2019

Inspector

Bill Hugill

Playground Name

Rayner Creative Playground
Mason, MI #7992

Year Playground was built

May 9, 1993

Report Date

07-15-2019

OVERVIEW

General overview statement

This playground was built in 1993 and is in very good shape for its age. The community group that maintained it for years has handed it over to the city (5 years ago) and the city has had it in their care for 1 1/2 years.

There are many maintenance issues and some safety non-compliances. This is not a full playground audit but a subjective assessment of your playgrounds condition and our professional recommendations.

General observations

This assessment is based on a site visit meeting with the client. The playground is 26 years old. The playground should be expected to last around 20 years with proper maintenance. The original materials used in the playground were pressure treated wood posts and framing. The original wood was treated with CCA. It is apparent from its condition that this playground is a well-used attraction in the area. There is a strong emotional connection with the community and the playground.

Pavilion Rental Data

Park	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total Reservations	% of Usage
Bond Park							1				1	0.15%
Griffin Park	1	3	2	2	2			3	1		14	2.04%
Hayes	8	22	21	19	18	22	20	21	17	12	180	26.24%
Laylin	5	23	32	26	19	25	16	19	1	7	173	25.22%
Rayner	8	24	23	24	39	29	32	31	30	21	261	38.05%
Various - City Parks	16	2	1	4	2	2	1	2	13	8	51	7.43%
Vacant lot north of Maple Street Mall				1	1	3	1				6	0.87%
Total Rentals	38	74	79	76	81	81	71	76	62	48	686	100.00%

The City of Mason

Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

2020-2024

Prepared By:



LAP + CREATIVE
Landscape Architects and Planners.

809 Center St, Suite 1 | Lansing, MI 48906 | info@lapinc.net | (ph) 517-485-5500 | (fax) 517-485-5576

Planning Consultants:

Robert Ford, LA, Project Manager, LAP Inc.

Nick Wallace, Recreation Planner, LAP Inc.



www.mason.mi.us



**CITY OF MASON
CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2024-06**

ADOPTION OF THE 2024 MASTER DESIGN PLAN FOR CITY OF MASON PARKS

January 15, 2024

WHEREAS, the City of Mason has adopted a City of Mason Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan (the “Plan”) which describes the physical features, existing facilities, and the desired actions to be taken to improve and maintain recreation facilities during the planning period between 2020 and 2024 (Resolution 2020-04); and

WHEREAS, the Plan’s Capital Improvement Schedule called for design work be done for all parks considering future needs of the park system; and

WHEREAS, the City prioritized the design work for the park in the Capital Improvement Plan and funded the work within the approved budget; and

WHEREAS, the City drafted a design plan and allowed citizens and stakeholders to provide input regarding these plans over the course of six months; and

WHEREAS, additional public input was received through meetings with every resident invited by direct mail; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mason considered that input and developed the Master Design Plan for City of Mason Parks for the benefit of the entire community and to adopt the Plan as an appendix within the Plan would assist in meeting the park, recreational and non-motorized needs of the community.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council adopts the City of Mason Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Plan 2020-2024 as a guideline for improving parks, recreation and non-motorized facilities for the residents of the City of Mason.

The foregoing Resolution was moved for adoption by Councilmember Droscha and seconded by Councilmember Preadmore and declared adopted by the following vote:

Yes (7) Clark, Droscha, Ferris, Preadmore, Schaffer, Vogel, Whipple

No (0)


Absent (0)

RESOLUTION DECLARED ADOPTED.

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
COUNTY OF INGHAM) ss
CITY OF MASON)

I, the undersigned, the duly qualified and acting Clerk of the City of Mason, County of Ingham, State of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Mason at a regularly scheduled meeting held on Monday, January 15, 2024, pursuant to the Michigan Open Meetings Act, the original of which is on file in my office as part of the Council minutes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my official signature, this 16th day of January, 2024.




Sarah J. Jarvis, City Clerk
City of Mason, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

Laylin Park: *Intergenerational*

City of Mason



E. Columbia St.



E. Maple St.

New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Walks
- 2 Pavilion/Restroom Renovations (*in progress*)
- 3 Outdoor Fitness Area
- 4 Intergenerational Play Equipment (*Grandparents, Parents and Kids can interact together*)
- 5 Renovated Parking Lot w/ Lighting (*39 total spaces including 2 van-accessible ADA spaces*)

Amenities to Remain

- A Playground
- B Fishing Docks
- C StoryWalk (*Capital Area District Libraries*)
- D Boat Launches
- E Existing Paved Walks
- F Park Entry Sign

Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 27)

- Reconstruct and add to the existing pathway system ensuring there are accessible routes to all park amenities.
- New pavilion and restroom building will address current security concerns.

"PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Additional Features to be Included


- ADA compliant water fountain w/ pet dish installed near restroom.
- Benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles
- Geese Management Plan



Bond Park: Neighborhood Park/Skatepark



City of Mason



New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Walks
- 2 Landscape Screening/Buffer
- 3 Dog Park (For small dogs w/ agility obstacles)
- 4 Open Lawn (Remove softball field)
- 5 Pavilion/Picnic Shelter
- 6 Shade Sails
- 7 Playground
- 8 Restroom Building
- 9 Park Entry Sign

Amenities to Remain

- A Skate Park
- B Parking Area (Re-stripe to include 21 total spaces, including 1 van accessible ADA space.)

Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 24)

- Reconstruct and add to the existing pathway system ensuring there are accessible routes to all park amenities.
- Removing the softball field negates the need for field renovations.


"PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Additional Features to be Included

- ADA compliant water fountain w/ pet dish installed near restroom.
- Benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles

Hayes Park: Winter Sports

City of Mason



*Existing paved surface area can fit (2) tennis courts or (6) pickleball courts.

New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Walks
- 2 Restroom Building
- 3 2-5 y.o. Playground
- 4 Renovated Tennis/Pickleball Courts
- 5 Speed Table
- 6 Detention Basin (w/ drain tiles)
- 7 Screening (Trees)
- 8 Park Entry Sign
- 9 Artificial Surface Ice Rink

Amenities to Remain

- A Softball Field
- B Sledding Hill
- C Open Space (Soccer)
- D 5-12 y.o. Playground
- E Pavilion
- F Basketball Court (Resurfaced)
- G Restroom/Storage Building

Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 26)

- New walks and restroom will address the current ADA issues.
- Renovating the courts will address the current condition issues.
- Detention basin and drain tiles will help to alleviate drainage issues.

*PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Additional Features to be Included

- ADA compliant water fountain w/ pet dish installed near restroom.
- Benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles
- Parking lot and sledding hill lighting, update lighting at softball field.

*Based on the "2022 NRPA Agency Performance Review" the average community with a population less than 20,000 has 1 pickleball court per 3,446 residents and 1 tennis court per 2,723 residents. Mason has a population of 8,235 (2021 U.S. Census). Therefore, Mason would need apx. 3 tennis courts and 3 pickleball courts to meet the average.



Rayner Park: *Regional Sports and Recreation*

City of Mason



New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Walks
- 2 Restroom Building
- 3 Paved Drives and Parking
- 4 Playground
- 5 Gaga Ball Pit
- 6 Softball Field
- 7 Sand Volleyball
- 8 Youth Soccer Fields
(2) 165' x 300', (1) 115' x 160'
- 9 Park Entry Sign

Amenities to Remain

- A Softball Field (Renovated)
- B Rotary Performance Stage
- C Pavilion
- D Basketball Court (Resurfaced)
- E Gravel Parking
- F Disc Golf (*Redesign layout around new facilities. Replace posts with baskets.*)

Additional Features to be Included

- ADA compliant water fountain w/ pet dish installed near restroom.
- Benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles
- Replace vertical and horizontal timbers for parking stops throughout park.
- Lighting on sports fields, playground, and throughout the park

Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 31)

- New walks and restroom will address the current ADA accessibility issues.
- Construction of a new playground addresses the safety concerns of the existing playground.
- The proposed layout features 129 permanent parking spaces including 5 van accessible ADA spaces. The proposed soccer field area on the south side of the park can support approximately 514 vehicles. Combined, this is greater than the 584 spaces required by the agreement with Ingham County.

*PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan



NORTH

Rayner Park: Woodlot Preserve

City of Mason



New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Trail
- 2 Trail Signs
- 3 Sidewalk along Kipp Rd.

Amenities to Remain


- A Nature Trails (*Improve with wood chips/gravel/boardwalk as needed*)

*Note: Trail alignment shown for conceptual purposes only. Actual trail alignment may vary.

Lee Austin Park: *Farmer's Market/Gateway*



City of Mason



New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Hayhoe Riverwalk
- 2 Ornamental Fencing
- 3 Paved Parking (13 total spaces including 1 van accessible ADA space)
- 4 Pavilion/Farmer's Market (32'x63' shown)
- 5 Playground (connections to upper and lower levels of hill)
- 6 Park Entry Sign
- 7 Restroom within Pavilion (2 unisex)

Amenities to Remain

- A Lower Trail (Realign north sidewalk connection, add stairs to traverse slope)
- B Drive Apron


Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 28)

- New section of Hayhoe Riverwalk would provide an ADA Accessible trail route.
- New playground would feature poured-in-place surfacing, eliminating the need to replenish wood chips.
- New pavilion would replace existing pavilion.

*PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Additional Features to be Included

- Bike racks, benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles



Property Division Diagram



NORTH

M-36/Ash St.

Lee Austin Park: *Alternative Layout*

City of Mason



New Amenities

- 1 ADA Accessible Hayhoe Riverwalk
- 2 Ornamental Fencing
- 3 Paved Parking (6 total spaces including 1 van accessible ADA space)
- 4 Pavilion (20'x30' shown)
- 5 Playground
- 6 Park Entry Sign

Amenities to Remain

- A Lower Trail (Realign north sidewalk connection, add stairs to traverse slope)
- B Drive Apron


Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 28)

- New section of Hayhoe Riverwalk would provide an ADA Accessible trail route.
- New playground would feature poured-in-place surfacing, eliminating the need to replenish wood chips.
- New pavilion would replace existing pavilion.

"PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Additional Features to be Included

- Bike racks, benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles



Property Division Diagram



NORTH

Griffin Park: Peaceful Retreat

City of Mason



New Amenities

- 1 Paved ADA Accessible Parking Space and Walk Connection
- 2 Water Access

Amenities to Remain

- A Gazebo
- B Planting Beds
- C Gravel Parking Area
- D Park Entry Sign
- E Grill
- F Bench

Addressing PRNMP Challenges (pg. 25)

- Establish a user agreement with the neighboring funeral home for use of the parking area.

"PRNMP = Parks, Recreation and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Additional Features to be Included

- Benches, tables, grills, trash receptacles



NORTH