



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/540/Planning-Parks

**MEETING AGENDA
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2023 AT 10:00 A.M.*
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM A-200**

***(10 MINUTES FOLLOWING CONCLUSION OF THE COUNTY BOARD MEETING, WHICHEVER IS LATER)**

*Bruce Ross, Chairperson
Thomas Grabow, Vice-Chairperson
Rob Holyoke, Scott Rishel, and Thomas Richart*

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Assurance that the Meeting has been Properly Noticed / Adoption of Agenda**
- 3. Approval of Minutes (July 19, 2023)**
- 4. Public Comment and Written Communications**
- 5. Update/Discussion – Park and Open Space Plan**
 - a. Development of Public Involvement Chapter (Chapter IV)
 - i. 2023 Park User Survey Update
 - ii. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analysis with CPB members
 - b. Development of Recommended Park and Open Space Plan (Chapter VI)
 - i. Comments/thoughts on the ongoing development of the Chapter
- 6. Other Business**
- 7. Next Meeting Date(s)**
- 8. Adjournment**



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director
www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/540/Planning-Parks

**MEETING AGENDA
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2023 AT 10:00 A.M.*
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM A-200**

***(10 MINUTES FOLLOWING CONCLUSION OF THE COUNTY BOARD MEETING, WHICHEVER IS LATER)**

*Bruce Ross, Chairperson
Thomas Grabow, Vice-Chairperson
Rob Holyoke, Scott Rishel, and Thomas Richart*

1. Call to Order

A regular meeting of the Comprehensive Planning Board was held in room A-200 at the Ozaukee County Administration Center.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
B. Ross	Chairperson	Present	10:49AM
T. Grabow	Vice-Chairperson	Present	10:45AM
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	10:45AM
S. Rishel	Supervisor, District 14	Present	10: 50AM
T. Richart	Supervisor, District 12	Present	10:47 AM

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director - Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department; Natalie Avallone, Senior Planner - Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department; Frani O'Toole, Planning Intern - Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department; Michelle Smith, Planning Intern - Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department

Others present: Joel Dietl, Chief Land Use Planner - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC); Robbie Robinson, Senior Planner - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)

2. Assurance that the Meeting has been Properly Noticed / Adoption of Agenda

Chairperson Ross called meeting to order at 10:51AM. Mr. Struck provided assurance the meeting was properly noticed.

3. Approval of Minutes (February 13, 2023)

Motion made by Supervisor Holyoke, seconded by Supervisor Grabow, that the February 13, 2023 minutes be approved as submitted. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment and Written Communications

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any public comments. There were no members of the public present. Mr. Struck confirmed no written communications were submitted/received.

5. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)

a. Introductions

Mr. Struck introduced SEWRPC representatives.

Mr. Dietl discussed his role at SEWRPC and then introduced Mr. Robinson. The Land Use Division works on all long-range County plans (Park and Open Space, Farmland Preservation and Comprehensive Plans).

Chairperson Ross requested a high-level overview of SEWRPC's role within County planning efforts. Mr. Dietl discussed SEWRPC's history and establishment of regional planning commissions in the state. They were set up to provide planning assistance to local communities with a focus on the counties in the region.

Chairperson Ross: What is SEWRPC's regulatory authority?

Mr. Dietl explained that SEWRPC has no regulatory authority by State Statute; their services are volunteered to local units of government but must be formally requested. SEWRPC does receive funding from Counties (levy), and state and federal grants (e.g., transportation planning). Most Counties take advantage of their assistance. They also have a Board of Directors including 3 members from every County. It was noted that SEWRPC's previous Executive Director had started moving towards modernizing their plan format. Stephanie Hacker, the new Executive Director, has the same vision.

Chairperson Ross: What does the new model look like?

Mr. Dietl: I did not bring an example but can take this issue up in the future.

Chairperson Ross: Maybe we can put something together for Committee consideration?

Mr. Dietl asked the Board if there were any questions after his general summary.

No additional questions on the SEWRPC general overview.

Mr. Struck: noted that a fairly substantial update was completed by the Department during the last park and open space planning process, which included additional inventory, mapping, public input and the creation of County project areas. The provided outline is a good representation on plan requirements by the State (WDNR), so we don't expect any major changes to content. The Department also creates and provides custom additional inventory, e.g., fish passage impediments, and has a strong relationship with local municipalities.

Chairperson Ross: Why is the POSP incorporated into SEWRPC regional plans, but not others?

Mr. Dietl: We look at both regional connections (e.g., trails), as well as at standards (e.g., how far should a park be from a community, size, etc.). This helps identify comparisons between communities. If we can partner with other Counties on local planning efforts, this can help jumpstart our efforts. There are also no requirements to incorporate other elements/plans into SEWRPC regional plans.

Mr. Struck added that there are different statutory requirements for regional plans vs. county level plans, and the Department has started to see regional connections through these plans. Having collaboration on these regional plans is very helpful.

Chairperson Ross: Questions from Board on overall SEWRPC participation?

No additional questions.

b. Discussion on Agreements/MOUs for Planning Support

- i. Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County - Agreement and Timeline
- ii. Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County
- iii. Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County

Mr. Struck introduced the POSP update timeline, and noted the Department also requested assistance from SEWRPC for the farmland preservation plan, which will be next, and comprehensive plan updates. The hope is that both the POSP and the Farmland Preservation Plan will feed into the Comprehensive Plan update (e.g., inventory, goals and objectives). It was noted the Comprehensive Plan update will probably not be as comprehensive as the last plan. Many local municipalities have already updated their own Comprehensive Plans. However, some have requested assistance from the County. This is all happening now as plans are reaching the end of their planning horizons, and statutory requirements.

Mr. Dietl: The timeline is tentative dependent on any new content requested and existing inventory already gathered. We would like to get a chapter to the Board every month or two.

Chairperson Ross: The Board tentatively adopted Chapter 1 and 2 in February with knowledge of needed updates.

Mr. Dietl: We can lump Chapter 1 and 2 with Chapter 3 for September or October's meeting. Staff generally review each chapter first.

Chairperson Ross requested clarification on the POSP timeline.

Mr. Robinson: the inventory data has since been updated to 2020 Census data, as well as an update to the Natural Areas data from the old draft Chapter 2 (previously reviewed) to the new draft.

Mr. Struck: Land use data too?

Mr. Dietl: We don't have 2020 land use for Ozaukee County yet but hope to have it done in the next few months.

Mr. Robinson: The current land use data in the plan is from 2015. But as park planning progresses, we can easily incorporate 2020 land use data as it becomes available.

Mr. Dietl confirmed the plan to look at three chapters for review in September or October. Then, the meeting in November for Chapter 4 and 5. For the objectives, not much will change except for anything unique to Ozaukee County.

Chairperson Ross: what we want accomplished needs to be incorporated into plan. Is there a need for earlier discussion on objectives so the Board can provide input?

Mr. Struck: A lot of nomenclature here that doesn't necessarily align with the County Board. So, think about Chapter 5 as standards whereas goals, policies, programs and objectives are really contained in Chapter 6. The standards are regional, state, and federal standards for how park and open spaces serve the public.

Chairperson Ross: Making sure the plan captures the vision of the Comprehensive Planning Board (and County Board). The Board should be informed by the process, but also guide the process, and should have significant input in the established objectives.

Mr. Dietl: Chapter 5 is more the technical side, so there is less opportunity for changes. It consists of guidelines commonly used by communities in the region and across country e.g., facilities per population. These guidelines are largely budgetary. Chapter 6 is where you will want to identify specific goals, and conversations could happen earlier than review of the draft Chapter. He thought the CPB should consider two meetings to discuss chapter 6.

Chairperson Ross: Supervisor Grabow and Supervisor Richart have both been through this before. I am interested in their perspective.

Mr. Struck: Would like to comment on the plan timeline. Going chapter by chapter at meetings is intentional to allow for feedback and incorporation of ongoing public input. It is also helpful to provide background allowing the Board to make informed discussions and recommendations on subsequent Chapters.

Supervisor Richart: For the Comprehensive Plan we also had input from a Citizen Advisory Board.

Mr. Struck: Public input helps frame what is desired and what is possible.

Chairperson Ross: Struggling with making sure the Board knows where we need to get to, to inform future budget decisions. I want to make sure we are comfortable with the historic Chapter 6, so we know what we are seeing when we get to the Chapter 6 draft.

Supervisor Grabow: Often we shoot for the sky, but the question of budget-wise can we do this? This issue is not knowing future budgets (grant dependent projects and programs as well).

Mr. Struck: The POSP and the goals, policies, programs and objectives makes us eligible to apply for grants, but if it is not in the plan, we can't even apply. We can always amend the plan, but that is timely. A lot of times we put something in there knowing we will need grant funding to accomplish it budgetarily.

Mr. Dietl: Park plans are truly aspirational plans. There is more in plan than a County can afford in the next 5-years. If helpful, I can identify a capital improvement program with a better guess on what can happen in the next 2 years.

Chairperson Ross: What will we do in the August Meeting?

Mr. Struck discussed either going on hiatus or discussing more public input in August. Mr. Struck noted the POSP is an aspirational plan, and there is a need to have a diverse set of goals, policies, programs and objectives.

Supervisor Richart: The plan is not a budgeting document. The County budget is used to implement the plan and where these two items meet is at the County Board level.

Chairperson Ross: Request to review existing Chapter 6 with presentation to understand where we are going to bring value to the policy piece. Agree?

Mr. Struck: We can provide a summary of Chapter 6. Please also read the existing Chapter 6. We can also have Chapter 6 as a standing agenda item for each meeting moving forward.

Chairperson Ross: Satisfied with proposal.

Supervisor Grabow requested a copy of the POSP.

Mr. Struck provided hard copies for all members.

Mr. Dietl continued summarizing the POSP timeline.

Mr. Robinson identified appendices to the inventory chapters.

Mr. Robinson: The CPB needs to be the advocates for the plan. These plans need to look 10 years in the future at a minimum.

Mr. Struck: We are working on public input throughout the development of the plan.

Mr. Dietl: we will always identify changes to the plan throughout the development and review. The executive summary will also serve as a standalone document including more visuals after plan adoption. It will be the most public-facing document. The goal is for the final draft plan to be complete prior to moving to County Board.

Mr. Struck: Yes, the CPB will make direct recommendation to the County Board regarding the final draft plan.

Mr. Dietl: You could recommend right away to incorporate the POSP as amendment to Comprehensive Plan. If so, there is a 30-day requirement to have public hearing. Full adoption is anticipated in Fall 2024.

Chairperson Ross: Does this meet the State's extension?

Mr. Struck: We have not been given a specific date, so will need to have a discussion with the WDNR. We will try to expedite as possible.

Mr. Robinson: As long as WDNR knows the County is working with SEWRPC and can show progress, they will accept Stewardship grant applications.

Mr. Struck: This is a bit different flexibility-wise as not listed specifically in State Statutes (like the Farmland Preservation Plan).

Mr. Dietl: Anything else to discuss on POSP? If not, we will move to the Farmland Preservation Plan. Mr. Dietl did have a discussion with SEWRPC's Deputy Director, Ben McKay, about the possibility of working on more than one plan at a time. It was agreed there will be some amount of overlap that will be outlined in the letter agreement with the County. Anticipate some overlap late summer-early fall next year between the POSP and the Farmland Preservation Plan. The Farmland Plan should be finalized within a year if all proceeds similar to last time.

Mr. Dietl will draft the agreement letter for review by Mr. Struck. There is a similar idea with the Comprehensive Plan. So, start that update prior to completion of the Farmland Preservation Plan (late summer to early fall 2025). This update will probably take 1-3 years depending upon participating municipalities.

Mr. Struck: Department staff will work on compiling local plan updates prior to starting the County Comp Plan update.

Mr. Dietl: Will try to update each local municipality's land use map at this time as well (even if not participating in comprehensive plan update with SEWRPC).

Mr. Struck: we are not anticipating as much local (municipal) participation (joint updates) as prior, but there will be some and it is something to work out over the coming year.

Mr. Dietl: The cost for the Farmland Preservation Plan is expected to be \$30,000. This could change as SEWRPC hasn't updated their fee schedule/reviewed costs in a number of years. The County has an existing agreement for the POSP.

Mr. Struck: We will work with SEWRPC and involve the CPB.

Chairperson Ross: Anything else on SEWRPC discussion item 5?

Mr. Dietl: No, just will need to have future discussions relating to Comprehensive Plan timeline and cost. This agreement will probably not pre-date cost amendments.

Chairperson Ross: Do we need to know which communities are participating to finalize agreement?

121 W. Main Street, P.O. Box 994, Port Washington, WI 53074

Phone: (262) 284-8257 Phone Metro: (262) 238-8257 Fax: (262) 284-8269 Fax Metro: (262) 238-8269

Mr. Struck: Yes, we will need to know which communities are participating and at what level of update. Of course, all the communities will be a part of the process regardless of whether they formally update their local comprehensive plan as part of the County process.

6. Update/Discussion – Park and Open Space Plan

- a. Planning and Parks Department updates
 - i. Planning Division Intern(s) - Introductions
- b. Public Involvement Chapter (Chapter IV)
 - i. Public outreach to-date (Past Park User Surveys, Public Opinion Survey, Comments)
 - ii. 2023 Park User Survey
 - iii. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats with CPB members – Schedule
 - iv. Public Visioning Sessions – Timing and Schedule

Chairperson Ross introduced item number 6.

Mr. Struck: noted he would like to introduce two new planning interns and introduce the ongoing park user surveys. Also, would like to remind the CPB that prior to COVID, the Department started updating the POSP back in 2017-2018 (with park user surveys). We recognized the need to conduct more up-to-date public input, so initiated another survey.

Ms. Smith: Introduction and background

Ms. O'Toole: Introduction and background, and discussion on how the 2023 survey was written/updated (demographics, economic impact).

Ms. Smith: Update from feedback at higher volume parks.

Chairperson Ross: Is it statistically significant?

Mr. Struck: No, but the goal is to get 50 surveys per park to get a good representation across different park users. There are a few parks we are not surveying given their current status. Once the individual park surveys are done, we plan to open up more widely to get additional public input. It is labor intensive, but 50 surveys per park is the goal. A real challenge in 2017-2018 was to get surveys outside of typical work hours. Trying to hit weekends and evenings is important as we want to get representation from all park users. The hope is to also do a separate trail survey.

Ms. Avallone: Noted the park user survey is also a partnership with UW Extension, who assisted in getting the survey on the online platform Qualtrics.

Supervisor Holyoke noted he was at a park when interns were out surveying and found it kind of passive. Had to come up to table vs. be approached. Do you ever approach park users?

Ms. Smith: noted it was a delicate balance.

Ms. O'Toole: noted it was nice to have the table for public interface but do a mix of approaching users.

Supervisor Holyoke: Could also be the location of the table?

Mr. Struck: we are trying to focus on the time parks will have more users and when reservations are happening. Trying to balance the level of effort.

Supervisor. Holyoke: Also, a balance of how long the survey is.

Mr. Struck: Tried to keep it relatively short but do want certain feedback for comparison to past survey efforts.

Supervisor Rishel: Might get higher percentage of online surveys if give QR code. Do you offer them the option?

Ms. O'Toole: Yes, we provide both options.

Mr. Struck: We will combine and compare these results with past park surveys. One thing we are also trying to be better at is documenting other informal comments from emails, meetings or other discussions in a formal way.

Mr. Struck: The main item to go over under #6 is the planned visioning sessions. During the last plan update we did vision sessions right at the beginning of the process. However, it is nice to be further along with inventory to have something for people to react to. Also, we want to compile goals and objectives met from the last plan to present. With that said, Mr. Struck recommending visioning sessions at mid-point in the process including initial public input. The recommended plan would be to do three different sessions at different locations across the County (Mee-Kwon, Hawthorne Hills, Admin Center). We will see different priorities in different parts of the County.

Mr. Struck. We also did a SWOT exercise with CPB during the last plan update. We recommend this exercise again during the August meeting. It could also be done remotely.

Supervisor Rishel: recommended doing the SWOT in-person.

Chairperson Ross: Is August too soon?

Mr. Struck: We could do the exercise between regularly scheduled meetings? In October?

Chairperson Ross: Thoughts?

Supervisor Rishel: There is an October 18th Board Meeting and could try to do it after.

Supervisor Holyoke: When is the budgeting meeting at the fairgrounds?

Mr. Struck: That is typically mid-September. Can do a poll on the specific date.

Chairperson Ross: If general timeline okay, we can sort out date.

Mr. Struck. So, maybe use the September or October date for public input, keep regular September date, and insert an October date (for SWOT or Chapters 1-3), come back in November with other Chapters (4 and 5).

7. Update/Discussion – Farmland Preservation Plan

a. DATCP Farmland Preservation Planning Grant Award and Extension

Mr. Struck. Not much additional to say except the Department did get awarded a DATCP planning grant to cover staff time, public outreach, and SEWRPC staff time. We also got an official deadline extension for plan certification (in packet, December 2025).

8. Other Business

No other business

9. Next Meeting Date(s)

121 W. Main Street, P.O. Box 994, Port Washington, WI 53074

Phone: (262) 284-8257 Phone Metro: (262) 238-8257 Fax: (262) 284-8269 Fax Metro: (262) 238-8269

In September (mid-month County Board meeting date, September 20th)

10. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Grabow. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 12:35 pm.



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/540/Planning-Parks

TO: Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board

From: Ozaukee County Planning & Parks Department

Date: 9/20/23

SUBJECT: 2023 Park User Survey Update

Department planning interns have continued to administer Park User Surveys at eight Ozaukee County Parks (Covered Bridge, Ehlers, Hawthorne Hills, Lion's Den Gorge, Mee-Kwon, Tendick, Virmond and Waubedonia). As of early September, the Department has received 285 completed surveys. These surveys are providing valuable community feedback concerning park usage and desired improvements. The following represents initial themes taken from park user responses to our questions "What's a new park amenity, experience, or expansion that the county should prioritize?" and "What do you like least about this park?", as well as a closer look at where users are travelling from while visiting the County Park System.

Many park users identified the need for additional wayfinding signage (e.g., maps, trail mileage signage) at County Parks, especially those parks with lengthier trails. Park Users also identified numerous accessibility-related improvement needs including additional accessible trails, accessible playgrounds, even surfaces, and ample and accessible parking. Concerns about water quality and trail maintenance needs (e.g., washed/eroded trails, safety concerns due to dead ash trees near trails) were also raised. There were also multiple requests to have restrooms open during the winter months. For camping recreation, users were interested in dump stations, shower facilities, and flush toilets.

Overall, park users believe the county should prioritize adding more nature trails for walking and running, as well as provided numerous ideas for further connecting the parks and trail system. More social and activity-oriented opportunities were requested in the parks such as food and beer gardens, designated mountain bike trails, a rock-climbing wall, skate park, and a potential dog park. Additionally, many park users expressed excitement about Clay Bluffs Cedar Gorge Nature Preserve. Sentiment to continue protecting/restoring the area was expressed as well as hopes for it to open soon.

Eighty-nine percent of those surveyed are from the state of Wisconsin, with primary users being from Ozaukee County, followed by Washington and Milwaukee Counties. (Figure 1). The remaining 11 percent of users were from various states across the United States, with the next most frequented visitors from Illinois.

**2023 Ozaukee County Parks Survey:
Wisconsin Residents Visiting Ozaukee County Parks**




Figure 1: Park users visiting Ozaukee County Parks (Question 20)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)

Park User Surveys were administered at the Ozaukee County Fair from Wednesday August 2nd to Sunday, August 6th. A total of 21 fair attendees took the 2023 park survey. The majority of those surveyed resided in Ozaukee County and the remaining were from Milwaukee and Washington Counties. (Figure 19). There was a fairly even distribution of males and females, and most respondents had at least some college and two people in their household. The sample represented a younger demographic with most users being in the 25-34 age range. (Figure 14).

For marketing purposes, fair attendees had a preference to hear about Ozaukee County Park events on social media followed by emails. (Figure 13).

Based on a scale of one to five, with five being the most satisfied, users scored their visits to the Ozaukee County Parks at a mean of 4.6. When asked to prioritize park uses, respondents overwhelmingly cited nature/ recreational trails as the top choice (roughly 90 percent) followed by access to water. This is consistent with park amenities, experiences, or expansions respondents think the County should prioritize: trails and accessibility, and dog play areas. (Figures 11 & 12). The reasons most people visited the park were to hike (90 percent), spend time with friends/ family, and connect with nature and scenic vistas. Most users visit a few times per year. 43 percent of fair attendees noted an increase in park visitation since the COVID-19 Pandemic. However, the remaining respondents no change in frequency of visits to the county parks. When making a trip to the park, it was considered the primary destination, and the majority of users preferred not to make other stops.

Additional flush restrooms were cited as the top choice for requested improvements, additional facilities, or new recreational opportunities. Others noted preferences for canoe/kayak launches and additional drinking water facilities (75 percent). Other optional requests not listed on the survey that were brought up by users were having Beer Gardens/ Food and Drink and Photo opportunities. New ideas include hike-in or bike-in campsites.

When asked what Fair attendees liked the best about the County Park System, they noted liking the many different parks the County has and the accessibility of the parks, as well as the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (Figure 1). Dislikes ranged in a variety of responses, from no money to replace dead trees, the close proximity to high-voltage power lines, lack of campgrounds, and few amenities (like open and available restroom facilities) in the off-season.

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)

TABLES AND FIGURES: 2023 Ozaukee County Parks Survey




Figure 1: Park Users top appreciation for parks (Survey Question 2)




Figure 2: Areas of dissatisfaction from park users (Survey Question 3)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)





Figure 3: Top reasons for park visits (Survey Question 4)



Other:
 The more natural, the better
 Dog Park Fenced with Drinking Water
 Bike-in or hike-in campsites

Figure 4: Requests in Park Improvements (Survey Question 5)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)

**There is no figure to question 6 since no responses were received to this question (Park barriers/ accessibility)*




Figure 5: Parks with the highest volume of park visitors (Survey Question 7)




Figure 6: Frequency of Park User Visits (Survey Question 8)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 7: Frequency of Visits to the county parks after COVID-19 Pandemic (Survey Question 9)




Figure 8: Primary means of transportation to county parks (Survey Question 10a)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 9: Why park users took automobiles to their park destination (Survey Question 10b)




Figure 10: Park User Travel Information (Survey Question 11)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 11: Most Important Park Uses as designated by park users (Survey Question 12)




Figure 12: Prioritization by Park Users (Survey Question 13)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 13: Marketing preference as noted by Park Users (Survey Question 14)




Figure 14: Age range of park users that were surveyed (Survey Question 15)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 15: Gender of Park Users (Survey Question 16)




Figure 16: Education Demographics of Park Users at Ozaukee County Fair (Survey Question 17)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 17: Number of People in the Household – Park Users (Survey Question 18)




Figure 18: Number of Children in the Household for Park Users (Survey Question 19)

OZAUKEE COUNTY FAIR – PARK USER SURVEYS
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (2023)




Figure 19: Park Users County of Residence (Survey Question 20)

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS (SWOT) ANALYSIS

A SWOT Analysis workshop is a planning tool used to identify a community's current assets and liabilities, as well trends that might have a positive or negative impact on its future. The Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board will be asked to identify and discuss the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that they perceive in Ozaukee County related to parks, recreation, and open space. Results will be incorporated into Chapter 4, Public Involvement, for consideration in preparing the ongoing Park and Open Space Plan update.