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What is contained within is the Eastern Upper Peninsula’s 2015-2019 Plan for Regional Prosperity which was made possible by funding from Michigan’s Department of Technology, Management and Budget.
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What is contained within was prepared by the Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission.
The Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission has produced or contributed to the production of various plans purposed with addressing and guiding the implementation of economic and community development efforts throughout the Michigan counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac.

The year 2014 presented the Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission, and, more importantly, the Eastern Upper Peninsula, with a particularly unique opportunity: the chance to develop a plan which embraces and incorporates the requirements of both the Economic Development Administration’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy as well as Michigan’s Regional Prosperity Initiative.

What resulted is the culmination of a large group of stakeholders across a broad spectrum of occupations involving themselves in a planning process which sought, and then found, ways to align regional resources with a regional direction pointing towards an exciting future.
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Executive Summary

Purpose:

_Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula_ is a plan which is to serve both as the 2015-2019 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy and the 2015-19 Regional Prosperity Initiative plan for the Michigan counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac. This plan is not only a declaration of where those affecting economic development across various fields intend to see the region be by 2019, but it is a living document which puts forth the first steps we will take towards a prosperous future.

Process:

Development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula began in late-July of 2014 with a meeting of the Stakeholder Committee where regional assets and needs were identified and focus areas for this plan were established. Six focus areas were deemed priorities for developing this plan: education, economic and workforce development, health care, tourism and natural resources, agriculture and local food systems, and infrastructure. Since then, the Stakeholder Committee met twice more, the Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee—a smaller committee which has been in place for the development of previous Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies—met five times (twice in conjunction with the Stakeholder Committee), and six focus-group meetings were held—one for each focus area.

Blueprint:

**Vision**

Michigan’s Eastern Upper Peninsula will be a region in the world attractive to enterprise, students, tourists, and residents alike; where one can be immersed in a natural setting yet access 21st-century amenities; and where opportunity prevails through the application of modern techniques, collaboration, and mindful allocation of resources.

The goals and strategies below were developed from the process described above, along with consideration of past plans and ongoing efforts, to aid the region in realizing its vision of prosperity. Furthermore, one can find the necessary actions items and proposed collaborative partners for each strategy in the Economic Development Blueprint (pages 57-66).

**Education**

Goal: Strengthen and, where feasible, expand career-technical education opportunities.

Strategies to achieve the goal:
- Strengthen and, where feasible, expand career-technical education opportunities.
- Promote the utilization of opportunities provided by enhanced-enrollment programs.
- Expand LSSU’s scope both in terms of target market and educational opportunities offered.

_The Executive Summary continues on the following page._
Economic and Workforce Development
Goal: A business environment where one can create, grow, or relocate a business knowing they will be able to access necessary labor, infrastructure and amenities in order to thrive sustainably and profitably.
Strategies to achieve the goal:
- Build reputation as a desirable location to conduct business through steadfast attention to the growth and sustainability of businesses located within the region.
- Use regional branding to change mindsets from remote location to desired destination.
- Use strategic placemaking in a manner that is unique, exciting, sustainable, and conducive to commercial activity.
- Improve customer service.
- Increase visibility and proactivity of workforce development agencies.

Health Care
Goal: A health care system focused on the community with active collaboration amongst providers, agencies and coalitions.
Strategies to achieve the goal:
- Continue, build upon and increase collaborative efforts.
- Retain physicians within the region.
- Continue to develop capacities necessary to train and develop health-care workforce within the region.
- Open cross-border access to health care.

Tourism and Natural Resources
Goal: Increased engagement of local residents around tourism and recreational use of our natural resources to promote quality of life and desirability of our region for family and business.
Strategies to achieve the goal:
- Promote existing and further develop the range of outdoor activities available within the region.
- Update recreation plans to be able to access funding opportunities.
- Use regional branding to convey the unique and range of recreational activities available in the region.

Agriculture and Local Food Systems
Goal: An agriculture and food sector able to increase production, add value to products, and reach new markets through collaborative efforts and development of aggregation, processing, storage and distribution infrastructure.
Strategies to achieve the goal:
- Educate consumers about eating locally produced food.
- Obtain necessary infrastructure to aggregate, process, store and distribute products within the region.
- Maintain support systems for farmers.
- Create a protocol for developing new farmers.

Infrastructure
Goal: Maintain functionality of existing infrastructure and implement sustainable improvements where funding permits.
Strategies to achieve the goal:
- Sustain and expand public transportation options.
- Maintain roads, bridges and key infrastructure.
- Improve broadband access throughout the region.
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1 | Introduction

This section discusses who oversaw the planning process, the uniqueness of this particular plan, how it was developed, and why a comprehensive plan for regional prosperity is a necessity.
The Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission


Directed by an eighteen member board comprised of public and private sector representatives from each county, including a seat specifically reserved for a representative from the region’s largest minority segment (Chippewa Native American), the EUPRPDC assists communities with land use planning, zoning, economic and community development, hazard mitigation planning, recreation planning, transportation, and Geographic Information Systems mapping and databases.

Table 1: EUPRPDC Board Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Term Ends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleen Dufo</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Luce</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Jan. 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Reid</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Mackinac</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jan. 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Claus</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Jan. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conor Egan</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jan. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Moore</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jun. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Gill</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Luce</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jan. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Therrian</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Mackinac</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jul. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Reid</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Mackinac</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Jan. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Becks</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Apr. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Walk</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Mackinac</td>
<td>MSUE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Jul. 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “EO” is an acronym for Elected Official.

Table 2: EUPRPDC Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Began at EUPRPDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Hagan</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Benoit</td>
<td>Finance and Programs Manager</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Fazer</td>
<td>Senior Planner; GIS Coordinator</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Coon</td>
<td>GIS Technician &amp; Analyst</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Wedesky</td>
<td>Economic Development Specialist</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haley Tasienski</td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Unique Opportunity

Every five years, the EUPRPDC is required to produce a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the United States Economic Development Administration (EDA). Having a CEDS is a central component to being able to receive federal funding for both regional planning, as well as for projects pursued by local champions. Additionally, a CEDS brings together leaders in multiple fields able to affect the mechanisms of economic development (further information regarding CEDS can be found on pages 86-87). The previous CEDS produced for the EUP was written in 2010 and expired in 2014. As 2014 began, so did the process for developing a new CEDS.

In 2013, Michigan’s Governor, Rick Snyder, advanced his Regional Prosperity Initiative (RPI)—including it in his Executive Budget Recommendation for 2014 which eventually passed through the legislature (59 Public Act 2013). The RPI seeks to clearly realign service areas for state agencies in an attempt to reduce overlaps and eliminate gaps in services while also providing means for State Designated Planning Regions and Metropolitan Planning Organizations—if they choose to apply for funding; it is a voluntary competitive grant—the necessary resources to facilitate the development of a plan conveying a consensus regional vision and to coordinate economic development goals and resources amongst those working in various fields. Furthermore, regions choosing to participate could do so in three capacities with varying levels of funding and scope: a Regional Prosperity Collaborative, which could receive grant funding up to $250,000; a Regional Prosperity Council, which could receive up to $375,000; and a Regional Prosperity Board, which could receive up to $500,000 (further information regarding the RPI can be found on pages 88-89).

In March of 2014, the EUPRPDC was awarded a grant from Michigan’s Department of Management, Technology and Budget on the Regional Planning Collaborative level, which helped enable the development this 5-year plan and the creation of a dashboard (currently being developed) for measuring the region’s advancement towards prosperity.

Due to the same three counties constituting both an Economic Development District and a State Designated Planning Region, in addition to how the timing worked out between needing to develop a new CEDS and receiving the RPI grant award, it was logical for the EUPRPDC facilitate the development of one plan satisfying the criteria of each the CEDS and the RPI. The requirements and deliverables of the CEDS and RPI are comparable and in many ways reflect evenly upon one another. Thus integrating the two not only seemed sensible, it provided the opportunity to leverage limited resources to produce a more thorough and inclusive plan.
Developing the Plan

To develop a plan which delivers upon the requirements of both the State of Michigan’s Regional Prosperity Initiative and the EDA’s Comprehensive Development Strategy, a unique process was developed and utilized by EUPRPDC staff. EUPRPDC used two committees, six focus groups, a survey and multiple one-on-one meetings to develop, screen, and approve what is put forth in this plan.

Regional Prosperity Initiative Collaborative

Criteria for developing Regional Prosperity Collaborative required the EUPRPDC to engage private, public and non-profit representatives from adult education, workforce development, economic development, transportation and higher education organizations. The EUPRPDC sought to engage these representatives on two levels. The first being a large assembly, called the Stakeholder Committee, which oversaw the planning process, identified and reassessed regional assets and shortcomings based on previous plans (2009’s Economic Opportunity Study for the Michigan Upper Peninsula/Wisconsin Border, 2010’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, and 2012’s Regional Growth Strategy), and gave direction to the EUPRPDC regarding focus areas that needed to be addressed in this plan. The second level of engagement manifested in the form of focus-area focus groups. Six focus groups were convened: agriculture and local food systems, tourism and natural resources, health care, education, infrastructure, and economic and workforce development (professionals in each sector were brought together for one focus group due to the interrelated nature of their work). With facilitation assistance from Michigan State University Extension, the focus groups were led through individual analyses to identify strengths, challenges and threats, and opportunities, shedding light onto a goal and subsequent strategies those working in the given focus area can incorporate in order for that component of the prosperity plan to be realized. The focus groups were the essential source of information and ideas used in forming the economic blueprint proposed later in this plan.

Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy

The Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee (REDAC) was formed to oversee the planning process, offer input at many junctions, and to recommend approval to the EUPRPDC Board based on their overall satisfaction of this plan as well as its adherence to the requirements set forth by the EDA. Of the members comprising the REDAC, the EDA required a private sector majority, which was met—though during the course of developing this plan, the EDA issued updated Federal requirements, stating that the REDAC need only see its composition reflect truly upon the nature of the region’s economy. Moreover, in previous CEDS, it was required that a regional list of projects requiring assistance from the EDA be included. Although this is no longer required, it was completed and included due to the fact the requirements were changed while developing this plan, and it gives the REDAC, along with readers of this plan, a broad overview of the types of projects being pursued throughout the region.
Why Attempt to Grow as a Region?

As the United States of America and the State of Michigan continue to rebound from the last recession, the production of this comprehensive plan to help guide the region towards prosperity is not only appropriate and timely, but essential if the Eastern Upper Peninsula intends to position itself to ride an economic upswing.

Furthermore, as an Economic Development District, possessing this plan which a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy qualifies the region’s counties, cities, villages, townships, economic development organizations, non-profits, institutions and businesses as eligible to apply for Economic Development Administration assistance under its public works and economic facilities program, technical assistance programs, loan programs, and planning programs.

Looking beyond qualifying for funding, a variety reasons exist explaining why for those living and working in the Eastern Upper Peninsula to embrace region-wide plan to guide economic development:

- Limited resources demand unique collaborations to propel change and economic development;
- The Eastern Upper Peninsula’s position amongst the Great Lakes, the Upper Peninsula, the Lower Peninsula and Canada differentiates it from any other region in Michigan;
- In 2010, 27 cities in the State of Michigan had populations greater than that of the entire Eastern Upper Peninsula (56,242 citizens);
- The Eastern Upper Peninsula has a wealth of talent working in each of the region’s three counties;
- The Eastern Upper Peninsula is home to some of Michigan’s major tourist attractions which draw people into each county year after year;
- The Eastern Upper Peninsula has a long-established cultural heritage which is both an identity and a source of pride;
- In order to be attractive to new businesses the Eastern Upper Peninsula must successfully pursue and implement measures to demonstrate vibrancy.
- The willingness to come together under an umbrella of regionalism has been clearly and successfully demonstrated throughout the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula.
2 | Examining the Eastern Upper Peninsula

Through the utilization of the most current data available from various federal, state and private resources, this section provides those reading this plan with a clear picture of the state of the Eastern Upper Peninsula. This section covers topics including demographics, economics, and regional assets.
Location

The Eastern Upper Peninsula (EUP) is a region within the State of Michigan encompassing the counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac. When considering Michigan in its entirety, the EUP located between the southern end of the Lower Peninsula and the western reaches of the Upper Peninsula. The EUP has the only point in the State where one can drive between the Lower Peninsula to the Upper Peninsula and vice versa; and one of three locations in Michigan where one can cross the international border into Canada. Only the western end of the EUP is connected to land: Lake Superior and the St. Mary's River touch the northern shores; the St. Mary's River and Lake Huron sculpt the eastern shore; and Lake Huron and Lake Michigan make up the southern shoreline.

*Map 1* shows where the EUP is located in the State of Michigan and also where it is located in relation to large markets surrounding the Great Lakes. Furthermore, *Map 1* illuminates urban areas in the states and provinces surrounding the Great Lakes. One can see that the EUP is without much urban area and is at a distance from the larger urban areas shown.

*Map 1: Eastern Upper Peninsula Location*
Table 3 shows linear distance, shortest distance by road, shortest drive time, and the metropolitan populations’ of the cities depicted in Map 1. All of the cities are within a 500 mile radius. Of these cities, only Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario—which happens to be the smallest market in terms of metropolitan population—is within 100 miles of the EUP.

Table 3: Proximity to Selected Markets – Measured from Sault Ste. Marie, MI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Linear Distance</th>
<th>Shortest Distance by Road</th>
<th>Shortest Drive Time</th>
<th>Metropolitan Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie, ON</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
<td>4 miles</td>
<td>0 h 12 min</td>
<td>79,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury, ON</td>
<td>163 miles</td>
<td>195 miles</td>
<td>3 h 56 min</td>
<td>160,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay, WI</td>
<td>227 miles</td>
<td>282 miles</td>
<td>5 h 03 min</td>
<td>312,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>255 miles</td>
<td>286 miles</td>
<td>4 h 34 min</td>
<td>1,016,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing, MI</td>
<td>260 miles</td>
<td>287 miles</td>
<td>4 h 15 min</td>
<td>464,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>298 miles</td>
<td>346 miles</td>
<td>5 h 05 min</td>
<td>4,292,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>299 miles</td>
<td>399 miles</td>
<td>6 h 49 min</td>
<td>1,569,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, ON</td>
<td>309 miles</td>
<td>431 miles</td>
<td>7 h 56 min</td>
<td>5,583,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>360 miles</td>
<td>463 miles</td>
<td>7 h 20 min</td>
<td>9,522,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>365 miles</td>
<td>553 miles</td>
<td>8 h 19 min</td>
<td>1,134,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>370 miles</td>
<td>501 miles</td>
<td>7 h 28 min</td>
<td>2,064,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth, MN</td>
<td>374 miles</td>
<td>416 miles</td>
<td>7 h 30 min</td>
<td>279,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>445 miles</td>
<td>542 miles</td>
<td>9 h 06 min</td>
<td>3,459,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>455 miles</td>
<td>520 miles</td>
<td>7 h 53 min</td>
<td>1,967,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>470 miles</td>
<td>535 miles</td>
<td>8 h 02 min</td>
<td>1,887,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>475 miles</td>
<td>617 miles</td>
<td>9 h 08 min</td>
<td>2,360,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Linear distance measured with ArcMap; driving distance and drive time measured with Google Maps; U.S. metropolitan data from 2010 Census; Canadian metropolitan data from 2011 Census.

Municipal Composition

The Eastern Upper Peninsula is comprised of a relatively small number of residents inhabiting a 3,479 square mile piece of land; there are only three cities within the region (Sault Ste. Marie, St. Ignace and Mackinac Island), two villages (Newberry and De Tour) and many small and unincorporated communities (Bay Mills, Brimley, Kincheloe, Pickford, Paradise, Rudyard, Curtis, Engadine, Naubinway, Hessel and Cedarville, to name a few).

Consequently, townships play a large roll in economic and community development efforts throughout the region. Chippewa County has sixteen townships: Bay Mills, Bruce, Chippewa, Drafter, Detour, Drummond, Hulbert, Kinross (Charter), Pickford, Raber, Rudyard, Soo, Sugar Island, Superior, Trout Lake and Whitefish. Luce County has four townships: Columbus, Lakefield, McMillan and Pentland. Mackinac County has eleven townships: Bois Blanc, Brevort, Clark, Garfield, Hendricks, Hudson, Marquette, Moran, Newton, Portage and St. Ignace.

One can reference the location of these communities and townships on the following page using Map 2.
Map 2: Eastern Upper Peninsula Municipalities – Draft Map
Table 4 presents data on total population. From 1990 to 2013, the population of the EUP increased by over 5,000 people. Chippewa County led the way in this regard, with over 4,000 more citizens residing in the county in 2013 than did in 1990. The counties of Luce and Mackinac are now home to over 700 and 400 more people, respectively, over that same timeframe. However it should be noted that although the total population of the EUP was 5,000 more in 2013 than in 1990, the highest number was measured by the 2000 census: there were over 1,000 more people residing in the EUP then than in 2013. With regards to peak total population, the same was true in the counties of Luce and Mackinac.

Table 4: Total Population – 1990, 2000, 2010 & 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EUP</th>
<th>Chippewa</th>
<th>Luce</th>
<th>Mackinac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 Census</td>
<td>51,041</td>
<td>34,604</td>
<td>5,763</td>
<td>10,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Census</td>
<td>57,510</td>
<td>38,543</td>
<td>7,024</td>
<td>11,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Census</td>
<td>56,264</td>
<td>38,520</td>
<td>6,631</td>
<td>11,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 ACS</td>
<td>56,409</td>
<td>38,760</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>11,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 1 displays annual data for the total populations of each of the counties in the EUP, along with the sum of the three, constituting the total population of the region. One can see that none of the counties, nor, consequently, the EUP experienced increases or decreases in population that varied more than several thousand from the initial measurement in 1990. Furthermore, over the duration studied in this figure, the EUP’s population peaked in 2007; Chippewa County’s in 2007; Luce County’s in 2001; and Mackinac County’s in 2000.

Figure 1: Total Population Trend – 1990-2013

Source: Munetrix
Figure 2 shows the percent change in total population year-to-year from 1990-2013. On the plane, annual percent changes in population in the EUP are compared to those of Michigan and the United States. Over the duration depicted, the United States saw its population had grown at every interval, with growth never exceeding 1.7% nor less than 0.6%. Changes in the populations of both the EUP and Michigan resembled one another—though in the mid-1990’s, the EUP’s population experienced stronger growth; in the early 2000’s, it alternated between growth and decline; and in 2010, it saw the most exacerbated loss of the two. Conversely, Michigan’s population grew from 1990-1991 and continued to do so until 2004; from 2005 to 2011, it shrunk; and it increased in both 2012 and 2013.

Figure 2: Annual Percent Change in Population – 1990-2013

Figure 3 and Map 3, on the following page, examine the population density in the EUP, as well as illustrate where population is more or less dense throughout the three counties, respectively.

At no point in time shown on Figure 3 does Chippewa County have more than 25 citizens per square mile, nor Luce County more than eight, nor Mackinac County more than twelve, nor the EUP more than seventeen. Conversely, the United States never has less than 70 (increasing all the way up to 90 in 2013) citizens per square mile, nor does Michigan ever have less than 165 citizens per square mile. In 2013, the EUP compared to the United States and Michigan had 73 and 158, respectively, less people per square mile of land.
Figure 3: Population Density – 1990, 2000, 2010 & 2013

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Geological Survey

Map 3: Eastern Upper Peninsula Density – Draft Map
Figure 4 shows a comparison of median ages at four points in time over the last 25 years. In 1990, the EUP had a higher median age (33.8) than the United States and Michigan. Furthermore, in 1990, Chippewa County had a lower median age (32.2) than both the USA and Michigan; but, both Luce and Mackinac had median ages of 37.1. Due to Chippewa County's larger population, the higher median ages in Luce and Mackinac had less influence on the median age of the EUP. In 2013, every area measured had a higher median age than in 1990; the median age in the EUP was by 8.5 years; Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac counties median ages increased by 7.7, 6.7 and 12.8 years, respectively. From 1990 to 2013, the margins between the median ages of those in the EUP and those in Michigan and the United States widened from 0.9 and 1.2 to 3.5 and 1.6, respectively, indicating younger segments of the population are not being retained nor replenished at a comparable rate.

Figure 4: Median Age of Population – 1990, 2000, 2010 & 2013

Table 5, on the following page, breaks down total population by sex and age. The first thing to note is that the age-range intervals are uneven. The EUP has over 9% more males than females—the gap is much less in Mackinac County, Michigan and the United States. The entire EUP and each individual county has less of their respective populations in the “17 & younger” age range than both Michigan and the United States. Conversely, the opposite is true—with one exception, Chippewa County females—for the “62 & older” age range. The “18-24” age range, along with aforementioned shortages in the “17 & younger” age range, for both males and females of Luce and Mackinac counties offer insight into what the future might hold for the two counties, and subsequently the EUP, if stayed the current course.
Table 5: Age Distribution by Sex – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>USA-M</th>
<th>MI-M</th>
<th>EUP-M</th>
<th>CC-M</th>
<th>LC-M</th>
<th>MC-M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 &amp; younger</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; older</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the nature of population in the EUP and the counties within. Population change only occurs through four vehicles: birth, death, immigration and emigration. The difference between births and deaths are shown here as “Natural Increase”—with a negative number indicating more dying than birthing occurred. The difference of immigration and emigration is shown here as “Net Migration”—with a negative number indicating more people are deicing to live elsewhere than reside somewhere within the EUP. “Net Population Change” is the sum of the two.

Components of population change were measured in three successive years for each area. The region netted more people than it lost in two out of the three years; the same was true for Chippewa County. Luce County lost more people than it gained at each interval over the three years, and Mackinac County did at two. In Chippewa County, more people were born over the three years than died. The opposite was true for both Luce and Mackinac Counties. More times than not, net migration was positive for the EUP and its counties; however, reasons as to the nature of their immigration are unknown.

Table 6: Components of Population Change – 2010-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Net Population Change</th>
<th>Natural Increase</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUP - '10-11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUP - '11-12</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUP - '12-13</td>
<td>-163</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC - '10-11</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC - '11-12</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC - '12-13</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC - '10-11</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC - '11-12</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC - '12-13</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC - '10-11</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC - '11-12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC - '12-13</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "CC" is Chippewa County; "LC" is Luce County; and "MC" is Mackinac County. Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
Table 7 and Table 8 display group quarter data collected with the 2000 and 2010 Censuses. Simply put, a group quarter is a residence for a mass of people. Studying group quarters data when attempting to understand the EUP is significant for several reasons: both Chippewa and Luce counties have institutional correctional facilities; and Chippewa County is home to Lake Superior State University, a four-year college where students have the option to reside on campus.

The tables are broken down into three tiers. The first tier, “Total Population in Group Quarters,” indicates the percentage of everyone in the area measured in group quarters. The second tier, “Institutionalized population/Noninstitutionalized population,” breaks down the first tier. An example using Table 7: In 2000, Chippewa County (CC) had 15.5% of its population in group quarters; 83.7% those in group quarters were in institutionalized group quarters and 16.3% were in noninstitutionalized group quarters. That translates to 5,974 of the 38,543 people in Chippewa County in 2000 being in group quarters. 5,000 of those 5,974 were in institutionalized group quarters, and the remainder were in noninstitutionalized group quarters. Tier 3—“Juvenile facilities,” “military quarters,” etc.—further elaborates on the types of group quarters one could reside in. Their sum is equivalent to the tier-2 group quarter they are breaking down. Green cells on Table 8 indicate an increase from their counterparts on Table 7.

The percentage of those residing in group quarters in the EUP—specifically the counties of Chippewa and Luce—is much higher than Michigan and the United States. This was the case in both 2000 and 2010; however, due to decreases in noninstitutionalized group quarters population, the percentage of total population in group quarters decreased while still maintaining a wide margin. To provide some perspective, if one references Table 4 to bring to light the amount of people Table 7 represents in percentages, one would find that of the 56,264 people in the EUP in 2010, 6,189 people were in group quarters. Of that, 5,551 were in institutionalized group quarters; which some 4,713 were held in “Correctional facilities for adults.”

Table 7: Group Quarters Population – 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>EUP</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population in Group Quarters</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized population</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Correctional facilities for adults</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Juvenile facilities</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Nursing &amp; skilled-nursing facilities</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other institutional facilities</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstitutionalized population</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-College/University student housing</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Military quarters</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other noninstitutional facilities</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “CC” is Chippewa County; “LC” is Luce County; and “MC” is Mackinac County. Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Table 8: Group Quarters Population – 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>EUP</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population in Group Quarters</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized population</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Correctional facilities for adults</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Juvenile facilities</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Nursing &amp; skilled-nursing facilities</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other institutional facilities</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstitutionalized population</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-College/University student housing</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Military quarters</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Other noninstitutional facilities</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “CC” is Chippewa County; “LC” is Luce County; and “MC” is Mackinac County. Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Figure 5 depicts racial composition in the EUP. The EUP is predominately composed of white citizens. There is some indication of a growth in the “Native American/Alaska Native” segment of the population with it nearly reaching 20%. Overall, the EUP lacks the diverse make-up one might find elsewhere in the United States, but does possess a unique cultural heritage.

Figure 5: Eastern Upper Peninsula Racial Composition – 2000, 2010 & 2013

Figure 6 compares the educational attainment of citizens of the EUP, organized in several age ranges, to those of Michigan and the United States. Note that the age ranges are uneven. What stands out on this graph is not the amount of people in the EUP with a high-school-diploma-or-higher; rather, it’s the disparity in the percentage of those with “bachelor’s degrees or higher” in the younger segments measured. Michigan and the United States had 29% and 32% of their 25-34 year olds with a “bachelor’s degree or higher”, respectively in 2013; the EUP had 13%.

Figure 6: Educational Attainment – 2013

Note: “HSGH” and “BDH” are acronyms for High School Graduate or Higher and Bachelor Degree or Higher, respectively. Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Housing and Households

Table 9 is organized in a fashion similar to that of Table 7 and Table 8. Compared to both the United States and Michigan, the EUP has comparable percentages of households that are “Family households” and “nonfamily households”. More sizeable variances exists particularly in the lines examining households “With own children under 18 years (old)”, and “Households with 1 or more people 65 years and older”.

Table 9: Nature of Households – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>EUP</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Households (HHs)</td>
<td>115,610,216</td>
<td>3,823,280</td>
<td>22,032</td>
<td>14,605</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family HHs (families)</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Married-couple family</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Male householder, no wife present</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Female householder, no husband present</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With own children under 18 years</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily HHs</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Householder living alone</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/ 1 or more people under 18 years</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHs w/ 1 or more people 65 years &amp; over</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “CC” is Chippewa County; “LC” is Luce County; and “MC” is Mackinac County. Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 7 compares incomes of all households in the EUP to both the United States and Michigan in 2013. The same data (in United States dollars) for the EUP is projected on either side of the y-axis; data for the United States is projected to the left of the y-axis, and data for Michigan to the right. One can see the greatest disparities exist where household income are between $15,000 and $34,999, and also at the highest two income ranges—with the EUP possessing more households living on lower incomes and less living on higher incomes.

Figure 7: Household Income Distribution – 2013

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Figure 8 displays median household income for the EUP, Michigan and the United States. Note that the data presented is not done so at even intervals. One can see that median household incomes have grown for each area measured between 1999 and 2013. Although the EUP retained its position as the lowest of the three areas in terms of median household income, it grew by a margin of $6,823 between 1999 and 2003, compared to $11,052 and $3,744 for the United States and Michigan, respectively.

Figure 8: Change in Median Household Income – 1999, 2010 & 2013

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 9 compares the status of dwelling in the EUP, and its counties, to those of the United States and Michigan. The data presented on this figure clearly shows the large amount of dwellings in the EUP purposed solely for seasonal, recreational and occasional use; nearly 20% more of the EUP’s dwellings are reported as such than the United States and Michigan.

Figure 9: Dwelling Status – 2010

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Table 10 examines the value of owner-occupied dwellings of the EUP in comparison to Michigan and the United States. Nearly 70% of the owner-occupied dwellings in the EUP are valued at $149,999 or less; roughly half of those are valued between $50,000 and $99,999. Michigan as a whole has a distribution comparable to that of the EUP—though with less of a concentration amongst the lower-value ranges. The United States has a much more even distribution of dwelling values between $50,000 and $499,999—with an additional 10% of its dwellings valued at $500,000 or higher. Looking at the median value of dwellings of each area, one can see a rather wide margin between the United States and all other areas.

Table 10: Value of Owner-Occupied Dwellings – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner-occupied units</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>MI</th>
<th>EUP</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>MC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>75,075,700</td>
<td>2,757,062</td>
<td>15,939</td>
<td>10,274</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>3,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 or more</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median value</td>
<td>$176,700</td>
<td>$121,700</td>
<td>$103,327</td>
<td>$101,600</td>
<td>$79,400</td>
<td>$119,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Measured in U.S. dollars. Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 10 shows the percentage of total dwellings built in various time periods for the EUP, United States and Michigan as of 2013. Of the nine intervals, the four that saw the most homes built in the EUP were (in descending order) 1990-1999, prior to 1940, 1970-1979, and 1950-1959. Michigan shares the same four periods of most prolific homebuilding; however, the order differs. The United States shares only two of same intervals in its top four. From 1990-1999, the EUP built over 17% its dwellings. No other interval—for any of the three areas—had as large of a percentage of construction.

Figure 10: Age of Dwellings – 2013

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
The Economy

*Figure 11* depicts the change in per capita income for the three counties of the EUP, Michigan and the United States. In 1990, the margins between per capita income of the United States and Michigan, Chippewa County, Luce County and Mackinac County were $642, $7,408, $3,866 and $4,117, respectively. By 2013, those margins widened across the board: the differences between per capita income in the United States and Michigan, Chippewa County, Luce County and Mackinac County were $5,710, $13,439, $17,361 and $6,092, respectively. With that said, between 1990 and 2013, per capita income in Chippewa County increased by 157%; 74% in Luce County; 150% in Mackinac County; 106% in Michigan; and 129% in the United States.

*Figure 11: Per Capita Income – 1990-2013*

![Figure 11: Per Capita Income – 1990-2013](image)

*Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis*

*Figure 12* on the following page looks at relative poverty in the EUP compared to that of Michigan and the United States. *Figure 13* provides insight as to who is being affected by poverty within the counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac. Both figures show data from 1999, 2009 and 2013. Both figures examine poverty levels for three different age groupings amongst all persons counted. An example: On the x-axis of *Figure 12*, one can see columns extending from “USA ’99”; in particular, the grey column extends to 6.9%. This means that of all people counted in 1999, 6.9% of them were both between the ages of eighteen and sixty-four years old, and living below the poverty line.

If added together, the three columns—on both figures—equal the percentage of all persons counted living below the poverty line. On *Figure 12*, one can see that in 1999, Michigan had a lower portion of its counted population (10.5%) impoverished than the United States (12.4%) and the EUP (12.5%). By 2009, Michigan had a higher percentage of its counted population impoverished than both the United States and the EUP (at 16.8%, 13.5% and 15.8%, respectively). In 2013, the EUP surpassed the other two, with a poverty rate of 17.3%—compared to 15.9% for Michigan and 15.4% for the United States. From 1999 to 2013, the amount impoverished in the EUP, Michigan and the United States increased by 4.8%, 5.4% and 2.9%, respectively.
Although all the areas represented on Figure 13 had a higher percentage of people impoverished in 2013 than in 1999, the paths taken varied. From 1999 to 2009, the poverty rate in Chippewa County rose from 10.8% to 16.5%, and decreased to 16.2% by 2013. From 1999 to 2009, the poverty rate in Luce County rose from 12.7% to 18.5%, and decreased to 13.9% by 2013. The poverty rate in Mackinac County rose from 1999 to 2009 and again from 2009 to 2013—going from 10.3% to 12.4% to 15.0%.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Figure 14 graphs the average monthly unemployment rates between 1990 and 2014 for the three EUP counties alongside those of Michigan and the United States. One can see that the unemployment rates of the United States and Michigan follow a similar trajectory, with Michigan always possessing a slightly higher rate. The EUP counties of Chippewa and Luce share similar monthly averages, reaching a crest around the summer months and a trough around the winter months. Mackinac County has the most pronounced fluctuations in unemployment of any area represented here: in the winter months, average unemployment surpasses 25.0%; in the summer months, it drops below all other areas to under 5.0%.

**Figure 14: Average Monthly Unemployment – 1990-2014**

![Graph showing average monthly unemployment rates for Chippewa, Luce, Mackinac, Michigan, and USA from 1990 to 2014.]

Table 11 on the following page breaks down the relative amounts of those sixteen years and older in or not in the labor force, and it also provides insight as to how those in the civilian labor force fared in 2000 and 2013. Where green cells are present, an increase from 2000 to 2013 occurred for the given area. Civilian labor force equals the labor force minus those in the armed forces; employed and unemployed added together equal the percentage present in the civilian labor force column.

The first thing one might notice is the differences between the amount of those in the labor in the United States and Michigan compared to those of the EUP—in some instances, there is over a 10.0% gap between the areas measured. The United States and Chippewa County saw increases in the amount of their populations’ over the age of sixteen participating in the labor force; Michigan, Luce County, and Mackinac County saw decreases; and EUP as a whole remained the same from 2000 to 2013.
Table 11: Labor Participation – 2000 & 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>In labor force</th>
<th>Not in labor force</th>
<th>Civilian labor force</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA '00</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA '13</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI '00</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI '13</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUP '00</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUP '13</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC '00</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC '13</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC '00</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC '13</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC '00</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC '13</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "CC" is Chippewa County; "LC" is Luce County; and "MC" is Mackinac County. Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Figure 15 is a visual representation of that data which speaks to the classes an employed person might find themselves in. Like Table 9, those counted in the labor force were over the age of sixteen years old. When examining the types of jobs supporting the EUP’s economy, one quickly notices the large size of the “government workers” class. In 2013, the United States and Michigan had nearly 15% and 12%, respectively, of their labor force working within the “government workers” class. The EUP had 30% working in the same class. The disparity between the United States and Michigan compared to the EUP—particularly Chippewa County—indicates a dependency on the government to provide jobs. With the international border crossing, lock system, prisons and large swaths of government-owned land in the EUP, the large amount of government jobs is understandable; however, the availability of more private sector employment opportunities would more closely align the EUP’s employment-by-class numbers with the United States and Michigan.

Figure 15: Workers by Class – 2013

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Tables 12, 13, 14 and 15 on the following pages utilize North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) data to further understanding of the economic situation which exists in the EUP. The four tables, although incomplete due to lack of information being provided, compare and contrast the counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac to one another and also to Michigan. The four tables present the total sums of all sectors—note that not all areas have every sector making up their economy—and then break down each sector using percentages so that they can be compared across tables. For each sector, these tables examine data from all non-profit and for-profit firms on the number of paid employees (PE) that were on the payroll for the pay period including March 12th, 2012; annual payroll (AP); average weekly wage (AWW)—which is the quotient of annual payroll by paid employees; and the number of establishments (EST)—which is defined as a single physical structure. Each table is ordered by the by the contribution each sector makes to the total annual payroll of the area in question.

Table 12 examines NAICS data for all of Michigan. One can see that the five sectors putting the largest sums of money into the pockets of their employees are manufacturing; health care and social assistance; professional, scientific, and technical services; management of companies and enterprises; and retail trade. These five sectors employed 54% of the paid employees and contributed to 59% of total payroll in Michigan in 2012. Although the management of companies and enterprises sector is a top-five contributor to total annual payroll, there are six other sectors employing more people—indicating a the high-paying nature of positions within the sector.

### Table 12: NAICS Data for Michigan – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PE %</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AWW</th>
<th>EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>$1,067</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>$846</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>$1,278</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Management of Companies &amp; Enterprises</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>$1,942</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>$464</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>$1,193</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; Support &amp; Waste Mgmt. &amp; Remediation Services</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>$589</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>$1,056</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>$862</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real Estate &amp; Rental &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, &amp; Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$1,359</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$694</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Industries not classified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “PE” = paid employees; “AP” = annual payroll; “AWW” = average weekly wage; “EST” = establishments; “N/A” = no data provided. Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Table 13: NAICS Data for Chippewa County – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AWW</th>
<th>EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>$249,556,000</td>
<td>$546</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>$683</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>$348</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>$412</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>$725</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>$965</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>$771</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>$313</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>$795</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; Support &amp; Waste Mgmt. &amp; Remediation Services</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>$482</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real Estate &amp; Rental &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>$383</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, &amp; Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Management of Companies &amp; Enterprises</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "PE" = paid employees; "AP" = annual payroll; "AWW" = average weekly wage; "EST" = establishments; "NDP" = no data provided. Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Table 14 looks at NAICS data for Luce County. Unfortunately, the data available for Luce County is even more incomplete than that for Chippewa County. Nonetheless, one can see from which sectors the majority of total annual payroll is earned: health care and social assistance; manufacturing; retail trade; construction; and finance and insurance—combining to contribute 80% of the 95% for which data was available. One might also notice the fact that several sectors—mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction; management of companies and enterprises; and educational services—were not present in Luce County as they were elsewhere in Michigan—and the EUP. In terms of annual payroll, manufacturing is a much larger part of Luce's economy than Chippewa's and Mackinac's, more closely resembling Michigan's. Of three counties, Luce County was the most dependent upon its natural resources to drive the economy. The average weekly wage was $257 less than the state average.

Table 14: NAICS Data for Luce County – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AWW</th>
<th>EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All sectors</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>$42,491,000</td>
<td>$587</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>$447</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>$663</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$669</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>$204</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real Estate &amp; Rental &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>$295</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>$619</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; Support &amp; Waste Mgmt. &amp; Remediation Services</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "PE" = paid employees; "AP" = annual payroll; "AWW" = average weekly wage; "EST" = establishments; "NDP" = no data provided. Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Table 15 also examines NAICS data—though in this instance for Mackinac County. One can see that the economy in Mackinac County shares a resemblance to the counties of Chippewa and Luce. Accommodation and food services; health care and social assistance; retail trade; construction and manufacturing contribute 75% of the total annual payroll in the county. Furthermore, 73% of those employed in Mackinac County are working in one of those five sectors. Unlike the other two counties of the EUP, Mackinac County had a higher average weekly wage than Michigan—with a positive margin of $79. Like Luce County, no firms concerned with the management of companies and enterprises were present in Mackinac County.

Table 15: NAICS Data for Mackinac County – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>AWW</th>
<th>EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation &amp; Food Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, &amp; Technical Services</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real Estate &amp; Rental &amp; Leasing</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing &amp; Hunting</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, &amp; Oil &amp; Gas Extraction</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; Support &amp; Waste Mgmt. &amp; Remediation Services</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: "PE" = paid employees; "AP" = annual payroll; "AWW" = average weekly wage; "EST" = establishments; "NDP" = no data provided. Source: U.S. Census Bureau
Tables 16, 17 and 18 present location quotient data for each county in the EUP. Location quotients (LQ) are a method used to understand if an area being studied has more or less laborers working in a subsector—note: Tables 14, 15 and 16 use the subsector (three-digit) NAICS data where Tables 12-15 used sector (two-digit) NAICS data—than a larger base area. To calculate a location quotient: divide the quotient of local employment in a subsector and total local employment by the quotient of base area employment in a subsector and total base area employment. If the location quotient for a subsector is equal to one, then the area being studied has an equal proportion of its employed persons working in that subsector compared to the base area. If the location quotient is less than one, the area being studied has less of its employed persons working in the subsector compared to the base area. If the location quotient is greater than one, the area being studied has a greater concentration of its employed persons working in a subsector compared to the base area; higher location quotients can indicate the presence of a cluster.

Clusters are usually considered to be multiple firms working in a given area, employing a large number of laborers, competing with one another to improve goods and services, and bringing money into the area due to their ability to export respective goods and services. For example, automobile manufacturing (NAICS subsector 336—Transportation Equipment Manufacturing) in southeastern Michigan is a widely-known cluster. With United States employment as the base, this subsector had a location quotient of 4.96 in 2013.

Each of the following three tables use both the United States and Michigan as bases. One will see the sizes of the three tables vary. All subsectors with information available are included; subsectors not being present is either due to the data being “not disclosable” or “not calculable, the data does not exist or it is zero”. Subsectors in the green sections of the tables had location quotients over 2.0; subsectors in the yellow sections had location quotients great than 1.0, but less than 2.0; and subsectors in red had location quotients that were less than 1.0. Analysis of the three tables is more concerned with subsectors that have potential to export goods and services or attract people into the region; so subsectors like Accommodation (721) and Gasoline Stations (447) are not discussed.

Table 16 examines location quotient data for Chippewa County from 2013. One can see the Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation (487) subsector had by far the largest location quotient. That, along with the Museums, Historical Sites, Zoos, and Parks (712) subsector, are indicative of the reliance Chippewa County has on tourism-related enterprises and attractions to support the economy. Of the remaining subsectors with location quotients above 1.0, only Forest and Logging (113), Mining, Except Oil and Gas (447), and Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing (312) are the only ones producing products. The majority of subsectors with location quotients about 1.0 are involved in some type of retail, accommodation or service.
Table 16: Chippewa County Location Quotients – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Base</th>
<th>LQ</th>
<th>Michigan Base</th>
<th>LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>487 Scenic and sightseeing transportation</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>487 Scenic and sightseeing transportation</td>
<td>42.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 Forestry and logging</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>488 Support activities for transportation</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 Museums, historical sites, zoos, and parks</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>712 Museums, historical sites, zoos, and parks</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488 Support activities for transportation</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>113 Forestry and logging</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452 General merchandise stores</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>212 Mining, except oil and gas</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 Accommodation</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>721 Accommodation</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447 Gasoline stations</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>447 Gasoline stations</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Mining, except oil and gas</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>452 General merchandise stores</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 Sports, hobby, music instrument, book stores</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>624 Social assistance</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>443 Electronics and appliance stores</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443 Electronics and appliance stores</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>453 Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444 Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>492 Couriers and messengers</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>814 Private households</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>451 Sports, hobby, music instrument, book stores</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>312 Beverage and tobacco product manufacturing</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 Beverage and tobacco product manufacturing</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>441 Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446 Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>999 Unclassified</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 Social assistance</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>446 Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 Credit intermediation and related activities</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>444 Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 Food services and drinking places</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>522 Credit intermediation and related activities</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442 Furniture and home furnishings stores</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>236 Construction of buildings</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>445 Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492 Couriers and messengers</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>814 Private households</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Construction of buildings</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>722 Food services and drinking places</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811 Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>442 Furniture and home furnishings stores</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 Nursing and residential care facilities</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>448 Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448 Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>238 Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Personal and laundry services</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>517 Telecommunications</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>454 Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517 Telecommunications</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>811 Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Membership associations and organizations</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>812 Personal and laundry services</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713 Amusements, gambling, and recreation</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>713 Amusements, gambling, and recreation</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423 Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>623 Nursing and residential care facilities</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532 Rental and leasing services</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>532 Rental and leasing services</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611 Educational services</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>237 Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454 Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>611 Educational services</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423 Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>423 Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424 Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>813 Membership associations and organizations</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>424 Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Professional and technical services</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care services</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484 Truck transportation</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>531 Real estate</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Real estate</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>484 Truck transportation</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 Performing arts and spectator sports</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>541 Professional and technical services</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
Table 17 looks at location quotient data for Luce County from 2013. The first thing one notices is the location quotient for the Forestry and Logging (113) subsector in the county. With a location quotient over 100 with both the United States and Michigan as the base, the data shows the importance of forestry and logging in Luce County. Aside from the aforementioned subsector, Luce County does not possess any subsectors with an inkling of a cluster worth noting.

Table 17: Luce County Location Quotients – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsector</th>
<th>United States Base</th>
<th>Michigan Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113 Forestry and logging</td>
<td>101.13</td>
<td>108.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447 Gasoline stations</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Membership associations and organizations</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 Credit intermediation and related activities</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424 Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Construction of buildings</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811 Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 Waste management and remediation services</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care services</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Administrative and support services</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics

Table 18 presents location quotient data for Mackinac County from 2013. Of any of the three counties in the EUP, Mackinac has subsector with the single largest location quotient: Fishing, Hunting and Trapping (114). Water Transportation (483) also has a strong location quotient, but is mainly a product of people traveling to islands around the Straits of Mackinac. Forestry and Logging (113) and Wood Product Manufacturing (321) are each subsectors with location quotients worth noting, but further highlight the county’s dependence upon its natural resources.

Table 18: Mackinac County Location Quotients – 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsector</th>
<th>United States Base</th>
<th>Michigan Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114 Fishing, hunting and trapping</td>
<td>130.64</td>
<td>155.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483 Water transportation</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>99.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>721 Accommodation</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>21.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Forestry and logging</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>13.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 Wood product manufacturing</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447 Gasoline stations</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 Food services and drinking places</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444 Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 Sports, hobby, music instrument, book stores</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Membership associations and organizations</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>813 Membership associations and organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238 Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>811 Repair and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811 Repair and maintenance</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>448 Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449 Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>561 Administrative and support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Administrative and support services</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>452 General merchandise stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524 Insurance carriers and related activities</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>524 Insurance carriers and related activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484 Truck transportation</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care services</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>624 Social assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Professional and technical services</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>484 Truck transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624 Social assistance</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>541 Professional and technical services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
Tables 19 and 20 contain data put forth by Michigan’s Department of Technology, Management and Budget projecting industry growth and decline measured by employment between 2010 and 2020. Aside from estimates for the totals of all industries, the two tables only include industries that were projected to either grow or shrink by at least 10%. The industries are identified by their NAICS-subsector code.

Table 19 examines statewide projections. From 2010 to 2020 employment in Michigan was projected to increase by 8.5%. Michigan has five industries that were projected to grow by at least 20%—with Social Assistance expected to grow by over 30%. Moreover, twelve industries were slated to grow by between 10% and 20%. Conversely, Michigan has seven industries projected to shrink by at least 10%. The most drastic changes in terms of total jobs being lost are expected in the Postal Service (491) and Printing and Related Support Activities (323).

Table 19: Michigan Industry Projections – 2010-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Estimated Employment</th>
<th>Projected Employment</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total All Industries</td>
<td>4,144,990</td>
<td>4,497,030</td>
<td>352,038</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>75,600</td>
<td>18,599</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Ambulatory Health Care Services</td>
<td>185,020</td>
<td>232,100</td>
<td>47,081</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Securities, Commodity Contracts, and Other Financial Inv</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Administrative and Support Services</td>
<td>232,240</td>
<td>284,000</td>
<td>51,756</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>222,090</td>
<td>269,600</td>
<td>47,511</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Nursing and Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>97,890</td>
<td>117,100</td>
<td>19,210</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Transit and Ground Passenger Transport</td>
<td>5,890</td>
<td>6,910</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519</td>
<td>Other Information Services</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Support Activities for Transportation</td>
<td>11,680</td>
<td>13,230</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>Museums, Historical Sites, and Similar Institution</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>34,230</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>220,300</td>
<td>247,200</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813</td>
<td>Religious, Grantmaking, Civic, Professional, and Similar O</td>
<td>95,200</td>
<td>106,200</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Specialty Trade Contractors</td>
<td>80,090</td>
<td>89,170</td>
<td>9,081</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Building Material and Garden Equipment and Supplies Dei</td>
<td>39,280</td>
<td>43,700</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>15,340</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>Funds, Trusts, and Other Financial Vehicles</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Apparel Manufacturing</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-313</td>
<td>-38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Leather and Allied Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-314</td>
<td>-37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Printing and Related Support Activities</td>
<td>14,070</td>
<td>12,100</td>
<td>-1,974</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Textile Mills</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Textile Product Mills</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>-259</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Postal Service</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>-2700</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michigan Department of Management Technology and Budget; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Employment & Training
Table 20 examines employment by industry projections for the entire Upper Peninsula. From 2010 to 2020, employment across the entire state was projected to increase by 8.5%; for the Upper Peninsula, only 3.6% growth is expected. Of the 25 industries expected to experience at least 10% growth, eleven industries in the Upper Peninsula are projected to grow by more than 20%. Of those 25 industries, eight are directly purposed with the manufacturing of goods. On top of that, the Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services (541), Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction (237), Support Activities for Transportation (488) industries all have potential to diversify the workforce and lead to improvements in infrastructure. The other side of the projections suggest industries including Mining (except Oil and Gas) (212) and Paper Manufacturing (322)—historically critical components of the Upper Peninsula’s economy—are to experience over 20% loss in the number of people employed in the industries. Seven other industries in the Upper Peninsula are expected to shrink by 10% by 2020.

Table 20: Upper Peninsula Industry Projections – 2010-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Estimated Employment</th>
<th>Projected Employment</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total All Industries</td>
<td>1,206,600</td>
<td>1,245,540</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Support Activities for Transportation</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>104.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Machinery Manufacturing</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Transportation Equipment Manufacturing</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Food Manufacturing</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>Administrative and Support Services</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Manufacturing</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Transit and Ground Passenger Transport</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Electronics and Appliance Stores</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Specialty Trade Contractors</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Nonmetallic Mineral Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishings Stores</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>Nursing and Residential Care Facilities</td>
<td>2,730</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Building Material and Garden Equipment and Supplies Dealer</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Plastics and Rubber Products Manufacturing</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Truck Transportation</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Merchant Wholesalers, Durable Goods</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Merchant Wholesalers, Nondurable Goods</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Mining (except Oil and Gas)</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>-420</td>
<td>-24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Paper Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>-440</td>
<td>-20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>Publishing Industries</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>Couriers and Messengers</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Nonstore Retailers</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Waste Management and Remediation Service</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Printing and Related Support Activities</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>Postal Service</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>-70</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michigan Department of Management Technology and Budget; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Employment & Training

Table 21 on the following page displays taxable value data for each county in the EUP. One can see that steady growth in terms of increases in taxable value occurred in each county from 2006 through 2009. Since 2010, Chippewa County only saw its tax base increase by more than 2% once; Luce County’s tax base decreased three out of four years; and Mackinac County’s tax base decreased once but increased three years—though two were by less than 1%.
Regional Assets

Natural Assets

Vast forests—and byproducts including lumber, waste-wood, biomass and maple syrup—both public and privately owned; access to water—Great Lakes, inland lakes, rivers and streams; open space; distinct seasons; wildlife and fisheries; minimal natural disasters; Niagara Escarpment; mineral and geological resources; agricultural land; Great Lakes’ shoreline; fresh air; parks and nature preserves; dark skies—stargazing opportunities; islands—Les Cheneaux, Mackinac, Sugar, Neebish, Drummond.

Institutional

Lake Superior State University; Bay Mills Community College; local school districts; Les Cheneaux Culinary School; the Great Lakes Boat Building School; Superior District Library; War Memorial Hospital; Helen Newberry Joy Hospital and Healthcare Center; Mackinac Straits Health System.

Infrastructural

Railway to Canada, the western Upper Peninsula and Wisconsin; highway system; regional and municipal airports; industrial parks; deep water ports; sewer and water systems in cities; the Mackinac Bridge; the International Bridge; the Soo Locks; natural gas pipelines; motorized and non-motorized trail systems; marinas for recreational boating; ferry system and public transportation overseen by the Eastern Upper Peninsula Transportation Authority.

Tangible and Intangible

Proximity to Wisconsin and Canada; sense of place; several top-tourist destination in Michigan; tribal communities; variety and abundance of security agencies—low crime rates; location between the western Upper Peninsula, the Lower Peninsula and Canada; historical and architectural uniqueness and significance; strong sense of regionalism; relatively no traffic compared to more populated regions; boating for recreation and work culture; artistic and cultural history; the “Yooper” lifestyle and pace.
3 | Focus Group Findings

This section discusses information collected through six focus groups: Agriculture and Local Food Systems; Tourism and Natural Resources; Health Care; Education; Infrastructure; and Economic and Workforce Development. The purpose was clear: bring together leaders working in the each focus area to analyze strengths in, needs of, challenges and threats facing, and opportunities for the Eastern Upper Peninsula; and develop language that for a region-wide goal that all working in that focus area could embrace and work towards achieving.
Focus Area: Education

The Education Focus Group session held for the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula saw educators across multiple levels come together and share their thoughts, insights and expertise on the state of education in the Eastern Upper Peninsula (EUP). Representatives from Lake Superior State University, the EUP Intermediate School District (ISD), and career technical education (CTE) all participated. Conversation ranged from primary and secondary education to higher education to career technical education and adult education. Information gathered from the focus group directly led to the goal, strategies and action items proposed under Education in the Economic Development Blueprint.

Strengths

- In a period where the population in the EUP is experiencing uneven growth (see Table 4 and Figures 1 and 2) while also aging (see Figure 4), the ability to continue to provide quality education to those living or wanting to study in the EUP in the face of declining enrollment numbers remains the region’s greatest strength in education. This resiliency is indicative of the region itself and is a commonality shared by those residing in the three counties constituting the EUP. With a blend of public, tribal, religious and skilled-trade institutions, the EUP has an educational infrastructure which established is, diverse and poised to aid the development of the region’s economy.

- Lake Superior State University (LSSU) offers students the opportunity earn degrees from 64 bachelor programs and 24 associate programs, plus four additional certificate programs. Tribally owned Bay Mills Community College (BMCC) also provides post-secondary learning opportunities in the region, offering thirteen associate degree programs, eight certificate programs, and two diploma programs. Additionally, one can attain unique skillsets at the Great Lakes Boat Building School or the Les Cheneaux Culinary School—both new additions to the EUP; opening in 2007 and 2014, respectively. Having institutions of this nature infuses the region with knowledge and skill as well as economic activity that is undeniably important.

- The EUP ISD encompasses fourteen school districts, two charter schools, two tribal schools, and maintains relationships with the three religious institutions in the region. At Sault Area High School, students have the opportunity to utilize the career-technical center to earn vocational certificates in numerous state-certified programs. This ability to equip young women and men with skills necessary to pursue employment immediately upon graduation provides them with opportunity that would otherwise be nonexistent or require them to attain post-secondary training.

Challenges and Threats

- Whether it is LSSU or local school districts, increasingly low enrollment continues to trouble the region. This results in less funding, requires institutions to continually consolidate and cut back, and identify more ways to get by with less. To some degree, particularly for the EUP ISD, declining enrollment can be attributed to factors outside the control of the institutions. However, the economic stimulation lost with declining enrollment cannot be overlooked.
• As CTE is pushed to the forefront of the political agenda in Michigan, the EUP revisiting the CTE opportunities available within the region will be essential. Due to declining enrollment and funding, as well as the fact that there is no millage supporting such programs in the region, CTE programs have been decimated. So much so that only Sault Area Schools has programs equipping students with tools to attain skilled-trade jobs. The has led other school districts to have to send students to Sault Ste. Marie, which reduces the amount of time they spend in classrooms. Some schools districts have the infrastructure necessary, but they cannot find or hire CTE instructors.

• Being that the EUP is a rural, low-density region, access to high-speed internet in many of the outlying areas is a major challenge. Also hindered by the remoteness of some of the schools is the attraction of qualified instructors, especially since they usually are required to teach multiple subjects and multiple grades.

• Something else which permeated throughout the focus group discussion—which is also likely induced by economic factors not controlled by the institutions themselves—was the notion that secondary-level students are being encouraged to pursue employment or education which takes them away from the region. Post-secondary students who come to the region to study at LSSU are not retained at a desirable rate due to the smaller job market, thus making the decision to seek employment outside of the region rather easy.

• The fact that the EUP is not home to a true community college—being that BMCC is tribal, enrollment ratio requirements affect the availability of classes—makes acquiring new funding becoming available with the state’s push bolster career-technical training through community colleges an opportunity that very well could be missed.

**Opportunities**

• An opportunity LSSU is in the early stages of taking advantage of: attracting non-traditional students to its campus. To make inroads into this market, the university is offering an in-state tuition rate to anyone in North America desiring to study in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. This bold and unprecedented strategy is going to provide opportunities for non-Michiganders which previously were not feasible for many prospective students. Furthermore, LSSU is reaching agreements with University of Wisconsin Colleges making it conducive for students who have acquired associate degrees in Wisconsin to transfer all their credits towards a bachelor’s degree in the Upper Peninsula.

• Between LSSU, BMCC and the EUP ISD, another opportunity exists in enhanced enrollment programs. Enhanced enrollment programs include concurrent enrollment, which involves college-approved teachers instructing secondary students on college-level material; dual enrollment, which involves secondary students enrolling in a community college; early/middle college which allows students to earn associates degrees, college credits or technical certificates while earning a diploma by extending the period of study in high school by an addition year; and apprenticeship programs. These programs have the opportunity to introduce students to college-level learning and develop workforce prior to high school graduation.

*Education analysis continues on the following page.*
• Expanding CTE program availability beyond Sault Area Schools can give more EUP students the chance to prepare themselves prior to graduating. This will require the identification of funding, locations, programs and partnerships; but with the growing demand for skilled-labor, not developing our workforce will only inhibit economic development in the region.

• More extensive collaboration amongst institutions in the region will be a critical step in identifying the best ways to share and maximize the capacity of limited resources in the region. Throughout the focus group meeting, stakeholders acknowledged this and it will be imperative to come together as soon as possible.

Focus Area: Economic and Workforce Development

The Economic and Workforce Development Focus Group session held for the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula saw those working in economic development and workforce development come together and share their thoughts, insights and expertise on the state of economic and workforce development in the EUP. The reason economic developers and workforce developers were brought together at the same table was due the closely related nature of their work. Furthermore, they share a common purpose: provide economic drivers with resources they need to grow and sustain. Information gathered from the focus group directly led to the goal, strategies and action items proposed under Economic and Workforce Development in the Economic Development Blueprint.

Strengths

• Between the economic development organizations, downtown development authorities, chambers of commerce, planning departments and commissions, Sault Ste. Marie Advanced Resources and Technology, Incorporated, and convention and visitor bureaus, the EUP is equipped with an ample supply of practitioners dedicated to improving the economy and quality of life.

• Also in all three counties is Michigan Works! Michigan Works! purpose is predicated on getting the unemployed employed and ensuring that local businesses are equipped with the personnel they need to grow and be successful.

• Perhaps the greatest strength of the region, in terms of economic and workforce development, is the willingness displayed by the aforementioned organizations to come together and sit around a table to collaborate under an umbrella of regionalism. The world’s economy is now globalized and embracing regional buy-in is going to better the odds of this low-density, low-population and rural region obtaining a piece of the market.

Challenges and Threats

• The labor force was discussed at length at the focus group session. Employers in the EUP are having difficulty accessing the supply of skilled-trade labor that they need to continue to grow. A lack of middle management is also proving to be problematic. Even entry-level laborers are without the customer-service skills and basic abilities which have a profound impact upon the consumers with whom they interact with.
• The region’s reliance upon seasonal jobs due the high dependence on tourism to support the economy leads to high unemployment rates in the winter months. Moreover, a lack of diversity in the types of jobs available has made it difficult for the region to retain those being educated at institutions within the region, thus depleting youth and knowledge.

• Discussion also revolved around the lack of amenities available. Dining, shopping, entertainment and social opportunities, even broadband and cellular service, are limited throughout the region. This causes other northern Michigan communities to be seen in a more favorable light. Attempting to attract young professionals and families will continue to be a challenge for the region until common amenities available elsewhere are in place and the region is distinct and exciting.

• The conversation also touched on several intangible things that must addressed. One being the palpable apathy which permeates throughout the region. The other being a stigma associated with working in skilled trades and manufacturing.

• Funding challenges persist for many organizations and efforts throughout the region. With inconsistencies in where funding comes from, amount of funding accessible, annual appropriations, and belief in economic and workforce development in general, organizations are often times limited in their scope and projects prove difficult to get off the ground.

Opportunities

• Embracing smart growth, collaboration and progressive change in the EUP is a step the region as a whole needs to embrace. Although its natural resources and tourism has sustained a certain way of life in the region for many years, today’s economy requires knowledge, information and creative sector jobs as well as manufacturing jobs to be competitive and attractive and prosperous in a global marketplace. The EUP cultivates talent in the region, but having opportunity and amenities which give them reasons to stay instead of reasons to leave is imperative.

• With that said, the perennially draw of EUP tourist attractions—and other Upper Peninsula tourist attractions by which one has to travel through the EUP to reach—remains a major economic development tool. The opportunity lies in the ability to positively impact the sensibilities of those coming to and traveling through the region—whether that is from bustling and vibrant EUP downtowns or from the ease by which one can find exciting things to do.

• Sault Ste. Marie is a college town. Although Lake Superior State University is a relatively small institution, its impact on the region is profound. Continuing to strengthen the bond between the school, the city and the region will encourage prospective students, entrepreneurs and businesses to see Sault Ste. Marie in a similar light, but obviously on a smaller scale, as an Ann Arbor, East Lansing or Kalamazoo.

Economic and Workforce Development analysis continues on the following page.
If those working in economic and workforce development can collaborate with those in education, local business leaders and local elected officials to develop a model with which youth and adults alike can be trained with hospitality-service skills or career-technical skills, major challenges and threats to the region would be addressed and remedied. The low population of the region could lend itself to creating a sustainable model on a smaller scale through which businesses and residents benefit and the region would prospers and perceptions are altered.

Focus Area: Tourism and Natural Resources

The Tourism and Natural Resources Focus Group session held for the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula saw those working in tourism and the recreational usage of the EUP’s natural resources come together and share their thoughts, insights and expertise. Tourism has long been a significant component to the region’s economy due to the natural and man-made attractions with which many people identify the EUP. Additionally, the abundance of natural amenities in the EUP provides a quality-of-life feature not available in metropolitan areas or other parts of the country. Information gathered from the focus group directly led to the goal, strategies and action items proposed under Tourism and Natural Resources in the Economic Development Blueprint.

Strengths

- Some of the state’s major tourist attractions—Mackinac Island, the Soo Locks, Tahquamenon Falls—are located within the region. Year in and year out, these bring people to the region. Not only do these destinations provide a means for people to be introduced to the region, they provide many living within the region employment opportunities.

- In addition to the major attractions, one can immerse themselves in the boundless forests—state and federally owned—as well as enjoy the beaches and beauty of Lake Michigan, Lake Huron and Lake Superior. The only region in the state where one can experience three Great Lakes in such close proximity.

- The EUP also has many miles of trails for hiking, biking, off-roading and snowmobiling. Every year people come to the EUP to just to utilize the trail system and often times, they have been coming to the EUP for years.

- The EUP is one of three locations in Michigan where one can cross an international border. This proximity to Canada also comes with a large market in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, whose population is larger than that of the entire EUP.

- The Great Waters is a brand that was developed for the EUP (also encompassing the two counties directly west of the EUP, Alger and Schoolcraft) and has had buy-in from nearly every community in the region. Not only is the organization equipped with a great brand, purpose and website, they are promoting three fun-filled and action-packed tours one can go on in the five counties.

Tourism and Natural Resources analysis continues on the following page.
**Challenges and Threats**

- There are those who visit the EUP and yet only visit the three major attractions in the region. Whether it is from a lack of knowledge pertaining to all the things there are to do in the region or tourists simply crossing the Mackinac Bridge in the morning, seeing several sites, then departing the region in the evening, a major opportunity is being missed. To capture those who see the EUP as an excursion rather than a destination must be a priority henceforth.

- Although the EUP is loaded with trails purposed for various activities, the connectivity between communities leaves something to be desired. If more linkages existed between where people stay and where people could potentially ride a bike, hike or snowmobile, there would be more incentive to traverse the region by some mode other than automobile or braving the shoulder of a thoroughfare.

- As alluded to in the economic and workforce development section, customer service and staff knowledgeability of the region are not consistent. When a tourist asks an employee about what there is to do in the region other than the obvious and the employee cannot respond, or lacks enthusiasm, the impression made upon the tourist will not be forgotten—and the other attractions are passed by.

- Another challenge which persists is that many efforts throughout the region are contributed to and attended by the same group of people. More involvement from community members would generate buy-in to regional activities and resources. This would also facilitate and create greater awareness of what the region has to offer.

**Opportunities**

- One opportunity is to increase and improve the way finding signs and materials available in the region. From signs leading to destinations to trailhead signage, a uniform system which is applied across the region could improve cohesion and further promote the region as one.

- Better communication between chambers of commerce, convention and visitor bureaus, downtown development authorities and economic development organizations can help cross-promote events and activities.

- Another opportunity exists in more vigorously promoting the lesser-known activities or destinations in the region. Finding locations to fish, nature preserves, trails, beaches, snow-shoeing and cross-country skiing all attract people. It is a matter of putting them in touch with where these activities can be found.

- Birding was discussed in the focus group session as another opportunity to promote the region. The known diversity of species coupled with the vast amounts of public space for woods wandering has the region poised to open itself up to another market.

- Lake Superior State University’s newly-opened Regional Outdoor Center now provides students and faculty with an opportunity to rent gear for outdoor adventures which previously may have been too expensive to purchase. Moreover, the Regional Outdoor Center provides guided trips, tours, and maps of the region.
Focus Area: Health Care

The Health Care Focus Group session held for the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula saw leaders from the region’s hospitals, Bay Mills Health and Community Health Action Coalition come together and share their thoughts, insights and expertise. The health care industry is a major employer in the region, as evidenced by Tables 13, 14 and 15. Furthermore, as the population of the region continues to age, the health care industry is able to provide the necessary services the elderly require, as well as opportunity for young professionals to find employment within the EUP. Information gathered from the focus group directly led to the goal, strategies and action items proposed under Health Care in the Economic Development Blueprint.

Strengths

- Each county in the EUP is serviced by an independent, non-profit hospital—in Chippewa, War Memorial Hospital; in Luce, Helen Newberry Joy Hospital and Health Center; and in Mackinac, Mackinac Straits Health System. Along with improving their facilities and offering vital services, the hospitals have maintained a dedication to the community which has been felt throughout the region. The hospitals hardly see one another as competition, which has led to unique working relationships benefiting those seeking health care in the EUP. Additionally, the region’s hospitals provide many specialty services—some of which, like the War Memorial’s Obstetrics Department, are provided at a cost to the institutions—allowing those needing attention to receive it without departing the region.

- Along with the hospital systems in the region, health care is bolstered by the health services provided by the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians, the Bay Mills Indian Community, the Chippewa County Health Department, the LMAS District (Luce, Mackinac, Alger and Schoolcraft) Health Department, the Community Health Access Coalition (CHAC), and various nursing and assisted living facilities.

- Consumer education programs are also available in the region to help reduce confusion surrounding health insurance and getting the medical attention one may need. CHAC works in each of the three counties with those without health insurance through an employer nor eligibility for state-funded programs. Staff from Michigan’s Department of Human Services are also stationed within the region to assist in the acquisition of medical attention.

Challenges and Threats

- The EUP has been fortunate that its major health institutions have remained independent. In the event that they were enveloped by for-profit health systems, the focus group participants suggested that the close bond between the institutions and the community would be weakened. The hospitals in Petoskey and Marquette were cited as examples of what could happen. Reductions in services, particularly the less-profitable ones, would require citizens of the EUP to travel further to receive health care they are currently accustomed to obtaining in the region.

Health Care analysis continues on the following page.
Health care institutions are having difficulty attracting and retaining physicians. Due to the lower population of the region, physicians, particularly those with specializations, are usually the only one in their field, thus, they must be on call more often than if they were at hospitals with multiple like physicians on the payroll. Therefore, common benefits like taking vacations proves problematic. A high turnover rate persists with physicians working in the region on J-1 visas—Mackinac Straits no longer employs physicians working on J-1 visas for this very reason. Due the fact these particular physicians are foreign-born, and the EUP is not as diverse as other areas in the state and country, cultural, religious and environmental factors which they are accustomed too are not as accessible or prevalent in the region, thus leading them to depart once they have completed their required period in an underserved area.

Changes in health insurance is presenting new issues to health care providers. The uncertainty and confusion surrounding the Affordable Care Act for employers and citizens must continue to be addressed. EUP health care leaders believe that insurers’ policies and deductible rates are dissuading those in need of health care from getting immediate treatment due to the economic burden.

A healthy relationship exists between health care institutions in the region and Lake Superior State University. Many of the nurses working in the region are graduates of the university. Health care leaders in the region suggested that if the university does not continue to invest in their nursing program, it will be tough to remain competitive.

Opportunities

The existing relationship between the health care institutions certainly paves the way for continued and future collaboration. A partnership arrangement is already in place between the three hospitals which sees the sharing of rehab facilities. The leaders from the institutions suggested that the replication of this type of agreement is possible and something worthwhile. Also discussed was the possibility of a surgical team which could work across county lines.

War Memorial Hospital is working with health care institutions in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, to explore the possibility of cross-border access to health care. Due to the longer wait times in Canada and the surplus of treatment options in Michigan, opening the door—in a manner beneficial to all parties involved—is certainly an enticing and exciting option for the region.

Leaders from the health care institutions also see Central Michigan University’s medical school’s new focus on rural medicine as promising for the region. Being that the EUP is predominately rural, the relationship which could be formed between the school and the region could pay dividends towards satisfying the demand for physicians.

Another opportunity which presented itself is further collaboration between health care providers and Lake Superior State University. From the ongoing hiring of nurses, to identifying in-demand programs which the school could pursue, to the development and improvement of facilities, the possibilities are there.

\textit{Health Care analysis continues on the following page.}
Bay Mills Health Center believes more cooperation agreements are possible. Instead of covering costs for members to travel their facilities, repurposing the funds more locally and for the uninsured could prove to be more beneficial to the region.

Focus Area: Agriculture and Local Food Systems

The Agriculture and Local Food Systems Focus Group session held for the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula saw those working in agriculture and related professions come together and share their thoughts, insights and expertise. Sustaining, supporting, growing and diversifying agriculture and improving local food systems are endeavors the Stakeholder Committee believe necessary if pursuing regional prosperity. Information gathered from the focus group directly led to the goal, strategies and action items proposed under Agriculture and Local Food Systems in the Economic Development Blueprint.

Strengths

- The EUP is an ideal location for the production of hay. In fact, it is the largest crop grown in the region. The climate and soil of the region are ideal. It is a product which is exported outside the region and the country.

- The agricultural community in the region is built up on the long-established commitment to the region by local farmers and agriculturally-related businesses. This also is evident in the many farmers’ markets throughout the region.

- Additionally, the region’s heavily forested land is primed to support and lead the burgeoning maple syrup industry in Michigan. In 2014, the Commercial Maple Syrup Producers of Michigan was formed, giving those in Michigan’s maple syrup industry a united voice supporting, promoting and encouraging sustained growth.

Challenges and Threats

- Perhaps more than any other factor, the climate presents the biggest obstacle for the agricultural industry in the region. Shorter grow seasons and cooler temperatures place a ceiling on the potential of the agricultural industry while employing conventional methods.

- The region does not possess the infrastructure one will find in other parts of the state. Whether it is storing, processing or distributing, supply chain mechanisms must be addressed in order to alter the abilities of local agriculture and food systems in the region. In the Upper Peninsula, there is only one facility licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture to process meat. Additionally, the fact that the EUP is removed from large markets in the United States presents issues with transportation costs. On the consumption end, schools and other institutions being encouraged to source their produce purchases locally do not, in many cases, possess the staff nor infrastructure to process or store on site.

Agriculture and Local Food Systems analysis continues on the following page.
• Of course labor concerns also are posing issues—as they are across the country—due to the fact that farmers and those in the agricultural industry are aging. Moreover, in many cases, farm succession plans have not been put in place, thus leaving many farms in a state of limbo as older farmers seek retirement or are simply unable to perform the day-to-day operations. The careers available in the agricultural industry are not garnering the interest from youth which would help stabilize the workforce.

• In some cases, there are some farm operations desiring to ramp up their production. However, insufficient revenue prevents them from adding additional staff so that the owner can focus on the big picture, or the owner cannot afford to hire someone to help manage the transition to a larger scale.

• Several challenges and threats are facing the maple syrup industry in our region. One is the perception that tapping maple trees damages the quality of the log for logging. Damage only occurs when veneer-quality trees are tapped, which is only a small portion of the harvested trees and they could avoid being tapped by simply having the forester mark them. Another is regulatory: In Canada, all producers are allowed and encouraged to clean their collection systems with isopropyl alcohol. This reduces costs and improves the quality of the maple syrup, along with keeping the systems in good condition. In the United States, alcohol is not allowed to be used as a sanitizer. This places maple syrup producers in the United States at a severe competitive disadvantage, and since Canada provides 80% of the maple syrup consumed in the United States, there is not enough demand yet for domestically-produced products to warrant research and alter regulations.

• Discussion also touched on tribal regulations facing food production. As they are sovereign nations, they can abide by rules and regulations differing from those issued by the United States’ government. For instance, they abide by USDA and MDARD in order to sell into non-tribal markets; however, doing otherwise proves problematic for small-scale and start-up opportunities.

Opportunities

• A great opportunity resides in continuing to educate the region’s population on the benefits of embracing and purchasing locally grown products. Not only do these programs encourage the consumption of healthy, less-processed food, they support local producers and in turn, the local economy. On the labor side of educating the population to the benefits of local agricultural production, one would learn that farms, although still requiring a strong work ethic, are much more high-tech and sophisticated than what common perception suggests, thus arises an opportunity to introduce interested youth to farming.

• In the past, a larger variety of crops were grown in the EUP. Broccoli, cauliflower, and peas were successfully grown. An opportunity exists in diversifying the types of products grown in the EUP.

• Furthermore, the EUP is an ideal location for seed potato farming and is home to large producers who have demonstrated their willingness to work with and embrace local communities.

Agriculture and Local Food Systems analysis continues on the following page.
With new innovations and breakthroughs in agriculture, the chance to embrace them and become a leader in the successful application of new practices, in comparatively adverse conditions, could provide the region with additional agricultural direction and production methods.

The maple syrup industry in the EUP holds tremendous potential. Not only has production increased dramatically in the region, the surface has been but scratched in terms of the capability. With the amount of maple syrup being imported from Canada, a legitimate opportunity exists in meeting demand with domestically produced products. If leaders in the maple syrup industry are able to reach terms with state and federal agencies controlling forest land in the EUP, it will further increase the amount of taps that could be used for bulk production.

Focus Area: Infrastructure

The Infrastructure Focus Group session held for the development of Elevating the Eastern Upper Peninsula saw representatives from road commissions, transportation agencies, the Chippewa County International Airport, Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians’ planning, the Saul Ste. Marie Bridge Authority, local snowmobile groups, and the Michigan Department of Transportation come together and share their thoughts, insights and expertise. Such a wide net as cast for this focus group due the vast encompassment of the word infrastructure; it includes the mediums through which we travel, transport, power, communicate, and facilitate growth. Information gathered from the focus group directly led to the goal, strategies and action items proposed under Infrastructure in the Economic Development Blueprint.

Strengths

A definite strength of the EUP is the variety of impressive infrastructural assets across the region. The Mackinac Bridge, the International Bridge and the Soo Locks are attractions in and of themselves, while also serving essential purposes at the same time.

The Eastern Upper Peninsula Transportation Authority (EUPTA) operates the local public transit options. With ferry service to the three largest islands in the region (Sugar, Neebish and Drummond), residents have a unique option to make their homes off of the mainland. EUPTA also operates busses between Sault Ste. Marie and De Tour; Sault Ste. Marie, Rudyard and Trout Lake; and Sault Ste. Marie and Kincheloe. In the Newberry and Curtis area, those needing public transportation options can use EUPTA’s Dial-a-Ride system.

The Chippewa County International Airport (CCIA) provides daily flights on a commercial airline to Detroit, through which one can travel to any destination of their choosing. The CCIA has recently constructed a new terminal, new hangars and repaved the main runway. Additionally the municipal airports located in each county allow for air travel and transportation.

The region’s four commercial harbors also provide the region with the ability to utilize the Great Lakes for transporting the products coming out of the region.

Infrastructure analysis continues on the following page.
Challenges and Threats

- A major challenge for infrastructure—which is not unique to the EUP—is funding availability and disinvestment. As the region’s infrastructure ages and falls into disrepair, the costs for upgrading and reconstructing infrastructure will rise as more time continues to pass. Ferries, bridges and roads can only be sustainable by conducting preventative maintenance for so long before they have to be rebuilt or bought anew.

- Long-term staff at agencies in the region, similar to that of the EUP’s entire population, has aged and is near retirement. If those on the cusp of retirement leave their positions without knowledgeable personnel waiting in the wing, the EUP will have a gap in experienced laborers.

- Also discussed by the focus group was the desire of some citizens to live away from the population centers of the region. It was remarked that their expectation to have new infrastructure put in place to facilitate living at such distances from developed centers is not sustainable nor cost-effective.

- It was also discussed that the EUP’s reliance upon energy produced outside the region places those within the region with doubts about the future of their energy procurement and its sustainability. The potential of additional costs placed on residents and businesses also pose a threat to the region.

Opportunities

- Improved infrastructure between Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, in the form of new and widened customs terminals on each end of the International Bridge, should improve the flow of traffic for both commercial and commuter purposes.

- The Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians recently concluded a transportation study aimed at identifying gaps in services and where existing transportation agencies could be supplemented and enhanced. They are applying for a grant which, if awarded, will be used to strengthen services offered in the region.

- Snowmobiling holds and has held a tremendous opportunity for the region. Further developing and maintaining the trail infrastructure will be essential to any attempt to fully capitalize on this opportunity. With long winters, heavy snowfall and miles of existing trails throughout the region, the region needs to be snowmobiling destination on the radar of all those who participate in the recreational activity. Economic activity for the region from snowmobilers comes from fuel, food, lodging, equipment, maintenance and other services.

- The non-motorized infrastructure in the region also generates economic activity in the region. Hiking and biking through the natural setting that is the EUP provides a change of pace, but signage and safe opportunities to do those activities are also paramount.

- Whether one is heading to the Upper Peninsula, the Lower Peninsula, or to Canada, traveling through the EUP is unavoidable. Subtleties like the roads traveled, ability to use one’s cell phone, and being able to stop and see sites will all impact perception of the region. To positively affect one’s sensibilities is an opportunity which will pay dividends.
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This section was developed from the information collected through Stakeholder Committee meetings, Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee meetings, and six focus group sessions. Elements of 2009’s Economic Opportunity Study for the Michigan Upper Peninsula/Wisconsin Border, 2010’s Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, and 2012’s Regional Growth Strategy, were considered and incorporated to build from past efforts. Furthermore, this blueprint addresses ways in which the region as a whole can become more efficient, collaborative and resilient.

What has been developed are sets of action items to be carried out by action partners, thus working the strategies; successfully carrying out the strategies will fulfill the goals; and fulfilling the goals will see us reach our vision of what regional prosperity means for the Eastern Upper Peninsula.
Regional Vision

*Michigan’s Eastern Upper Peninsula will be a region in the world attractive to enterprise, students, tourists, and residents alike; where one can be immersed in a natural setting yet access 21st century amenities; and where opportunity prevails through the application of modern techniques, collaboration, and mindful allocation of resources.*

Regional Goals

**Education Goal:** Region-wide access to educational opportunities which support learning, career-preparedness, and self-efficacy.

**Economic and Workforce Development Goal:** A business environment where one can create, grow, or relocate a business knowing they will be able to access necessary labor, infrastructure and amenities in order to thrive sustainably and profitably.

**Health Care Goal:** A health care system focused on the community with active collaboration amongst providers, agencies and coalitions.

**Tourism and Natural Resources Goal:** Increased engagement of local residents around tourism and recreational use of our natural resources to promote quality of life and desirability of our region for family and business.

**Agriculture and Local Food Systems Goal:** An agriculture and food sector able to increase production, add value to products, and reach new markets through collaborative efforts and development of aggregation, processing, storage and distribution infrastructure.

**Infrastructure Goal:** Maintain functionality of existing infrastructure and implement sustainable improvements where funding permits.
Please note that although many of strategies will require utilizing resources and expertise from various federal and state agencies, they have not been listed among the action partners because the initial movements and work must be championed by those working specifically in the region.

Acronyms can be referenced on page 91.

Education Blueprint

**Goal:** Region-wide access to educational opportunities which support learning, career-preparedness, and self-efficacy.

**Strategy:** Strengthen and, where feasible, expand career-technical education opportunities.

**Action items:**

- Map career-technical education assets and where demand exists; determine costs, implementation methods, and locations for expanded services.
- Work with the Upper Peninsula partners during the development of career technical education marketing tools, messages and implementation procedures for the Upper Peninsula.
- Pursue additional classes integrating academics with career technical education.
- Incorporate additional business and community leaders into discussions and development of career technical education programs to build support, anticipate future demand, and capture new ideas.

**Action partners:** EUP ISD, EUPRPDC, MI Works!, LSSU, BMCC, SSMTCI, BMIC, EUP EDOs, private enterprises, community leaders; UP CDC, CUPPAD, WUPPDR.

**Strategy:** Promote the utilization of opportunities provided by enhanced-enrollment programs.

**Action items:**

- Assess how enrollment programs are promoted to students, faculty and parents.
- In-depth discussions amongst education stakeholders to address funding mechanisms, programmatic intricacies, and consistency of region-wide offerings.
- Use successful cases of early/middle college programs to determine practicality for replication the Eastern Upper Peninsula.

**Action partners:** EUP ISD, EUP school districts, LSSU, BMCC, EUPRPDC.

The Education Blueprint continues on following page.
Strategy: Expand LSSU’s scope both in terms of target market and educational opportunities offered.

Action items (first two from LSSU’s 2012-2015 Strategic Plan):

- Improve internal and external communications, increase visibility, student enrollment and retention.
- Provide comprehensive higher education and workforce training programs and services of superior quality that are affordable and accessible and meet individual, business, and community needs.
- Continue development of unique programs which distinguish the university.

Action partners: LSSU; EUPRPDC, MI Works!

Economic and Workforce Development Blueprint

Goal: A business environment where one can create, grow, or relocate a business knowing they will be able to access necessary labor, infrastructure and amenities in order to thrive sustainably and profitably.

Strategy: Build reputation as a desirable location to conduct business through steadfast attention to the growth and sustainability of businesses located within the region.

Action items:

- Promote successes of local businesses across relevant mediums.
- Region-wide appreciation and award ceremony to celebrate and bring together business leaders and recognize exceptional employees.
- Encourage local businesses and entrepreneurs to utilize the SmartZone when developing new products.
- Promote grant and loan opportunities and available resources for business development and improvements.
- Work with local governments to ensure policy does not withhold opportunity.
- Continue to assess and develop exporting initiatives.

Action partners: EUP EDOs, EUPRPDC, MSUE, SSMART Inc., private enterprise.

The Economic and Workforce Development Blueprint continues on the following page.
**Strategy**: Use regional branding to change mindsets from remote location to desired destination.

**Action items**:  
- Meet with leaders of the Great Waters initiative to discuss the use of the brand they developed across all modes of bringing people to the region—tourism, recreation, business attraction, workforce retention, and education.  
- Incorporate regional brand into advertising efforts.  

**Action partners**: EUP CVBs, EUP COCs, EUP DDAs, EUP EDOs, EUPRPDC, MI Works!, Great Waters.

**Strategy**: Use strategic placemaking in a manner that is unique, exciting, sustainable, and conducive to commercial activity.

**Action items**:  
- Establish networks with owners of vacant and undeveloped property within downtowns to assess plans for investment, redevelopment and attraction of businesses.  
- Define trade areas and utilize target market analyses for business districts to concentrate marketing and advertising efforts.  
- Employ best practices from comparable locations which are prospering in a manner adjusted to the needs and uniqueness of the region.  
- Study local policies addressing the attraction of new enterprises as well as the growth and sustainability those already established.  
- Continued construction of regional geographic information system databases.  
- Increase supply of housing in downtowns.  

**Action partners**: EUP DDAs, EUP EDOs, EUPRPDC, EUP housing authorities, EUP COCs, MSUE, municipal governments, municipal planners and planning commissions.

**Strategy**: Improve customer service.

**Action items**:  
- Through curriculum, training, and personalized services, equip service-industry employers with resources to further develop their employees.  
- Create a hospitality institute that would coordinate a soft-skills training programs.  
- Replicate the “Sault Certified” initiative on a regional scale to establish a consistent knowledge of regional activities and facts amongst workforce.  
- Develop a forum or feedback system to gauge improvement and showcase positive encounters; create competition to provide best service.  

**Action partners**: EUP EDOs, EUP CVBS, EUP COCs, MI Works!, MSUE EUPRPDC, private enterprises.
**Strategy**: Increase visibility and proactivity of workforce development agencies.

**Action items**:

- Develop a demand driven system for accessing and utilizing workforce programs.
- Establish a coordinated Business Services Team to assist in meeting the needs of employers across the region.
- Identify and pursue resources to adequately market the existing workforce development agency, programs and services available to job seekers and employers in the Region.

**Action partners**: MI Works, CCSS, Northern Transitions, EUP EDOs, private enterprises.

---

**Health Care Blueprint**

**Goal**: A health care system focused on the community with active collaboration amongst providers, agencies and coalitions.

**Strategy**: Continue, build upon and increase collaborative efforts.

**Action items**:

- Use the healthy relationship already established between health care institutions, county health care entities and tribal health entities to come together with greater frequency in order to facilitate discussions addressing issues and identifying opportunities for collaboration.
- Replicate agreement that exists amongst the three hospitals in the region for rehab service where feasible with other services.
- Work with long-term skilled-nursing and short-term rehabilitation centers in the region to understand their needs, requirements and plans to ensure citizens will have necessary care options available.
- Examine the feasibility of a surgical team which could be shared between the three hospitals within the region.
- Examine the feasibility of sharing coding specialists between the three hospitals and tribal health entities.

**Action partners**: WMH, HNJH, MSHS, LMASDHD, CHAC, CCHD, STH, BMH, private health care providers.

---

*The Health Care Blueprint continues on the following page.*
**Strategy:** Retain physicians within the region.

**Action items:**

- Work with physicians coming into the region to understand their needs and desires for where they would ideally practice.
- Continue to develop relationships with medical schools.
- Study cases where rural regions have been successful in accommodating specialty physicians and reducing time on call, addressing vacation concerns and the like.
- Work closely with economic, downtown and planning organizations to express requirements for retaining physicians.

**Action partners:** WMH, HNJH, MSH; EUPRPDC, EUP EDOs, EUP DDAs.

**Strategy:** Continue to develop capacities necessary to train and develop health-care workforce within the region.

**Action items:**

- Continue exploring a partnership with LSSU in regards to developing a nursing simulator facility.
- Identify opportunities to get students into health-care facilities earlier to improve preparedness upon entry into the workforce as well as to retain students up graduation.

**Action partners:** WMH, HNJH, MSHS, BMH, STH, LSSU, BMCC.

**Strategy:** Open cross-border access to health care.

**Action items:**

- Work out legal intricacies of cross-border health care provision.
- Continue study of cases where this occurs elsewhere in the United States.
- Work with physicians and insurers to provide clarity.
- Advertise to desired target markets.

**Action partners:** WMH; Canadian health-care partners.
Tourism and Natural Resources Blueprint

**Goal:** Increased engagement of local residents around tourism and recreational use of our natural resources to promote quality of life and desirability of our region for family and business.

**Strategy:** Promote existing and further develop the range of outdoor activities available within the region.

**Action items:**

- Develop materials for specific outdoor activities. For example: “Fish the EUP”; “Hike the EUP”; “Swim the EUP”.
- At major tourist attractions, promote other destination within the region.
- Use the fact that one can see three Great Lakes in one region to strengthen promotional materials.
- Support water trail planning to increase awareness of access points along Great Lakes’ coastline.
- Engage local birding experts to gauge viability of birding throughout the region.
- Invite members of the International Mountain Biking Association to assess mountain biking opportunity in the region and steps to move forward.
- Increase awareness of the Regional Outdoor Center located at LSSU.
- Study interest of youths in outdoor activity available throughout the region.
- Identify new trail segments which could link communities, improve walkability and biking opportunities as well as stakeholders.

**Action partners:** EUP CVBs, EUP COCs, EUPRPDC, EUP EDOs, MSUE.

**Strategy:** Update recreation plans to be able to access funding opportunities.

**Action items:**

- Create a regional recreation plan for the region.
- Educate municipalities on what the regional recreation plan means for their communities.
- Collaborate on grant applications.

**Action partners:** EUPRPDC, municipal governments, planning commissions and departments.

**Strategy:** Use regional branding to convey the unique and range of recreational activities available in the region.

**Action items:**

- Support regional branding efforts currently underway.
- Apply brand beyond tourism advertisements.

**Action partners:** Great Waters, EUP CVBs, EUP COCs, EUPRPDC, EUP EDOs.
Agriculture and Local Food Systems Blueprint

**Goal:** An agriculture and food sector able to increase production, add value to products, and reach new markets through collaborative efforts and development of aggregation, processing, storage and distribution infrastructure.

**Strategy:** Educate consumers about eating locally produced food.

**Action items:**

- Discuss with institutions why they should source 20 percent of their food products from Michigan growers, producers and processors and how to access the supply chain.
- Work with schools to identify how they can and why they should incorporate food and agriculture into the pre-K through 12th grade curriculum.
- Increase awareness of when and where locally-grown products can be purchased.

**Action partners:** UPFE, MSUE, EUP farmers, CLMCD, EUP farmers’ markets, EUPRPDC, EUP EDOs, SSMTCI, and Bay Mills Waishkey Bay Farm.

**Strategy:** Obtain necessary infrastructure to aggregate, process, store and distribute products within the region.

**Action items:**

- Justify investments by demonstrating increased local demand.
- Work with farmers in the region aggregating, processing and storing on a small scale to determine if their operation can be transitioned to larger scale.
- Increase regional food production.
- Identify and apply for grant funding.
- Study where and how products are being shipped to be aggregated, stored, processed and distributed.

**Action partners:** UPFE, MSUE, CLMCD.

**Strategy:** Maintain support systems for farmers.

**Action items:**

- Support and distribute information on agribusiness opportunities for local businesses/farms to sell product outside of the region and state.
- Address legislative and regulatory obstacles that create barriers for local production and consumption.

**Action partners:** UPFE, MSUE, CLMCD, Farm Bureau.

*The Agriculture and Local Food Systems Blueprint continues on the following page.*
**Strategy:** Create a protocol for developing new farmers.

**Action items:**
- Identify models for mentorship for new farmers or existing farm transition to a non-family member.
- Develop methods for attracting new and young farmers.
- Engage youth in food and agriculture with entrepreneurial opportunities.

**Action partners:** UPFE, MSUE, CLMCD, Farm Bureau.

---

**Infrastructure Blueprint**

**Goal:** Maintain functionality of existing infrastructure and implement sustainable improvements where funding permits.

**Strategy:** Sustain and expand public transportation options.

**Action items:**
- Map usage, gaps and surplus of public transportation throughout the region to ensure efficiency.
- Develop a long-term maintenance schedule for vehicles.
- Work with governmental entities to increase funding.
- Continue collaborations amongst service providers and the SSMTCI.
- Study cases of other small-scale public transportation systems who have experienced success in a rural, low-density service area.

**Action partners:** EUPTA, SSMTCI, municipal and county governments, EUPRPDC.

**Strategy:** Maintain roads, bridges and key infrastructure.

**Action partners:** County road commissions, municipalities; MDOT.

**Strategy:** Improve broadband access throughout the region.

**Action items:**
- Collaborate on vertical asset mapping inventory with other Upper Peninsula regional planning entities to identify areas needing investment.
- Carry out actions proposed in County Technology Action Plans.

**Action partners:** EUPRPDC; CUPPAD, WUPPDR, Connect MI.
Prosperity Metrics

The metrics listed below will be used to measure the region’s goals; they can be found on the RPI Dashboard unless stated otherwise. The RPI Dashboard can be found at: (Currently being developed)

**Education:** high school graduation rates; number of students enrolled in EUP primary and secondary institutions; number of students enrolled in EUP post-secondary institutions—total, non-Michigan, non-traditional; number of citizens enrolled in adult education; percentage of citizens 25+ with a bachelor’s degree or higher; number of students enrolled in CTE programs; CTE funding; number of students enrolled in enhanced enrollment courses.

**Economic and Workforce Development:** number of new businesses; per capita income; median household income; taxable land value; foreign direct investment; household value; new businesses at the SmartZone; monthly unemployment; number of people coming into MI Works!; federal and state grant dollars for business development; downtown investments; Business Services Team visits; median age; percentage of labor force with health care benefits; decreases in crime rates; number of vehicles crossing the bridges—commercial and non-commercial.

**Health Care:** NAICS healthcare data; bed occupancy rates; investments in new facilities, technology and equipment; retention of physicians on J-1 visas.

**Tourism and Natural Resources:** number of people visiting major attractions—Mackinac Island, Soo Locks and Tahquamenon Falls; occupancy rates; tourism-related website traffic.

**Agriculture and Local Food Systems:** U.P. Food Exchange online sales; farmers’ markets sales.

**Infrastructure:** PASER data; investments in road infrastructure; investments in broadband; energy costs/kwh; cellular investments; investments in marine infrastructure; airport investments; number of EUPTA riders; number of EUPTA vehicles; miles of trails—motorized and non-motorized.
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In this section, one will find additional material relevant both to this plan and to the process used in its development.
1st Appendix: Letters of Adoption
**2nd Appendix: Strategic Regional Projects**

**Introduction**

**Eastern Upper Peninsula Priority Project Selection Criteria**

The questions listed below serve as the criteria to assist in the identification of priority projects and to determine the relative importance of each one. Only projects with a completed “Project Questionnaire Form” are considered for placement in the Priority Listing. These criteria are purposefully broad to provide flexibility within the prioritization process, and to allow local input and permit subjective contributions. Based on project prioritization (see Table below) implementation plans have been established. Projects are given priority by the Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee based upon the following:

1. How many permanent and part-time jobs are directly created and/or retained within the Region as a result of this project?
2. Are matching funds secured for the project?
3. Has the preliminary engineering been completed?
4. Is the project located in a community suffering from high levels of unemployment or other economic distress?
5. Is the project identified and/or prioritized by another Region-wide program being carried out by the EUPRPDC?
6. What is the estimated number of indirect jobs created or the possibility of related developments as a result of this project being implemented?
7. Is there a clearly demonstrated need for the project?
8. Will the project enhance the attractiveness of the Region for new growth or improve the "quality-of-life" in the EUP?
9. Is the project a wise and prudent environmental use of the Region's natural resources?
10. Is there a strong local commitment to the project?
11. What is the priority for this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>TOT:</th>
<th>FED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE:</td>
<td>LOCAL:</td>
<td>PRIVATE:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following pages list the top priority community and economic development projects, for the Eastern Upper Peninsula Region. Based on the above criteria, the “Priority Projects” were selected and listed on the following page. Details on the various priority projects can be found on the proceeding pages.

**EDA Funding Programs**

**Public Works Program:**
Supports the construction, expansion or upgrade of essential public infrastructure and facilities. ([CFDA No. 11.300- PDF](#))

**Economic Adjustment Assistance:**
Provides a wide range of technical, planning, and public works and infrastructure assistance in regions experiencing adverse economic changes that may occur suddenly or over time (e.g., strategy development, infrastructure construction, revolving loan fund capitalization). ([CFDA No. 11.307- PDF](#))
Planning Grants:
Assists local and regional organizations (District Organizations, Indian Tribes, and other eligible entities) with their short- and long-term planning efforts. To read more about EDA's Planning Program and EDD Designation Requirements and District Modifications, Click Here (CFDA No. 11.302–PDF)

Technical Assistance Program:
Focused assistance provided to public and nonprofit leaders to help in economic development decision making (e.g., project planning, impact analyses, feasibility studies); also includes the University Center (PDF) Economic Development Program, which makes the resources of universities available to the economic development community. (CFDA No. 11.303–PDF)

Research and Evaluation:
Supports research of cutting-edge economic development practices, as well as information dissemination efforts to national audiences. (CFDA No. 11.312–PDF)

Trade Adjustment Assistance for Firms:
Supports a national network of eleven Trade Adjustment Assistance Centers that assists U.S. small and medium-sized businesses impacted by increased imports with the development and implementation of business recovery and global competitiveness strategies to retain and create jobs. (Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.) Complete and updated information on the program can be found at www.eda.gov/TAAF.

Community Trade Adjustment Assistance:
Provides planning and/or implementation project grants to communities that have experienced or are threatened by job loss resulting from international trade impacts. Complete and updated information on the program can be found at www.eda.gov/InvestmentsGrants/CommunityTAA.xml.

Global Climate Change Mitigation Incentive Fund:
From amounts otherwise made available for the economic development assistance programs authorized by PWEDA, promotes EDA policies and strategies which contribute to environmentally sustainable development. Click here for more information (PDF).

EDA Investment Guidelines

1. Collaborative Regional Innovation:
Initiatives that support the development and growth of innovation clusters based on existing regional competitive strengths. Initiatives must engage stakeholders; facilitate collaboration among urban, suburban and rural (including tribal) areas; provide stability for economic development through long-term intergovernmental and public/private collaboration; and, support the growth of existing and emerging industries.

2. Public/Private Partnerships:
Investments that use both public and private sector resources and leverage complementary investments by other government/public entities and/or non-profits.

3. National Strategic Priorities:
Initiatives that encourage job growth and business expansion in clean energy; green technologies; sustainable manufacturing; information technology (e.g., broadband, smart grid) infrastructure; communities severely impacted by automotive industry restructuring; natural disaster mitigation and resiliency; access to capital for small and medium sized and ethnically diverse enterprises; and, innovations in science, health care and alternative fuel technologies.

4. Global Competitiveness:
Investments that support high-growth businesses and innovation-based entrepreneurs to expand and compete in global markets.
5. **Environmentally-Sustainable Development:**
Investments that encompass best practices in “environmentally sustainable development,” broadly defined, to include projects that enhance environmental quality and develop and implement green products, processes, and buildings as part of the green economy.

6. **Economically Distressed and Underserved Communities:**
Investments that strengthen diverse communities that have suffered disproportionate economic and job losses and/or are rebuilding to become more competitive in the global economy.

**Eligibility**

The Chicago Regional EDA Office determines project eligibility for those proposals submitted for funding consideration in the Eastern U.P. EDD. However, it is generally based upon the average 24 month unemployment rate and per capita personal income (PCPI) or federally declared disasters. The grant rate is the maximum percent of funding for a project that is provided by the federal grant.

During 2010, the EDA initiated a new process for submitting and evaluating proposals for funding. Projects are due to EDA at quarterly intervals during the program year, applicants who submit a complete application package prior to the quarterly deadline will be notified of EDA’s selection decision within 20 business days of that deadline. All projects will be assessed against EDA’s strategic priorities and evaluated by an investment review committee where EDA professionals will analyze and recommend proposals to the EDA Regional Director for that quarter’s available funding.

**Other Funding Programs**

The EDA—while a major funding component of many economic development projects throughout the Region—has limited and very competitive number of funds available. Furthermore, many entities within the Region cannot construct a competitive EDA application package, due to this, many other sources of funding are utilized in creating a competitive funding package for economic development projects in the EUP.

*Continues on the next page.*
Eastern Upper Peninsula Region Project Inventory

*Any acronyms can be referenced in the 6th Appendix (page 94).*

Project Scoring Criteria

Project submitted for priority consideration through the Commission’s annual “Call for Projects” must complete an associated project information form that addresses the criteria below which was established during the development of the 2010 Revised CEDS Five Year Plan. The Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee performed the ranking based on Regional Impacts of the priority projects submitted for consideration.

![2011 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy Project Ranking and Distress Factor Standards Worksheet](image)

### Key Projects – 2013-2014

Several key projects were initiated or completed during the past year in the Eastern Upper Peninsula, these projects are summarized below.

**Pullar Stadium Renovation Project**

Pullar Stadium renovations, totaling $890,000 for EDA improvements, and other much needed improvements at this historic arena in Sault Ste. Marie, MI. An additional $260,000 from the Matheson Trust has been allocated towards the renovation of washrooms, locker rooms and other minor modifications including those involving the boards and glass.
War Memorial Hospital Improvements

War Memorial Hospital, in downtown Sault Ste. Marie has initiated a several phase plan to improve various aspects of the hospital, including the recently completed skywalk that connects the downtown parking garage to the hospital, as well as the rear entrance to the hospital, the current phase of these $21 million improvements is the complete renovation of the emergency room area.

Tahquamenon Scenic Byway Site Improvements

EUPRPDC recently completed work under a 2007 Federal Highway grant along the Tahquamenon Scenic Byway to upgrade two popular sites along the Byway, at the Eckerman Trout Pond in Chippewa Township and the Hamilton Lake Natural Area in Luce County. The $94,000 project also saw the development of a new website, marketing and promotional materials, including videos, and a watershed and recreation attractions map.

Continues on the next page.
3 Mile Water Extension

The City of Sault Ste. Marie and the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians reached an agreement on a water line extension to the Odenaang Subdivision in Soo Township, providing service to 94 single-family customers and 89 multi-family units that will utilize water service. This $600,000 project was funding through the ICDBG program and USDA Rural Development.

AMI Hose Expansion

AMI Hose invested approximately $2.2 million in Sault Ste. Marie to bring 40 new permanent jobs to the area. AMI Hose currently shares space with AMI in the former Soo Plastics building in the Sault Ste. Marie Industrial Park. This high tech venture manufactures Teflon-coated braided hose used in the automotive industry.

Continues on the next page.
### Upcoming Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Submitting Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
<th>Job Retention</th>
<th>Project Readiness</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>In Plan</th>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Broadband Upgrades</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Development of a more robust and interconnected network of broadband across the Eastern Upper Peninsula. Peninsula Fiber and Merit Network projects are underway, but last mile connectivity remains a priority.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Partially secured</td>
<td>Yes (CEDS)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South End Bridge Widening Project</td>
<td>International Bridge Authority</td>
<td>The south end bridge widening would add two more US bound lanes, a designated truck lane and a designated NEXUS lane, for the southernmost 880 feet of the bridge which would increase the multilane lead-up to the CBP booths to about 1200 ft. This would facilitate expedited truck access to truck inspection lanes by getting them out of the noncommercial traffic queue. Plus the goal of the NEXUS program to expedite processing of prescreened travelers would be accomplished by providing a designated NEXUS lane. With the current single lane there is really no benefit for local crossers to spend $50+ to get a NEXUS card because you are delayed in the traffic queue with all the other non-program traffic. Eighty percent of bridge users are Canadian and the majority of them are frequent crossers for shopping, travel and entertainment purposes. So there is significant added economic benefit to MI for the bridge widening that would provide a fully functional NEXUS program to expedite the crossing.</td>
<td>$8.0 million</td>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Not Secured</td>
<td>Yes (CEDS)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Planned/Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiss Coal Dock Development</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie EDC</td>
<td>Redevelopment of the former Reiss Coal Dock into a commercial port.</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Over two years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes (CEDS)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continues on the next page.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North State Street Sewer Project</th>
<th>Submitting Agency: City of St. Ignace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Replacement and enhancement of 3,300 foot of sanitary sewer line along North State Street from the City lift station at 1025 North State Street to the new Straits Hospital development at 1160 North State Street. The current line is along the Lake Huron shore and feeds six existing motels, three restaurants, the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indian’s youth detention facility, a mini-golf course, several small retail shops, and a five residential homes on this line. This line will also serve the new 82,000 square foot Straits Hospital facility scheduled to open this spring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Cost:</strong> $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Creation:</strong> 26-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Retention:</strong> 75+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Readiness:</strong> Immediately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Funds:</strong> Not secured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Plan:</strong> Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Planned/Needs Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Huron Scenic Pathway</th>
<th>Submitting Agency: City of St. Ignace DDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Proposed non-motorized pathway from St. Ignace to Drummond Island. Recent studies have shown that individuals are now choosing “place” over “job” when looking at employment opportunities, one the amenities that makes a community marketable is its connectivity, in terms of multi-modal transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Cost:</strong> $57.0 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Creation:</strong> 11-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Retention:</strong> 75+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Readiness:</strong> Over 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Funds:</strong> Partially secured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Plan:</strong> Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact:</strong> Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Needs Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Construction of a new Ashmun Streetscape including both underground and above ground improvements between Easterday Ave. and Sheridan Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Readiness:</strong> Immediately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Funds:</strong> Secured (Local)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Plan:</strong> Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact:</strong> Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Needs Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannelton Superfund Site Infrastructure</th>
<th>Submitting Agency: Sault Ste. Marie EDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Placement of road, water, sewer and utilities to the Cannelton Superfund site (former Tannery). This would allow for this area to be redeveloped for public or private uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Readiness:</strong> Immediately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Funds:</strong> Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Plan:</strong> Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact:</strong> Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Needs Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DeTour Village Business/Industrial Park</th>
<th>Submitting Agency: DeTour Area EDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Development of a business/industrial park on a 33 acre parcel of property owned by DeTour Village. The DeTour Area EDC proposes this development, including road, water, sewer, and utility construction, for nine (9) lots. The EDC is currently in the process of selling their first lot to a local business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Cost:</strong> $1.6 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Creation:</strong> 26-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Retention:</strong> 1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Readiness:</strong> Immediately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matching Funds:</strong> Secured (Local)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Plan:</strong> Yes (2014 CEDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact:</strong> Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Needs Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continues on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Submitting Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
<th>Job Retention</th>
<th>Project Readiness</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Industrial Park Infrastructure</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie EDC</td>
<td>Placement of needed road, water, sewer and utilities to develop the southwest side of the Airport Industrial Park in Sault Ste. Marie.</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newberry Water System Upgrade</td>
<td>Village of Newberry</td>
<td>Continued improvements and upgrades to the Village's Water distribution system.</td>
<td>$10.0 million</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Secured (USDA Loan)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKL Bahweting School Expansion</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians</td>
<td>Expansion and improvements to the existing JKL Bahweting Tribal Charter School to a location on existing tribal trust lands.</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>50-75</td>
<td>3+ years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Borgstrom Road Improvements</td>
<td>Hudson Township</td>
<td>Completion of the South Borgstrom Road project would produce connectivity between H-40 and US-2, and also produce an alternate route to M-28. This road is used extensively by loggers and the surface is in deplorable condition. The substrate is also incapable of handling the tonnage allowed by the State of Michigan.</td>
<td>$730,000</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Planned/Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Tourism Concept Model</td>
<td>Regional CVB's</td>
<td>Development of a plan to market to foreign tourists of the EUP as a one-stop destination to various tourist attractions and amenities.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>3+ years</td>
<td>Not secured</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Research Lab and Educational Center Renovation</td>
<td>LSSU</td>
<td>Funding for the Center for Freshwater Research and Education, proposed expansion of the ARL to enhance research capabilities, create a visitor friendly interpretive center and park.</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>partially secured (State)</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Downtown Kitchen Incubator

**Description:** A shared-use commercial kitchen is a fully licensed facility where food producers can legally produce their food products. The kitchen will offer start-up businesses the opportunity to explore food production without the high cost of equipment or manufacturing space. The kitchen is rented out by the hour as needed at affordable rates and provides community food businesses the opportunity to expand into new lines or potential food entrepreneurs to start entirely new businesses. Additionally, it will be a place small business owners can learn more about technical aspects of proper food production and receive help with basic business skills as well. Users of the kitchen will include those interested in making and packaging specialty/gourmet foods, caterers, cart/street vendors, and farmers doing light processing to sell to schools, restaurants or institutions. Since many of the users will not need the facility on a daily basis, we anticipate that people from up to two hours away would be interested in the services provided at the facility.

**Project Cost:** $200,000 - $800,000  
**Job Creation:** 0-10  
**Job Retention:** 0-10  
**Project Readiness:**  
**Matching Funds:** Partially Secured.  
**In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Regional Impact:** Significant  
**Type:** Needs Funding

### EUP Food Hub

**Description:** The primary goal of the Eastern Upper Peninsula (EUP) Food Hub, which encompasses Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac counties, is to develop and implement strategies that will help support the viability and sustainability of EUP Agriculture and food production. Our regional growers and producers face a number of challenges and opportunities and we believe a solid, producer/agency driven collaborative can have a very positive, short- and long-term impact. The goal is to see growers/food producers earn more from food production and to make locally produced food more available to restaurants, schools and other institutions in the EUP.

This project aims to establish both online and physical aggregation sites for farm products, improve local food storage capacity, and educate consumers, farmers, and institutional purchasers about the resources and benefits available to them via this network. The project has used some current grant funding to improve storage space at Harmony Health Foods but this will need to be expanded as we move forward at the current or possibly a new location.

**Project Cost:** $200,000 - $500,000  
**Job Creation:** 11-25  
**Job Retention:** NA  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Unknown  
**In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Regional Impact:** Significant  
**Type:** Needs Funding

*Continues on the next page.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Submitting Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
<th>Job Retention</th>
<th>Project Readiness</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>In Plan</th>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Lucas Infrastructure</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie EDC</td>
<td>Development of road, water, sewer and utilities to complete the infrastructure for the Camp Lucas site for future development in the City of Sault Ste. Marie.</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout Construction</td>
<td>City of Sault Ste. Marie</td>
<td>Construction of a roundabout at the I-75 Business Spur, Mackinac Trail and 3 Mile Road intersection, to alleviate traffic congestion and related issues and improve traffic movements and non-motorized access in this area.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>Over two years</td>
<td>Secured</td>
<td>Yes (SSM CIP)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Simulation Lab</td>
<td>City of Sault Ste, Marie DDA/LSSU</td>
<td>Development of a permanent home for the LSSU Nursing simulation lab, currently housed at the SmartZone Technology Breeder building, this facility would also allow or training of community emergency technicians, and other health care related training.</td>
<td>$2.0 million</td>
<td>11-25</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>Partially secured</td>
<td>Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Mills Comm. College Administrative Building</td>
<td>Bay Mills Community College</td>
<td>New construction of an Administrative building on the campus of the Bay Mills Community College. This facility will replace an outdated building on the campus of the Community College, which resides on the shores of Lake Superior west of Sault Ste. Marie.</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>secured (ICDBG)</td>
<td>Yes (2015 CEDS)</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Needs Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continues on the next page.
### Pte. LeBarbe Road Water Line Extension

**Submitting Agency:** Moran Township  
**Project Cost:** $2.275 million  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 1-10  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Not secured  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Type:** Needs Funding

### Cedarville Harbor Expansion Project

**Submitting Agency:** Clark Township  
**Project Cost:** $2,040,000  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 1-10  
**Project Readiness:** Immediately  
**Matching Funds:** Partially  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Type:** Planned/Needs Funding

### SSMART Fab Lab Equipment and Training

**Submitting Agency:** SSMart Inc. (SmartZone)  
**Project Cost:** $100,000  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 0  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Partially secured  
**Regional Impact:** Needs Funding

### Soo Theatre Restoration Project

**Submitting Agency:** Sault DDA/Soo Theatre Group  
**Project Cost:** $7,000,000  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 1-10  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Secured  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Type:** Needs Funding

### Downtown Revitalization Project

**Submitting Agency:** Clark Twp.  
**Project Cost:** Unknown  
**Job Creation:** 11-25  
**Job Retention:** 0  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Not secured  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Type:** Needs Funding

*Continues on the next page.*
**Tahquamenon Outdoor Recreation Facility**  
**Submitting Agency:** Tahquamenon Area Rec Authority  
**Description:** Construction of the Tahquamenon Outdoor Recreation Facility, featuring a synthetic ice surface, a sheltered walking track around the perimeter of the rink, skate-park, sports field, nature trails and other recreational amenities.  
**Project Cost:** $1.95 million  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Matching Funds:** Secured (DNR, DEQ, Local fundraising)  
**In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 0  

**Training Trailer/Career Tech/Manufacturing Project**  
**Submitting Agency:** SSmart Inc. (SmartZone)  
**Description:** Purchase of a 5th wheel style trailer, outfitted with server, 3D printer, Generac, 6 axis robot, CNC mill and computer stations for CAD programs. Regional schools could schedule use of the trailer in their local areas. EDC, SmartZone and City intend to apply for USDA Rural Development funding through the RBEG program.  
**Project Cost:** $250,000  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Regional Impact:** Significant  
**Matching Funds:** Partially secured  
**In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 0  

**Former Straits Hospital Building Study**  
**Submitting Agency:** Mackinac County  
**Description:** Funding is needed to complete a professional study prior to the end of 2013 in order to determine other potential uses for the old Straits Hospital building in St. Ignace. This project is a very high priority for Mackinac County in order for the potential re-use to be determined before the County formally takes ownership of the structure at the end of May, 2014.  
**Project Cost:** $25,000  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Not secured  
**In Plan:** No  
**Regional Impact:** Little  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 0  

**Garfield Commons**  
**Submitting Agency:** City of Sault Ste. Marie/Private  
**Description:** Purchase of the old Garfield School built in 1897, located on Spruce Street, east of the downtown district, near the power canal. Plans call for the redevelopment of the historic structure with the location of a kitchen incubator, bakery, tearoom and retail space on the first floor; dance studio and other shared space (offices, classrooms, art gallery) on the second floor, and renovation of the grounds, including a pavilion or gazebo and renovating the gymnasium area.  
**Project Cost:** $1,700,000  
**Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Regional Impact:**  
**Matching Funds:** Partially Secured  
**In Plan:** No  
**Job Creation:** 20  
**Job Retention:** 0  

*Continues on the next page.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ashmun Bay Park Improvements Phase III (Linear Trail)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Submitting Agency:</strong> Sault Ste. Marie EDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description:** Phase III of the Ashmun Bay park improvements plan, which includes the development of a linear trail to connect into the Soo/Strongs rail trail. | **Project Cost:** $575,000  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** NA |
| **Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Secured (MDNR) | **In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Type:** Needs Funding |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Father Marquette Memorial Park</strong></th>
<th><strong>Submitting Agency:</strong> Moran Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description:** Restoration of the Father Marquette National Memorial. This includes a rebuild of the museum on this site that burned down in 2000 and a reconnection of the existing park area to the Straits State Park with a pedestrian bridge. | **Project Cost:** $275,000  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 1-10 |
| **Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Not secured | **In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Regional Impact:** Moderate  
**Type:** Needs Funding |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Whitefish Township Park Development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Submitting Agency:</strong> Whitefish Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description:** Redevelopment of a brownfield site in Paradise, adjacent to the Community Center into a waterfront park area. | **Project Cost:** Unknown  
**Job Creation:** 1-10  
**Job Retention:** 1-10 |
| **Project Readiness:** Over 2 years  
**Matching Funds:** Unknown | **In Plan:** Yes (Twp. Master Plan)  
**Regional Impact:** Minimal  
**Type:** Needs Funding |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Motor Pool Building Construction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Submitting Agency:</strong> Sault Ste. Marie EDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Description:** Construction of a new building on 3 Mile Road on existing tribal property to house the motor pool operations for the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians. | **Project Cost:** $750,000  
**Job Creation:** 6  
**Job Retention:** |
| **Project Readiness:** 1-2 years  
**Matching Funds:** No | **In Plan:** Yes (2015 CEDS)  
**Regional Impact:**  
**Type:** Needs Funding |
3rd Appendix: Meeting Schedule and Agendas

July 31st, 2014
- Stakeholder Meeting: background—Regional Prosperity Initiative, EUP funded proposal, planning process, project timeline; committee structure overview—Stakeholder Committee, Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee (REDAC); facilitated discussion—review of strategies from previous plans, identifying focus areas, identifying regional assets and needs.

September 12th, 2014
- REDAC Meeting: background—Regional Prosperity Initiative, EUP funded proposal, planning process, project timeline; committee structure overview—Stakeholder Committee, Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee; facilitated discussion—review of strategies from previous plans, identifying focus areas, identifying regional assets and needs.

November 18th, 2014
- REDAC Meeting: 2015 RPI grant application discussion; data presentation—group discussion on what data means for the EUP; defining what prosperity means for the EUP—developed language for the regional vision; prosperity metrics and RPI dashboard discussion.
- Tourism and Natural Resources Focus Group meeting: brief overview of the Regional Prosperity Initiative; analyzed strengths, weaknesses opportunities and threats to the focus area in the EUP; developed language for the regional goal; outlined strategies, projects, needs and collaborations needed to achieve the goal.

December 12th, 2014
- Agriculture & Local Food Systems Focus Group meeting: same agenda as the November 18th, 2014 focus group meeting.

January 20th, 2015
- Health Care Focus Group meeting: same agenda as the November 18th, 2014 focus group meeting.
- Education Focus Group meeting: same agenda as the November 18th, 2014 focus group meeting.
- Economic & Workforce Development Focus Group meeting: same agenda as the November 18th, 2014 focus group meeting.

January 29th, 2015
- Joint Stakeholder Committee & REDAC meeting: updates—plan progress, discussion of focus group results, call for projects, 2015 RPI application status report; panel of representatives from state agencies discussing how they incorporate the RPI into their programs; broadband presentation by Connect MI.

February 17th, 2015
- REDAC meeting: reviewed and altered goals; assessed strategies/action items on their viability of enabling the achievement of the goals.
- Infrastructure Focus Group meeting: same agenda as the November 18th, 2014 focus group meeting.

April 20th, 2015
4th Appendix: Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Role &amp; Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becks, Eric</td>
<td>President &amp; Chief Executive Officer, SSMart, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Sutter</td>
<td>Director, Consolidated Community Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolen, Rebecca</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Mackinac Economic Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claus, Kristen</td>
<td>Executive Director, City of Sault Ste. Marie Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig, Nikki</td>
<td>Owner, Freighters View Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrolofski, Joe</td>
<td>President, Superior Fabrication Company LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin Marra</td>
<td>Regional Manager, Kanava International LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evashevski, Deb</td>
<td>Director, City of St. Ignace Downtown Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing, Tom</td>
<td>President, Chippewa County Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finley, David</td>
<td>Dean, Lake Superior State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon, Steve</td>
<td>Director of Human Resources and Finance, EUP Intermediate School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goudreau, Dave</td>
<td>President, Norhtern Wings Repair, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Development Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hagan</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, Eastern Upper Peninsula Michigan Works!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knepper, Justin</td>
<td>Director, Sault Ste. Marie Downtown Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marv Pichla</td>
<td>Owner, Inspiring Innovations, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, Don</td>
<td>Chippewa County Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk, Amy</td>
<td>Director, Les Cheneaux Island Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Gary</td>
<td>Township Supervisor, Clark Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliger, Susan</td>
<td>Administrator, War Memorial Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk, Michelle</td>
<td>Extension Educator, Michigan State University Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worley, Gwen</td>
<td>Former Executive Director, Eastern Upper Peninsula Michigan Works!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman, Greg</td>
<td>Department Head, Lake Superior State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5th Appendix: Federal Regulations and Requirements
B. Technical Requirements

Pursuant to 13 C.F.R. § 303.7, a Planning Organization must include the following information in a CEDS submitted to EDA:

1. **Background:** The CEDS must contain a background of the economic development situation of the region that paints a realistic picture of the current condition of the region. This background must include a discussion of the economy, population, geography, workforce development and use, transportation access, resources, environment, and other pertinent information.

2. **Analysis of Economic Development Problems and Opportunities:** The CEDS must include an in-depth analysis of the economic development problems and opportunities that identifies strengths and weaknesses in the regional makeup of human and economic assets, and problems and opportunities posed by external and internal forces affecting the regional economy. This analysis must:
   - Incorporate relevant material from other government-sponsored or supported plans and demonstrate consistency with applicable State and local workforce investment strategies.
   - Identify past, present, and projected future economic development investments in the region.
   - Identify and analyze economic clusters within the region.

3. **CEDS Goals and Objectives — Defining Regional Expectations:** The CEDS must contain a section setting forth goals and objectives necessary to solve the economic problems, or capitalize on the resources, of the region. Any strategic project, program, or activity identified in the CEDS should work to fulfill these goals and objectives.
   - Goals are broad, primary regional expectations.
   - Objectives are more specific than goals, clearly measurable, and stated in realistic terms considering what can be accomplished over the five (5) year time frame of the CEDS.

4. **Community and Private Sector Participation:** The CEDS must include a section discussing the relationship between the community in general and the private sector in the development and implementation of the CEDS. Public and private sector partnerships are critical to the implementation of the CEDS.

5. **Strategic Projects, Programs and Activities:** The CEDS must contain a section which identifies regional projects, programs and activities designed to implement the Goals and Objectives of the CEDS. This section should identify and describe:
   - **Suggested Projects**:
     - All suggested projects, programs and activities and the projected number of jobs to be created as a result.
     - Lead organizations responsibilities for execution of the projects.
   - **Vital Projects**:
     - A prioritization of vital projects, programs, and activities that address the region's greatest needs or that will best enhance the region's competitiveness, including sources of funding for past and potential future investments. These can be overarching "themes" for regional economic development success and is expected to include components. Funding sources should not be limited to EDA programs.

6. **CEDS Plan of Action:** The plan of action, as described in the CEDS, implements the goals and objectives of the CEDS in a manner that:
   - Promotes economic development and opportunity;
   - Fosters effective transportation access;
   - Enhances and protects the environment;
   - Maximizes effective development and use of the workforce consistent with any applicable State or local workforce investment strategy;
   - Promotes the use of technology in economic development, including access to high-speed telecommunications;
   - Balances resources through sound management of physical development; and
   - Obtains and utilizes adequate funds and other resources.

The CEDS must also contain a section that discusses the methodology for cooperating and integrating the CEDS with a State's economic development priorities.

7. **Performance Measures:** The CEDS must contain a section that lists the performance measures used to evaluate the Planning Organization's successful development and implementation of the CEDS, including but not limited to the:
   - Number of jobs created after implementation of the CEDS;
   - Number and types of investments undertaken in the region;
   - Number of jobs retained in the region;
   - Amount of private sector investment in the region after implementation of the CEDS; and
   - Changes in the economic environment of the region.

These are not meant to be the only performance measures for the CEDS. Most Planning Organizations developing a CEDS will benefit from developing additional quantitative and qualitative measures that will allow them to evaluate progress toward achieving the goals identified as important in their regions.

For more information: www.eda.gov
6th Appendix: State Regulations and Requirements

This plan was funded and developed at the Regional Prosperity Collaborative level.

Table 22: Regional Prosperity Initiative Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Prosperity Collaborative</th>
<th>Regional Prosperity Council</th>
<th>Regional Prosperity Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive Based Funding Eligible Applicants</strong></td>
<td>Up to $250,000</td>
<td>Up to $375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State Designated Planning Regions</td>
<td>• State Designated Planning Regions</td>
<td>• State Designated Planning Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations</td>
<td>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations</td>
<td>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Structure Description**

A Regional Prosperity Collaborative is any committee currently existing or developed by a regional planning organization which serves to bring organizational representation together among the required participants (see below) from within a region for the purpose of creating a regional prosperity plan.

A Regional Prosperity Council has shared administrative services and an executive governing entity, as demonstrated by a formal local agreement(s).

A Regional Prosperity Board, at a minimum, must demonstrate the consolidation of regional metropolitan planning organization board(s), state designated regional planning agency board(s), workforce development board(s), and federally designated economic development district(s).

**Required Participants**

Regional private, public and non-profit representatives from:
- Adult education
- Workforce development
- Economic development,
- Transportation;
- Higher education organizations.

Regional private, public and non-profit representatives from:
- Adult education
- Workforce development
- Economic development,
- Transportation;
- Higher education organizations.

Regional private, public and non-profit representatives from:
- Adult education
- Workforce development
- Economic development,
- Transportation;
- Higher education organizations.

**Deliverables**

- A 5 year regional prosperity plan, including an economic development blueprint; and
- A performance dashboard and measurable annual goals.

- A status report of the approved five year plan
- A ten-year regional prosperity plan, including an economic development blueprint; and
- A performance dashboard with measurable annual goals
- A prioritized list of regional projects.

- A status report of the approved ten-year plan
- Including a status report of the approved performance dashboard and measurable annual goals
- A regional services recommendations report outlining the prioritized list of state funded services and programs provided to the region and recommendations for state-regional partnerships to support the adopted 10 year plan

**Additional Structural Requirements**

The council shall identify additional opportunities for shared administrative services and decision-making among the private, public and non-profit entities within the region.

The board, at a minimum, must demonstrate the consolidation of regional metropolitan planning organization board(s), state designated regional planning agency board(s), workforce development board(s), and federally designated economic development district(s).

**Source:** Michigan Department of Technology, Management & Budget
Sec. 890. (1) The funds appropriated in part 1 for the regional prosperity initiative are to be used as grants to eligible regional planning organizations qualifying for funding as a regional prosperity collaborative, a regional prosperity council, or a regional prosperity board. A regional planning organization may not qualify for funding under more than 1 category in the same state fiscal year. An eligible regional planning organization is defined under any of the following: (a) An existing regional planning commission pursuant to 1945 PA 281, MCL 125.11 to 125.25. (b) An existing regional economic development commission pursuant to 1966 PA 46, MCL 125.1231 to 125.1237. (c) An existing metropolitan area council pursuant to 1989 PA 292, MCL 124.651 to 124.729. (d) A Michigan metropolitan planning organization pursuant to the moving ahead for progress in the 21st century act, Public Law 112-141.

(2) Regional planning organizations may qualify to receive not more than $250,000.00 of incentive based funding as a regional prosperity collaborative subject to meeting all of the following requirements: (a) The existence or formation of a regional prosperity collaborative, defined as any committee developed by a regional planning organization which serves to bring organizational representation together from private, public, and nonprofit entities within a region for the purpose of creating a phase one: regional prosperity plan, as follows: (i) The collaborative must include regional representatives from adult education, workforce development, economic development, transportation, and higher education organizations. (ii) The phase one: regional prosperity plan is required, at a minimum, to include a 5-year economic development blueprint for the region, a performance dashboard and measurable annual goals. (iii) The 5-year economic development blueprint must include plans related to regional planning of adult education, workforce development, economic development, transportation, and higher education. (iv) The regional prosperity collaborative shall adopt its phase one: regional prosperity plan by a 2/3 majority vote of its members. (b) Accountability and transparency, which requires the regional prosperity collaborative to meet the following requirements: (i) Convene monthly meetings to consider and discuss issues leading to a common vision of economic prosperity for the region, including, but not limited to, economic development, talent, and infrastructure opportunities. ii) Make available on a publicly accessible Internet site by 1 or all of the regional prosperity collaborative member organizations, pertinent documents, including, but not limited to, monthly meeting agendas, minutes of monthly meetings, and the regional prosperity plan and performance dashboard. (c) The existence of a status report detailing the spending associated with previous regional prosperity initiative grants. Organizations that have successfully received grant awards in previous fiscal years shall be required to make available to the department and on a publicly accessible Internet site information regarding the use of those grant dollars.
7th Appendix: Additional Maps (Drafts)

*Map 4: Land Cover – Draft*
Map 6: Major Infrastructure – Draft
Map 7: Medical Institutions and Services – Draft
8th Appendix: Acronym Reference

AP: Annual payroll
ARRA: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
AWW: Average weekly wage
BIA: Bureau of Indian Affairs
BMCC: Bay Mills Community College
BMH: Bay Mills Indian Community Health
BMIC: Bay Mills Indian Community
CC: Chippewa County
CCEDC: Chippewa County Economic Development Corporation
CCRC: Chippewa County Road Commission
CDBG: Community Development Block Grant
CEDS: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
CHAC: Community Health Access Coalition
CLMCD: Chippewa-Luce-Mackinac Conservation District
CM: Clean Michigan Initiative
COE: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
CPLHS: Crisp Point Lighthouse Historical Society
CTE: Career-technical education
CUPPAD: Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development
CZM: Coastal Zone Management
DDA: Downtown Development Authority
DED: Department of Education
DHS: Department of Homeland Security
DNRE: Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment
DOA: Department of Agriculture
DOE: Department of Energy
EDA: Economic Development Administration
EDD: Economic Development District
EPA: Environmental Protection Agency
EPASDCGP: Environmental Protection Agency Sustainable Development Challenge Grant Program
EST: Number of establishments
EUP COCs: Eastern Upper Peninsula Chambers of Commerce
EUP CVBs: Eastern Upper Peninsula Convention and Visitors Bureaus
EUP DDAs: Eastern Upper Peninsula Downtown Development Authorities
EUP ISD: Eastern Upper Peninsula Intermediate School District
EUPRPDC: Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission
FAA: Federal Aeronautics Administration
FDJ: Federal Department of Justice
FHWA: Federal Highway Administration
FHBR: Federal Highway Bridge Replacement
GMF: General Motors Fellowship
HAL: History Arts and Libraries (Michigan)
HHS: Department of Health and Human Services
HNHJ: Helen Newberry Joy Hospital
HOME: Housing Opportunities Made Equal
ICDBG: Indian Community Development Block Grant
IHS: Indian Health Services
LC: Luce County
LCCF: Les Cheneaux Community Foundation
LCEDC: Luce County Economic Development Corporation
LMAS: Luce-Mackinac-Alger-Schoolcraft Health Department
LSSU: Lake Superior State University
MAP-21: Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
MC: Mackinac County
MDEQ: Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
MDNR: Michigan Department of Natural Resources
MAC: Michigan Aeronautics Commission
MCBP: Michigan Critical Bridge Program
MCRC: Mackinac County Road Commission
MCACA: Michigan Council for Arts and Cultural Affairs
MDARD: Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
MDCH: Michigan Department of Community Health
MDOT: Michigan Department of Transportation
MDOTEDF: Michigan Department of Transportation's Economic Development Fund
MEDC: Michigan Economic Development Corporation
MDOT-STM: State Transportation Planning
MI: Michigan
MiKLAP: Michigan Rail Loan Assistance Program
MDNRTP: Michigan Department of Natural Resources Trust Fund
MDTMB: Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget
MHSDA: Michigan State Housing Development Authority
MHS: Mackinac Straits Health System
MSUE: Michigan State University Extension
MWC: Michigan Waterways Commission
NA: Not Applicable
N/A: Not Available
NCCCED: Nature Conservancy's Center for Compatible Economic Development
NFS: National Forest Service
NPS: National Parks Service
PAL: People and Land
PE: Number of paid employees
RC&D: Resource Conservation and Development Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture
REDA: Regional Economic Development Advisory Committee
RPI: Regional Prosperity Initiative
RTF: Rural Task Force
S.A.: Special Assessment
SAFE-TEA-LU: Safe Accountable Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2005-06: A Legacy for Users
SBA: Small Business Association
SHPO: State Historic Preservation Office
SMART Inc.: Sault Ste. Marie Advanced Resources and Technology, Incorporated
SSMTCI: Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians
STH: Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians Health
TIFA: Tax Increment Finance Authority
UP CDC: Upper Peninsula Collaborative Development Council (run through the Lake Superior Community Partnership)
UPFE: Upper Peninsula Food Exchange
U.S./USA: United States of America
USDARD: United States Department of Agriculture
USDARD-CFP: United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development
USDARD-CPP: Community Facilities Program
USDA: United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development
WUPPDR: Western Upper Peninsula Planning and Development Region