

TOWNSHIP SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY

Surveys were completed in 4 of the 5 Townships of Keweenaw County during 2001. Thanks to funding assistance from the Americana Foundation, surveys were drafted by the Township Planning Committees within the Townships of Allouez, Eagle Harbor, Grant and Sherman. No survey was done in Houghton Township. Each committee formulated questions unique to each Township and mailed surveys to landholders in order to solicit the collective opinions of residents and landholders. The following pages are summaries and comments from the township surveys. **The complete survey results are available from the respective township offices and should be consulted for more detailed responses.**

The survey response rates within each township are as follows:

Allouez:	1,200 Sent	-54 Returned
Eagle Harbor:	572 Sent	-371 Returned
Grant:	574 Sent	-195 Returned
Sherman:	200 Sent	- 49 Returned

**ALLOUEZ TOWNSHIP LAND USE QUESTIONNAIRE
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES**

July, 2001

1. What do you like about the Keweenaw area?

The scenic rugged natural beauty of the rivers, lakes and timberlands.
Great scenery, hunting, fishing and other recreational opportunities.
The undeveloped and unimproved lakeshore and timberlands
Peaceful and quiet, a great place to raise a family.

2. What are our township's good points?

Sense of community, friendliness, good/great people.
Allouez Township Firemen and EMT,
Snow plowing in the winter and road maintenance
Parks are clean with flowers, cemetery is clean

3. What are our township's shortcomings?

Junk cars and old appliances in the woods, abandon buildings
The lakeshore and rivers are getting inaccessible - loss of public access
Need recreation for kids
Need more small business

4. What historic features in the township would you like to preserve?

The general ambiance of Eagle River
Cliff cemeteries
Allouez township mining sites - some old rock piles
Patrick's buildings, Ahmeek Fire Hall

5. What natural features in the township would you like to preserve?

Scenic highway M 26/ US 41, Cliff Drive
Mouth of the Gratiot, Gratiot River, Seneca Lake
Lake Superior shoreline, Veale Park
Mouth of all rivers

6. What kinds of businesses would you like to see in Allouez township and where should they be located?

Grocery store, Restaurant, service businesses
Businesses utilizing timber resources

Tourism related businesses
Bank, gas station, food store
Those with minimal impact on the environment
Locate in Mohawk, Ahmeek, Allouez, Fulton area

7. To preserve public access to Lake Superior shoreline and interior timberland for recreation, hunting, and fishing, would you support the township and/or the county buying land with monies obtained through:

- a) the township/county pursuing grant funding? 52 yes out of 57
b) the township/county asking for a special millage? 28 yes out of 57

8. What park or recreational facilities would you like to see developed in Allouez Township? Should the township/county expand Veale Park?

Gratiot River
Mohawk school yard
Veale Park
7 Mile Point
Ahmeek Ice Rink and Park

9. Should there be a Township/County owned transfer station or sanitary landfill in Allouez Township?

Yes 39 out of 57

10. Do you have any concerns with the present County Zoning Ordinance?

Yes, 15 out of 57
Junk and abandon buildings
Preserving public access

11. Any other suggestions/comments you would like to make?

Wider shoulders on roads for pedestrians and bicycles
Make a place for kids to ski on the bluff by Ahmeek
Plant fish and clean up Seneca Dam and Lake for kids to fish
Be sure an updated zoning ordinance strikes a balance between economic development and natural preservation

Mail or drop off at: Allouez Township Hall, 102 Second Street, Mohawk MI 49950

(Note: 840 questionnaires mailed, 57 responses received, Mailing cost \$343.51)

ANALYSIS OF 2001 EAGLE HARBOR TOWNSHIP SURVEY

This reports and analyzes results from the September, 2001 Eagle Harbor Township Land Use Survey by the Township's Land Use Planning Steering Committee. The committee and Township Board will use these results to refine land use goals and to suggest updates in county planning and zoning. Questions may be directed to the Township Office at 906-289-4407, or to survey coordinator Paul Freshwater at 906-289-4877.

Background — The committee was established in November, 2000 by the Township Supervisor at the request of the Township Board in response to a November, 2000 request for planning and zoning guidance by the Keweenaw County, Michigan Planning & Zoning Board which manages those functions for the county's five townships. During the past year, a dozen local volunteers have belonged to the committee, supported in a variety of information gathering and planning projects by fellow citizens, other townships, and various county, regional and state agencies. This survey project received design guidance from participants in two well-attended public meetings and from MTU Professor of Marketing Alan Brokaw who oversaw the Keweenaw County voter survey in 1981. The Township Treasurer and Clerk helped with execution. Numerical data are presented via an Excel program designed and donated by part-time resident Michael Wakeman of ABB Corporation (231-398-0530).

Survey Design — The survey contained three parts. Part One used a 4-point, asymmetric scale (3 very important, 0 = not important) to assess the importance to respondents of 17 assets in the township, things we like about it and want to protect, and invited them to list their most special places here. Part Two used the same scale to assess the importance of 18 potential concerns in our township, things we might improve. Parts One and Two posed questions alphabetically to help reduce any bias, and invited respondents to vote for the three most important and three least important questions in each part as a way to help clarify priorities. Part Three used a yes-maybe-no scale to ask if respondents would vote to pay about \$100 more property tax per year to protect specific assets or help fix specific concerns. Respondents were invited to add their own items at the end of each part, to add general comments at the end of the two-sided form, and to give their name and address (optional). Each mailing included two blank forms, a letter of explanation from the planning committee, an endorsement by the Township Supervisor, and a stamped return envelope.

Survey Audience and Response — Survey forms were mailed to each of 572 homes or business addresses, including the current list of 153 township voter addresses and 419 other property owner addresses. Each group received a different color of form to allow separate tabulation. Duplication was eliminated between addresses serving more than one voter or classification. Surveys were mailed on September 13, with responses requested by September 30 but included through October 22. Nine were returned as not deliverable. As of October 22, 268 deliverable addresses (48%) had responded with 371 individual forms. Voters returned 114 forms (31% of responses versus 27% of addresses mailed), while non-voters returned 257 forms.

Conclusions — A high response rate, rich with comments, makes this survey a valuable tool to gauge thinking on planning issues by both voters and non-resident property owners, and indicates that many value this opportunity to provide their opinions to township officials. The survey pretty well covered what people like about this area, but respondents added dozens of concerns and improvements they would pay for. There is strong consensus to keep the wilderness character of the area, its environmental quality, and public access to its many special places - as well as willingness to pay to preserve those places. However, opinions are divided on at least two major issues and several minor ones. One major issue is restrictions on development, where many want stronger planning, zoning and enforcement while a smaller but significant group wants less regulation of private property. Local voters are especially concerned about enforcement of zoning laws. Another major issue is local taxes, where many say they are willing to pay more taxes for specific purposes but many others believe taxes already are too high and should not be raised. There is an undercurrent of “taxation without representation” among non-residents who outnumber voters almost 3 to 1. Lesser areas of disagreement include the importance of logging, motor sports, local services, public safety, jobs, schools and age diversity, as well as the quality of local governance.

Key Findings - Both numerical data and comments are summarized in the attached pages. Numerical data are shown for voters, non-voters, and all respondents. The first page presents each survey question with the number of responses for each importance rating, the average rating for that question, and that rating’s rank compared with other questions. Parts One and Two also show votes for “most important” and “least important,” which in most cases closely parallel regular importance rankings. Five pages that follow show key data as bar graphs. Finally come comment summaries, presenting information respondents added identifying their favorite places, additional assets, additional concerns, and general thoughts. Comments are listed in order of the number of respondents commenting, and are grouped by subject where possible. Raw data from each respondent and a compilation of all verbatim comments can be viewed in the township office.

Part One: Assets - Our top rated asset is clean air and water, followed by our wilderness character and access to the shoreline and water. Priorities are similar for voters and non-voters, except that voters place higher priority on safety/security, while non-voters indicate stronger support for preserving special places. The list of special places mentioned is long - 58 within the township and 16 beyond it, with more than 40 mentions each for the light station, beaches, lake shore, Great Sand Bay, Brockway Mountain and Mt. Baldy. Seen as least important are motor sport trails. Local services, schools and jobs also have low average ratings because there is more disagreement about their importance than for most other items. Respondents suggested only a few other assets (13) beyond those in the questionnaire, and some of those are similar to listed ones.

Part Two: Concerns - Of greatest concern are too much development, loss of wilderness and access to it, followed by threats to environmental quality. Also of strong concern to voters is enforcement of zoning regulations. Of least concern are the “not-enoughs” — mix of ages,

affordable housing, opportunities for young people, people to hire, and well-paying jobs, although job issues show widely varying opinions. Few see taxes as too low, although this is not among the three concerns voted least important. Concern with high taxes is of only medium priority in the numerical rankings, but it drew more comments than any other subject. Also drawing large numbers of comments on both sides are the conflicting issues of private property rights versus restrictions on land development and use, and the numerical responses reflect this. Several medium-priority concerns also show divided opinions, including threats to safety and responsiveness of local officials. A noteworthy 47 concerns beyond those in the questionnaire were written in by one to three of 64 respondents, about evenly divided among issues of development, regulation, conservation, and local governance.

Part Three: What People Would Pay More Tax For - Majorities of respondents voted “yes” to purchase special places and for better enforcement of zoning, with voters carrying the zoning issue. Majorities voted “maybe” or “no” on three other issues, although in each case more than 40% voted “yes.” Voters were more likely than non-voters to pay for more health and safety services and for better planning, while non-voters were more likely than voters to pay to restore damaged environments. A noteworthy 36 items were added by one to three of 51 respondents willing to pay for them.

Other Comments - Respondents added 225 comments beyond the questions asked. They fall in five categories:

- Regulation of Development - Opinions are closely divided in this area of greatest interest. 24 comments urge stronger zoning, zoning enforcement and land use planning, and another 11 urge further restrictions on development. But 20 want less regulation of private property development and use. A few also believe that variances have not been granted evenly.
- Conservation - 18 comments urge keeping the character of the area, expressed as small, rural, natural beauty, wilderness, clean. 5 want to clean up ugly junk, graffiti and litter. There is minor disagreement over three issues — whether to clean up mine and logging sites or keep them as part of local history, whether or not to set aside more land for public use, and whether or not to have motorized ATV trails.
- Taxes - Broad dissatisfaction with high tax rates is evident in 21 comments that taxes are too high or need to be better managed, plus 18 comments against more taxes. Related issues include high CLK school taxes and variations in assessments (lake lots too high, CFR too low).
- Governance and Government Services - Service issues raised by more than one respondent include resolution of Hebard Plat boundaries, growing need for 911/medical/fire services, unplowed seasonal roads at Lake Medora and Gratiot Lake, deepening Lake Bailey, more help from the Regional Health Department in designing acceptable sanitation systems, and updating Eagle Harbor waterlines.

Governance issues raised by more than one respondent include non-responsiveness of the County Board (except for Don Keith), fairness/responsiveness of the Township Board, allegations that the Township Board improperly sold land, and more representation of non-residents.

- This Survey - 16 respondents expressed thanks, while 3 were critical. Names and addresses were given by 58% of non-voters but by only 32% of voters (who may feel more enfranchised despite anonymity).

**GRANT TOWNSHIP LAND USE SURVEY
SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS
APRIL, 2002**

1. 34% Survey Response Rate - 193 Respondents.

The profile of respondents mirrors the profile of Grant Township landowners -- largely homeowners and non-voters that work elsewhere or are retired.

2. Homeowners, Non-voters, Voters are the three largest segments.

Homeowners (voters and non-voters) - 137 (71%)

Non-voters - 132 (68%)

Voters -59 (31%)

3. Respondents endorse Mission Statement - 4.4 average score.

Unique in Michigan, the United States and the world, Grant Township encompasses a wide range of largely undeveloped, unspoiled native ecosystems indigenous to the Great Lakes Region. The mission and purpose of Grant Township is to protect and preserve these special lands and waters for current and future generations. The focus of Grant Township is selective economic development and redevelopment which promotes and preserves the natural wilderness.

4. Respondents very supportive of Goals & Objectives.

5 point scale: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = No opinion;
2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree.

Normal curve heavily skewed toward 5.

Goals - average scores ranged from 4.5 to 3.9.

Objectives - average scores ranged from 4.5 to 3.5.

5. Respondents strongly endorse Goals focused on preserving Grant Township.

	<u>Average score</u>
Goal 1: Land Use	4.5
Goal 5: Community Character	4.4
Goal 2: Environmental Protection	4.3
Goal 6: Archaeological and Historical	4.3

6. More agreement than disagreement on all Goals & Objectives.

Average scores by major segment for each goal and objective varied by 4/10's of a point or less.

Voters rated Recreational and Cultural, and Economic Development goals and objectives relatively higher.

Non-voters rated Land Use, Environmental Protection, and Community Character goals and objectives relatively higher.

Homeowners tended to reflect the scores for all respondents. Sometimes homeowner average scores were closer to voters and other times to non-voters.

Most wanted more input to land use issues, particularly non-voters.

7. Topics of Concern - Personal property rights, more government and duplicate regulatory responsibilities.

Infringement on personal property rights and creating more government were reasons respondents disagreed with goal and objective statements.

Several respondents were concerned about duplication with existing laws and regulations and the corresponding cost.

Goals and objectives that respondents felt less passionate about tended to have lower average scores.

8. Respondents willing to pay 1-3 additional mils to accomplish certain purposes.

50% or more of All Respondents were willing to pay 1-3 more mils for each of the 5 items listed. A significant number of “maybe” respondents (approximately 10% of all respondents) wanted more information.

All Respondents rated Health and safety services (61%), Purchase of special places by local government (56%) and Copper Harbor School (55%) most important.

Voters rated Copper Harbor School (71%), Health and safety services (63%), and Purchase of special places by local government (51%) most important.

9. Wonderful, thoughtful written comments demonstrate love for Grant Township and desire to preserve its uniqueness.

10. Areas for additional emphasis or examination

1. Trail systems, particularly non-motorized
2. Watercraft regulation, power and non-power areas
3. Timberland management direction and support
4. Preservation of special places

SUMMARY OF SHERMAN TOWNSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
FALL 2001

1. What brought you to Keweenaw County?

Family roots -27
Natural setting - 14
Waterfront -8

2. What do you like about the township?

Peace and quiet, rural setting, wilderness, Lake Superior -48

3. Is there anything you would like to see changed in the township?

Better community services - 22
ordinances - 12
better roads - 2
new water system - 2
better utilities - 2
public marina - 1
move trash bins - 3

4. Would you like to see commercial development in Sherman Township?

no - 29
yes, small low impact, like a convenience store, small motel - 30
yes, substantial job creation - 7

5. What do you think should be done with the old school?

tear it down - 18
Preserve/restore - 29
senior citizen - 3
B&B,motel-5
Community building -3
museum - 9

6. Would you like to see the old Gay Park turned back into a park?

yes -48
no - 12

7. Would you like to see more public access to the waterfront?

yes -34

no - 25

8. Are you in favor of a small roadside park at the mouth of the Tobacco River?

yes -42

no- 13

9. What is the most Important thing you would like to see preserved in our area?

Keep the status quo, peace and quiet.

The smoke stack.

The area could use a boat launching facility.