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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Ishpeming is a 9.38 square mile parcel of land located in the central portion of Marquette County, within the Marquette Iron Range of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. It is located adjacent to the City of Negaunee, about 14 miles west of the City of Marquette. A map showing the location of the City of Ishpeming is located in Appendix A.

The history of Ishpeming is inseparable from the history of mining on the Marquette range. Indeed, it is isolated, and the location could only have come about because of the wealth underground. The early mining activities lead to the establishment of numerous area-wide services in the City. Today there is no active mining within the City’s corporate limits; however, two mines are active just south of the City in Tilden and Richmond townships. Mining still has an impact on the City’s economy but not as significantly as it once did. In recent decades, tourism has become very important to the economy of the City and County. Much of the growth of tourism has been the result of increased interest in recreational opportunities within the area. The service and retail trade sectors have benefitted the most from the increase in the number of visitors to the area.

This Recreation Plan should serve several useful purposes. It should serve as (1) a source of information, (2) a guide for correcting deficiencies, (3) an indicator of goals and policies, (4) a framework for making decisions, and (5) a means of stimulating public interest and participation in local community recreation progress.

This plan was adopted by the City Council on December 3, 2008. A copy of this plan is on file with the Marquette County Planning Commission and the CUPPAD Regional Commission.

2.0 ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Under 1917 Public Act 156, the City of Ishpeming City Council has appointed a Parks and Recreation Commission. The Parks and Recreation Commission is a 9 person advisory group which includes representatives from Ishpeming City Council, Ishpeming High School Superintendent, and the Ishpeming School Board. The Commission meets on a regular basis to formulate, update, review and submit input on the five year plan. In addition, joint meetings with the City of Negaunee and Ishpeming Township are being held.

Figure 2-1 shows the City of Ishpeming’s organizational chart. Figure 2-2 shows the City’s Parks and Recreation Commission organizational chart.
Figure 2-1
City of Ishpeming
Organizational Chart
2.1 Committees

Nine City departments operated under the direction of the City Manager: a Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals, Parks and Recreation Commission, Cemetery Board, Library Board, Street Committee, Housing Commission, Act 345 Board, Downtown Development Authority, Commission on Aging, Economic Development Corporation, Wastewater Treatment Board, Water Authority, and Compensation Commission exist as appointive bodies and recommend to the Recreation Director, City Council, and City Manager, but independent of the City Council.

The City of Ishpeming is a member of the Iron Ore Heritage Trail Recreation Authority.
2.2  Staff

The City currently employs 43 full-time and numerous part-time people.

The Parks and Recreation Department and the Department of Public Works are responsible for the maintenance and improvement of over 450 acres of land.

2.3  Budget

2.3.1  Projected Annual Budgets

The City has allocated approximately $160,000 of general fund monies for recreation annually for years 2008-2012.

2.3.2  Funding Sources

The City of Ishpeming funds recreation activities mainly through its general fund monies. The city receives nominal user fees for a number of activities including skiing, horseshoe leagues, and baseball leagues. The City also receives 25% of all user fees from participating in the Noquemanon Trail Network.

3.0  RECREATION INVENTORY

3.1  City Recreational Facilities

A map of the recreation facilities can be found in Appendix A.

| 1. City Playground | Size: 60 acres | Accessibility Assessment Rating: 4 |

Located along West Empire Street in the north central portion of the City. About 16 acres of the total acreage is undeveloped. The remaining area provides various types of recreational activities. Facilities at the park include:

City Playground
- Two Lighted Ball Diamonds
- Two Unlighted Tennis Courts
- Four Lighted Basketball Courts
- Warming Shelter & Restrooms
- Stadium (2,600 seating)
- Paved Track
- Lighted Football Area
- Storage Building & Restrooms
- Pavilion/Concession Area
- Parking and New Entrance
- Renovated Hardball Field
- Volleyball Courts
- Blacktop Roads

Playground Inventory
- Four Swing Sets
- Four Teeter Totters
- Slide
- Climber

Six Unlighted Ball Diamonds
- Five Lighted Tennis Courts
- Restroom/Locker Room
- Natural Ice Rink
- Twelve Sets of Bleachers
- Three Paved Field Event Areas
- Concession Area
- Four Horseshoe Courts
- Three Little League Baseball Fields
- New Fencing (Ball fields/perimeter)
- New Softball Field
- Practice Golf Cage/Net

Merry-go-Round
- Seven Tennis Courts
- Seven Backstops
- 13 Bleachers
Six Fields
16 Benches
Four Picnic Tables
Two Flagpoles
Four Lighted Paved Basketball Courts

Tot Lot Inventory
Saddle Mate Swing
Snyder-the-Spider
Spring Mate w/Handrail
Mini-Dale
Dome Climber
Two Picnic Tables

Ten Dugouts
Two Bike Racks
Two Electric Scoreboards
Three Football Goal Posts

Swinging Gate
Buck-a-Bout
Four Saddle Mates
Eagle Whirl
Sandbox

DNR Grant History:
1972, Project No. 26-00339
1976, Project No. 26-00762
1980, Project No. 26-01104 T1
1989, Project No. BF89-521
1989, Project No. BF89-66

2. Al-Quaal

Size: 460 acres
Accessibility Assessment Rating: 2

This regional recreation site is located in the northern portion of the City, along Popular Street. This is the largest recreation area within the City Corporate limit. The land that currently makes up the recreation area was leased by the City in 1939 and purchased in 1999.

The site is utilized year round, with tennis, basketball, baseball, horseshoes, volleyball, mountain biking, hiking, swimming picnicking, boating and fishing, occurring in the summer months and skiing, tobogganing, ice fishing, and snowmobiling occurring in winter months. Facilities at this site include:

Ball Diamond
Restroom Building
Ski Ticket & Patrol Shelter
Two Basketball Courts
Picnic Area
12 Picnic Grills
One Maypole
Gym Set
Backstop
16 Horseshoe Courts
Four Cross-Country Trails (One Lighted)
Snowboarding
Lighted Sledding Area
Toboggan House & Slide (1,500’ Toboggan Run with Water Lines & Lighting)
Outdoor Skating/Hockey Area
Fitness Trail
Mountain Bike Trail
Rustic Cabin
Additional Volleyball Courts
Golf Facilities (Nets & Range Area)

Pavilion
Ski Warming Shelter
Two Ski Tow Buildings
Two Tennis Courts
40 Picnic Tables
Seven Swing Sets
Two Merry-go-Rounds
Two Slides
Flagpole
Three Downhill Ski Slopes
Tubing
Snowshoeing
Mountain Bike Trail System (included Section of CC Ski Trails)
Clubhouse (Restrooms, Concession Area, and Kitchen Facilities)
Expand Tube/Sled Area
New North Ski Tow/Improve Ski Run
New Paved Roads
New Second Toboggan Slide
Large Wooden Playlot
Boat Launch
Teal Lake-New Log Cabin
Skateboard

Improved Swimming Beach Area
Lighted Areas (Horseshoes, volleyball, cross-country skiing)

DNR Grant History: 1979, Project No. 26-01052
1990, Project No. TF90-242
1991, Project No. TF91-080
1994, Project No. TF94-054
1995, Project No. TF95-316
1997, Project No. TF97-228

3. Lake Bancroft Park

This three acre parcel is a community park located between Cliff Street and the west shore of Lake Bancroft. This property was originally developed by a local Jaycee group. The setting of the park makes it one of the most attractive areas in the City. Facilities at the recreational site include:

- 16 Picnic Tables
- Five Dusk-to-Dawn Lights
- Flagpole and Marker
- Paved Walking Path
- Paved Parking Area
- New Brick Path Memorial
- Decorative Water Fountains
- Maintain & Refurbish Park Equipment
- Bog Walk & Bike Path Around Lake
- Complete Lake Restoration and Cleanup
- Eight Picnic Grills
- Shelter
- State Historical Marker
- Rustic Sign
- New Gazebo
- Restrooms/Storage Area
- Park Signage and Identification
- Jogging/Walking Area
- Playground Equipment
- Board Walk

DNR Grant History: 1976, Project No. 26-00787

4. Marquette Street Playlot

A one acre neighborhood recreation site that is located in the east central portion of the City, just south of Business M-28. Facilities at this site include:

- Three Swing Sets
- Basketball Standard
- Slide
- New Equipment

5. Barnum (7th Addition) Playlot

This eleven acre neighborhood park is located off of Carp Street in the west central portion of the City. Facilities at this site include:

- Three Swing Sets
- Whirl Merry-go-Round
- Picnic Table
- Upgrade Equipment
### 6. Lake Angeline Playlot

| Size: 1 acre | Accessibility Assessment Rating: 3 |

This neighborhood park is located on a one acre parcel of land along Lower Pine Street, just west of Lake Angeline. The boulevard at the site was formerly an old trolley route. The park has the following facilities:

- Three Swing Sets
- Whirl Merry-go-Round
- Landscaping
- New Pavement-Basketball Court
- Slide
- Picnic Table
- New Equipment
- Maintain & Refurbish Equipment

### 7. Wabash Heights Playlot

| Size: 1 acre | Accessibility Assessment Rating: 3 |

This one acre neighborhood recreation site is located along Wabash Street, just south of Mather “A” Ball field. Facilities at this site include:

- Buck-a-Bout
- 10’ Whirl Merry-go-Round
- Two Paved Basketball Courts
- Picnic Table
- Maintain & Refurbish Equipment
- Volleyball Court
- Three House Slide
- Four Saddle Mates
- Three Swings
- Barrier Poles/Parking Area
- New Paved Basketball Court

### 8. Salisbury Playlot

| Size: 1 acre | Accessibility Assessment Rating: |

This neighborhood park is a one acre parcel of land located in southern portion of the City, west of South Pine Street. Facilities at this site include:

- Three Swings Sets
- Slide
- Picnic Table
- Three Swings
- One Molded Animal

### 9. Palms Area Playlot

| Size: 1 acre | Accessibility Assessment Rating: 3 |

This neighborhood park is a one acre parcel of land located in the southern portion of the City, along Juniper Street. Facilities at this park include:

- Three Swing Sets
- Merry-go-Round
- Slide
- Basketball Standard

### 10. Mather “A” Ballfield

| Size: 1 acre | Accessibility Assessment Rating: 2 |

A one acre community recreation site located at the inactive Mather “A” mine site in the northwestern portion of the City. The site was acquired in 1984 by the City as an additional auxiliary ball field to compliment expansion of recreation leagues. It was built by the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company (CCI) originally to service their employee softball league. Because of scheduling and maintenance problems, CCI requested the City take over this area. The ball field is now used on a daily basis during the summer months because of the current demand for ball field facilities. Facilities at this site include:
11. Holmes Playlot  
**Size:** 1 acre  
**Accessibility Assessment Rating:** 4

This recently established one acre neighborhood park is located in the western portion of the City between D Street and E Street, off of Washington Street. The playlot has a new play center. Facilities at this site include:

- Tree House Jungle Gym
- Picnic Tables
- Four Swing Sets
- Basketball Standard

12. Second Street Playlot  
**Size:** 1 acre  
**Accessibility Assessment Rating:** 3

This neighborhood park occupies a 1 acre parcel of land located in the central portion of the City, on South Second St., west of East Superior.

- Swing Set
- Picnic Table
- Playstation
- Merry-Go-Round
- Fence
- Maintain and Refurbish Equipment

3.2 Public and Private School Recreational Facilities

**Ishpeming High School/Central School**  
**Size:** 5 acres  
**Accessibility Assessment Rating:** 3

These two schools occupy the same structure which is located on a five acre parcel of land in the central portion of the City, along Division Street. Facilities provided at this site include:

- Pool
- 2 Gymnasiums
- Playground Equipment
- Weightlifting Room
- Volleyball
- New Rubberized Track
- Tennis Court Resurfacing

- Whirlpool
- Two Paved Basketball Standards
- 4 Locker Rooms
- Wrestling Equipment
- Tot Lot Area
- New Practice Football Field

**Birchview Elementary School**  
**Size:** 2 acres  
**Accessibility Assessment Rating:** 3

This school is located on a two acre parcel of land in the northern portion of the City along Popular Street. Facilities provided at this site include:

- Gymnasium
- Two Swing Sets
- Merry-go-Round

- Cafeteria
- Slide
- Two Tennis Courts
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- 2 Locker Rooms  
- Two Basketball Standards  
- Complete Play Center  
- Climbing Tower  
- Locker Room  
- Tot Lot Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.L. Phelps Intermediate School</th>
<th>Size: 1 acre</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment Rating: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Phelps School occupies a one acre parcel of land in the central portion of the City, along North 3rd Street. Recreation facilities at the site include:

- Gymnasium  
- Cafeteria  
- Complete Play Center  
- Six Paved Basketball Courts  
- Maintain & Refurbish Equipment/Facilities  
- Weightlifting Room  
- Locker Room  
- Picnic Table  
- Gazebo/Pavilion Type Facility

3.3 Public Owned Recreational Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ishpeming Senior Citizen Center</th>
<th>Size: 5 acres</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment Rating: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The senior center is a community recreation facility located along South Pine Street in the central portion of the City. The facility offers the following recreational opportunities to seniors: bingo, crafts, cards, movies, exercise, hiking club, shuffleboard, chorus, trips, oil painting class, dances, and day excursions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Citizen Park</th>
<th>Size: 5 acres</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment Rating: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This 5 acre mini-park is located within the senior citizen housing complex area, along Bluff Street in the central portion of the City. The site has the following facilities:

- Two Picnic Tables  
- Flower Garden  
- Flagpole  
- Patio Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Ski Hall of Fame</th>
<th>Size: 1 acre</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment Rating: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Hall of Fame structure is located on about a one acre parcel of land, along U.S. 41/M-28, in the northern portion of the City. The one and a half million dollar structure was constructed in 1992. It is a museum with historical displays and artifacts of skiing from all countries. The Lake Superior Partnership office is located here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Guard Armory</th>
<th>Size: 5 acres</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment Rating: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The armory facility is located along U.S. 41/M-28 in the northern portion of the City. It provides the following recreational facilities:

- Gymnasium  
- Pistol & Rifle Range
3.4 Private Owned Recreational Facilities

The following recreational facilities are privately owned facilities in the City of Ishpeming or in close vicinity of the City that are for use by the general public:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country Lane &amp; Billiards</td>
<td>1011 North Road</td>
<td>Ten Bowling Lanes, 12 Billiards Tables, and a Dart Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns Church</td>
<td>South Pine Street</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kountry Kids Child</td>
<td>1025 Country Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Hour</td>
<td>Local Church groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Trail Riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishpeming Wawonowin Country Club</td>
<td>CR478, Six Miles West of City</td>
<td>Club and Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishpeming Trail Riders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Horse Shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishpeming Beagle Club</td>
<td>Four Miles West of City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Rainbow Day Care Center</td>
<td>Greenwood Street</td>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength and Fitness</td>
<td>115 South Main Street</td>
<td>Health and Fitness Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishpeming Ski Club &amp; City of Ishpeming</td>
<td>Suicide Bowl Road</td>
<td>Ski Jumping Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Nearby Recreational Facilities

The following is an inventory of nearby public recreational sites that are most likely utilized by residents of the City of Ishpeming:

City of Negaunee

- **Negaunee Ice Arena**: A full-sized, city owned, area with restrooms, lobby, 4 locker rooms, summer volleyball court, and hard surface parking area. This site is a 3.5 acre parcel.

- **Lacombe Field**: Owned by the city, this is a 3.3 acre parcel with an illuminated softball field, restrooms, storage facility, and open field used for football practice and soccer.

- **Lions Field**: City owned baseball field with six illuminated horseshoe courts, playground equipment, restrooms, concessions, and a storage building. This site is a 2.1 acre parcel.

- **Iron Town Field**: City owned baseball field with concessions, restrooms, and storage building. This is a 5 acre site.

- **Jackson Park**: Five acre, city owned, park with picnic area, 12 picnic tables, playground equipment, 2 tennis courts, and 6 horseshoe courts.
• **Miner’s Park:** Five acre, city owned, park with picnic area, 2 illuminated basketball courts, playground equipment, 2 horseshoe courts, green open area, historical markers, and volleyball courts.

**City of Marquette**

• **Presque Isle Park:** 312-acre park with 2 picnic areas, cross-country ski trail, playground, 2 tennis courts, band shell, fishing, shuffleboard, horseshoe pits, gazebo, breakwall with lighthouse, outdoor swimming pool, and water slide.

• **Presque Isle Marina:** 40-acre site with boat launching and docking facilities on Lake Superior.

• **Marquette Mountain:** Downhill skiing, lodge, and picnic area.

• **Lakeview Arena:** Recreation and Convention facility used for hockey, skating, concerts, shows, exhibits, etc.

• **Superior Dome:** World’s largest wooden dome containing football field, also used for trade shows, concerts, etc.

• **Mount Marquette Lookout:** Lookout view of the City of Marquette and Lake Superior, snowmobile trail, and hiking trail.

**Marquette Township**

• **Sugar Loaf Mountain Area:** 80-acre site with nature trail and scenic overlook.

• **NMU Forest (Long Year Forest):** 180-acres with nature trail and physical fitness trail.

• **Forestville Dead River Public Access Site:** Five acres with boat launch on Dead River.

• **Little Garlic River Public Access Site:** Fishing access site.

**Ishpeming Township**

• **Ishpeming Township:** Seven acres with softball diamond, Little League diamond, tennis courts, pavilion, Tot Lot, restrooms, concessions, playground, horseshoe court, shuffleboard, volleyball court, basketball court, picnic table, and grills.

**Negaunee Township**

• **Negaunee Township Park:** 71-acres with basketball court, pavilion, warming building, concessions, playground area, Little League field, Babe Ruth Baseball Field, softball field, tennis court, cross-country ski trail, picnic tables, snowmobile trail access.

• **Michigan Mining Museum:** 30-acres with exhibits of early iron ore mining artifacts, audio-visual programs, and outdoor interpretive paths.

• **McClure Storage Basin Access Site:** Hard-surface launch ramp, toilets, and parking area. Site is 1.03 acres.
• **Hoist Basin Access Site:** Hard-surface launch ramp, toilets, and parking area. Site is 1.82 acres.

Richmond Township

• **Richmond Township Park:** Horseshoe court, basketball court, tennis courts, baseball field, playground, picnic area, pavilion and restrooms.

Tilden Township

• **Tilden Township Recreation Complex:** Six acre site with tennis courts, baseball field, horseshoe courts, basketball court, playground area, pit toilets, parking, picnic area and pavilion.

Sands Township

• **Blueberry Ridge Pathway:** Trail system (cross-country skiing, mountain biking, and hiking).

• **Marquette County Fairgrounds:** 60 acre site with exhibition building, American Legion building, 4 H Building, 2 cattle show rings, horse barn, poultry and small animal building, large livestock building, office building, barrier-free restroom/utility building, 2 storage structures, power outlets, 2 wells, large lighted parking area, outside speaker system, ½ mile oval race track, mud drag strip, paved go-cart track, large carnival area, outside horse stall, 2 outdoor pavilions, and portable bleachers.

4.0 DESCRIPTION OF PLANNING AND PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS

4.1 Community Data

4.1.1 Population

For any planning endeavor, careful attention must be given to the analysis of population trends and projections. Such an analysis is necessary to determine existing or future needs based on the characteristics of the area’s population. Population analysis assists with determining the direction of local capital improvements and related expenditures. For recreation planning, population data is also useful when applying recreation standards to a community.

While the population in the State of Michigan increased in the last twenty years, Marquette County and the City of Ishpeming have experienced steady declines. The population trends are shown in Table 4-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Ishpeming</td>
<td>7,538</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette County</td>
<td>74,101</td>
<td>70,887</td>
<td>64,634</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Peninsula</td>
<td>319,757</td>
<td>313,915</td>
<td>317,616</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>9,262,044</td>
<td>9,295,297</td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Age Characteristics

The age of the residents of an area may indicate emerging needs for recreational facilities.
The median age of Ishpeming residents was 38.9 in 2000. Over half of the population is in the working age category (age 20-64).

4.1.3 Gender

The majority of the population in the City of Ishpeming is female (52.8%).

4.1.4 Economic Characteristics

For most of the City of Ishpeming and Marquette County’s history, the economy was principally based on the iron ore mining industry. Mining on the Marquette Iron Range in Marquette County goes back about 150 years. In the late 1800’s and early 1900’s, iron ore mining was by far the dominant industry within the City and the County. However, in the latter half of the 1900’s, the mining industry lost some of its economic dominance within the County, with the closing of several mines along the Iron Range. Today, one large open mine is in operation within the County, the Cliffs Michigan Mine (in Tilden Township and Richmond Township). This mining operation is owned by individual partnerships composed of the mine operator, the Cliffs Michigan Mining Company, and various U.S. and Canadian steel companies who are also customers of the mines. The iron ore from the mine is shipped via railroad to either Presque Isle Harbor in Marquette or Escanaba for loading on lake ore carriers and delivery to various steel mills. There are about 1,365 individuals currently employed at the mine. The City of Ishpeming, along with the City of Negaunee, serve as living areas and retail and service centers for many working at the mine. The research lab for the mine is located within the City. This facility has about 35 employees.

The long-term future of the iron ore industry within Marquette County is uncertain. It will depend on the national demand for steel and steel products, popularity of steel substitute materials, international competition, federal governmental trade policies, labor productivity, availability and price of electric power and the other energy sources, environmental constraints, and financial considerations. However, in the foreseeable future, the impact of iron ore mining on the County’s economy will probably stay about the same.

The economy within the City’s corporate limit is most influenced by the service and retail trade sectors, which accounts for 800 and 750 jobs, respectively. The City of Ishpeming, along with the cities of Negaunee and Marquette, serve as the retail trade and service center for Marquette County and nearby communities outside of the County. The two largest employers in the City are Bell Memorial Hospital.
(365 employees) and the Ishpeming School District (135 employees). Both of these establishments are part of the County service sector. The service and retail trade sectors are also the strongest industries at the County level and have experienced the greatest growth in the number of jobs in recent decades. Much of this growth can be attributed to an increase in the number of visitors to the Ishpeming/Negaunee area. The promotion of tourism has been the focus point for many businesses and governmental units within the area.

In 1999, the per capita income for the City of Ishpeming was $16,946, which was lower than the per capita income levels for the County and State. The City showed an increase in per capita income from 1989 after adjusting for inflation, along with both the Count and State. The City’s income level increased by 24 percent during this ten year period.

4.1.5 Area Physical Characteristics

The topography of the southern half of the City is hilly, while the northern half is characterized with gently rolling hill terrain. A substantial part of the southeastern portion of the City has slopes greater than 10 percent. The City’s elevation is at 1,436 feet above mean sea level and over 800 feet higher than Lake Superior. Water resources within the City’s corporate boundaries include: Lake Bacon, Lake Angeline, Lake Sally, Lake Minnie, Lake Bancroft, Lake Ogden, Carp Creek, Ely Creek, and Partridge Creek.

The predominant soil association type within the City limits is the Tilden-Michigamme-Rock Outcrop Association, characterized by rock outcrop and very deep and moderately deep, gently rolling to very hilly, well drained loamy soils on bedrock controlled moraines. The only other soil association found in the City is the Pits-Dumps-Mine-Slickens-Association, which is located in the south-central portion of the City. This area is the site of an inactive iron ore mining operation.

The Climate in the City is humid continental that is heavily influenced by Lake Superior, with cool late springs and early summers and warm late falls and early winters. However, during the late winter and early spring, once ice builds up on Lake Superior, the City is subjected to climate more closely associated with interior locations. The City’s mean monthly temperature ranges from 13.7 degrees Fahrenheit in January to 66.1 degrees Fahrenheit in July, with a mean annual temperature of 41.0 degrees Fahrenheit. Total precipitation in the City averages 31.87 inches per year. The City averages 142 days per year with one inch of snow or more on the ground. The frost free growing season is about 109 days.

4.1.6 Land Use

The current land use inventory of the City of Ishpeming indicates that 1,966 acres of land is in forest use, or 33 percent of the City’s total land use. In terms of total acreage, this land use category is followed by non-forested and single family, duplex uses, which consume 1,564 and 766 acres, respectively.

4.1.7 Local Transportation System

U.S. 41/M-28 is the major thoroughfare through the City of Ishpeming. It links the City to the Cities of Negaunee and Marquette to the east. U.S. 41 is north-south highway corridor in the central U.P. that is important for hauling raw materials and finished products by truck for businesses in the U.P. and northeastern Wisconsin. M-28 is a major east-west corridor through the northern half of the U.P. that serves as a major route for travelers to the U.P. U.S. 41/M-28 also serves as the main commuting route for City residents that work in Ishpeming, Negaunee, and Marquette.

Commercial air passenger service is provided to City residents at the Sawyer International Airport within Sands Township (formerly Marquette County Airport). This airport facility is owned and operated by Marquette County.
Rail service in the City is provided by Wisconsin Central Ltd (WC) and Lake Superior & Ishpeming (LS&I).

4.2 Recreation Standards

One method to assess community recreation needs is the standard system. Standards that have been developed by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) provide a scale against which an existing recreation system can be measured so the guidelines for future needs can be created. Standards link the number of acres to the community’s population.

4.2.1 Suggested Facility Development Standards

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Grants Management Division "Guidelines for the Development of Community Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Plans" includes a table of suggested facility development standards which can be found in Appendix B.

A direct comparison of the suggested facility development standards to the existing facilities in the City of Ishpeming is shown below.
### Comparison of Existing Recreational Facilities to Suggested NRPA Standards

#### City of Ishpeming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>No. of units per population</th>
<th>Standard required for area</th>
<th>No. of Existing Facilities</th>
<th>Deficiency per Standards?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball (3-4 wall)</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>Indoor-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depends on climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1 - outdoor</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>1 court per 2000</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>1 court per 5000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Little League</td>
<td>Lighted-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf-driving range</td>
<td>1 per 50,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ - Mile Running Track</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1 per 5,000 (if also used for youth baseball)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Recreation Court (Basketball, Volleyball, Tennis)</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>1 system per region</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Range</td>
<td>1 per 50,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination Skeet and Trap Field (8 station)</td>
<td>1 per 50,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>1. Par 3 (18-hole)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 9-hole standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/25,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 18-hole standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/50,000</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pools should accommodate 3% to 5% of the total population at a time.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Areas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Recommended Classification System for Local and Regional Recreation Open Space and Trails

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Grants Management Division “Guidelines for the Development of Community Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Plans” includes a table of a recommended classification system for local and regional recreation open space and trails which can be found in Appendix C.
• Mini Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Standard Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mini Park Acreage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Neighborhood Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Standard Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marquette Street Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Street Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnum Playlot</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Angeline Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palms Area Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mather “A” Ball Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Playlot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchview Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. Phelps Intermediate School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Neighborhood Park Acreage</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7 to 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Community Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Standard Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Playground</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Bancroft Park</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishpeming High School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizen Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Ski Hall of Fame</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Park Acreage</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36 to 58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Regional Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Standard Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al Quaal</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>58 to 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regional Park Acreage</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 National Park and Recreation Standards for Park Acreage

The National Park and Recreation Association has suggested standards for park size and type based on the population of the area. No standards exist to determine how much open space a community needs, however, these standards can be used as guidelines in the planning process. Appendix D includes a table of these suggested standards.

The City of Ishpeming possesses over 550 acres of Public Park and school owned recreation land. The breakdown of this recreational land includes five acres of mini parks, 22 acres of neighborhood parks, 65 acres of community parks, and 461 acres of regional parks. Comparing the NPRA standards with the number of acres of recreational land found in the City, the City has excess acreage of land in all four of the park and recreation types. The total acreage of recreation land in the City is adequate for the current population.
4.2.4 Barrier Free Accessibility Requirements for Parks

The barrier free accessibility requirements for parks is provided in Appendix E.

4.3 Systems Approach to Planning

The systems approach to planning incorporates information gained from citizen surveys and detailed recreation inventories to determine the recreation needs of a community.

4.3.1 The Public Input Process

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources requires that two methods be used to incorporate public input into the recreation planning process. After a 30 day public review period, the City of Ishpeming held two public hearing on April 16, 2008 and on May 21, 2008 to secure public input regarding to this recreation plan. A copy of the minutes from these two meetings can be found in Appendix F.

5.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

5.1 Identified Recreational Needs

The City of Ishpeming is a member of the Iron Ore Heritage Recreation Authority and is in support of the Iron Ore Heritage Trail.

Lake Angeline is currently “land-locked” with no public access points. The City intends to pursue opportunities for purchasing land adjacent to the lake for public access.

The study of development plan options of the “Cliffs Land Purchase” was prepared for the City of Ishpeming and the Downtown Development Authority. Included in this study is a recreational development conceptual plan which the city would like to further investigate implementing. This study is included as Appendix G.

There is a section of land on the north side of Teal Lake in which the City, partnering with neighboring communities, plans to acquire and develop for recreational use by the public.

In taking a proactive approach to recreational development, the City intends to acquire land, with special interest in waterfront properties, as it becomes available for purchase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost (Funding Source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvements to North Ski Tow Area at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$25,000 (City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop second Tube Slide at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$70,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Move Toboggan Slide</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$20,000 (City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Move Teal Lake Lodge to top of Hill</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$30,000 (City/Negaunee, Ishpeming Water Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cost (Funding Source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install Ice Rink at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$20,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Bike Trail Development at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$10,000 (City/Argall/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a new large Play lot at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$40,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Access to Lake Angeline</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$750,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Crossing on US-41 at Lakeshore</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$500,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a paved Roller Ski Loop at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$150,000 (Cities/CCI/NMU/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Park land and water front Property</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$500,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Hematite Heights</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$200,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop North Shore of Teal Lake</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$150,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Trails connecting Country Village to Downtown, Bell Hospital and the Al Quaal Trails.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$200,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanup Lake Bancroft</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$200,000 (City/CNR/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a new Snowmobile Trail at North Teal Lake Property (Al Quaal)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$15,000 (Cities/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install new equipment at seven City Owned Play lot sites</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$30,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Rustic R.V. Sites at Al Quaal</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$80,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Golf Facility with Range/Nets at City Playground</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$25,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Ice Arena – Multi-Purpose Facility</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$750,000 (City/Grant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

MAPS
APPENDIX B

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION
SUGGESTED FACILITY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>Recommended Space Requirements</th>
<th>Recommended size and dimensions</th>
<th>Recommended orientation</th>
<th>No. of units per population</th>
<th>Service Radius</th>
<th>Location Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>1620 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Singles – 17’ x 44’</td>
<td>Long axis north – south.</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td>Usually in school, recreation center or church facility. Safe walking or biking access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doubles – 20’ x 44’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With 5’ unobstructed area on all sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long axis north – south.</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td>Same as badminton. Outdoor courts in neighborhood and community parks, plus active recreation areas in other park settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Youth</td>
<td>2400–3036 sq. ft.</td>
<td>46’-50’ x 84’</td>
<td>Long axis north – south.</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High School</td>
<td>5040-7280 sq. ft.</td>
<td>50’ x 84’</td>
<td>Long axis north – south.</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collegiate</td>
<td>5600-7980 sq. ft.</td>
<td>50’ x 94’</td>
<td>Long axis north – south.</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with 5’ unobstructed space on all sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handball (3-4 wall)</td>
<td>800 sq. ft. for 4-wall 1000 sq. ft. for 3-wall</td>
<td>20’ x 40’ – Minimum of 10’ to rear of 3-wall court. Minimum 20’ overhead clearance.</td>
<td>Long axis north-south. Front wall at north end.</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>15-30 minute travel time</td>
<td>4-wall usually indoor as part of multi-purpose facility. 3-wall usually outdoor in park or school setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>22,000 sq. ft. including support area.</td>
<td>Rink 85’ x 200’ (minimum 85’ x 185’. Addition 5000 sq. ft. support area).</td>
<td>Long axis north-south if outdoors.</td>
<td>Indoor-1 per 100,000 Outdoor-Depends on climate</td>
<td>½ - 1 hour travel time</td>
<td>Climate important consideration affecting number of units. Best as part of multi-purpose facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>Minimum of 7,200 sq. ft. single court. (2 acres for complex.)</td>
<td>36’ x 78’. 12’ clearance on both sides; 21’ clearance on both ends.</td>
<td>Long axis north-south.</td>
<td>1 court per 2000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td>Best in batteries of 2-4. Located in neighborhood/community park or near school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Minimum of 4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>30’ x 60’. Minimum 6’ clearance on all sides.</td>
<td>Long axis north-south.</td>
<td>1 court per 5000</td>
<td>½- 1 mile</td>
<td>Same as other court activities (e.g., badminton, basketball, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3. Official 3.0-3.85 A minimum</td>
<td>• Baselines-90’ Pitching distance-60.5’ Foul lines-min. 320’ Center field-400’+</td>
<td>Locate home plate so pitcher throwing across sun and batter not facing it. Line from home plate through pitcher’s mound to run east-northeast.</td>
<td>1 per 5000</td>
<td>¼ - ½ mile</td>
<td>Part of neighborhood complex. Lighted fields part of community complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Little League 1.2 A minimum</td>
<td>• Baselines-60’ Pitching distance-46’ Foul lines-200’ Center field-200’-250’</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lighted-1 per 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity/Facility</td>
<td>Recommended Space Requirements</td>
<td>Recommended size and dimensions</td>
<td>Recommended orientation</td>
<td>No. of units per population</td>
<td>Service Radius</td>
<td>Location Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>Minimum 1.5A</td>
<td>180’ x 300’ with a minimum of 10’ clearance on all sides.</td>
<td>Fall season-long axis northwest to southeast. For longer periods, north to south.</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>15-30 minutes travel time</td>
<td>Usually part of baseball, football, or soccer complex in community park or adjacent to high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Minimum 1.5A</td>
<td>160’ x 360’ with a minimum of 6’ clearance on all sides.</td>
<td>Same as field hockey.</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>15-30 minutes travel time</td>
<td>Same as field hockey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>1.7 to 2.1 A</td>
<td>195’ x 225’ x 330’ to 360’, with a 10’ minimum clearance on all sides.</td>
<td>Same as field hockey.</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
<td>1-2 miles</td>
<td>Number of units depends on popularity. Youth soccer on smaller fields adjacent to schools or neighborhood parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf-driving range</td>
<td>13.5 A for minimum of 25 tees</td>
<td>900’ x 690’ wide. Add 12’ width for each additional tee.</td>
<td>Long axis southwest/northeast with golfer driving toward northeast.</td>
<td>1 per 50,000</td>
<td>30 minutes travel time.</td>
<td>Part of golf course complex as a separate unit. May be privately operated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¼ - Mile Running Track</td>
<td>4.3 A</td>
<td>Overall width – 276’ Length – 600’ Track width for 8 to 4 lanes is 32’.</td>
<td>Long axis in sector from north to south to northeast/southwest with finish line at northerly end.</td>
<td>1 per 20,000</td>
<td>15-30 minutes travel time.</td>
<td>Usually part of high school or community park complex in combination with football, soccer, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>1.5 t 2.0 A</td>
<td>Baselines-60’ Pitching distance -45’ (men), -40’ (women). Fast pitch field radius from plate – 225’ between foul lines. Slow pitch -275’ (men) -250’ (women)</td>
<td>Same as baseball.</td>
<td>1 per 5,000 (if also used for youth baseball)</td>
<td>¼- to ⅔- mile</td>
<td>Slight difference in dimensions for 16” slow pitch. May also be used for youth baseball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Recreation Court (Basketball, Volleyball, Tennis)</td>
<td>9.840 sq. ft.</td>
<td>120’ x 80’</td>
<td>Long axis of courts with primary use north-south</td>
<td>1 per 10,000</td>
<td>1 – 2 miles</td>
<td>In neighborhood or community parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Park and Recreation Association

#### Suggested Facility Development Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>Recommended Space Requirements</th>
<th>Recommended size and dimensions</th>
<th>Recommended orientation</th>
<th>No. of units per population</th>
<th>Service Radius</th>
<th>Location Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trails</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Well defined head. Capacity - Rural trails – 40 hikers/day/mile. Urban trails – 90 hikers/day/mile.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 system per region</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archery Range</strong></td>
<td>Minimum 0.65 A</td>
<td>300' length x minimum 10' between targets. Roped clear space on sides of range. Minimum of 30' clear space behind targets. Minimum of 90' x 45' with bunker.</td>
<td>Archer facing north + or + 45 degrees.</td>
<td>1 per 50,000</td>
<td>30 minutes travel time</td>
<td>Part of a regional/ metro park complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combination Skeet and Trap Field (8 station)</strong></td>
<td>Minimum 30 A</td>
<td>All walks and structures occur within an area approximately 130' wide by 115' deep. Minimum cleared area is contained within two superimposed segments with 100-yard radii (4 acres). Shot-fall danger zone is contained within two superimposed segments with 300-yard radii (36 acres).</td>
<td>Center line of length runs northeast/southwest with shooter facing northeast</td>
<td>1 per 50,000</td>
<td>30 minutes travel time</td>
<td>Part of a regional/ metro park complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golf</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Par 3 (18-hole)</strong></td>
<td>50-60 A</td>
<td>Average length varies 600-2700 yards.</td>
<td>Majority of holes on north-south axis.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>½ to 1 hour travel time</td>
<td>9-hole course can accommodate 350 people per day. 18-hole course can accommodate 500-550 people per day. Course may be located in community park or school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>9-hole standard</strong></td>
<td>Minimum 50 A</td>
<td>Average length 2250 yards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>18-hole standard</strong></td>
<td>Minimum 110 A</td>
<td>Average length 6500 yards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity/Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>Recommended Space Requirements</th>
<th>Recommended size and dimensions</th>
<th>Recommended orientation</th>
<th>No. of units per population</th>
<th>Service Radius</th>
<th>Location Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pools</td>
<td>Varies on size of pool and amenities. Usually 1 to 2 A site.</td>
<td>Teaching-minimum of 25 yards x 45' even depth of 3 to 4 feet. Competitive-minimum of 25m x 16m. Minimum of 27 square feet of water surface per swimmer. Ratio of 2:1 deck vs. water.</td>
<td>None-although care must be taken in sighting of lifeguard stations in relation to afternoon sun.</td>
<td>1 per 20,000 (Pools should accommodate 3% to 5% of the total population at a time.)</td>
<td>15 to 30 minutes travel time</td>
<td>Pools for general community use should be planned for teaching, competitive, and recreational purposes with enough depth to accommodate 1m and 3m diving boards. Located in community park or school site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Beach area should have 50 sq. ft. of land and 50 sq. ft. of water per user. Turnover rate is 3. There should be 3-4 A supporting land per A of beach.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>½ to 1 hour travel time</td>
<td>Should have sand bottom with slope a maximum of 5% (flat preferable). Boating areas completely segregated from swimming areas. In regional/metro parks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from:
APPENDIX C

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION
RECOMMENDED CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM FOR LOCAL AND REGIONAL
RECREATION OPENSCE AND TRAILS
## Classification System for Local and Regional Recreation Open Space and Trails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Location Criteria</th>
<th>Size Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mini-Park</strong></td>
<td>Used to address limited, isolated or unique recreational needs.</td>
<td>Less than ¼ mile distance in residential setting.</td>
<td>Between 2500 sq. ft. and one acre in size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Park</strong></td>
<td>Neighborhood park remains the basic unit of the park system and serves as the recreational and social focus of the neighborhood. Focus is on informal active and passive recreation.</td>
<td>¼ - to ½-mile distance and uninterrupted by non-residential roads and other physical barriers.</td>
<td>5 acres is considered minimum size. 5 to 10 acres is optimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-Park</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Determine by location of school district property.</td>
<td>Variable-depends on function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Park</strong></td>
<td>Serves broader purpose than neighborhood park. Focus is on meeting community-based recreation needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces.</td>
<td>Determined by the quality and suitability of the site. Usually serves two or more neighborhoods and ½ to 3 mile distance.</td>
<td>As needed to accommodate desired uses. Usually between 30 and 50 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large Urban Park</strong></td>
<td>Large urban parks serve a broader purpose than community parks and are used when community and neighborhood parks are not adequate to serve the needs of the community. Focus is on meeting community-based recreational needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces.</td>
<td>Determined by the quality and suitability of the site. Usually serves the entire community.</td>
<td>As needed to accommodate desired uses. Usually a minimum of 50 acres, with 75 or more acres being optimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Resource Areas</strong></td>
<td>Lands set aside for preservation of significant natural resources, remnant landscapes, open space, and visual aesthetics/buffering.</td>
<td>Resource availability and opportunity.</td>
<td>Variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenways</strong></td>
<td>Effectively tie park system components together to form a continuous park environment.</td>
<td>Resource availability and opportunity.</td>
<td>Variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Complex</strong></td>
<td>Consolidates heavily programmed athletic fields and associated facilities to larger and fewer sites strategically located throughout the community.</td>
<td>Strategically located community-wide facilities.</td>
<td>Determined by projected demand. Usually a minimum of 25 acres, with 40 to 80 acres being optimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Use</strong></td>
<td>Covers a broad range of parks and recreation facilities oriented toward single-purpose use.</td>
<td>Variable-dependent on specific use.</td>
<td>Variable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix C*
**Classification** | **General Description** | **Location Criteria** | **Size Criteria**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Private Park/Recreation Facility | Parks and recreation facilities that are privately owned yet contribute to the public park and recreation system. | Variable-dependent on specific use. | Variable. |
Park Trail | Multipurpose trails located within greenways, parks and natural resource areas. Focus is on recreational value and harmony with natural environment. | • Type I: Separate/single-purpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians or bicyclists/ in-line skaters.  
• Type II: Multipurpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians and bicyclists/ in-line skaters.  
• Type III: Nature trails for pedestrians. May be hard- or soft- surfaced. | |
Connector Trails | Multipurpose trails that emphasize safe travel for pedestrians to and from parks and around the community. Focus is on recreational value and harmony with natural environment. | • Type I: Separate/single-purpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians or bicyclists/ in-line skaters located in independent r.o.w. (e.g., old railroad r.o.w.).  
• Type II: Separate/single-purpose hard-surfaced trails for pedestrians or bicyclists/in-line skaters. Typically located within road r.o.w. | |
On-Street Bikeways | Paved segments of roadways that serve as a means to safely separate bicyclists from vehicular traffic. | Bike Route: Designated portions of the roadway for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists.  
Bike Lane: Shared portions of the roadway that provide separation between motor vehicles and bicyclists, such as paved shoulders. | |
All-Terrain Bike Trail | Off-road trail for all-terrain (mountain) bikes. | Single-purpose loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas. | |
Cross-Country Ski Trail | Trails developed for traditional and skate-style cross-country skiing. | Loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas. | |
Equestrian Trail | Trails developed for horseback riding. | Loop trails usually located in larger parks and natural resource areas. Sometimes developed as multipurpose with hiking and all-terrain biking where conflicts can be controlled. | |

Adapted from:  

*Appendix C*
## NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARK ASSOCIATION Standards for Park Acreage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Desirable Size</th>
<th>Acres/1,000 Population</th>
<th>Desirable Size Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini-park</td>
<td>Specialized facilities that serve a concentrated or limited population or specific group, such as tots or senior citizens</td>
<td>Less than ¼ miles radius</td>
<td>1 acre or less</td>
<td>0.25 to 0.5 A</td>
<td>With neighborhoods in close proximity to apartment complexes, townhouse development or housing for the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Area for intense recreational activities, such as field games, crafts, playground apparatus areas, skating, picnicking, wading pools, etc.</td>
<td>¼ to ½ mile radius to serve a population up to 5,000 (a neighborhood)</td>
<td>15 + acres</td>
<td>1.0 to 2.0 A</td>
<td>Suited for intense development. Easily accessible to neighborhood population (geographically centered for safe walking and biking access). May be developed as a school park facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park</td>
<td>Area of diverse environmental quality. May include areas suited for intense recreation facilities, such as athletic complexes, large swimming pools. May be an area of natural quality for outdoor recreation, such as walking, viewing, sitting, picnicking. May be any combination of the above, depending upon site suitability and community need.</td>
<td>1 to 2 mile radius (several neighborhoods)</td>
<td>25 + acres</td>
<td>5.0 to 8.0 A</td>
<td>May include natural features, such as water bodies and areas suited for intense development. Easily accessible to neighborhood served.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Close-to-Home Space = 6.25 – 10.5 A/1,000
APPENDIX E

BARRIER FREE ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PARKS
BARRIER FREE ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PARKS

Recreational areas, facilities, and programs play an important role in the life of the community; therefore it is essential that people with disabilities have an equal opportunity to enjoy these areas and any programs provided. Federal and state laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability, and these laws apply to parks and other recreation lands and programs controlled and operated by local units of government. The DNR has a strong commitment to barrier free recreational opportunities in our Department-managed programs and facilities. This commitment extends to those communities that receive recreation grants.

Under the state Utilization of Public Facilities by the Physically Limited Act (1966 PA 1, as amended) all public facilities, including improved areas used for recreation, must meet the barrier free design requirements contained in the state construction code. Under this act, the administration and enforcement related to barrier free design requirements are vested in the local or state government agency responsible for issuing a building permit. If the project does not require a building permit, administration and enforcement of barrier free design requirements are vested in the Department of Labor and Economic Growth.

Any request for an exception to the barrier free design requirements of the state construction code must be submitted to the Barrier Free Design Board, within the Department of Labor and Economic Growth (517-241-9300). The Barrier Free Design Board has the responsibility to receive, review, and process requests for exceptions to barrier free design specifications; require appropriate equivalent alternatives when exceptions are granted; and receive, process, and make recommendations for barrier free design rules.

Because the state construction code does not apply to many recreation facilities, it is essential that you also be aware of and understand the existing federal guidelines covering these types of facilities. In July 2004, the federal Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (known as the Access Board) issued updated guidelines, entitled the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), for new or altered facilities covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) or the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-480). These guidelines should eventually be adopted as enforceable standards. Until that occurs, the existing ADAAG standards must be followed when the two conflict.

 Included in the updated ADAAG are technical provisions for a number of types of recreation facilities, including play areas, amusement rides, boating facilities, fishing piers and platforms, golf courses, miniature golf courses, shooting facilities, swimming and wading pools, and spas. Technical provisions for these recreation facilities do not exist in the current AADAG. The Access Board has also proposed guidelines for sports facilities, trails, beaches, and picnic and camping areas. While none of these guidelines has yet been adopted as federal standards, they represent the best information available on developing barrier free recreation facilities and may be upheld in a court of law. Therefore, they should be referred to when designing new or renovated recreation facilities.
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APPENDIX F

NEWSPAPER AFFIDAVITS AND MINUTES
FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS HELD ON
APRIL 16, 2008 AND MAY 21, 2008
The Mining Journal
Upper Michigan's Largest Daily Newspaper
249 W. Washington St., P.O. Box 439, Marquette, Michigan 49855. Phone (906)228-2500. Fax (906)228-3273.

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION
STATE OF MICHIGAN

For the County of MARQUETTE

In the matter of: Notice: Ishpeming City Five-Year Recreation Plan
Second Public Review

Size: 2x2 ¼

State of MICHIGAN, County of Marquette ss.

SKIP SCHNEIDER

being duly sworn, says that he is

ADVERTISING DIRECTOR

of THE MINING JOURNAL

a newspaper published and circulated in
said county and otherwise qualified
according to Supreme Court Rule; that
annexed hereto is a printed copy of a
notice which was published in said
newspaper on the following date, or
dates, to-wit:

April 20, 2008

[Signature]

SKIP SCHNEIDER

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of December, 2008.

[Signature]

AMY L. BOND
Notary Public for Marquette County, Michigan
Acting in the County of Marquette
My commission expires: July 3, 2013
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION
STATE OF MICHIGAN

For the County of MARQUETTE

In the matter of: Notice; Ishpeming City Five-Year Recreation Plan
Public Review Period

Size: 2x2 ¼

State of MICHIGAN, County of Marquette ss.

SKIP SCHNEIDER
being duly sworn, says that he is

ADVERTISING DIRECTOR
of THE MINING JOURNAL

a newspaper published and circulated in said county and otherwise qualified
according to Supreme Court Rule; that annexed hereto is a printed copy of a notice which was published in said newspaper on the following date, or dates, to-wit

March 13, 2008

[Signature]

SKIP SCHNEIDER

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of December, 2008.

[Signature]

AMY L. BOND
Notary Public for Marquette County, Michigan
Acting in the County of Marquette
My commission expires: July 3, 2013
NOTICE
Ishpeming City
Five-Year Recreation Plan
Public Review Period

The Draft Recreation Plan is available for public review at the Ishpeming Department of Public Works, Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. Contact Jim Bertucci, the Public Works Superintendent at the Department of Public Works with any questions or comments concerning the plan or attend the scheduled public hearing.

A public hearing of the Ishpeming Parks and Recreation Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 2008 at 6:00 p.m. at the Al Quaal Lodge to secure citizen input regarding the Ishpeming City Recreation Plan.

NOTICE
Ishpeming City
5-Year Recreation Plan
Second Public Review

The draft for the Recreation Plan is available for public review at the Ishpeming Department of Public Works, Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. Contact Jim Bertucci, the Public Works Superintendent at the Department of Public Works with any questions or comments concerning the plan or attend the scheduled public hearing.

A public hearing of the Ishpeming Parks and Recreation Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, May 21, 2008 at 6:30 p.m. at the Al Quaal Lodge to secure citizen input regarding the Ishpeming City Recreation Plan.
5 YEAR PLAN PUBLIC REVIEW READING

Public Comment:

None

The Public Review Reading for 5 year plan was called to order by Mr. James Bertucci at 6:00 p.m.

No one from the public was present for the reading; therefore, no questions or comments were discussed at this time.

The Public Review was closed by Mr. Bertucci at 6:30 p.m.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION SPRING MEETING

The spring meeting of the Parks & Recreation Commission was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 16, 2008, at the Al Quaal Lodge.

Present: Mr. James Bertucci (Superintendent), Mr. John Stone, Dr. Stephen Piereson, Ms. Doreen Bertucci, Mr. Dave Morton, and Mr. Angelo Bosio

Absent: Mr. Norman Andrew, Mr. Edmund Holmgren, Ms. Marilyn Hart, and Mr. Karl Lehmann

Public Comment:

Ball team representatives: Mr. Lloyd Hooper, representing the American Legion League, Mrs. Donna Champion and Mr. Gary O’Brien, representing the Superior Iron Range Woman’s Softball League, Mr. Bill Zulkie, representing the Little League, Mr. Dennis Andrews, representing the Marquette County Men’s League, and Mrs. Shannon Edmark, representing Woman’s Horseshoes

Minutes (Spring Meeting)

The spring meeting was called to order by Mr. Bertucci at 6:30 p.m.

The schedule for the ball fields will be similar to last year’s.

- Little League and Girls Fast Pitch League will play on Tuesdays and Thursdays
- Woman’s Softball League is Wednesdays, using the Fast Pitch and Slow Pitch Fields
• Men’s Marquette County League is requesting to play on the Mather A Field on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m.
• The Tee Ball League will play from 9:30a.m to 12:00p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays.
• Men’s Recreation League is scheduled for Monday’s at 7:00 p.m. at the Fast Pitch, Slow Pitch, and Mather A fields.

Women’s Horseshoe League is requesting the use of a portable bathroom at the horseshoe court.

COMMISSION MEETING

Public Comment

Lisa Coombs-Gerou

Lisa Coombs is with the YMCA of Marquette County. The YMCA is requesting the use of the Teal Lake Lodge for a summer day camp. The camp will be outside for most activities unless the weather is bad. They would like the lodge for their home base. The dates scheduled for the camp would be June 9, 2008, to August 29, 2008.

The ages of children range from kindergarten through eighth grade. The camp is hoping to get about 20 participants.

A motion was made by Mr. John Stone to rent out the Teal Lake Lodge to the YMCA for a summer day camp at the price of $250 per week, seconded by Mr. Dave Morton. All were in favor, none opposed.

Mr. James Bertucci commented on the rates of the lodge rentals and the use of city property. It is his opinion that the rates be increased as follows:

1. Little League fees should be raised from $1,500 to $1,600 per year.
2. Men’s Recreation League should be raised from $325 to $350 per time slot.
3. Women’s Horseshoe League should be raised from $35 to $40.
4. Al Quaal rentals should remain the same.
5. The Gazebo rental should be raised to $75 for residents and $100 for non-residents.

Rentals for the Tube Slide and Lodge are as follows:
• 0-25 people - $160
• 26-100 people - $185
• 101 or more people - $210

Mr. Dave Morton suggested having a group rate of $50 for a group of ten people for the tube slide.
Mr. Dave Morton made a motion to raise the non-resident fee from $130 to $150 for lodge rentals, seconded by Mr. John Stone. All were in favor, none opposed.

Dr. Stephen Piereson made a motion to accept the minutes from the February 20, 2008, meeting. Mr. Stone seconded it; all were in favor, none opposed.

**Parks Report, Mr. James Bertucci (Superintendent)**

Mr. James Bertucci and Mr. Norman Andrew attended a meeting with the City of Negaunee and Ishpeming Township. The meeting was to recommend that all three communities pull together and form a recreation committee to help with the development of our communities and receive better grants.

To form this new committee, there would be two members from our Parks Commission.

Dr. Stephen Piereson asked about the goals and duties of the Recreation Committee. It was suggested by Mr. Angelo Bosio that the Recreation Committee bring all concerns back to our regular Parks and Recreation Commission.

A motion was made by Mr. John Stone to have Mr. Norman Andrew and Dr. Stephen Piereson sit on the board of the new committee, seconded by Mr. Angelo Bosio. All were in favor, none opposed.

Mr. Bertucci received a letter from the Girl Scout troop requesting to have reimbursement of payment for the rental from the Tube slide and Teal Lake Lodge on February 23, 2008, as they only used the slide for two hours.

Mr. Angelo Bosio made a motion to reject all reimbursements to the Girl Scouts and it was seconded by Mr. John Stone. All were in favor, none opposed.

The amount of money brought in from the Tube Slide, concession, and rentals of the slide came to a total of $13,646. With the ski trails and the pay pipes the grand total of receipts is $15,948.

The Noquemanon owes the City of Ishpeming a total of $949 while the Jr. Olympics owes $760. Bills were previously sent out.

Mr. Craig Stein, who is with the Noquemanon Trail Networking, sent a letter stating there was no contract with the city. It was suggested that the City consider selling their own tickets for the trails next year.

A letter from Mr. Paul Argall mentioned he would pay $5,000 to connect our ski trails. Mr. Paul Argall would be responsible for the connecting of the trails. Mr. Jim Bertucci felt that it would be a great benefit for both parties.
Dr. Stephen Piereson advised the Parks Committee about Northern Michigan University using Al Quaal for ski practice and should be charged a fee for the use of city trails.

A letter was received for the second time from the Jacobetti Home for Veterans in Marquette, requesting the use of the Teal Lake Lodge for a discounted price or no fee at all. The City of Marquette does not give them a discount.

Mr. John Stone made a motion to have Mr. Alan Bakalarski, City Manager, write a letter to the Director of the Jacobetti Center regarding how the City of Ishpeming is being treated by their Activities Director. It seems as if we are the only government unit that is being asked to waive its standard rental fees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dave Morton. All were in favor, none opposed.

**Old/New Business**

Mr. John Stone suggested we put signs around the ball fields for advertisement. However, because this was built with grant money, advertisements and signs are not permitted.

Mr. Dave Morton mentioned the Ride for Glory Bike Race date was changed to June 28, 2008.

A recommendation from Mr. Dave Morton was to have the ski trails groomed more in the later season, as the trails can get very icy and dangerous.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Angelo Bosio made a motion to adjourn at 8:25 p.m. Mr. John Stone seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.
5 YEAR PLAN PUBLIC REVIEW; SECOND READING

Public Comment: None

The Public Review Reading for 5 year plan was called to order by Mr. Norman Andrew at 6:30 p.m.

No one from the public was present for the reading; therefore, no questions or comments were discussed at this time.

The Public Review was closed by Mr. Norman Andrew at 6:35 p.m.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION MEETING

The meeting of the Parks & Recreation Commission was held at 6:35 p.m. on Wednesday, May 21, 2008, at the Al Quaal Lodge.

Present: Mr. James Bertucci (Superintendent), Mr. John Stone, Mr. Norman Andrew, Ms. Doreen Bertucci, Mr. Dave Morton, and Mr. Angelo Bosio, Mr. Karl Lehmann

Absent: Dr. Stephen Piereson, Mr. Edmund Holmgren, and Ms. Marilyn Hart

Public Comment:

None

Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Norman Andrew to accept the minutes of April 16, 2008 with a change in the attendance of Mr. Dave Morton. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Stone. All were in favor, and none opposed.

Fees for 2009

Mr. John Stone commented on the rates charged to Northern Michigan University Skiers. He suggested that the rates be raised. Mr. Jim Bertucci said the rate will be changed to $7.00 per person.

Mr. Dave Morton mentioned that the pay pipes still say $3.00 so they should be changed to $5.00
A motion to accept the rates as presented was made by Mr. Karl Lehmann, and seconded by Mr. Dave Morton. All were in favor, none opposed.

**Parks Report, Mr. Jim Bertucci**

- The Summer Camp will be at the Teal Lake Lodge starting June 9, 2008, and will go until August 29, 2008.
- The Track and Field day for elementary students will be held at the Playground on May 28, 2008.
- Relay for Life will be held on June 13 and 14, 2008.
- Ride for Glory will take place at Al Quaal on June 28, 2008.
- 4th of July celebration will be held as usual.
- The Italian Festival will be held on July 26, 2008, at Al Quaal.
- Bell Memorial Hospital Swim will be held on July 26, 2008, at the Teal Lake Lodge.
- The Renaissance Festival will be held at Lake Bancroft on August 2, 2008.

The City Council approved all recommendations from the parks meeting which consisted of:

1. The Veteran Letter from Ms. Beth Heikkinen
2. The Girl Scouts of America Letter
3. Dr. Stephen Piereson and Mr. Norman Andrew to be part of the Board with Negaunee and Ishpeming Township.
4. The YMCA Camp

Baseball/Softball games started last week and everything is going very well.

A meeting with Dr. Stephen Piereson, Mr. Jim Bertucci, Mr. Norman Andrew, Mrs. Pat Bureau, and Mr. Alan Bakalarski was held at the Manager’s office on Tuesday at 3:34 p.m. to discuss the altered contract and how Al Quaal became a part of the Joint Plan.

The Joint Recreation Committee met on Tuesday, May 20, 2008.

Mr. Jim Bertucci expressed a concern with the wording of the newly formed joint recreation plan. The Al Quaal should be separate from this plan. The land that is owned by the City of Ishpeming should stay in the control of the city. The land that is owned jointly should be controlled by the communities who own them.

Mr. Jim Bertucci asked the committee to vote on a chairperson and vice chairperson. Mr. Angelo Bosio made a motion to have Mr. Norman Andrew as the Chairperson and convert the Vice Chairperson to Mr. Jim Bertucci. The motion was seconded by Mr. John Stone and all were in favor, none opposed.

**Old/New Business**
Mr. Norman Andrew mentioned that the contract written by CUPPAD was presented to the joint committee stating fees between Ishpeming, Negaunee, and Ishpeming Township. For an unknown reason, the contract has been altered regarding Al Quaal and Mr. Andrew would like to know who altered it. He also would like to know specific details of the Joint Recreation Committee Plan that was recently approved by the City Council. The Parks and Recreation Commission agree that the Al Quaal should remain under the control of the City of Ishpeming.

Mr. Angelo Bosio asked if $15,000 could be added to this year’s budget to begin planning for the replacement of the groomer.

**Adjournment**

Mr. Karl Lehmann made a motion to adjourn at 7:45 p.m. Mr. Norman Andrew seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed.
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**INTRODUCTION:**

**History and Background:**

In March of 2003, the City of Ishpeming was successful in purchasing several significant parcels of land located within the city limits from the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company (CCIC). The land sale, consisting of approximately 720 acres, have parcels of varying sizes, located in parts of Sections 2, 3, 10 and 11, T.47N.;R.27W, a reference map titled, Ishpeming Land Sale, prepared by CCIC showing the location of the parcels, is available for review at the City Hall, and will also be referenced during this presentation. The largest contiguous area, approximately 600 acres, is located immediately East of the city in Sections 2 and 11, and is bounded on the North by the L S & I Railroad R.O.W. Line (located just South of U.S. Highway 41), on the South by Business Route M-28, (Division Street), on the West by existing residential development in the city, and on the East by the East City Limits, the common boundary line between the Cities of Ishpeming and Negaunee. This specific parcel is unique, not only in its location adjacent with existing development within the city, but this large parcel also being located within the City limits affords the City a potential for growth within its corporate boundaries with a variety of significant development options. Map No. 1, is a part of a United States Geological Survey (USGS) colored map and shows the project site and surrounding area and also highlights the location with respect to the City. Additional physical features, including the topography, forest and vegetative cover, along with existing land use(s) and man-made improvements are also depicted on this map. An overlay, delineating the revised Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District Boundary, approved and adopted by the City Council on May 11, 2005, is also provided to specifically define the proposed development plan location.

**PLANNING METHODOLOGY:**

**Data Inventory:**

The initial step in the Planning Process, to determine feasible development plan options, is to obtain all available and record data relative to the site, and to compile this information into a Data Inventory Base. The information is subsequently analyzed, synthesized and utilized, with the application of facts and data, and provides the basis for the plan design and alternative land use options. The Data Inventory Base, compiled from various public and private sources, is portrayed in this report on a series of Maps, numbered 1 thru 10, and are included as a vital part of this report. The background studies for this project included a review of the history, problems and opportunities, associated with the site, along with an inventory of the natural characteristics and physical features of the site in addition to the positive features of the site, a careful review of the site constraints and problems precipitated by man-made activities and improvements, above and below the surface, were also carefully noted. Once again, all of the available, data and information obtained during this phase of the planning process, which could be graphically presented, are portrayed on the aforementioned series of maps. The following review of all of the Maps contained in this report will highlight the positive natural features and characteristics of the site along with the obvious problems and development constraints.

**MAP NO. 1:**

USGS Colored Map with revised TIF Boundary 5-11-05; This map and the overlay have already been discussed earlier in this report.
MAP NO. 2: Surficial Geology:

The information portrayed on the Surface Geology Map is based upon the U.S. Department of Interior Geological Survey, 1954. Since Surficial Geology does not typically change over the years, unless altered by man-made activities, the information, although five decades old, can be considered reasonably accurate and reliable for purposes of this study. The location of underground mining activities, with relation to the Mather A Underground Mine, will be discussed later in this report with the review of Map No. 6, Mather "A" Mine Surface Reuse Potential. A major portion of the proposed development plan site, approximately 70%, is mainly composed of Outwash Plains and is located in the Northwest and Southwesterly corners of the site. Large Bedrock Outcropping represents approximately 15% of the total site. The remaining 15% of the site is composed of a combination of Rock Controlled Till, located in the Southwest and Southeast parts of the site, along with Locustrine Deposits, Small Bedrock Outcropping, Pits, Swamps and Wetlands. The Surficial Geology of the site does not appear to present any particular problems with the reuse potential of the surface areas.
MAP NO. 3: On-Site Soils:

The On-Site Soils Map information is based upon the Soil Survey of Marquette County, Michigan and the Interim Report, May 1997, Volume I, Soil Map Units. The detailed description of the Soil Map Units is in Appendix A. The On-Site Soils Map outlines the various areas within the plan site and identifies the Soil Map Unit by a number designation such as 43-B or 55-F. Each Soil Unit has a detailed description of its individual characteristics defining slope, setting, typical profile, soil properties and qualities, composition, inclusions, along with the Use and Management characteristics of each Soil Unit. This category includes the Management of Woodland, Buildings, Septic Tank and Absorption Fields and co-ordinates with other Interpretative Groups of the Land Capability Classification System. A major area of the plan site, approximately 60%, is designated as Soil Map Unit No. 43-B, Karlin Sandy Loam, and its location on the site reflects the approximate location and area represented on the surficial Geology Map designated as Outwash Plains. Karlin Sandy Loam is best described as having dark brown coloration at the surface and turning to a yellowish brown sand from 29" - 80" below the surface. Slopes are generally no greater than 1% - 6% and this Soil Unit has moderate to high permeability. Due to its sandy composition, cut banks will cave, if unsupported, therefore, during the initial Phase(s) of building construction or with the underground installation of utilities, trench walls should be reinforced appropriately. The balance of the plan site is a combination of differing Soil Units and include the following summary;

Soil Unit 55-F, - Michigamme Rock Outcrop exhibits slopes from 25% - 70%, and is located in very hilly areas atop Bedrock Controlled Moraines. This Soil Unit is quite hostile to construction and is generally unsuited for building sites. The 55-F Soil Unit is located in part of the central portion of the site, along the Northerly part and in scattered locations in the Southerly part.

Soil Unit 56-F, - Peshekee-Rock Outcrop Complex exhibits 35% - 70% slopes and is very bouldery. Once again, this type of Soil Unit is very much like Soil Unit 55-F, as noted above, and would also be unsuitable for building sites.

Soil Unit 57, - Carbondale and Tawas Soils are essentially located in depressions and drainage ways and consists essentially of black muck and mucky peat. It is a poorly drained Soil Unit and exhibits a high water table and high organic content. This soil is obviously unsuited for any type of building development or septic tank absorption fields. Carbondale Soils occur along drainage courses that are located in the Southerly part of the project site along the old RR R.O.W. Line and present snowmobile trail.

Soil Unit 64, - Consists mainly of Pits, Dumps and Mine Areas, nearly level to very steep areas located at or near former mining locations. This Soil Unit covers a relatively small area and is located just North of the Malton Electric Facility and the Range Telecommunications Sub-Station.

Soil Unit 65-B, - Udorthents-Urbanland Complex and Soil Unit 66-B, Udipsamments-Urbanland Complex are both very similar, exhibiting nearly level to very steep areas depending upon former mining activities in the area. Soil Unit 65-B is located in a part of the Northeastern corner of the site along the Southerly L S & I Railroad R.O.W. Soil Unit 66-B is located in the Southeastern corner of the site close to Business M-28. With regard to building construction, on-site investigation is required to determine suitability for specific uses in both Soil Units. The Soil Units that are located within the proposed development plan areas, where building construction, roadway and infrastructure are proposed, do not appear to present any major problems to development accept as noted. Detailed characteristics of each Soil Unit within the project area are listed in Appendix A.
MAP NO. 4: Development Limitations:

This map is intended to graphically show the physical constraints to on-site development. Problem areas have been highlighted using a variety of shading and cross-hatch techniques to define their location and extent. Areas specifically noted on the Map exhibit natural and man-made features which conflict or render certain areas unsuitable for development of any kind. Some of the natural physical features limiting the development potential of the site include severe topography, steep slopes, swamps, wetlands, unsuitable on-site Soil Units and drainage areas. Man-made development constraints include past underground mining activities, parcel exceptions, leases, existing infrastructure locations, access road connection points, a landfill site, power lines, motorized and non-motorized trails, existing land use, existing zoning districts and the Brownstone Development Area. Some development limitations which initially appear negative, such as severe topography and steep slopes located on Bedrock Outcappings, can be utilized as excellent buffer zones or open space areas, effectively separating different land uses of varying intensities. The Preliminary Development Plan, Options A and B, have utilized as much as possible these specific site constraints and limitations to enhance the final layout. The Development Limitations Map has been prepared at a large scale and will be reviewed in detail during the presentation to City Officials.
MAP NO. 5: Brownstone Development:

This map depicts the current plan for the Brownstone Development, which comprises a total area of approximately 45.6 acres and is located in the southwest corner of the Project area. The City of Ishpeming is in the process of preparing several parcels for sale and/or lease within this former CCIC industrial site located on the Northeast corner of Business M-28 (Division Street) and Seventh Street.
MAP NO. 6: Mather “A” Mine Subsurface Reuse Potential:

This map depicts areas within the proposed development plan where past underground mining activities have taken place. A total of approximately 183 acres of the 600 acres project site have had some type of underground mining activity in the past. The largest area of mining activity, approximately 135 acres, is located in the Northeast corner of the site with past mining activities conducted below 1600 feet. The other area of underground mining activity 3000 feet below the surface is located in the Southeast corner of the site, directly below the Negaunee/Ishpeming - Negaunee Township landfill site which was closed with benefit of a MDNR Grant in 1990. According to a report prepared by Paul R. Bluekamp, Geological Engineer, dated May 30, 2003, “slight slumpage is possible where mining is below 1600 feet, and mining below 3000 feet will not cave to the surface.” The balance of the site, containing approximately 417 acres, has had no underground mining activity. A complete copy of the “Report on Mather “A” Mine Surface Reuse Potential for the City of Ishpeming” is in Appendix B.
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MAP NO. 7:

Proposed Hematite Drive Extension and Malton Road Connection:

A major requirement and an absolute necessity for any type of Land Development Plan is easy access to the site and subsequent accessibility to all interior areas within the development utilizing a safe and efficient Road Circulation System. The Hematite Drive Extension (4,180 L.F.) is critical to the development of the area and it will provide a direct and major link to the Ishpeming Downtown Business District. The Extension is planned to be located along the old vacated RR grade and will extend East from the Third Street intersection to the intersection with proposed Malton Road. At a future date, and when funds can be appropriated, Malton Road will be extended North (4,200 L.F.) to U.S. Highway 41. As the final phase of the major On-Site Road Circulation System, Malton road will be extended South, (3,400 L.F.) from the intersection of Hematite Drive and Malton Road, to intersect with Business Route M-28 (Division Street), approximately 1/4 mile West of the Ishpeming City Limits. The completion of these two major roads within the development will provide the necessary backbone for the subsequent local road circulation system which will provide direct access to all of the proposed sites within the Development Plan.
HEMATITE DRIVE EXTENSION TO PROPOSED MALTON ROAD = 4.180 LINEAL FEET

PROPOSED MALTON ROAD - BUS. RTE. M-28 TO EXISTING MALTON RD = 7600 LINEAL FT

PREPARED FOR: CITY OF ISHPEMING DOA / PC

02/06/06    JOB NO. 11714

MAP NO. 7
MAP NO. 8:
Evaluation of Alternate Development Plan Options Alternate Plan A:
Planned Unit Development Concept

Alternate Plan A was developed utilizing the Planned Unit Development (PUD) option as provided for within the City of Ishpeming Zoning Ordinance. Using this approach provides for a much more flexible type of development, and creates the potential for a variety of Land Uses of varying intensities. The site is well suited to this type of development as some of the limitations to development, ie: severe topography, steep slopes and rock outcroppings, can be utilized to effectively buffer or screen difficult types of land uses with varying land use intensities. The buffer areas will remain essentially an undisturbed area, and will provide the excellent separation required. A variety of housing options are provided using this concept, and along with the typical single family type residential, site condominium and multi-family districts are planned along with a variety of differing land uses. Also included within the PUD concept, are more intense land uses including professional office, neighborhood and general commercial, integration of the existing Industrial sites along with areas which can be designated DD, Deferred Development, until such time as development pressures force change in use. The flexibility for development within the PUD concept offers a plan which can accommodate future growth trends as well as the dictates of the market place. Further study and review of the land uses noted on the plan drawing will be required prior to finalizing locations and the areas required for each use.
Alternative Plan B: Residential-Recreational Plan Development Concept

Alternative Plan B was developed from input obtained from Planning Commissioners and the Downtown Development Authority Board. The objective, after careful review of all of the site constraints, was to determine what the lot yield would be for the total site. A conscious attempt was made to create "estate" size lots which would be significantly larger than the minimum size currently allowed under the residential districts provided for in the City Zoning Ordinance. As discussed earlier in this study, accessibility is key to site development. Therefore, the extension of Hematite Drive, along with the future Malton Road connection, running from U.S. Hwy 41 South to Business M-28, will provide the backbone for the future local road system affecting direct access to each site.

Approximately 200 generous sized lots could be developed utilizing the Alternative Plan B. However, different type land uses are precluded from development within the plan, and the necessary flexibility for future development is quite limited. While the site offers a significant amount of open space due to the many on-site development constraints, city officials also indicated a need for some type of semi-active recreational activity. Since a golf course was located on the site some years ago, it was suggested that a study be initiated to determine the feasibility of this amenity. It was determined that a nine-hole golf course was possible and could be designed into the plan utilizing a significant part of the former landfill site.

The Alternative Plan B option fits the site very well, however, it limits future development to essentially single family, high type residential development. Since the site is well suited for a variety of land uses, it became apparent that another alternative plan, based upon a Planned Unit Development (PUD) could be a good alternative.
MAP NO. 10: Current Zoning:

The current Zoning Map for the City of Ishpeming shows that, with the exception of several parcels Zoned I, Industrial, the majority of the project site is zoned MI, Mining and DD, Deferred Development. Since a development plan has not yet been officially adapted by the City, rezoning of any areas of the project site would appear to be premature at the time. After a determination of what type of development plan will be pursued, the on-site zoning can be revised and recommendations for rezoning can be made based upon plan requirements. The City of Ishpeming zoning ordinance also provides for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), option for land development. Therefore, should the City decide to pursue Alternate Plan A, which is based upon this concept, then rezoning would not be necessary.
Summary

An Old Chinese Proverb states that “one picture is worth a thousand words”. Therefore, in developing this study, extra effort has been expended to provide as much information as possible utilizing maps and graphics.

It is anticipated that the maps will be carefully reviewed along with the supporting text to hopefully spawn new ideas as well as solidify some of the plan elements.

The current economic outlook in the Central U.P. appears to be quite positive. CCIC has been hiring additional help, and the profits announced recently by the Company have been welcome news to the stock holders. The anticipation of new mining activities announced recently by the Kenecott Minerals Company will help to continue to fuel the economy in the area. Therefore, it appears that the preparation of a plan for the development of the “Cliff’s Purchase” is quite timely. City officials are encouraged to proceed with the prioritizing of specific phases of development. The following pages titled considerations and recommendations should be employed in the process of prioritization of these specific phases.
Considerations

- Creation of Tax Incentives
- County Road 480 Jurisdictional Transfer
- Residential Infill Development along Business M-28 (Division St.)
- Multi-Purpose Trails System
- Possible inclusion of Ishpeming within the loop for Annual Sled Dog Races
- Development commitments from major "people" magnets
- Team vision for future plan development phases
- Prioritization of plan development phases
- Media coverage expansion
- Approval authority for future development
- Expedient review and approval procedures
- Sensitivity to market demands, dictates, and trends
- Coordination of planning and development with adjacent jurisdictions
Recommendations

- Public participation in plan development
- Cooperative creation of a flexible development plan
- Official adoption of a final development plan
- Name identification for the development plan area
- Provide flexibility for development of different land use intensities
- Provide a variety of housing opportunities
- City retains approval authority
- Prioritize phases of development
- All new development proposals to consider existing infrastructure locations
- Adopt policy statement regarding development plan
APPENDIX A

Detailed Soil Map Units
29D-Yalmer fine sand, 6 to 18 percent slopes

Setting

Landform: Gently rolling and rolling areas on ground moraines and till-floored lake plains
Shape of areas: Irregular
Size of areas: 25 to 90 acres

Typical Profile

Organic mat:
0 to 1 inch—black partially decomposed forest litter
Surface layer:
1 to 10 inches—reddish gray fine sand
Subsoil:
10 to 30 inches—dark reddish brown and reddish brown fine sand
30 to 36 inches—mottled, very firm, dark reddish gray loamy fine sand and reddish brown fine sandy loam
36 to 80 inches—mottled, very firm, reddish brown fine sandy loam and dark reddish gray loamy fine sand

Soil Properties and Qualities

Depth class: Very deep
Permeability: Rapid in the surface and upper subsoil very slow in the lower subsoil
Available water capacity: Low
Drainage class: Moderately well drained
Seasonal high water table: Perched, 1 to 2 feet below the surface from October to May
Surface runoff: Slow
Flooding: None
Organic matter content: Low
Hazard of water erosion: Off road—slight: Roads and trails—moderate
Hazard of soil blowing: Severe

Composition

Yalmer soil and similar soils: 85 to 90 percent
Contrasting inclusions: 10 to 15 percent

Inclusions

Contrasting inclusions: The excessively drained Kalkaska soils in similar positions on the landscape
The somewhat poorly drained Skane and the poorly drained Gay soils in depressions and drainageways
Similar inclusions: Areas where the upper profile is fine sandy loam

Use and Management

Land use: Dominant use—woodland; other uses—cropland, pasture

Woodland
Major management concerns: Equipment limitation, seedling mortality, windthrow hazard, plant competition

Management measures: Year-round logging roads require roadfill and gravel.
Culverts are needed to maintain the natural drainage system.
Equipment should be used only when the soil is relatively dry or has an adequate snow cover.
Planting special nursery stock or containerized seedlings can reduce the seedling mortality rate.
Windthrow can be minimized by harvest methods that do not leave the remaining trees widely spaced.
Special harvest methods may be needed to control undesirable plants.
If trees are planted, site preparation by mechanical or chemical means is needed to control competing vegetation.
Subsequent control of the invasion and growth of hardwoods may be needed.

Cropland
Major management concerns: Water erosion, soil blowing, nutrient loss, seasonal droughtiness, low organic matter content
Management measures: Cropping rotations that include close-growing crops, conservation tillage, grassed waterways, cover crops, and crop residue management help to prevent excessive soil loss.
Conservation tillage, windbreaks, vegetative barriers, cover crops, stripcropping, and cropping systems that include close-growing crops help to control soil blowing.
Increasing organic matter content in the root zone may increase the ability of the soil to hold water, nutrients and pesticides, and reduce the risk of groundwater pollution.
Leaving crop residue on the surface and adding other organic material conserve moisture.
Inclusion of green manure crops in the cropping sequence, no-till planting, and crop residue management increase the organic matter content.

Pasture
Major management concerns: Seasonal droughtiness
Management measures: Proper stocking rates, controlled grazing, and restricted use during dry periods help to keep the pasture in good condition.

Buildings
Major management concerns: Cutbanks cave, seasonal wetness, slope
Management measures: Because cutbanks are not stable and subject to caving, trench walls should be reinforced.
Buildings can be constructed on well compacted fill material, which raises the site a sufficient distance above the water table.
Buildings should be designed so that they conform to the natural slope of the land. Land shaping is necessary in some areas.

Septic tank absorption fields
Major management concerns: Seasonal wetness, percs slowly, slope
43B—Karlin sandy loam, 1 to 6 percent slopes

Setting

*Landform:* Gently undulating areas on stream terraces, outwash plains, and disintegration moraines
*Shape of areas:* Irregular
*Size of areas:* 10 to 450 acres

Typical Profile

*Organic mat:* 0 to 1 inch—black well decomposed forest litter
*Surface layer:* 1 to 4 inches—brown sandy loam
*Subsoil:* 4 to 15 inches—dark brown and brown sandy loam
15 to 29 inches—brown sand
*Substratum:* 29 to 80 inches—yellowish brown sand

Soil Properties and Qualities

*Depth class:* Very deep
*Permeability:* Moderately rapid in the surface and upper subsoil, and rapid in the lower subsoil and substratum
*Available water capacity:* Low
*Drainage class:* Somewhat excessively drained
*Seasonal high water table:* More than 6 feet
*Surface runoff:* Slow
*Flooding:* None
*Organic matter content:* Low
*Hazard of water erosion:* Off road—slight; Roads and trails—moderate
*Hazard of soil blowing:* Moderate

Composition

Karlin soil and similar soils: 85 to 90 percent
Contrasting inclusions: 10 to 15 percent

Inclusions

Contrasting inclusions: The poorly drained Deford soils in depressions and drainageways
The moderately well drained Chabeneau soils in slightly lower positions on the landscape
Similar inclusions: Areas where the upper profile is sand

Use and Management

Woodland

*Major management concerns:* Erosion hazard, plant competition
*Management measures:* The risk of erosion can be reduced by seeding logging roads, landings, and areas that have been cut and filled, and by installing water bars and culverts.
Special harvest methods may be needed to control undesirable plants.
If trees are planted, site preparation by mechanical or...
**55F—Michigamme-Rock outcrop complex, 25 to 70 percent slopes, very bouldery**

**Setting**

*Landform:* Very hilly areas on bedrock-controlled moraines over igneous and metamorphic bedrock  
*Shape of areas:* Irregular  
*Size of areas:* 6 to 2000 acres

**Typical Profile**

*Organic mat:*  
0 to 2 inches—black well decomposed forest litter  
*Surface layer:*  
2 to 5 inches—dark reddish gray cobbly fine sandy loam  
*Subsoil:*  
5 to 24 inches—dark reddish brown cobbly fine sandy loam  
24 to 29 inches—reddish brown cobbly fine sandy loam  
*Bedrock:*  
29 inches—gneiss

**Soil Properties and Qualities**

*Depth class:* Moderately deep to igneous or metamorphic bedrock  
*Rock fragments on surface:* Boulders spaced approximately 10 to 65 feet apart  
*Permeability:* Moderate  
*Available water capacity:* Low  
*Drainage class:* Well drained  
*Seasonal high water table:* More than 6 feet  
*Surface runoff:* Rapid  
*Flooding:* None  
*Organic matter content:* Low  
*Hazard of water erosion:* Severe  
*Hazard of soil blowing:* Moderate

**Composition**

*Michigamme soil and similar soils:* 55 to 80 percent  
*Rock outcrop:* 10 to 35 percent  
*Contrasting inclusions:* 10 to 15 percent

**Inclusions**

*Contrasting inclusions:* The well drained Keewaydin and Schweitzer soils in similar positions on the landscape  
The moderately well drained Distho soils in areas on the landscape that have slopes less than 25 percent  
The poorly drained Witbeck soils in depressions and drainageways  
*Similar inclusions:* Areas where the depth to bedrock is less than 20 inches or greater than 40 inches

**Use and Management**

*Woodland:*  
*Major management concerns:* Erosion hazard, equipment limitation, windthrow hazard, plant competition

*Management measures:* Because of the erosion hazard, water should be removed by water bars, out-sloping or in-sloping road surfaces, culverts, and drop structures. Building logging roads on the contour or on the gentler slopes and seeding logging roads, skid roads, and landings after the trees are logged also help to prevent excessive soil loss. Skidders should not be used during wet periods when ruts form easily. Year-round logging roads require a gravel base. Ordinary crawler tractors and rubber-tired skidders cannot be operated safely on these slopes. As a result, special logging methods, such as yarding the logs with a cable, may be needed. Small areas of nearly level included soils, if any are available, and suitable nearly level adjacent areas should be selected as sites for landings. Rock outcrops and boulders within this unit may interfere with the use of harvesting equipment and haul road locations. Because of stones and boulders on the surface, wheeled skidders with high clearance should be operated at a reduced speed over carefully chosen routes. Windthrow can be minimized by harvest methods that do not leave the remaining trees widely spaced. Carefully managed reforestation helps to control undesirable understory plants.

**Buildings**

*Major management concerns:* Slope  
*Management measures:* Because of slope, this map unit is generally unsuited to building sites.

**Septic tank absorption fields**

*Major management concerns:* Slope  
*Management measures:* Because of slope, this map unit is generally unsuited to septic tank absorption fields.

**Interpretive Groups**

*Land capability classification:* VII  
*Woodland ordination symbol:* Michigamme—3R  
*Michigan soil management group:* Michigamme—3/Ra  
*Hydrologic group:* C  
*Primary habitat type:* ATD  
*Secondary habitat type:* TMV
56F—Peshekee-Rock outcrop complex, 35 to 70 percent slopes, very bouldery

Setting

*Landform:* Very steep areas on bedrock-controlled moraines over igneous and metamorphic bedrock
Shape of areas: Irregular
Size of areas: 8 to 1000 acres

Typical Profile

*Organic mat:* 0 to 1 inch—black well decomposed forest litter
*Surface layer:* 1 to 3 inches—dark brown cobblely very fine sandy loam
*Subsurface layer:* 3 to 5 inches—reddish gray cobblely very fine sandy loam
*Subsoil:* 5 to 14 inches—dark reddish brown cobblely very fine sandy loam
*Bedrock:* 16 inches—granite

Soil Properties and Qualities

*Depth class:* Shallow to igneous or metamorphic bedrock
*Rock fragment on surface:* Boulders spaced approximately 10 to 65 feet apart
*Permeability:* Moderate
*Available water capacity:* Very low
*Drainage class:* Well drained
*Seasonal high water table:* More than 6 feet
*Surface runoff:* Medium
*Flooding:* None
*Organic matter content:* Low
*Hazard of water erosion:* Severe
*Hazard of soil blowing:* Moderate

Composition

Peshekee soil and similar soils: 30 to 55 percent
Rock outcrop: 30 to 55 percent
Contrasting inclusions: 10 to 15 percent

Inclusions

*Contrasting inclusions:* The somewhat excessively drained Ishpeming soils in similar positions on the landscape
The poorly drained Witbeck soils in depressions and drainageways
*Similar inclusions:* Areas where the depth to bedrock is greater than 20 inches
Areas where the surface stones and boulders are less than 1 to 3 feet apart

Use and Management

*Woodland*
*Major management concerns:* Erosion hazard.

*equipment limitation, seedling mortality, windthrow hazard, plant competition*

*Management measures:* Because of the slope, shallow depth to bedrock, large boulders and rock outcrops logging operations are not practical on this map unit.

*Buildings*
*Major management concerns:* Slope
*Management measures:* Because of slope, this map unit is generally unsuited to building sites.

*Septic tank absorption fields*
*Major management concerns:* Slope
*Management measures:* Because of slope, this map unit is generally unsuited to septic tank absorption fields.

*Interpretive Groups*

*Land capability classification:* VIIa
*Woodland ordination symbol:* 2R
*Michigan soil management group:* Ra
*Hydrologic group:* D
*Primary habitat type:* ATD
*Secondary habitat type:* AQVac
57—Carbondale and Tawas soils

Setting

Landform: Depressions and drainageways on moraines, outwash plains, and till flooded lake plains
Shape of areas: Irregular or elongated
Size of areas: 3 to 500 acres

Typical Profile

Carbondale
Surface tier: 0 to 6 inches—black muck
Subsurface tier: 6 to 38 inches—black muck
Bottom tier: 38 to 80 inches—black mucky peat

Tawas
Surface tier: 0 to 6 inches—black muck
Subsurface tier: 6 to 25 inches—black muck
Substratum: 25 to 80 inches—grayish brown sand

Soil Properties and Qualities

Depth class: Very deep
Permeability: Carbondale—moderately slow to moderately rapid; Tawas—moderately slow to moderately rapid in the surface and subsurface tiers, and rapid in the substratum
Available water capacity: Very high
Drainage class: Very poorly drained
Seasonal high water table: 1 foot above to 1 foot below the surface from September to June
Surface runoff: Very slow or ponded
Flooding: None
Organic matter content: High
Hazard of water erosion: Slight
Hazard of soil blowing: Moderate

Composition

Carbondale soil and similar soils: 20 to 80 percent
Tawas soil and similar soils: 10 to 75 percent
Contrasting inclusions: 5 to 15 percent

Inclusions

Contrasting inclusions: The poorly drained Deford and Ensley soils near the edge of the map unit
Well drained sandy and loamy soils on ridges and knolls
Similar inclusions: Areas in the Tawas soil where the substratum is sandy loam

Use and Management

Woodland
Major management concerns: Equipment limitation, seedling mortality, windthrow hazard, plant competition

Management measures: Because of wetness and low strength, special harvesting equipment is needed. The equipment can be used only during periods in winter when skid roads and access roads are frozen. Because of wetness, seedling mortality, and plant competition, trees are generally not planted on this soil. Windthrow can be minimized by harvest methods that do not leave the remaining trees widely spaced and by such harvest methods as selective cutting and strip cutting. After cutting, competition from brush can delay or prevent natural regeneration of desired species.

Buildings
Major management concerns: Ponding, excess humus, low strength, subsidence
Management measures: Because of ponding and the instability of the organic material, this map unit is generally unsuited for building site development.

Septic tank absorption fields
Major management concerns: Ponding, excess humus, low strength, subsidence, percol slowly
Management measures: Because of ponding, slow permeability, and the instability of the organic material, this map unit is generally unsuited for septic tank absorption fields and dwellings.

Interpretive Groups

Land capability classification: VIw
Woodland ordination symbol: SW
Michigan soil management group: Carbondale-Mc; Tawas-M/4c
Hydrologic group: A/D
Primary habitat type: TTS
Secondary habitat type: TTM
64—Pits and Dumps, mine

Setting

Landscape position: Nearly level to very steep areas at active and former mining locations
Shape of areas: Irregular or oval
Size of areas: 10 to 3600 acres

Composition

About 70 percent of this map unit consists of open pit iron mines. Currently, large active iron mines are in operation at the Tilden and Empire mines near National Mine and Palmer. Inactive mines, such as the Republic, Humboldt, and several smaller mines near Negaunee, Ishpeming, and Gwinn are also included in this unit. Some of these areas remain idle and are re-vegetating naturally. Other areas are being re-vegetated through reclamation efforts. Some small areas are water.

About 20 percent of this map unit consists of made land. These areas include roads, parking lots, railroad tracks, buildings, and small man-made ponds.

About 10 percent of this map unit is rock outcrop.

Use and Management

Land use: Active and inactive iron mines
Management measures: Onsite investigation is needed to determine the suitability for specific uses.

Interpretive Groups

Land capability classification: None
Woodland ordination symbol: None
Michigan soil management group: None
65B—Udorthents-Urbanland complex, nearly level and gently sloping

Setting

*Landscape position*: Nearly level and gently sloping urban areas
*Shape of areas*: Irregular
*Size of areas*: 20 to 100 acres

Typical Profile

**Udorthents**
*Surface layer*: 0 to 6 inches—reddish brown cobbly very fine sandy loam
*Substratum*: 6 to 80 inches—reddish brown very cobbly sandy loam

Soil Properties and Qualities

**Udorthents**
*Depth class*: Very deep
*Permeability*: Moderate
*Available water capacity*: Moderate
*Drainage class*: Well drained
*Seasonal high water table*: More than 6 feet
*Surface runoff*: Slow, but may be medium to rapid in areas such as streets, parking lots, and other man made structures
*Flooding*: None
*Organic matter content*: Low
*Hazard of water erosion*: Slight
*Hazard of soil blowing*: Moderate

Composition

Udorthents soil and similar soils: 40 to 60 percent
Urban land: 25 to 35 percent
Contrasting inclusions: 5 to 15 percent

Inclusions

*Contrasting inclusions*: Areas of rock outcrops
Poorly or very poorly drained areas
*Similar inclusions*: Soils that have similar textures and are undisturbed

Use and Management

*Land use*: Urban land—streets, parking lots, buildings, and other structures
Udorthents—commercial, residential, and industrial sites
*Management measures*: Onsite investigation is needed to determine the suitability for specific uses.

Interpretive Groups

*Land capability classification*: None
*Woodland ordination symbol*: None
*Michigan soil management group*: None
66B—Udipsamments-Urban land complex, nearly level and gently sloping

Setting

Landscape position: Nearly level and gently sloping
urban areas
Shape of areas: Irregular
Size of areas: 10 to 1800 acres

Typical Profile

Udipsamments
Surface layer:
0 to 6 inches—strong brown sand
Substraum:
6 to 80 inches—light brown sand

Soil Properties and Qualities

Depth class: Very deep
Permeability: Rapid
Available water capacity: Low
Drainage class: Excessively drained
Seasonal high water table: More than 6 feet
Surface runoff: Very slow or slow, but may be medium
to rapid in areas such as streets, parking lots, and other
man made structures
Flooding: None
Organic matter content: Low
Hazard of water erosion: Slight
Hazard of soil blowing: Udipsamments—severe

Composition

Udipsamments soil and similar soils: 40 to 60 percent
Urban land: 25 to 35 percent
Contrasting inclusions: 5 to 15 percent

Inclusions

Contrasting inclusions: Areas of rock outcrops
Poorly and very poorly drained areas
Similar inclusions: Soils that have similar textures and
are undisturbed

Use and Management

Land use: Urban land—streets, parking lots,
buildings, and other structures; Udipsamments—
residential, commercial, and industrial
Management measures: Onsite investigation is needed to
determine the suitability for specific uses.

Interpretive Groups

Land capability classification: None
Woodland ordination symbol: None
Michigan soil management group: None
APPENDIX B

Report on Mather “A” Mine Surface Reuse Potential
REPORT ON MATHER “A” MINE SURFACE REUSE POTENTIAL
FOR THE CITY OF ISHPEMING

I. INTRODUCTION

There are two general types of ore present in the Mather property: hard ore and soft ore. Hard ore is usually shallow, occurring from surface to 500 feet below. This ore comprises a very small part of the mining but has an important impact on the availability of the surface area. Underground mining in these mines was done by the room and pillar method. Depending on the rock conditions and the pillar design, this method usually produced a stope that would last for many years or even indefinitely. However, some of those close to surface have had some caving problems.

The soft ore lies below 1200 feet and comprises 99% of the ore mined from the Mather Mine. It was mined by block caving; a method where blocks of ore were undercut and allowed to cave into drifts for haulage.

II. HISTORY

The New York and Cleveland Hematite Mines are two hard ore mines which represent the first commercial mining of iron ore on the Mather “A” property. This mining was initiated on the surface and followed the veins of iron ore downward as far as practical. At this point shafts were sunk and mining of the iron veins was carried on using underground room and pillar stopes. The area over the Cleveland Hematite Mine was considered safe due to its depth and presently the railroad runs over it. The New York Mine is an unknown, safety wise, and should remain fenced. This stope is outlined in red on the map and, for the most part, should be considered “off limits” for any surface development.

The Mather Mine development was started in the early 1940's and mining commenced in the middle 40's to recover the vast reserves of soft ore located below 1600 feet. It is this mining that will be the main subject of this report.

III. MINING METHODS

Mining of semi-hard ores on 2nd, 3rd and 5th levels was done by sub level stoping and long hole stoping. These were rather thin ore bodies and because of the hardness, probably never caved. The vast majority of the Mather “A” was mined by block caving. In this method of mining, a block of ore, usually about 70 to 105 feet in width and 100 to 200 feet long, is outlined. Drifts are driven under the ore block and a series of closely spaced, upward driven raises are installed.
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At the top of the raises, a 20 foot high slot is blasted under the entire block resulting in a complete undercut of the ore. When the ore, which is of an earthy nature, is undercut, it begins to cave and runs down the raises into the drift below. The ore is scraped from the drift and dropped into tram cars for hauling to the shaft.

IV. CAVE PROGRESSION

This caving continues upward through the ore and up into the rock capping above. When all of the ore has been removed, mining of that block is stopped and the stope abandoned. However, the rock above the empty stope, being unsupported, continues to cave downward filling the original cavity and, in effect, causes the original opening to proceed upwards. The rock capping, being hard material, breaks up into large chunks and takes up more space than the original tightly packed earthy ore. This results in the filling of the stope, as it proceeds upwards, and finally results in the complete filling of the cave. With the caprock now resting on the broken material in the former stope, the caving process comes to a temporary halt until the fill material settles enough to allow more caprock to move down. This is obviously a very slow process, and one that will come to a halt, depending on depth, because the angular fill has expanded to 115% of its original volume.

V. STUDIES OF CAVE PROGRESSION

It was considered very important to determine when the initial cave might break through to surface at the Mather “A” Mine because it was thought possible that a large inflow of water might accompany this event and also part of the original mining was under the stockpile grounds. It was believed that stopes on the 6th and 7th levels would most likely be the first to cave to surface. These stope were about 100 feet thick and 1800 feet from ledge surface.

Extensive studies of this cave progression were carried on at the Mather Mine in conjunction with the U.S. Bureau of Mines and Michigan Technological University. These studies utilized four diamond drill holes drilled from surface over and around the stope area. The holes were utilized for the installation of a variety of electronic and mechanical devices designed to indicate the progress of the cave.

The stope were mined from 1945 to 1950. The subsidence studies showed that the caving above the stope progressed quite slowly, reaching a point about 1000 feet from surface in 1957. In 1958, the cave activity essentially halted with only a few cracks reaching to within 800 feet of ledge surface. No surface reflection of this cave has ever been detected.

Following the apparent stabilization of this test stope, a pattern of steel pins were installed on the surface over this and several adjacent stopes. These pins were checked for elevation monthly until somewhere in the 80's with no sign of significant slumpage.

The results of these tests showed that a stope would decrease in size as it progresses upward due to the inability of the caving rock fragments to compact into their original volume. A loss of 15% of a stope’s volume applied to back-to-floor stope advancement seems to fit the actual conditions very well. By using this “formula”, one can quite accurately predict whether a stope will actually reach surface and how much effect it will have upon reaching surface.
VI. CONDITIONS RESULTING FROM CAVING GROUND

Basically, three types of conditions could exist over these old mining stope:

A. The surface cave reasonably matches the original stope in outline and in volume. This condition, if it has existed for a period of 20 plus years, indicates that the caving process is over and the area should be safe to traverse and occupy.

B. The stope, because of it’s size and depth from surface, cannot reach the surface. This can be calculated as stated earlier.

C. The stope should cave to surface but has not. This could be due to some geologic structure or due to lack of insufficient time.

Condition A does not exist at the Mather Mine due to the great depth of mining and will not enter into consideration.

Condition C only exists in the Cleveland Hematite and New York Mines. As previously stated, the latter Mine should remain fenced.

VII. CATEGORIES OF LANDS OVER THE MINING AREA

The area over the Mather “A” Mine has been divided into four categories and color coded on the map to show the use for which the various areas are suited. These categories are:

A. Not undermined and safe for any purpose (green). This land can be treated as any other non-mining property.

B. Undermined land which is stable, not subject to catastrophic caving (orange). May experience widespread slow-occurring slumping over a long period of time. This land would be suitable for parks, access roads, campgrounds, golf courses or other construction not highly sensitive to slight slumping.

C. Undermined but too deep to effect the surface (blue). This mining is over 3000 feet below surface and is not expected to ever reach the surface. This area could be considered for anything but the most extremely sensitive construction.

D. Very old stope within 80 feet of ledge surface (red). Not considered safe for trespass.
VIII. CONCLUSIONS

Both the scientific tests and the tests of time have indicated that underground mining at the Mather Mine does not necessarily render the surface unusable. The Mather was the first to mine at depths of over 2000 feet. All of the other mines in the area mined much shallower ore bodies which caved to surface quite readily. It was assumed that all stopes caved to surface and no one seemed to be concerned about it as long as there was no danger of catastrophic water inflow. The practice was to clear and fence the surface and proceed to mine. This was the thinking which prompted the Mather Mine to fence around all mining areas with no idea that the deep mine stopes would not result in a surface "cave". No one had any experience with mining soft ore below 2000 feet and to be on the safe side the surface over the mining area was automatically cleared and fenced. We now know that mining of deep ore does not necessarily result in caves to surface. Deep mining at the Bunker Hill/Athens also failed to reach surface.
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Golf Course Architect’s Report
ISHPEMING GOLF COURSE

March 1, 2004

Description

The golf course portrayed in the ECI study is a championship caliber par 36, 3500 yard 9 hole course featuring:

1. Multiple tees so that it can be challenging but fair and fun for golfers of all abilities.

2. Uses current player safety standards as well as safety/liability zones and setbacks from surrounding land uses.

3. Ease of access from a major thoroughfare.

4. Visibility from a major thoroughfare for "advertising" effect.

5. End use for an existing capped landfill - a desired MDEQ attribute and dual use of land.

6. Includes a practice and teaching component for both long and short game play where existing golfers can improve their skills or the game can be taught to new golfers of all ages.

7. Provides a home facility for the local high school golf team.

8. Can support leagues for women, seniors and men as well as open play.
City of Ishpeming  
100 E. Division Street  
Ishpeming, MI 49849

Attn: Gary Nelson, Chairman Downtown Development Authority  
Raymond Roberts, Chairman City Planning Commission

Re: Study of Development Plan Options of the “Cliffs Land Purchase”

Dear Authority and Commission Members:

Enclosed please find 20 copies of the referenced study. As discussed in the study, there are many options available for development of the site. The considerations and recommendations presented in the report are intended to provide a foundation for the future development. The goal of this study is to present the information in a manner which will allow the people responsible for approving and implementing the desired plan a means to accomplish that objective in an orderly fashion.

The plan options presented are examples of development plan alternatives and are not meant to dictate any specific type of development. Careful review of the information provided will allow the determination of necessary zoning revisions along with the development of infrastructure and other considerations.

The water pressure is marginal in this area and will have to be increased by either a water pressure booster station and/or a water storage tank. The elevation of the hill near the center of the property lends itself to a ground storage tank. This could be constructed similar to the tank recently built in Tilden Township and would be concealed by the mature trees on the site.

I will be in attendance at the February 6, 2006 joint Planning Commission and DDA meeting to respond to questions and comments the commissioners may have.

Sincerely,

(ECI logo)

Joseph O. Wasie, F.C.P., R.L.S.  
Executive Vice President

enclosure

Cc: John Korhonen, City Manager

JOW:ett
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February 10, 2006

Attn: City of Ishpeming Planning Commission and
Downtown Development Authority

RE: Study of Development Plan Options of the "Cliffs Land Purchase"

Please note the following corrections to this report:

On Appendices, Appendix C: should read "Golf course Architect's (not Architech's) Report"

On Maps Index, Map No. 7: should read "Preliminary Sketch of the Proposed Hematite Drive
(not Ddrive) Extension"

On page 4, Map No. 2: in paragraph 1, line 8 should read: "located in the Northwest and Southwesterly
corners of the site. (missing punctuation) Large Bedrock Outcropping"

On page 6, Map No. 3: in paragraph 6, line 9 should read "listed in Appendix A" (not attached to this map
for additional information).

On page 8, Map No. 4: in paragraph 1, line 3 should read "Areas specifically noted on the Map exhibit (was
omitted) natural and man-made features which"

On page 10, Map No. 5: in paragraph 1, line 1 should read "which comprises a total area of (was omitted)"

On page 14, Map No. 7: in paragraph 1, line 3 should read "The Hematite Drive Extension (4,180 L.F.) is
(not capitalized)."

On page 16, Map No. 8: in paragraph 1, line 6 should read: "buffer or screen different (not difficult) types
of land uses with varying land use intensities."

On page 18, Map No. 9: in paragraph 1, line 3 should read: "was to determine what the lot yield would be
for the total site (not sale)."

Very truly yours,

Joseph O. Wasie, Executive Vice President

"Quality Service to the U.P. Since 1974"
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RESOLUTIONS OF ADOPTION
RESOLUTION NO. 2008-16

RESOLUTION ADOPTING A RECREATION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF ISHPeming

Whereas, a five-year Recreation Plan has been prepared for the City of Ishpeming; and

Whereas, the Ishpeming Planning Commission and Parks and Recreation Commission have reviewed and recommended adoption of this plan to the City Council; and

Whereas, this plan includes an inventory of parks and recreation facilities, long term recreation planning objectives, and an action program for achieving the objectives; and

Whereas, the City Council has reviewed the City Recreation Plan and is in full accord with the Plan.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved by the City Council of the City of Ishpeming that the Recreation Plan for the City of Ishpeming be adopted for use in planning recreation facilities and programs in the community.

Gary P. Nelson
Mayor

Adopted: December 3, 2008

I certify that I am the City Clerk of the City of Ishpeming and that the above is a true copy of the resolution adopted by a unanimous vote of the City Council at a meeting held on December 3, 2008.

Jennifer M. Rajala
City Clerk

The City of Ishpeming is an equal opportunity program/employer.
Auxiliary aids and service are available upon request to individuals with disabilities.
RESOLUTION OF ADOPTION

CITY OF ISHPEMING FIVE-YEAR RECREATION PLAN

Whereas, the City of Ishpeming Parks and Recreation Commission has reviewed the City of Ishpeming Five-Year Recreation Plan, 2009-2013, which recognizes various City recreation needs; and

Whereas, the Ishpeming Parks and Recreation Commission has accepted the Capital Improvement Schedule that proposes a variety of improvements to enhance recreation opportunities, including improvements to playground equipment, picnic areas, recreation buildings, ball fields, trails, ski hill, tube slide, and land acquisition; and

Whereas, a five-year recreation plan is required to be eligible to apply for recreation grants administered by the Department of Natural Resources, Grants Management; and

Whereas, the Ishpeming Planning Commission has reviewed and recommends adoption of the Five-Year Recreation Plan.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Ishpeming Parks and Recreation Commission hereby recommends that the Ishpeming City Council adopt the City of Ishpeming Five-Year Recreation Plan, 2009-2013, as its official recreation planning document.

Norman Andrews
Parks and Recreation Commission Chairman

Adopted: November 11, 2008
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LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL TO COUNTY AND REGION
December 12, 2008

Mr. Norman Holmes, Chair
Marquette County Planning Commission
Courthouse 234 W. Baraga
Marquette, MI 49855

RE: City of Ishpeming Five Year Recreation Plan

Dear Mr. Holmes:

Enclosed is the new City of Ishpeming Five Year Recreation Plan 2009-2013. The plan was adopted by the Ishpeming City Council on December 3, 2008 as City’s recreation document. This copy of the adopted plan is being forwarded to the Marquette County Planning Commission pursuant to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Guidelines for the Development of Community Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Plans.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alan Bakalarski
Ishpeming City Manager
December 12, 2008

Mr. Lloyd Matthes
2415 14th Avenue South
Escanaba, MI 49829

RE: City of Ishpeming Five Year Recreation Plan

Dear Mr. Matthes:

Enclosed is the new City of Ishpeming Five Year Recreation Plan 2009-2013. The plan was adopted by the Ishpeming City Council on December 3, 2008 as the City’s recreation document. This copy of the adopted plan is being forwarded to CUPPAD pursuant to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Guidelines for the Development of Community Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Plans.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alan Bakalarski
Ishpeming City Manager