Q: What is the project budget?
   o A: $112,000.

Q: In section 2 of the Part 1 scope of work, EUP is asking for an “Analysis of statutes concerning cargo transportation – this must include analysis of statutes concerning air cargo transport.” Since most of these statutes already exist on-line can you provide a bit more details to the exact type of information you’re looking for? (custom, preclearance, weight, environmental, ...)
   o A: We are interested in knowing the major pieces of regulation that govern the logistics/transportation industry and the broad strokes of how they may affect what EUP aims to achieve with the strategy. For instance, if an international flight were to land at Chippewa County International Airport, who would have to be there to check the cargo and which piece of legislation governs that. I would say there is a good bit of latitude in the scope item, but we are mainly interested in knowing the basics to educate ourselves before taking inaccurate steps.

Q: In the description of the project, in part 1 we find the following phrase: “analyze the region’s existing transportation and industrial infrastructure.” Can you confirm if you are looking for an “engineering analysis” of the infrastructure or more an “economic analysis”?
   o A: We are interested in an economic analysis—that is, are the spaces conducive to enterprises relevant to the strategy? Our local economic developers have a good handle on the structural integrity of their facilities. However, it would be beneficial to analyze what amenities are offered and what amenities are demanded by enterprises relevant to the strategy, and where gaps exist—if they exist at all.

Q: Can you expand on your decision to include an analysis of potential air cargo over the arctic to Russia, China, Scandinavia, etc.? Would you be interested in new opportunities that may exist via other modes?
   o The entire project idea stems from an idea that a professor here at Lake Superior State University pushed several years ago regarding polar air cargo/trade. Thus, the projects roots lie there. However, we desire for the project to look beyond simply that: are there opportunities to utilize the seaway, opportunities to be a crossroads for trade in northern Michigan where the east-west highways meet the north-south interstate, and opportunities to have air cargo flown in domestically and internationally to utilize our Chippewa County international airport. Opportunities over
the arctic should be discussed, but do not need to be the central focus of the strategy.

- **Q:** Will references suffice instead of testimonials? We can include the project summary and complete client contact information.
  - **A:** References with the project summary and contact information would be excellent.

- **Q:** If we organize the project and our team delivers a quality project with a shorter time line, will that impact on the payment schedule?
  - There would be no issue with a shorter timeline—it would be welcomed, in fact. The reason we organized the payment schedule how we did is because we have a grant with EDA to fund only Part 1 of the strategy, and they want that portion of the plan completed by late-August (we believe we could get an extension, but it would be best if the consultant could have items done by the proposed timeline or sooner). Another grant is funding the project, but we have a much longer timeline for that, so that won’t be an issue.

- **Q:** Objectives: The project scope that is identified in the RFP is well-stated and robust in its intentions and by the way it's oriented it seems to indicate that local leaders believe that less than ideal logistics connectivity and a lack of modern warehouse asset are a major impediment to economic growth. With better logistics connectivity, we would assume that the region (bi-national or US-specific) would presume improved economic competitiveness for attracting new investment. This upside growth would be an important factor for investors in new assets. This isn’t specifically identified in the RFP, should the bidder firms assume to include or ignore this aspect?
  - **A:** Yes, the upside growth analysis would be a major benefit to any proposal. Unfortunately, we are not experts in the field, and, truthfully, developed the outline for the scope of work based on what seemed logical rather than using industry insights. We are interested in proposals that will help make the region more competitive and guide the work of local economic developers. Thus, if a proposal varies from the proposed scope of work to ensure a better result, it would be well received.

- **Q:** Partners: We notice that Chippewa County is included as a partner in the project, to what extent is Luce County, Mackinac County and the State of Michigan also involved? Are there business groups such as the local chambers of commerce in Michigan or in Canada also involved in any way?
  - **A:** Chippewa County is listed as a partner because they received 1 of the 2 grants that are helping to finance this
project. The primary points of contact will be EUPRPDC, the Chippewa County EDC, and, to an extent, the Sault Ste. Marie EDC. We do have partners in the other 2 counties, however we see this project primarily affecting Chippewa County. If need be, we can arrange to bring in other partners. We have worked on this in a manner close to the chest to keep the project focus on what regional planning believes the project needs to achieve.

- **Q: Transport Infrastructure:** In your opinion, can you describe any outstanding important public or private (rail) ground transportation/infrastructure projects planned or hoped for in Michigan or connecting/in Canada, that might influence the outcome of these analytics?
  - **A:** Transportation Infrastructure: I do not foresee any rail projects in the region soon. CN owns the railroad in our region and have been tough to collaborate with at any level. MDOT has been approached for rail spurs at various industrial sites in the region, but nothing has come to fruition. If there was a business case, I believe they would work to install them as needed.

- **Q: Property Infrastructure:** The CCEDC owns assets and there are several other assets in the market. Has there been interest in investing in other property assets recently? Do you feel that the US-side is substantially under-invested as compared to the Canadian-side?
  - **A:** CCEDC and SSMEDC work to maintain their assets (primarily industrial spaces), but no major improvements are planned. CCEDC owns hangar space leftover from the air force base. The City of Sault Ste. Marie is planning updates to the Carbide Dock, which is having structural issues due to the St. Marys current—but the timetable is TBD as far as we know. To answer your question: yes, I feel like the U.S. side is underinvested, but I think that is a product of both a lack private sector demand for improvements, and a lack of knowledge as to what could be invested in to make the region more enticing.

- **Q: Resources:** We understand very well the steps for taking a planning and feasibility analysis and transitioning to a deliverable economic development implementation product. From reading the scope, a serious assessment of this sort will likely require sharp market/competitiveness model analytics and at least some asset/engineering assessment. Can you explain the resources available to this project, including funds available for the study and staff and data availability?
  - **A:** Resources: The region has $112,000 for this project. In the event the funds are insufficient to accomplish all the work outlined in the project scope, the region is interested in proposals outline what can be done for the
available funding. In terms of local staff, there is available to assist on answering questions about the region’s assets and conditions and collaborating where needed (if a more specific question is posed, I could give a more specific answer here). Regarding the data, depending on what you need we may have it.