



Target Market Analysis

Gogebic County

Michigan

2016

Prepared by:



Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



Acknowledgements

Michigan State
Housing Development Authority

Partners | Michigan Prosperity Region 1

Erik Powers | Western Upper Peninsula
Planning & Development Region | WUPPDR | 1a

Emilie Schada | Central Upper Peninsula
Planning and Development | CUPPAD | 1b

Jeff Hagan | Eastern Upper Peninsula
Regional Planning & Development | EUPRPD | 1c

TMA Consultant

Sharon M. Woods, CRE
Counselor of Real Estate
www.LandUseUSA.com



Prepared by:



Table of Contents	Page
Executive Summary	1
Report Outline	7
The Target Markets	9
Prevalent Lifestyle Clusters	12
Conservative Scenario	14
Aggressive Scenario	15
“Slide” by Building Format	17
Ironwood, Bessemer, and Wakefield	18
Non-Residents and Seasonality	20
Rents and Square Feet	21
Comparison to Supply	23
Market Assessments – Introduction	25
Gogebic County – Overview	25
The City of Ironwood Advantage	27
Analysis of PlaceScores™	29
Contact Information	30

Executive Summary

Through a collaborative effort among public and private stakeholders, LandUse|USA has been engaged to conduct this Residential Target Market Analysis (TMA) for the Upper Peninsula Prosperity Regions 1a, 1b, and 1c. The West Region 1a includes Gogebic County with five other counties; the Central Region 1b includes six counties; and East Region 1c has three counties (for a total of fifteen counties).

Together with regional contributions, this study has also been funded by a matching grant under the state's Place-based Planning Program. The program is funded by the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), and has also has the support of the Community Development division and the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC). Regional Community Assistance Team (CATeam) specialists are available to help places become redevelopment ready.

This study has involved rigorous data analysis and modeling, and is based on in-migration into Gogebic County and each of its cities, villages, and census designated places (CDPs). It is also based on internal migration within those places, movership rates by tenure and lifestyle cluster, and housing preferences among target market households. This Executive Summary highlights the results and is followed by a more complete explanation of the market potential under conservative (minimum) and aggressive (maximum) scenarios.

Maximum Market Potential – Based on the Target Market Analysis results for an aggressive scenario, there is a maximum annual market potential for up to 186 attached units throughout Gogebic County, plus 323 detached houses (for a total of 509 units). Among the 186 attached units, the majority of the market potential will be captured by the Cities of Ironwood (79 units annually), Bessemer (20 units), and Wakefield (10 units). These three cities are all located along Highway 2 and within 5 to 12 miles of each other.

There will also be 77 migrating households in Gogebic County each year seeking attached units in locations other than the three cities. Compared to other counties in the Upper Peninsula region, a large share of the market potential for Gogebic County will be generated by households choosing to live in the surrounding townships and unincorporated places like Marenisco and Watersmeet – even if it means commuting for more job choices within the larger cities.

Gogebic County’s three cities should continue developing new housing formats that would appeal to its migrating households. They should also invest in their downtown districts, add amenities through the placemaking process, and strive to grow small businesses to help create jobs. New amenities could include waterfront access along the Montreal River in Ironwood, and along the Sunday Lake in Wakefield, with walkable pedestrian paths linking the waterfronts to the downtown districts.

Summary Table A

Annual Market Potential – Attached and Detached Units
Renters and Owners – Aggressive (Maximum) Scenario
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a – 2016

Annual Market Potential Aggressive Scenario	Detached Houses	Attached		Total Potential
		Duplex Triplex	Other Formats	
The City of Ironwood	177	8	71	79
The City of Bessemer	41	.	20	61
The City of Wakefield	27	.	10	37
<u>All Other Places</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>332</u>
Gogebic County Total	323	18	168	509
Format as a Share of Total	35%	10%	55%	100%

Missing Middle Typologies – Each county and place within the Upper Peninsula is unique with varying degrees of market potential across a range of building sizes and formats. Results of the analysis are intended to help communities and developers focus on Missing Middle Housing choices (the types are online at www.MissingMiddleHousing.com), which include triplexes and fourplexes; townhouses and row houses; and multiplexes like courtyard apartments, and flats/lofts above street-front retail.

Implementation Strategies – Depending on the unique attributes and size of each place, a variety of strategies can be used to introduce new housing formats.

Missing Middle Housing Formats – Recommended Strategies

1. Conversion of high-quality, vacant buildings (such as schools, city halls, hospitals, hotels, theaters, and/or warehouses) into new flats and lofts.
2. New-builds among townhouses and row houses, particularly in infill locations near rivers and lakes (including inland lakes) to leverage waterfront amenities.
3. Rehab of upper level space above street-front retail within downtown districts.
4. New-builds with flats and lofts in mixed-use projects, above new merchant space with frontage along main street corridors.
5. New-builds among detached houses arranged around cottage courtyards, and within established residential neighborhoods.
6. The addition of accessory dwelling units like flats above garages, expansions to existing houses with attached or detached cottages, or other carriage-style formats.

Lifestyle Clusters and Target Markets – The magnitude of market potential among new housing formats is based on a study of 71 household lifestyle clusters across the nation, including 16 target markets that are most likely to choose attached units among new housing formats in the downtowns and urban places. Again, the target markets have been selected based on their propensity to choose a) attached building formats rather than detached houses; and b) urban places over relatively more suburban and rural settings.

Within any group of households sharing similar lifestyles, there are variances in their preferences across building sizes and formats. For example, 52% of the “Bohemian Grooves” households, but only 11% of the “Digital Dependent” households are inclined to choose attached housing formats. Both groups are among the top target markets for Michigan and the Upper Peninsula.

In general, moderate-income renters tend to have higher movership rates, are more likely to live in compact urban places, and are more likely to choose attached units. However, there are many exceptions, and better-income households and owners are also showing renewed interest in attached products. Across the nation, single householders now represent the majority, albeit by a narrow margin. Households comprised of unrelated members, and multi-generational households are also gaining shares. These diverse householders span all ages, incomes, and tenures; and many are seeking urban alternatives to detached houses.

Summary Table B

Annual Market Potential – Attached Units Only

Renters and Owners – Aggressive Scenario

Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1 – 2016

Renters and Owners Aggressive Scenario Attached Units Only	Upscale Target Markets	Moderate Target Markets	Most Prevalent Clusters	All 71 Lifestyle Clusters
1a Houghton County	374	1,366	58	1,798
Share of County Total	21%	76%	3%	100%
1a Gogebic County	35	131	20	186
Share of County Total	19%	70%	11%	100%
1b Marquette County	1,094	2,354	82	3,530
Share of County Total	31%	67%	2%	100%
1c Chippewa County	581	916	41	1,538
Share of County Total	37%	60%	3%	100%
Others West Region 1a				
Baraga County	2	64	12	78
Iron County	14	29	16	59
Ontonagon County	1	8	2	11
Keweenaw County	.	.	1	1
Others Central Region 1b				
Delta County	74	681	57	812
Dickinson County	60	364	42	466
Menominee County	86	249	24	359
Schoolcraft County	5	71	19	95
Alger County	5	41	11	57
Others East Region 1c				
Mackinac County	25	38	2	65
Luce County	2	0	8	10

The market potential for Gogebic County is generally proportionate to its total size, composition of target markets, and popularity among transient households. As shown in the Summary Table B (on the preceding page), 19% of its annual market potential will be generated by Upscale Target Markets, and 70% will be generated by Moderate Target Markets. The balance (11%) will depend on other households that are more prevalent in the market. Those more prevalent households also tend to be settled and more likely to choose a detached house – if they move at all.

Among the three largest counties (Houghton, Marquette, and Chippewa), Chippewa County is doing the best job of attracting the upscale target markets; and Gogebic County is doing a particularly good job of attracting moderate target markets (when measured as a share of total market potential within each county).

Summary Table C

Counties and Cities with the Largest Market Potential Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1 – 2016

County Name	Largest Places	Target Markets that are Unique to the County
1a Houghton County	Houghton and Hancock	053 Colleges and Cafes
1a Gogebic County	Ironwood	..
1b Marquette County	Marquette, Trowbridge Park Ishpeming and Negaunee	053 Colleges and Cafes E19 Full Pockets, Empty Nests K37 Wired for Success R67 Hope for Tomorrow
1b Delta County	Escanaba and Gladstone	P61 Humble Beginnings
1b Dickinson County	Kingsford, Norway, Iron Mountain	..
1c Chippewa County	Sault Ste. Marie	052 Urban Ambition 053 Colleges and Cafes
1c Mackinac County	Saint Ignace	052 Urban Ambition

Largest Places and Unique Targets – Summary Table C on the preceding page shows the counties and places that will capture the largest share of market potential across the region. Among sixteen target markets (lifestyle clusters) for the region, the “Colleges and Cafes” households are only residing in Houghton, Marquette, and Chippewa Counties. Marquette is also the only county with households in the “Full Pockets, Empty Nests”, “Wired for Success”, and “Hope for Tomorrow” groups.

Similarly, the “Humble Beginnings” are only living in Delta County, and the “Urban Ambition” households are only living in Chippewa and Mackinac Counties. Other target markets like “Bohemian Groove” and “Digital Dependents” households are living in nearly every county across the region (including Gogebic County) with varying degrees of prevalence.

These observations are only intended as an overview and to provide some regional perspective. The detailed market potential results for the cities and villages within each county are provided within their respective Market Strategy Report, independent from this document. The remainder of this document focuses on details for Gogebic County and the Cities of Ironwood, Bessemer, and Wakefield.

Report Outline

This draft narrative accompanies the Market Strategy Report with results of a Residential Target Market Analysis (TMA) for Gogebic County, Michigan. The outline and structure of this report are intentionally replicated for each of the fifteen counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Regions 1a (west), 1b (central), and 1c (east). This leverages work economies, helps keep the reports succinct, and enables easy comparisons between counties in the region.

Variable	General Description
Target Markets	Upscale and Moderate
Lifestyle Clusters	71 Total and Most Prevalent
Scenario	Conservative and Aggressive
Tenure	Renter and Owner Occupied
Building Sizes	Number of Units per Building
Building Formats	Missing Middle Housing, Attached and Detached
Places	Cities, Villages, and Census Designated Places (CDP)
Seasonality	Seasonal Non-Resident Households
Prices	Monthly Rents, Rent per Square Foot, Home Values
Unit Sizes	Square Feet and Number of Bedrooms

Results of the TMA and study are presented by lifestyle cluster (71 clusters across the nation), and target markets (8 upscale and 8 moderate), scenario (conservative and aggressive), tenure (renter and owner), building format (detached and missing middle housing), place (city, village, and census designated place), price point (rent and value), and unit sizes (square feet). These topics are also supported by attachments with tables and exhibits that detail the quantitative results.

This Market Strategy Report also includes a series of attached exhibits in Section A through Section H, and an outline is provided in the following Table 1.

Table 1
TMA Market Strategy Report – Outline
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a

The Market Strategy Report		Geography
Narrative	Executive Summary	County and Places
Narrative	Technical Report	County and Places
Narrative	Market Assessment	County and Places
Section A	Investment Opportunities	Places
Section B	Summary Tables and Charts	County
Section C	Conservative Scenario	County
Section D	Aggressive Scenario	County
Section E	Aggressive Scenario	Places
Section F ₁	Contract Rents	County and Places
Section F ₂	Home Values	County and Places
Section G	Existing Households	County and Places
Section H	Market Assessment	County and Places

This Market Strategy Report is designed to focus on data results from the target market analysis. It does not include detailed explanations of the analytic methodology and approach, determination of the target markets, derivation of migration and movership rates, Missing Middle Housing typologies, or related terminology. Each of those topics is fully explained in the Methods Book, which is part of the Regional Workbook.

The Regional Workbook is intended to be shared among all counties in the Upper Peninsula region, and it includes the following: a) advisory report of recommended next-steps, b) methods book with terminology and work approach; and c) demographic profiles of the target markets. An outline is provided in the following Table 2.

Table 2

TMA Regional Workbook – Outline
Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1

The Regional Workbook

Narrative	The Advisory Report
Narrative	The Methods Book

Target Market Profiles

Section J	Formats by Target Market
Section K	Building Typologies
Section L	Lifestyle Clusters
Section M	Narrative Descriptions

The Regional Workbook (including the Methods Book) is more than a supporting and companion document to this Market Strategy Report. Rather, it is essential for an accurate interpretation of the target market analysis and results, and should be carefully reviewed by every reader and interested stakeholder.

The Target Markets

To complete the market potential, 8 upscale and 8 moderate target markets were selected based on their propensity to a) migrate throughout the State of Michigan; b) choose a place in the Upper Peninsula; and c) choose attached housing formats in small and large urban places. Among the 8 upscale markets, those moving into and within Gogebic County include the Bohemian Groove, Digital Dependent, and Striving Single Scene households. Similarly, the moderate target markets moving into and within the county include Family Troopers, Senior Discounts, Tight Money, and Tough Times.

The following Table 3 provides an overview of the target market inclinations for attached units, renter tenure, and average movership rate. Detailed profiles are included in Section B attached to this report and in the Regional Workbook.

Table 3
Preference of Upscale and Moderate Target Markets
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a – Year 2016

Group	Lifestyle Cluster Name	Share in Attached Units	Renters as a Share of Total	Average Movership Rate
Upscale	K40 Bohemian Groove	52%	91%	17%
Upscale	O51 Digital Dependents	11%	34%	36%
Upscale	O54 Striving Single Scene	98%	96%	50%
Moderate	O55 Family Troopers	64%	99%	40%
Moderate	Q65 Senior Discounts	100%	71%	13%
Moderate	S70 Tight Money	92%	100%	36%
Moderate	S71 Tough Times	86%	95%	19%

Upscale Target Markets for Gogebic County

- K40 Bohemian Groove** – Nearly eighty percent are renting units in low-rise multiplexes, garden apartments, and row houses of varying vintage. They are scattered across the nation and tend to live unassuming lifestyles in unassuming neighborhoods. Just in case they get the urge to move on, they don't like to accumulate possessions - including houses. Head of householder's age: 48% are between 51 and 65 years.
- O51 Digital Dependents** – Widely scattered across the country, these households are found in a mix of urban and second-tier cities, and usually in transient neighborhoods. Many have purchased a house, townhouse, flat, or loft as soon as they could; and a high percent are first-time homeowners. Two-thirds are child-free; they are independent and upwardly mobile; and over two-thirds will move within the next three years. Head of householder's age: 90% are 19 to 35 years.

Upscale Target Markets for Gogebic County (continued)

- O54 Striving Single Scene – Young, unattached singles living in city apartments across the country, usually in relatively large cities and close to the urban action. They are living in compact apartments and older low-rise and mid-rise buildings that were built between 1960 and 1990 – some of which are beginning to decline. These are diverse households and most hope that they are just passing through on the way to better jobs and larger flats or lofts. Head of householder’s age: 53% are 35 years or younger.

Moderate Target Markets for Gogebic County

- O55 Family Troopers – Families living in small cities and villages, and many have jobs linked to national and state security, or to the military. In some markets they may even be living in barracks or older duplexes, ranches, and low-rise multiplexes located near military bases, airports, and water ports. They are among the most transient populations in the nation and may have routine deployments and reassignments – so renting makes smart sense. Head of householder’s age: 85% are 35 years or younger.
- Q65 Senior Discounts – Seniors living throughout the country and particularly in metro communities, big cities, and inner-ring suburbs. They tend to live in large multiplexes geared for seniors, and prefer that security over living on their own. Many reside in independent and assisted living facilities. Head of householder’s age: 98% are over 51 years, including 84% who are over 66 years.
- S70 Tight Money – Centered in the Midwest and located in exurban and small cities and villages, including bedroom communities to larger metro areas, and in transitioning and challenging neighborhoods. They are living in low-rises and some in duplexes, but few can afford to own a house. Head of householder’s age: 53% are between 36 and 50 years.
- S71 Tough Times – Living east of the Mississippi River and in aging city neighborhoods. They tend to live in multiplexes built in the urban renewal era of the 1960’s to 1980’s, when tenement row houses in downtowns were being bulldozed to create new housing for low income and disadvantaged households. Many of their buildings are declining and the tenants are intent on finding alternatives. Head of householder’s age: 68% are between 51 and 65 years.

Prevalent Lifestyle Clusters

While upscale and moderate target markets represent most of the annual market potential for Gogebic County, the model also measures the potential among other and more prevalent lifestyle clusters. The most prevalent lifestyle clusters for Gogebic County are documented in [Section G](#) of this report, with details for each of the three cities of Ironwood, Bessemer, and Wakefield.

As shown in [Exhibit G.1](#), the most prevalent lifestyle clusters in Gogebic County include True Grit Americans, Town Elders, Rural Escape, Unspoiled Splendor, Homemade Happiness, and Red White and Bluegrass households. Only through their large numbers do these households collectively generate additional market potential for attached units in the county.

The following [Table 4](#) provides a summary of these lifestyle clusters with their propensity to choose attached units, renter tenure, and renter movership rates. For example, about 17% of the Booming and Consuming households are likely to be renters and 15% are inclined to move each year. However, only 9% of these households will choose an attached housing format over a detached house. Therefore, building attached housing formats for these households is not likely to be very effective. Instead, developers should design new formats for the upscale and moderate targets that are more inclined to choose them.

Table 4
Most Prevalent Lifestyle Clusters
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a – Year 2016

Lifestyle Cluster Name	Share in Attached Units	Renters as a Share of Total	Average Movership Rate	Gogebic County Hhlds.
N46 True Grit Americans	4%	9%	11%	3,367
Q64 Town Elders	3%	4%	2%	1,553
J35 Rural Escape	3%	3%	4%	520
E21 Unspoiled Splendor	2%	2%	2%	451
L41 Booming, Consuming	9%	17%	15%	232
L43 Homemade Happiness	3%	5%	6%	230
M44 Red, White, Bluegrass	5%	11%	6%	134

Prevalent Lifestyle Clusters – Gogebic County

- N46 True Grit Americans – Typically in scenic settings and small cities and villages throughout the Midwest, and in remote rural areas. Living in older houses and cottages, mainly ranch or craftsman-style houses built before 1970. Head of householder’s age: diverse, with 36% between 36 and 50 years.
- Q64 Town Elders – Seniors living in small and rural communities; in detached ranch houses and bungalows typically situated on small lots and built more than half a century ago. Head of householder’s age: 98% are over 66 years.
- J35 Rural Escape – Empty nesters living in remote and quiet communities, and retirement havens; and choosing detached houses on large lots, or manufactured homes. Head of householder’s age: 69% are over 51 years, and 49% are over 66 years.
- E21 Unspoiled Splendor – Scattered locations across small remote rural communities in the Midwest. Most live in detached houses that are relatively new and built since 1980, on sprawling properties with at least 2 acres. Head of householder’s age: 87% are between 51 and 65 years.
- L41 Booming and Consuming – Empty nesters living in scattered small cities and villages; and tending to choose newer ranch-style houses or townhouses. Head of householder’s age: 58% are between 51 and 65 years, and most of the balance is older.
- L43 Homemade Happiness – Empty nesters living in Midwest heartland; in houses built in 1970 (with 15% in manufactured homes), but on large lots in rustic settings to enjoy the quiet country. Head of householder’s age: 97% are over 51 years, including 88% between 51 and 65 years.
- M44 Red, White, and Bluegrass – Located in scattered rural locations, tending to live in newer detached houses, ranches, farmhouses, and bungalows on sprawling lots with two acres. About 10% are living in manufactured homes, and many also have campers and RV’s in the backyard. They are young families but settled in their community and likely to stay as five to fifteen years before moving. Head of householder’s age: 74% are between 25 and 45 years.

Conservative Scenario

The TMA model for Gogebic County has been conducted for two scenarios, including a conservative (minimum) and aggressive (maximum) scenario. The conservative scenario is based on in-migration into the county and each of its local places, and is unadjusted for out-migration. It does not include households that are already living in and moving within the county and its three cities.

Results of the conservative scenario are presented in three exhibits in [Section C](#) attached to this report, with a focus on county totals. [Exhibit C.1](#) is a summary table showing the county-wide, annual market potential for all 71 lifestyle clusters, the 8 upscale target markets, and the 8 moderate target markets. The 71 lifestyle clusters include all existing households currently living in Gogebic County, whether they are prevalent or represent a small share of the total.

Under the conservative scenario, Gogebic County has an annual market potential for at least 48 attached units (i.e., excluding detached houses), across a range of building sizes and formats. Of these 48 attached units, 8 will be occupied by households among the upscale target markets, and 37 will be occupied by moderate target market households. The small balance of 3 units will be occupied by other lifestyle clusters that are prevalent in the county – and with a lower propensity to choose attached housing formats.

[Exhibit C.1](#) shows these same figures for Gogebic County’s conservative scenario, including totals for all 71 lifestyle clusters, and the upscale and moderate target markets; and split between owners and renters. Detailed results are also provided for each of the upscale ([Exhibit C.2](#)) and moderate ([Exhibit C.3](#)) target markets, with owners at the top of each table and renters at the bottom.

Aggressive Scenario

The aggressive scenario represents a maximum or not-to-exceed threshold based on current migration patterns within and into Gogebic County, and unadjusted for out-migration. It also assumes that every household moving into and within the county would prefer to trade-up into a refurbished or new unit, rather than occupy a unit that needs a lot of work.

Attached [Section D](#) of this report includes a series of tables that detail the market potential under the aggressive (maximum) scenario. The following [Table 5](#) provides a summary and comparison between the aggressive and conservative scenarios, with a focus on attached units only. In general, the aggressive scenario for Gogebic County is nearly four times larger than the conservative scenario (+388%, or 186 v. 48 attached units annually).

Table 5
Annual and Five-Year Market Potential – Attached Units Only
71 Lifestyle Clusters by Scenario
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a – 2016

Renters and Owners Attached Units Only	Conservative Scenario (Minimum)		Aggressive Scenario (Maximum)	
	Annual # Units	5 Years # Units	Annual # Units	5 Years # Units
Upscale Targets	8	40	35	175
Moderate Targets	37	185	131	655
Other Prevalent Clusters	3	15	20	100
71 Lifestyle Clusters	48	240	186	930

For Gogebic County, the difference between the conservative and aggressive scenarios is disproportionately high for the region and indicates that Gogebic needs to do a better job of attracting new households under the conservative scenario. Based on in-migration to other counties in the Upper Peninsula, Gogebic County should be attracting 75 new households rather than just 48 new households annually.

Under the aggressive scenario, only 6% of the annual market potential (3 units) will be generated by other households that are prevalent in Gogebic County (i.e., they are the “Prevalent Lifestyle Clusters”). Although they are prevalent in the county, they have low movership rates and are more inclined to choose houses – if they move at all.

The vast majority (about 94%) of market potential for Gogebic County will be generated by households that have a higher propensity to choose attached units (thus, they are the “Target Markets”). They are living in the county in relatively fewer numbers, but they have high movership rates and are good targets for new housing formats.

All figures for the five-year timeline assume that the annual potential is fully captured in each year through the rehabilitation of existing units, plus conversions of vacant buildings (such as vacant warehouses or schools), and some new-builds. If the market potential is not captured in each year, then the balance does not roll-over to the next year. Instead, the market potential will dissipate into outlying areas or be intercepted by competing counties in the region.

Note: Additional narrative is included in the Methods Book within the Regional Workbook, with explanations of the conservative and aggressive scenarios, upscale and moderate target markets, and the annual and 5-year timelines.

“Slide” by Building Format

All exhibits in the attached [Section B](#) through [Section F](#) show the model results before any adjustments are made for the magnitude of market potential relative to building size. For example, under the aggressive scenario, Gogebic County has an annual market potential for up to 35 units among buildings with 100 or more units each. This is not enough to support development of a 100+ unit building, and that building format probably wouldn’t be appropriate for any of its three cities. However, the units can “slide” down into smaller formats, and the following [Table 6](#) demonstrates the adjusted results.

Table 6
Annual Market Potential – “Slide” along Formats (in Units)
71 Lifestyle Clusters – Conservative and Aggressive Scenarios
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a – 2016

Number of Units by Building Format/Size	Conservative Scenario		Aggressive Scenario	
	Unadjusted w/out Slide	Adjusted with Slide	Unadjusted w/out Slide	Adjusted with Slide
1 Detached Houses	150	150	323	323
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	.	.	5	4
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	.	13	12
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	4	7	8
5-9 Townhouse, Live-Work	10	10	43	44
10+ Multiplex: Small	6	10	24	24
20+ Multiplex: Large	10	24	33	33
50+ Midrise: Small	8	.	26	61
100+ Midrise: Large	10	.	35	.
Subtotal Attached	48	48	186	186

Note: Additional explanations for “sliding” the market potential along building formats are provided in the Methods Book within the Regional Workbook. Significant narrative in the Methods Book is also dedicated to explanations of building formats, Missing Middle Housing typologies, and recommended branding strategies for developers and builders.

Ironwood, Bessemer, and Wakefield

Section E attached to this Market Strategy Report details the annual market potential and model results for each of the three cities (Ironwood, Bessemer, and Wakefield) within Gogebic County. Results are shown for the aggressive scenario only, which is based on both in-migration and internal movership within each city.

Table 7 on the following page shows the annual results for the three cities, including a) unadjusted model results for the aggressive scenario, and b) adjustments with a “slide” along building sizes. The conservative scenario (reflecting in-migration only) is not provided for the local places, but it can be safely assumed that results would be about 25% of the aggressive scenario (note: this figure should be closer to 40% when compared to other counties in the region).

Intercepting Migrating Households – The market potential for each city is based on the known inclination for households to move into and within that place. When few if any households are moving into or within a given place, then the market potential will be similarly low. To experience more population growth, Gogebic County’s three cities must do a better job of competing with other communities in the region and intercepting migrating households. This can best be accomplished with a combination of job creation, placemaking processes, and real estate investment.

As demonstrated in the prior section of this report, there is an annual market potential for 186 attached units throughout Gogebic County (the aggressive scenario). Each of the local communities can compete for households that are migrating into and within the county and seeking those choices. Some (albeit not all) of the migrating households will seek townhouses with patios or balconies and vista views of the downtown districts.

Table 7
Annual Market Potential – “Slide” along Formats (in Units)
71 Lifestyle Clusters – Aggressive Scenario
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a – 2016

Number of Units Unadjusted Model Results	City of Ironwood	City of Bessemer	City of Wakefield	Gogebic County Totals
1 Detached Houses	177	41	27	323
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	.	.	5
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	6	.	.	13
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	.	.	7
5-9 Townhouse, Live-Work	18	5	2	43
10+ Multiplex: Small	9	3	2	24
20+ Multiplex: Large	13	4	3	33
50+ Midrise: Small	11	3	2	26
<u>100+ Midrise: Large</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>35</u>
Subtotal Attached	79	20	10	186
Number of Units Adjusted with “Slide”	City of Ironwood	City of Bessemer	City of Wakefield	Gogebic County Totals
1 Detached Houses	177	41	27	323
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	.	.	4
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	6	.	.	12
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	4	.	.	8
5-9 Townhouse, Live-Work	18	5	10	44
10+ Multiplex: Small	10	15	.	24
20+ Multiplex: Large	39	.	.	33
50+ Midrise: Small	.	.	.	61
<u>100+ Midrise: Large</u>	<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>	<u>.</u>
Subtotal Attached	79	20	10	186

The Three Cities – Based on the magnitude and profile of households already moving into and within each of the three cities, they share an annual market potential for 109 attached units through the year 2020. This annual market potential includes 79 attached units in Ironwood, 20 units in Bessemer, and 10 units in Wakefield.

All three cities may compete with each other to intercept a larger share of the total market potential. Additional units can be added if the three cities can intercept households that might choose other places and counties, by creating new jobs, reinvesting in the downtowns, and adding amenities through a placemaking process.

Non-Residents and Seasonality

In many of Michigan’s counties, seasonal residents and non-residents comprise a significant share of total households. Seasonal residents are captured in the market potential, but seasonal non-residents are not. So, in some unique markets with exceptionally high seasonality, even the aggressive scenario can be viewed as being more than reasonable.

In some unique markets, local developers may be particularly interested in understanding the upside market potential for new housing units that could be specifically designed for seasonal non-resident households. To provide some perspective, LandUse|USA has calculated an adjustment factor for each place in Gogebic County and based on data and assumptions that are described in the Methods Book (see narrative within the Regional Workbook).

Results may be applied to the market potential within most of Gogebic County’s markets. The premiums are relatively small for all three of the cities, so they can be applied with little risk that they will lead to over-building in those real estate markets.

Seasonal Non-Residents	Market Potential “Premium”
Gogebic County	+16%
The City of Ironwood	+3%
The City of Bessemer	+10%
The City of Wakefield	+4%

Rents and Square Feet

This section of the report focuses on contract rents and unit sizes, and stakeholders are encouraged to review the materials in [Section F₁](#) for information on rents (see [Section F₂](#) for home values). [Section F₁](#) includes tables showing the general tolerance of the upscale and moderate target markets to pay across contract rent brackets, with averages for the State of Michigan. The exhibits also show the allocation of annual market potential across rent brackets for Gogebic County. Results are also shown in the following [Table 8](#), with a summary for the upscale and moderate target markets under the aggressive scenario.

Table 8

Annual Market Potential by Contract Rent Bracket
71 Lifestyle Clusters – Aggressive Scenario
Gogebic County – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a
(2016 Constant Dollars)

Renter Occupied Units Attached and Detached	Renter-Occupied Contract (Cash) Rent Brackets					Total Potential
	\$ 0 \$600	\$600 \$800	\$800 \$1,000	\$1,000 \$1,500	\$1,500- \$2,000+	
Upscale Targets	19	22	11	4	0	56
Moderate Targets	69	40	15	5	2	131
Other Clusters	39	43	17	5	1	105
Gogebic County	127	105	43	14	3	292

Note: Figures in Table 8 are for renter-occupied units only, and might not perfectly match the figures in prior tables due to data splicing and rounding within the market potential model.

[Section F₁](#) also includes tables showing the median contract rents for Gogebic County’s three cities, which can be used to make local level adjustments as needed. Also included is a table showing the relationships between contract rent (also known as cash rent) and gross rent (with utilities, deposits, and extra fees). For general reference, there is also a scatter plot showing the direct relationship between contract rents and median household incomes among all 71 lifestyle clusters.

Forecast rents per square foot are based on existing choices throughout the Upper Peninsula region and used to estimate the typical unit size within each rent bracket. Existing choices are documented in [Section F₁](#), including a scatter plot with the relationships between rents and square feet. The following [Table 9](#) summarizes the results for the entire region, with typical unit sizes by contract rent bracket.

Table 9
Typical Unit Sizes by Contract Rent Bracket
Attached Units Only
Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1
(2016 Constant Dollars)

Contract Rent Brackets (Attached Units Only)	Renter-Occupied Contract (Cash) Rent Brackets					
	\$ 0- \$ 600	\$ 600- \$ 700	\$ 700- \$ 800	\$ 800- \$ 900	\$ 900- \$1,000+	
Minimum Square Feet	450	500	700	900	1,200	sq. ft.
Maximum Square Feet	600	800	1,000	1,300	1,600	sq. ft.

The analysis is also conducted for owner-occupied choices, and stakeholders are encouraged to review the materials in [Section F₁](#) for those results. Again, additional explanations of the methodology and approach are also provided within the Methods Book included in the Regional Workbook.

(Note: Marquette is the only city in the region with rents and square feet that consistently exceed averages for the Upper Peninsula region. See [Section F₁](#) of the Marquette County Market Strategy for results of that real estate analysis and unique market).

Comparison to Supply

This last step of the TMA compares the market potential to the existing supply of housing by building format, and for all 71 lifestyle clusters. To complete the comparison, it is first determined that among all renters and owners in Michigan, a weighted average of about 14% will move each year. Theoretically, this suggests that it will take roughly seven years for 100% of the housing stock to turn-over. Therefore, the annual market potential is multiplied by seven before comparing it to the existing housing stock.

Results are shown in the attached [Exhibit B.1](#) (Gogebic County), and [Exhibit B.2](#) (the City of Ironwood) and indicate that there is no need to build more detached houses in the city. A summary is also provided in the following [Table 10](#).

Table 10
Seven-Year Cumulative Market Potential v. Existing Units
 71 Lifestyle Clusters – Aggressive Scenario
 The City of Ironwood – Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1b
 Years 2016 – 2022

Number of Units by Building Format	Potential 7-Year Total	Existing Housing Units	Implied Gap for New-Builds
1 Detached Houses	1,239	2,623	--
2 Duplex, Subdivided House	14	193	-179
3-4 Side-by-Side, Stacked	56	21	35
Subtotal Duplex – Fourplex	70	214	-144
5-9 Townhouse, Live-Work	126	50	76
10-19 Multiplex: Small	63	19	44
20-49 Multiplex: Large	91	66	25
50+ Midrise: Small	203	70	133
Subtotal Multiplex & Midrise	357	155	202
Total Attached Units	553	419	134

As shown in the preceding table, up to 1,239 households will be seeking detached houses throughout Ironwood over the span of seven years – and it is assumed that most would prefer a house that has been refurbished or significantly remodeled. Meanwhile, the results reveal a net surplus of houses (2,623 existing units v. 1,239 migrating households).

(Note: Theoretically, it will take 15 years for all of Ironwood’s existing detached houses to turn over and before a new market gap emerges for that product.)

Although there is a net surplus of detached houses, 126 of Ironwood’s migrating households will be seeking townhouses, row houses, or similar formats over the span of seven years, which exceeds the current supply (50 existing units v. 126 migrating households). Similarly, there are 155 existing units among multiplexes and midrise formats, which is insufficient to meet the needs of the 357 households seeking those options over the span of seven years. These figures are detailed in the following [Table 10](#).

The histograms comparing the 7-year market potential to existing housing units is intended only to provide a general sense of magnitude. Direct comparisons will be imperfect for a number reasons described in the following list.

Exhibit B.1 – Some Cautionary Observations

1. The market potential has not been refined to account for the magnitude of market potential among building sizes, and is not adjusted for a “slide” along building formats.
2. The histogram relies on data for existing housing units as reported by the American Community Survey (ACS) and based on five-year estimates through 2014. The data and year for the market potential is different, so comparisons will be imperfect.
3. The number of existing housing units is not adjusted for vacancies, including units difficult to sell or lease because they do not meet household needs and preferences. Within the cities and villages, a small share may be reported vacant because they are seasonally occupied by non-residents. Seasonal occupancy rates tend to be significantly higher in the rural areas.
4. On average, the existing housing stock should be expected to turnover every seven years, with variations by tenure and lifestyle cluster. However, owner-occupied units have a slower turn-over rate (about 15 years), whereas renter occupied units tend to turn-over at least every three years. Again, these differences mean that direct comparisons are imperfect.

5. The 7-year market potential assumes that the market potential is fully met within each consecutive year. However, if Gogebic County cannot meet the market potential in any given year, then that opportunity will dissipate and not roll-over.

Market Assessment – Introduction

The following sections of this report provide a qualitative market assessment for Gogebic County and the City of Ironwood. It begins with an overview of countywide economic advantages, followed by a market assessment for Ironwood. The last section provides results of a PlaceScore™ analysis for Ironwood, based on placemaking attributes relative to other cities and villages throughout the State of Michigan.

Materials attached to this report include Section A with downtown aerials, photo collages, and investment opportunities. All lists with sites, addresses, and buildings include information that local stakeholders reported and have not been field-verified by the consultants. In contrast, the photo collages document what the consultants observed during independent market tours and field research.

Collages of Downtown Photos – Observations by the consultants during independent field work.

Lists of Investment Opportunities – Information that stakeholders provided to the consultants.

In addition, Section H includes demographic profiles, a table of traffic counts, and the comparative analysis of PlaceScores™. The following narrative provides a summary of some key observations, and stakeholders are encouraged to study the attachments for additional information.

Gogebic County – Overview

Geographic Overview - Gogebic County is located in the western Upper Peninsula of Michigan and shares its west and south borders with the State of Wisconsin (the west border also follows along the Montreal River). In Michigan, Gogebic County also shares borders with Ontonagon County to the north and Iron County to the east.

Highway Linkages – Gogebic County is connected with its economic region by Highway 2, which links west to Duluth, Minnesota, and east to the cities of Iron River (Iron County), Iron Mountain (Dickinson County), and Escanaba (Delta County). Highway 2 also has the county’s peak daily traffic volume, or 10,600 vehicles.

Highway 2 links with Highway 28 in the City of Wakefield, and which provides access east to the City of Marquette. Highway 2 also links with Highway 45 in the eastern portion of the county, which provides access south to Wisconsin and north to the cities of Ontonagon, Houghton, and Hancock.

Other Transportation – Trade and transportation of goods are also supported by the Canadian National railway, which links south into Wisconsin. The Gogebic-Iron County Airport (Ironwood Township) supports general aviation with flights to Chicago and Minneapolis.

Economic Profile – Arts, entertainment, recreation, hospitality, and retail trade account for nearly 27% of all jobs in Gogebic County. This is followed by education, health care, and social assistance, which collectively represent over 23% of total employment. In addition, manufacturing and government administration represent about 13% and 7% of employment, respectively.

Employers – Most of the county’s largest employers and anchor institutions are located in the tri-cities of Ironwood, Bessemer, and Wakefield, and are listed in the following section of this report. Employers in the City or Ironwood are listed in the following section of this report, and those in other places are listed on the following page. (Note: The lists of employers exclude local public schools and local government, and include other anchor institutions like hospitals, colleges, county seats, and airports).

County Seat - Bessemer is the county seat for Gogebic County, and government functions provide good paying jobs for the tri-city region while supporting local businesses in finance, insurance, real estate (mortgage, title, and property surveying), legal (attorneys and lawyers), and related professions.

The City of Bessemer – Employers and Anchor Institutions

- Gogebic County | Government Administration
- Bessemer Plywood Corporation (Bessemer) | Wood Products
- Big Powderhorn Mountain Resort (Bessemer) | Recreation

The City of Wakefield – Employers and Anchor Institutions

- Extreme Tool & Engineering (Wakefield) | Manufacturing
- First National Bank (Wakefield) | Finance
- Indianhead Mountain Resort (Wakefield) | Traveler Accommodations

Watersmeet CDP – Employers and Anchor Institutions

- Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (Watersmeet) | Gov't. Admin.
- Lac Vieux Desert Resort and Casino (Watersmeet) | Entertainment

The City of Ironwood Advantage

Geographic Setting – The City of Ironwood is the westernmost city in the state of Michigan, and it shares the Wisconsin State border with the City of Hurley (and across the Montreal River). It is also the westernmost city in an economic chain that is completed by the cities of Bessemer (about four miles east) and Wakefield (another four miles east).

Economic Profile – Arts, entertainment, recreation, hospitality, and retail trade collectively comprise about 30% of all jobs in the City of Ironwood. Within the west and central Upper Peninsula, this is surpassed only by the cities of Escanaba (Delta County) and Calumet (Houghton County). The city has become exceptionally well-known for its ski resorts, including Big Powderhorn, Blackjack, Indianhead, Mount Zion and Whitecap.

Education, health, and social services represent about 20% of total employment for Ironwood, trailed by government administration with about 4 percent. The city has an exceptionally high share of total employment in manufacturing, with 17% compared to about 13% for the county average. Some of its largest employers are in the fabric and plastics industries (see the following list).

Some of Ironwood’s largest employers and anchor institutions are shown in the following list, which excludes city government and public schools and include institutions such as the local hospital, county seat, an assisted living facility, and the county airport.

The City of Ironwood – Employers and Anchor Institutions

- Aspirus Grand View Health System Inc. | Health Care
- Gogebic Community College | Advanced Education
- Ironwood Plastics | Manufacturing
- Jacquart Fabric Products | Manufacturing
- Gogebic-Iron Co. Airport (Ironwood Twp.) | Transportation
- CCG Ironwood | Assisted Living
- Gogebic Range Bank | Finance

Community Awards – The City of Ironwood has received several awards in recent years, including a 2016 Sinclair Exceptional Service Award to its city manager (from the Michigan Municipal League); 2015 Daniel Burnham Award for a Comprehensive Plan (from the Michigan Association of Planning); and 2013 Community Excellence Award for its Ironwood Railroad Depot Park project (also from the Michigan Municipal League).

Investment Opportunities – Downtown Ironwood is aligned along Aurora Street, which is used by most traffic to cross the Montreal River and link to (and from) Hurley, Wisconsin. Based on stakeholder input, several buildings at 307 Aurora Street and 216 W. McLeod Avenue benefit from visibility to traffic and may be candidates for adding new housing formats.

Other reinvestment opportunities are listed among [Section A](#) attached to this report. Photo collages are intended to reinforce reinvestment opportunities located in downtown districts and reflect independent observations by the consultants.

Riverfront Amenities – Ironwood’s downtown district is located about one-third mile east of the Montreal River, which is also the boundary between Ironwood, Michigan and Hurley, Wisconsin. The City of Ironwood owns a parcel along the Montreal River (at W. Ayer and Hemlock Streets) that could be developed into a riverfront park. If streetscape improvements are also added along W. Ayer Street, then the new park could help link downtown pedestrians to the riverfront.

Analysis of PlaceScores™

Introduction – Placemaking is a key ingredient for achieving Gogebic County’s full residential market potential, particularly under the aggressive or maximum scenario. Extensive Internet research was conducted to evaluate the success of the City of Ironwood relative to other places throughout Michigan. PlaceScore™ criteria are tallied for a possible 30 total points, and based on an approach that is explained in the Methods Book (see the Regional Workbook). Results are detailed in [Section H](#) attached to this report.

Summary of the PlaceScores – The City of Ironwood is the largest city in Gogebic County, and therefore was the focus of the PlaceScore analysis. It has an overall PlaceScore of 21 points out of 30 possible. The score is exemplary and includes a point for the SISU Ski Fest, which draws visitors from the Upper Midwestern states during winter months. It also includes a bonus point for the city’s comprehensive plan, which mentions intentions of eventually developing a unified code within its zoning ordinance.

PlaceScore v. Market Size – There tends to be a correlation between PlaceScore and the market size in population. If the scores are adjusted for the market size (or calculated based on the score per 1,000 residents), then the results reveal an inverse logarithmic relationship.

Smaller places may have lower scores, but their points per 1,000 residents tend to be higher. Larger markets have higher scores, but their points per 1,000 residents tend to be lower. Although the City of Ironwood’s adjusted PlaceScore for market size is low (6 points), it is still within a range that would be typically be expected for a city of its size.

Contact Information

This concludes the Draft Market Strategy Report for the Gogebic County Target Market Analysis. Questions regarding economic growth, downtown development initiatives, and implementation of these recommendations can be addressed to the following project managers.

West Region 1a	Central Region 1b	East Region 1c
Erik Powers	Emilie Schada	Jeff Hagan
Regional Planner	Regional Planner	Executive Director
WUPPDR	CUPPAD	EUPRP
393 E. Lakeshore Drive	2950 College Avenue	1118 E. Easterday Avenue
Houghton, MI 49931	Escanaba, MI 49829	Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
(906) 482-7205 x315	(906) 786-9234 x508	(906) 635-1752
epowers@wuppdr.org	eschada@cupp.ad.org	jshagan@eup-planning.org

Questions regarding the work approach, methodology, TMA terminology, analytic results, strategy recommendations, and planning implications should be directed to Sharon Woods at LandUse|USA.

Sharon M. Woods, CRE
 Principal, TMA Team Leader
 LandUse|USA, LLC
www.LandUseUSA.com
sharonwoods@landuseusa.com
 (517) 290-5531 direct



A - H

Gogebic County

Prepared by:



Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a

Michigan State Housing Development Authority





Prepared by:



Table of Contents


Investment Opportunities	A
Summary Tables and Charts	B
Conservative Scenario County	C
Aggressive Scenario County	D
Aggressive Scenario Places	E
Contract Rents County and Places	F ₁
Home Values County and Places	F ₂
Existing Households County and Places	G
Market Assessment County and Places	H



A

Investment Opportunities

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:


Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority





MSHDA
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Geographic Setting with Places, Highways, and Lakes
Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a



Source: Mapping provided by DeLorme; exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016 ©.
Blue squares indicate the inside corners of the county.





Downtown Scale with Some Opportunities for Upper Level Rehabs and/or Restorations
The City of Ironwood | Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a

Exhibit A.3



Photo credit (above): Original photos by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

Downtown with Some Opportunities for Horizontal Infill and/or Vertical (upward) Expansion
The City of Ironwood | Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a



Photo credit (above): Original photos by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

Downtown with Some Opportunities for Horizontal Infill and Vertical (upward) Expansion
The City of Ironwood | Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a



Photo credit (above): Original photos by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

List of Investment Opportunities for Missing Middle Housing

Exhibit A.6

The City of Ironwood | Gogebic Co., Michigan | UP Prosperity Region 1a | 2016

City, Village, Township	Water Front	Down Town	Existing Conditions/Current Use Notes and Comments	Investment Opp./Future Use Notes and Comments
1 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	Historic 1900 2-level building. 216 E. Aurora St. 8,160 sq. ft. Currently in use and for sale.	Potential for historic rehab for mixed-use for upper level condos or lofts.
2 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	124 W. Ayer St. Built in 1935. 8,400 sq. ft. Includes 40 x 100 garage; offices and 3 upper apartments. For sale.	Candidate for rental rehab of upper lofts.
3 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	Historic 1900 2-level building. 112 S. Lowell St. 2,580 sq. ft. First level is used as a bar and grill. For sale.	Potential for historic rehab for mixed-use for upper level condos or lofts.
4 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	Historic 1900 3-level brick building. 115 E. Ayer St. 2,700 sq. ft. For sale.	Potential for historic rehab for condos, lofts, or flats.
5 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	Historic 1900 2-level building. 103 S. Suffolk St. 3,280 sq. ft. Vacant and for sale.	Potential historical rehab for mixed-use for upper level condos or lofts.
6 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	240 E. Aurora St. 2,400 sq. ft. Single level masonry building. For sale.	building's downtown location is ideal for vertical expansion to include upper level condos or lofts.
7 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	216 W. McLeod Ave. Large vacant downtown building with large parking lot. For sale.	Potential for adaptive reuse, or razed and new construction of Live/Work units, flats, or lofts.
8 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	102 & 104 Aurora St. 3-level building. 14,265 sq. ft. Building used for restaurant and apts.	Potential for historic rehab for mixed-use for upper level condos or lofts.
9 The City of Ironwood	No	Yes	307 W. Aurora St. 22,100 sq. ft. vacant downtown building with large parking lot. 94,000 sq. ft. total lot size. For sale.	Potential for adaptive reuse, or razed and new construction of Live/Work units, flats, or lofts.

Notes: This list is intended to focus on the largest opportunities for adding new housing formats.

This list of projects is based only on stakeholder input, and they have not been field-verified.

Source: Interviews with stakeholders and market research conducted by LandUse|USA, 2016.

FRAMING CONCEPTS

INFILL & REDEVELOPMENT

Redevelopment is a key goal articulated within this chapter and other chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. Redevelopment is often a challenging and complicated tasks that requires collaboration between the city, agencies responsible for service delivery, property owners, adjacent property owners, and ultimately the developer who redevelops the property. The City should consider a variety of roles vis a vis infill and redevelopment of key sites:

The City as a Broker: This applies where city owns the property in question and has the ability to make key decisions. The City's primary responsibility is to package the site and market it to potential users. The City has the added benefit of being able to assist with property entitlements for the site and removing barriers to redevelopment.

The City as a Facilitator: This approach requires the city to provide the linkage between prospective developers and property owners.

The City as a Developer / Partner: As the developer/partner, the city becomes an invested partner in the project, and as such, the city may have a direct role in completing a public improvement or securing financing in support of the redevelopment project.

In any of the above redevelopment roles, the City's objective is to help revitalize tired or under-utilized areas, return vacant land to revenue generating uses more quickly, and to help advance the city's vision.

Figure 3-2 (opposite) illustrates priority infill and redevelopment sites in Ironwood. The areas identified as "key infill opportunity sites" were identified based on the following criteria:

- Public ownership or landowner interested in redevelopment
- Vacant or underutilized land / buildings
- Location within city limits and availability of (and capacity of) existing infrastructure
- Suitability for future development (soils, wetlands, etc.)
- Potential for redevelopment to serve as a catalyst for other public improvements or remediation of environmental problems

Further planning may be necessary to accelerate infill and redevelopment in these areas. The City should look to align its redevelopment strategies and planning efforts with requirements of the Michigan Economic Development Corporation's (MEDC) [Redevelopment Ready Communities](#) program.

RELATED STRATEGIES:

*Strategy 3.3:
Conduct regular land use & building condition inventories*

*Strategy 3.4:
Identify project area for a pilot small area plan*

*Strategy 6.11:
Support infill & redevelopment*

SEE P. 3-16 & P. 6-10 FOR MORE ON THE STRATEGIES LISTED ABOVE

Exhibit A.7

Florence Street Site

Acres: 6.5

Ownership: Private

Potential future uses: Senior, Live-work, Commercial, Park

City Role: Facilitator/Partner

Redevelopment Strategy: Public/private partnership to study redevelopment options



Potential Character

Former Grocery Store Site

Acres: 1.6

Ownership: Private

Potential future use: Mixed Use Commercial/Housing

City Role: Facilitator/Partner

Redevelopment Strategy: Public/private partnership to study redevelopment options



Potential Character

Former School Site


Acres: 2.2

Ownership: Public (School District)

Potential future uses: Residential, Park

City Role: Broker

Redevelopment Strategy: Prepare design concept and market to developers



Potential Character

East Ayer Site

Acres: 26.2

Ownership: City-Owed

Potential future uses: Residential, Live-Work


City Role: Broker

Redevelopment Strategy: Prepare design concept and market to developers



Potential Character

FIGURE 3-2. REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY SITES



The redevelopment opportunity sites described on the preceding page include suggestions for future land use, potential redevelopment roles for the City, and general strategies for redevelopment. Further planning and study is strongly recommended to understand redevelopment potential and desired community outcomes for these sites.



Character and Scale of Two-Level Buildings, Some with Upper-Level Lofts / Flats
The City of Bessemer | Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a



Photo credit (above): Original photos by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

Downtown Scale with Some Opportunities for Rehabs and/or Restorations
The City of Bessemer | Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a



Photo credit (above): Original photos by LandUse | USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.



Downtown with Some Opportunities for Horizontal Infill and/or Vertical (upward) Expansion
The City of Wakefield | Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a

Exhibit A.13




Photo credit (above): Original photos by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.



B

Summary Tables and Charts

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA


Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority




7-Year Market Potential v. Total Existing Housing Units
 All 71 Lifestyle Clusters - Aggressive Scenario
 Gogebic County | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | 2016 - 2022




Source: Based on analysis and target market analysis modelling conducted exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 (c) with all rights reserved. Unadjusted for seasonal, non-resident households.

7-Year Market Potential v. Total Existing Housing Units
 All 71 Lifestyle Clusters - Aggressive Scenario
 The City of Ironwood | Gogebic County, Michigan | 2016 - 2022



Source: Based on analysis and target market analysis modelling conducted exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 (c) with all rights reserved. Unadjusted for seasonal, non-resident households.

Missing Middle Housing Formats v. Detached Houses
 Preferences of Most Prevalent Lifestyle Clusters
 Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1 | Year 2016




Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and licensed to LandUse|USA through Sites|USA. Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016; all rights reserved.

Residential Market Parameters for Lifestyle Clusters
 For Missing Middle Housing - Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1
 With Averages for the State of Michigan - 2015

Lifestyle Cluster Code	Duplex				Renters Share of Total	Owners Share of Total	Blended Mover- ship Rate
	Detached House 1 Unit	Triplex Fourplex 2-4 Units	Townhse., Live-Work 6+ Units	Midplex 20+ Units			
MOST PREVALENT CLUSTERS							
Unspoiled Splendor E21	97.9%	0.9%	1.1%	0.1%	2.0%	98.0%	1.8%
Rural Escape J35	97.3%	1.2%	1.5%	0.0%	3.2%	96.8%	3.9%
Booming and Consuming L41	91.2%	2.6%	4.8%	1.4%	17.3%	82.7%	14.5%
Homemade Happiness L43	97.0%	1.2%	1.6%	0.2%	4.9%	95.1%	5.8%
Red White and Bluegrass M44	95.3%	1.8%	2.6%	0.3%	11.3%	88.7%	5.6%
True Grit Americans N46	95.5%	1.2%	2.6%	0.6%	9.3%	90.7%	11.4%
Town Elders Q64	96.7%	1.4%	1.7%	0.2%	4.4%	95.6%	2.4%
Small Town Shallow Pockets S68	92.8%	2.7%	3.8%	0.7%	34.5%	65.5%	14.9%
INTERMITTENTLY PREVALENT							
Touch of Tradition N49	97.6%	1.2%	1.1%	0.1%	5.7%	94.3%	9.8%
Settled and Sensible J36	97.8%	1.0%	1.2%	0.1%	2.7%	97.3%	4.4%
Infants and Debit Cards M45	95.0%	2.0%	2.6%	0.3%	29.7%	70.3%	15.5%
Stockcars and State Parks I30	97.1%	1.1%	1.7%	0.1%	3.3%	96.7%	4.6%
Sports Utility Families D15	97.7%	0.7%	1.5%	0.1%	2.8%	97.2%	2.3%


Source: Underlying data represents Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian and Powered by Regis/Sites|USA.
 Analysis and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

Missing Middle Housing Formats v. Houses Preferences of Upscale Target Markets Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1 | Year 2016



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and licensed to LandUse|USA through Sites|USA. Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016; all rights reserved.

Missing Middle Housing Formats v. Houses Preferences of Moderate Target Markets Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1 | Year 2016



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and licensed to LandUse|USA through Sites|USA. Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016; all rights reserved.

Residential Market Parameters for Upscale and Moderate Target Markets
 For Missing Middle Housing - Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1
 With Averages for the State of Michigan - 2015

Lifestyle Cluster Code	Duplex				Renters Share of Total	Owners Share of Total	Blended Mover- ship Rate
	Detached House 1 Unit	Triplex Fourplex 2-4 Units	Townhse., Live-Work 6+ Units	Midplex 20+ Units			
UPSCALE TARGET MARKETS							
Full Pockets - Empty Nests E19	67.2%	9.1%	8.6%	15.1%	21.8%	78.2%	8.2%
Status Seeking Singles G24	87.3%	5.3%	6.2%	1.2%	29.9%	70.1%	16.9%
Wired for Success K37	23.7%	12.1%	15.6%	48.6%	80.2%	19.8%	39.7%
Bohemian Groove K40	48.3%	16.8%	17.4%	17.5%	91.4%	8.6%	17.3%
Full Steam Ahead O50	0.3%	0.8%	1.4%	97.5%	97.6%	2.4%	53.8%
Digital Dependents O51	89.2%	4.4%	5.6%	0.9%	34.1%	65.9%	36.3%
Urban Ambition O52	52.0%	17.3%	20.2%	10.5%	95.2%	4.8%	34.4%
Striving Single Scene O54	2.4%	5.4%	6.7%	85.4%	96.0%	4.0%	50.2%
MODERATE TARGET MARKETS							
Colleges and Cafes O53	51.3%	10.8%	9.6%	28.3%	83.1%	16.9%	25.1%
Family Troopers O55	36.3%	17.6%	19.2%	26.9%	98.9%	1.1%	39.5%
Humble Beginnings P61	0.1%	0.6%	0.7%	98.5%	97.3%	2.7%	38.1%
Senior Discounts Q65	0.1%	1.9%	2.4%	95.6%	70.9%	29.1%	12.9%
Dare to Dream R66	62.8%	20.3%	15.7%	1.1%	97.7%	2.3%	26.3%
Hope for Tomorrow R67	62.9%	19.5%	16.7%	0.8%	99.3%	0.7%	29.7%
Tight Money S70	8.2%	15.7%	20.4%	55.7%	99.6%	0.4%	35.5%
Tough Times S71	14.0%	6.2%	6.2%	73.6%	95.4%	4.6%	18.9%


Source: Underlying data represents Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian and Powered by Regis/Sites|USA.
 Analysis and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.



C

Conservative Scenario County

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



MSHDA
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - CONSERVATIVE SCENARIO

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

CONSERVATIVE SCENARIO	Gogebic COUNTY 71 Lifestyle Clusters			Gogebic COUNTY Upscale Target Markets			Gogebic COUNTY Moderate Target Markets		
	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters
Total Housing Units	198	122	76	19	5	14	38	3	35
1 Detached Houses	150	119	31	11	5	6	1	0	1
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	10	0	10	3	0	3	4	0	4
10-19 Multiplex: Small	6	0	6	1	0	1	5	0	5
20-49 Multiplex: Large	10	1	9	1	0	1	9	1	8
50-99 Midrise: Small	8	1	7	0	0	0	8	1	7
100+ Midrise: Large	10	1	9	1	0	1	9	1	8
Total Units	198	122	76	19	5	14	38	3	35
Detached Houses	150	119	31	11	5	6	1	0	1
Duplexes & Triplexes	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1
Other Attached Formats	46	3	43	7	0	7	36	3	33

Source: Target Market Analysis and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUses|USA © 2016, all rights reserved.

Notes: Not intended to imply absolutes or exclusive building formats, and may be qualified for unique projects.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - CONSERVATIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit C.2

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
CONSERVATIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market - Level	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	198	19	0	0	0	8	0	12	0	1
Gogebic COUNTY - Owners	122	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
1 Detached Houses	119	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic COUNTY - Renters	76	14	0	0	0	8	0	7	0	1
1 Detached Houses	31	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	10	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - CONSERVATIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit C.3

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

CONSERVATIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	198	38	0	9	0	21	0	0	6	4
Gogebic COUNTY - Owners	122	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Gogebic COUNTY - Renters	76	35	0	9	0	18	0	0	6	4
1 Detached Houses	31	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	10	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	6	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1
20-49 Multiplex: Large	9	8	0	1	0	4	0	0	2	1
50-99 Midrise: Small	7	7	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	1
100+ Midrise: Large	9	8	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	1

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.


Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".



D

Aggressive Scenario County

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



MSHDA
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO	Gogebic COUNTY 71 Lifestyle Clusters			Gogebic COUNTY Upscale Target Markets			Gogebic COUNTY Moderate Target Markets		
	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters
Total Housing Units	509	211	298	66	10	56	134	4	130
1 Detached Houses	323	207	116	31	10	21	3	0	3
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	5	0	5	2	0	2	2	0	2
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	13	0	13	5	0	5	5	0	5
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	7	0	7	3	0	3	3	0	3
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	43	0	43	14	0	14	16	0	16
10-19 Multiplex: Small	24	0	24	4	0	4	19	0	19
20-49 Multiplex: Large	33	1	32	3	0	3	29	1	28
50-99 Midrise: Small	26	1	25	1	0	1	25	1	24
100+ Midrise: Large	35	2	33	3	0	3	32	2	30
Total Units	509	211	298	66	10	56	134	4	130
Detached Houses	323	207	116	31	10	21	3	0	3
Duplexes & Triplexes	18	0	18	7	0	7	7	0	7
Other Attached Formats	168	4	164	28	0	28	124	4	120

Source: Target Market Analysis and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUses|USA © 2016, all rights reserved.

Notes: Not intended to imply absolutes or exclusive building formats, and may be qualified for unique projects.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit D.2

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market - Level	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	509	66	0	0	0	31	0	34	0	4
Gogebic COUNTY - Owners	211	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	0
1 Detached Houses	207	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gogebic COUNTY - Renters	298	56	0	0	0	30	0	25	0	4
1 Detached Houses	116	21	0	0	0	5	0	16	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	13	5	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	7	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	43	14	0	0	0	9	0	5	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	24	4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1
20-49 Multiplex: Large	32	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1
50-99 Midrise: Small	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	33	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit D.3

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	509	134	0	30	0	70	1	0	22	15
Gogebic COUNTY - Owners	211	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Gogebic COUNTY - Renters	298	130	0	30	0	65	1	0	22	15
1 Detached Houses	116	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	13	5	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	7	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	43	16	0	8	0	2	0	0	5	1
10-19 Multiplex: Small	24	19	0	3	0	9	0	0	4	3
20-49 Multiplex: Large	32	28	0	3	0	16	0	0	6	3
50-99 Midrise: Small	25	24	0	2	0	16	0	0	3	3
100+ Midrise: Large	33	30	0	3	0	21	0	0	1	5

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.


Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".



E

**Aggressive Scenario
Places**

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



MSHDA
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Places in Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO	City of Bessemer 71 Lifestyle Clusters			City of Ironwood 71 Lifestyle Clusters			Marenisco CDP 71 Lifestyle Clusters		
	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters
Total Housing Units	61	24	37	256	125	131	3	1	2
1 Detached Houses	41	24	17	177	122	55	3	1	2
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	5	0	5	18	0	18	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	3	0	3	9	0	9	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	4	0	4	13	1	12	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	3	0	3	11	1	10	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	5	0	5	18	1	17	0	0	0
Total Units	61	24	37	256	125	131	3	1	2
Detached Houses	41	24	17	177	122	55	3	1	2
Duplexes & Triplexes	0	0	0	8	0	8	0	0	0
Other Attached Formats	20	0	20	71	3	68	0	0	0

Source: Target Market Analysis and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUses|USA © 2016, all rights reserved.

Notes: Not intended to imply absolutes or exclusive building formats, and may be qualified for unique projects.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO
 Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form
 Places in Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO	City of Wakefield 71 Lifestyle Clusters			Watersmeet CDP 71 Lifestyle Clusters		
	Total	Owners	Renters	Total	Owners	Renters
Total Housing Units	37	24	13	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	27	24	3	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	2	0	2	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	2	0	2	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	3	0	3	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	2	0	2	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	0	1	0	0	0
Total Units	37	24	13	0	0	0
Detached Houses	27	24	3	0	0	0
Duplexes & Triplexes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Attached Formats	10	0	10	0	0	0

Source: Target Market Analysis and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUses|USA © 2016, all rights reserved.
 Notes: Not intended to imply absolutes or exclusive building formats, and may be qualified for unique projects.
 Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.
 Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.
 Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.3

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

City of Bessemer | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohemian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market - Level	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
City of Bessemer - Total	61	9	0	0	0	3	0	5	0	3
City of Bessemer - Owners	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
1 Detached Houses	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Bessemer - Renters	37	8	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	3
1 Detached Houses	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
20-49 Multiplex: Large	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
50-99 Midrise: Small	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.4

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

City of Bessemer | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
City of Bessemer - Total	61	13	0	4	0	13	0	0	0	0
City of Bessemer - Owners	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Bessemer - Renters	37	13	0	4	0	12	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	4	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	3	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	5	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.5

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

City of Ironwood | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market - Level	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
City of Ironwood - Total	256	31	0	0	0	24	0	6	0	0
City of Ironwood - Owners	125	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
1 Detached Houses	122	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Ironwood - Renters	131	28	0	0	0	23	0	4	0	0
1 Detached Houses	55	7	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	6	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	18	8	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	9	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	12	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	17	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.6

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

City of Ironwood | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
City of Ironwood - Total	256	50	0	6	0	33	1	0	0	13
City of Ironwood - Owners	125	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
City of Ironwood - Renters	131	47	0	6	0	30	1	0	0	13
1 Detached Houses	55	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	18	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1
10-19 Multiplex: Small	9	7	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	2
20-49 Multiplex: Large	12	10	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	2
50-99 Midrise: Small	10	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	2
100+ Midrise: Large	17	15	0	1	0	10	0	0	0	4

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.7

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Marenisco CDP | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market - Level	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Marenisco CDP - Total	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marenisco CDP - Owners	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marenisco CDP - Renters	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.8

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Marenisco CDP | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Marenisco CDP - Total	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marenisco CDP - Owners	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marenisco CDP - Renters	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.9

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

City of Wakefield | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)										
Target Market - Level	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
City of Wakefield - Total	37	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
City of Wakefield - Owners	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
1 Detached Houses	24	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Wakefield - Renters	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
1 Detached Houses	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.10

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

City of Wakefield | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
City of Wakefield - Total	37	10	0	0	0	5	0	0	7	0
City of Wakefield - Owners	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
City of Wakefield - Renters	13	10	0	0	0	4	0	0	7	0
1 Detached Houses	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
100+ Midrise: Large	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.11

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Watersmeet CDP | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohemian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market - Level	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Watersmeet CDP - Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watersmeet CDP - Owners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watersmeet CDP - Renters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.

Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit E.12

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Tenure and Building Form

Watersmeet CDP | Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market - Level	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Watersmeet CDP - Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watersmeet CDP - Owners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Watersmeet CDP - Renters	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 Detached Houses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Side-by-Side & Stacked	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5-9 Townhse., Live-Work	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10-19 Multiplex: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20-49 Multiplex: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-99 Midrise: Small	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
100+ Midrise: Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due only to rounding, these figures might not sum exact and might not perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Qualifiers: Houses may include rehabs of existing mansion-style houses, carriage-style expansions, and accessory dwelling units.

Duplexes (2), triplexes (3), and fourplexes (4) may include units that are either stacked or side-by-side, and may be subdivided houses.


Townhouses may include row houses and brownstones; and multiplexes may include bungalow courts and courtyard "apartments".



F₁

Contract Rents County and Places

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA


Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



Upscale Target Markets for Missing Middle Housing Formats Stacked by Contract Rent Brackets Averages for the State of Michigan - 2016



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and powered by Sites|USA. Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Current Contract Rent Brackets | Existing Households by Upscale Target Market
Gogebic County | Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1b | Year 2016

Contract Rent Brackets	All 71	Status							
	Mosaic Lifestyle Clusters	Full Pocket Empty Nest E19	Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohemian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Dependents O51	Urban Ambition O52	Striving Single Scene O54
<\$500	7.5%	0.8%	1.2%	6.6%	8.3%	12.4%	6.6%	6.8%	8.6%
\$500 - \$599	19.0%	6.9%	8.6%	16.9%	25.1%	35.9%	24.5%	31.0%	27.8%
\$600 - \$699	13.9%	9.0%	10.0%	12.2%	20.9%	19.3%	21.8%	23.7%	19.8%
\$700 - \$799	12.2%	12.3%	16.9%	13.8%	17.5%	12.2%	18.8%	17.0%	12.1%
\$800 - \$899	11.5%	15.1%	21.5%	12.5%	12.3%	7.7%	13.8%	10.8%	9.1%
\$900 - \$999	7.2%	9.9%	12.5%	8.1%	6.1%	3.4%	6.7%	4.6%	5.9%
\$1,000 - \$1,249	3.4%	5.4%	5.2%	3.6%	2.0%	1.1%	2.0%	1.4%	2.1%
\$1,250 - \$1,499	8.8%	14.6%	10.4%	9.3%	3.4%	2.2%	2.6%	2.0%	4.5%
\$1,500 - \$1,999	6.3%	10.8%	5.5%	6.0%	1.3%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	2.5%
\$2,000+	6.7%	8.4%	2.4%	6.1%	1.0%	4.1%	0.2%	0.4%	4.6%
Summation		93.0%	94.2%	95.0%	97.9%	99.1%	98.0%	98.6%	97.1%
Median	\$418	\$608	\$533	\$521	\$427	\$417	\$423	\$409	\$453

Source: Underlying data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and the American Community Survey (ACS) with 1-yr estimates through 2014. Analysis, forecasts, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

Figures are current rents paid by existing households in 2016, and have not been "boosted" for the analysis of market potential.

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit F1.3

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Contract Rent Bracket

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	487	64	0	0	0	31	0	34	0	4
Gogebic COUNTY - Renters	292	56	0	0	0	30	0	25	0	4
<\$500	40	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0
\$500 - \$599	87	15	0	0	0	8	0	6	0	1
\$600 - \$699	62	12	0	0	0	6	0	5	0	1
\$700 - \$799	43	10	0	0	0	5	0	5	0	0
\$800 - \$899	29	7	0	0	0	4	0	3	0	0
\$900 - \$999	14	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0
\$1,000 - \$1,249	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
\$1,250 - \$1,499	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
\$1,500 - \$1,999	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,000+	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summation	292	56	0	0	0	29	0	25	0	2
Med. Contract Rent	\$639	--	\$729	\$639	\$625	\$513	\$501	\$508	\$491	\$543


Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Contract rent typically excludes some or all utilities and extra fees for deposits, parking, pets, security, memberships, etc.

Note: Due to data splicing and rounding, these figures might not sum exact or perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Median Contract Rents include a +20% boost and assumes new-builds; quality rehabs; and housing market recovery.

Moderate Target Markets for Missing Middle Housing Formats Stacked by Contract Rent Brackets Averages for the State of Michigan - 2016



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and powered by Sites|USA.
Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Current Contract Rent Brackets | Existing Households by Moderate Target Market
Gogebic County | Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1b | Year 2016

Contract Rent Brackets	All 71								
	Mosaic Lifestyle Clusters	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Beginnings P61	Senior Discounts Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomorrow R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
<\$500	7.5%	5.9%	11.6%	30.2%	21.3%	19.2%	25.3%	25.6%	19.4%
\$500 - \$599	19.0%	23.1%	30.1%	30.4%	32.3%	43.6%	48.5%	30.4%	37.9%
\$600 - \$699	13.9%	19.8%	21.9%	14.7%	17.1%	20.5%	19.0%	20.8%	18.5%
\$700 - \$799	12.2%	16.9%	14.0%	6.5%	11.5%	9.8%	5.9%	9.5%	7.7%
\$800 - \$899	11.5%	14.1%	10.1%	5.6%	7.5%	4.7%	2.4%	7.1%	5.7%
\$900 - \$999	7.2%	6.1%	4.5%	2.5%	3.6%	2.2%	1.0%	3.4%	3.1%
\$1,000 - \$1,249	3.4%	2.5%	1.7%	1.1%	1.3%	0.7%	0.3%	1.0%	1.1%
\$1,250 - \$1,499	8.8%	4.6%	2.5%	2.5%	2.3%	0.9%	0.5%	1.5%	2.3%
\$1,500 - \$1,999	6.3%	2.1%	1.4%	1.4%	1.1%	0.3%	0.2%	1.0%	1.3%
\$2,000+	6.7%	1.8%	1.0%	5.7%	2.3%	0.1%	0.1%	1.1%	3.2%
Summation		96.9%	98.8%	100.6%	100.2%	101.9%	103.3%	101.2%	100.1%
Median	\$418	\$448	\$410	\$405	\$398	\$364	\$345	\$379	\$398

Source: Underlying data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and the American Community Survey (ACS) with 1-yr estimates through 2014. Analysis, forecasts, and exhibit prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 © with all rights reserved.

Figures are current rents paid by existing households in 2016, and have not been "boosted" for the analysis of market potential.

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit F1.6

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Contract Rent Bracket

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	487	135	0	30	0	70	1	0	22	15
Gogebic COUNTY - Renters	292	131	0	30	0	65	1	0	22	15
<\$500	40	26	0	3	0	14	0	0	6	3
\$500 - \$599	87	43	0	9	0	21	0	0	7	6
\$600 - \$699	62	26	0	7	0	11	0	0	5	3
\$700 - \$799	43	14	0	4	0	7	0	0	2	1
\$800 - \$899	29	11	0	3	0	5	0	0	2	1
\$900 - \$999	14	4	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0
\$1,000 - \$1,249	6	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
\$1,250 - \$1,499	8	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
\$1,500 - \$1,999	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
\$2,000+	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Summation	292	131	0	29	0	65	0	0	23	14
Med. Contract Rent	\$639	--	\$538	\$492	\$486	\$477	\$437	\$414	\$455	\$478

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Contract rent typically excludes some or all utilities and extra fees for deposits, parking, pets, security, memberships, etc.

Note: Due to data splicing and rounding, these figures might not sum exact or perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Median Contract Rents include a +20% boost and assumes new-builds; quality rehabs; and housing market recovery.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Households in Renter-Occupied Units
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010 Census	2010 ACS 5-yr	2011 ACS 5-yr	2012 ACS 5-yr	2013 ACS 5-yr	2014 ACS 5-yr	2016 Forecast	2020 Forecast
		Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.
Order	Region 1a - West								
1	Baraga Co.	785	853	834	728	709	688	775	775
2	Gogebic Co.	1,498	1,865	1,785	1,834	1,830	1,774	1,832	1,832
3	Houghton Co.	4,395	4,396	4,488	4,440	4,511	4,511	4,564	4,564
4	Iron Co.	1,018	850	848	859	870	858	922	1,124
5	Keweenaw Co.	103	138	138	137	151	147	146	153
6	Ontonagon Co.	457	521	514	502	492	477	508	508
Order	Region 1b - Central								
1	Alger Co.	670	706	670	622	578	560	544	529
2	Delta Co.	3,356	3,400	3,384	3,691	3,484	3,513	3,642	3,642
3	Dickinson Co.	2,241	2,344	2,421	2,248	2,273	2,204	2,264	2,264
4	Marquette Co.	8,546	7,190	7,672	8,094	8,330	8,539	8,907	9,540
5	Menominee Co.	2,161	2,134	2,262	2,297	2,191	2,143	2,184	2,184
6	Schoolcraft Co.	671	470	479	560	604	652	734	734
Order	Region 1c - East								
1	Chippewa Co.	4,189	4,429	4,255	4,518	4,584	4,469	4,534	4,534
2	Luce Co.	484	518	528	550	639	637	682	682
3	Mackinac Co.	1,087	970	1,044	1,205	1,226	1,250	1,316	1,451

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Households in Renter-Occupied Units
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a

Order	County Name	2010	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2020
		Census	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	Forecast	Forecast
		Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.	Renter Hhlds.
	Gogebic Co.	1,498	1,865	1,785	1,834	1,830	1,774	1,832	1,832
1	Bessemer City	--	306	329	316	324	314	321	321
2	Ironwood City	--	820	790	865	866	839	869	869
3	Marenisco CDP	--	36	36	35	23	23	26	39
4	Wakefield City	--	235	211	157	194	229	270	270
5	Watersmeet CDP	--	55	22	22	48	46	51	51

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016. Owner- and renter-occupied households have been adjusted by LandUse|USA.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Median Contract Rent
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2020
		ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	Forecast	Forecast
		Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Median
		Contract	Contract	Contract	Contract	Contract	Contract	Contract
		Rent	Rent	Rent	Rent	Rent	Rent	Rent
Order	Region 1a - West							
1	Baraga Co.	\$328	\$338	\$347	\$373	\$420	\$463	\$552
2	Gogebic Co.	\$379	\$392	\$406	\$406	\$410	\$418	\$433
3	Houghton Co.	\$458	\$475	\$502	\$506	\$512	\$524	\$547
4	Iron Co.	\$372	\$377	\$389	\$403	\$428	\$472	\$563
5	Keweenaw Co.	\$267	\$298	\$350	\$422	\$422	\$422	\$422
6	Ontonagon Co.	\$335	\$338	\$332	\$343	\$343	\$343	\$343
Order	Region 1b - Central							
1	Alger Co.	\$392	\$421	\$439	\$447	\$478	\$527	\$628
2	Delta Co.	\$426	\$429	\$439	\$442	\$442	\$442	\$442
3	Dickinson Co.	\$400	\$426	\$429	\$446	\$468	\$515	\$613
4	Marquette Co.	\$478	\$488	\$505	\$503	\$503	\$503	\$503
5	Menominee Co.	\$365	\$378	\$400	\$417	\$438	\$483	\$577
6	Schoolcraft Co.	\$379	\$399	\$390	\$428	\$445	\$481	\$554
Order	Region 1c - East							
1	Chippewa Co.	\$413	\$419	\$439	\$448	\$475	\$524	\$625
2	Luce Co.	\$453	\$460	\$466	\$476	\$476	\$476	\$476
3	Mackinac Co.	\$457	\$462	\$466	\$461	\$467	\$479	\$502

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Median Contract Rent
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a

Order	County Name	2010 ACS 5-yr Median Contract Rent	2011 ACS 5-yr Median Contract Rent	2012 ACS 5-yr Median Contract Rent	2013 ACS 5-yr Median Contract Rent	2014 ACS 5-yr Median Contract Rent	2016 Forecast Median Contract Rent	2020 Forecast Median Contract Rent
	Gogebic Co.	\$379	\$392	\$406	\$406	\$410	\$418	\$433
1	Bessemer City	\$371	\$383	\$386	\$398	\$403	\$413	\$432
2	Ironwood City	\$376	\$387	\$406	\$406	\$406	\$406	\$406
3	Marenisco CDP	\$353	\$355	\$360	\$365	\$365	\$365	\$365
4	Wakefield City	\$340	\$392	\$392	\$392	\$408	\$442	\$511
5	Watersmeet CDP	\$672	\$672	\$672	\$672	\$672	\$672	\$672

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.
 Contract rent excludes utilities and extra fees (security deposits, pets, storage, etc.)

Median Contract Rent v. Median Household Income
71 Lifestyle Clusters (Mosaic|USA)
The State of Michigan - 2015




Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and licensed to LandUse|USA through Sites|USA. Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA (c) 2016 with all rights reserved.

Market Parameters - Contract and Gross Rents
Counties in Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1 - Year 2016

Geography	Median Household Income (Renters)	Monthly Median Contract Rent	Monthly Median Gross Rent	Gross v. Contract Rent Index	Monthly Utilities and Fees	Fees as a Share of Gross Rent	Gross Rent as a Share of Renter Income
The State of Michigan	\$28,834	\$658	\$822	1.25	\$164	20.0%	34.2%
Prosperity Region 1a							
1 Baraga County	\$23,500	\$485	\$572	1.18	\$87	15.2%	29.2%
2 Gogebic County	\$20,128	\$427	\$634	1.49	\$208	32.7%	37.8%
3 Houghton County	\$20,905	\$543	\$663	1.22	\$119	18.0%	38.0%
4 Iron County	\$19,405	\$469	\$581	1.24	\$111	19.2%	35.9%
5 Keweenaw County	\$30,089	\$522	\$995	1.91	\$473	47.5%	39.7%
6 Ontonagon County	\$14,611	\$427	\$462	1.08	\$35	7.7%	38.0%
Prosperity Region 1b							
1 Alger County	\$24,761	\$524	\$645	1.23	\$122	18.8%	31.3%
2 Delta County	\$19,369	\$456	\$587	1.29	\$131	22.3%	36.3%
3 Dickinson County	\$31,854	\$503	\$749	1.49	\$246	32.9%	28.2%
4 Marquette County	\$22,330	\$522	\$663	1.27	\$141	21.2%	35.6%
5 Menominee County	\$24,224	\$486	\$564	1.16	\$78	13.8%	27.9%
6 Schoolcraft County	\$15,788	\$482	\$636	1.32	\$154	24.2%	48.3%
Prosperity Region 1c							
1 Chippewa County	\$23,826	\$520	\$660	1.27	\$139	21.1%	33.2%
2 Luce County	\$33,587	\$492	\$656	1.33	\$164	25.0%	23.4%
3 Mackinac County	\$32,904	\$482	\$617	1.28	\$136	22.0%	22.5%

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Census and American Community Survey (ACS) through 2014. Analysis, forecasts, and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016 ©.

Forecast Contract Rent per Square Foot v. Unit Size
Attached Renter-Occupied Units Only
Gogebic County - Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1 - 2016



Source: Estimates and forecasts by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessors records. Excludes 2 outliers.

Selected Inventory of Rental Housing Choices - Attached Units Only
 Gogebic County - Michigan Prosperity Region 1 - 2016

Name and Address	Building Type	HCV	Sen- iors	Stu- dents	Lake front	Down town	Min. Mo. in Lease	Yr. Open	Units in Bldg.	Bed Room	Bath Room	Estimat. Sq. Ft.	Forecast Rent	Forecast
														Rent per Sq. Ft.
1 Condo-Chalet E6242 Snowdrift St. Bessemer City	--	1	--	--	--	--	12	--	6	1	2	700	\$725	\$1.04
										2	2	800	\$765	\$0.96
2 Condo-Chalet E6262 Snowdrift Street Bessemer City	Condo Chalet	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	2	2	800	\$500	\$0.63
3 Condo-Chalet E6266 Snowdrift Street Bessemer City	Condo Chalet	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	1	1	600	\$400	\$0.67
4 106 W Galena Street Bessemer City	Duplex	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	1	--	\$400	--
5 Condo-Chalet E6242 Snowdrift St Bessemer City	Condo Chalet	1	--	--	--	--	12	--	6	1	2	700	\$725	\$1.04
										2	2	800	\$765	\$0.96
1 Riverview Apartments 205 Nunnemacher St Wakefield City	Apts.	--	--	--	--	--	12	1982	32	1	1	615	\$650	\$1.06
										2	1	805	\$780	\$0.97
										3	1	1,015		

Source: Estimates and forecasts by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessors records. Under attributes, "1" is an affirmation.

Numbers in the leftmost column list the number of observations by community name, alphabetically.

HCV indicates that Housing Choice Vouchers are available for qualifying low-income tenants.

Selected Inventory of Rental Housing Choices - Attached Units Only
 Gogebic County - Michigan Prosperity Region 1 - 2016

Exhibit F1.15

Name and Address	Building Type	HCV	Sen- iors	Stu- dents	Lake front	Down town	Min. Mo. in Lease	Yr. Open	Units in Build.	Bed Room	Bath Room	Estimat. Sq. Ft.	Forecast Rent	Forecast
														Rent per Sq. Ft.
1 Pickard Place 101 N. Lowell St. Ironwood City	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1920 1970	17	0	1	500	\$400	\$0.80
										1	1	500	\$350	\$0.70
										2	1	750	\$500	\$0.67
2 Ahonen Apartments 246 Ashland Ct. Ironwood City	Apts.	--	--	--	--	--	12	--	12	1	1	700	\$425	\$0.61
												800	\$425	\$0.53
										2	1	800	\$650	\$0.81
												900	\$650	\$0.72
3 Woodland Court Apts. 661 E. Ayer St. Ironwood City	Apts.	1	--	--	--	--	12	--	--	2	1	--	\$460-\$580	--
4 Mill Trace Apts. E5113 MacDonald Ln. Ironwood City	Apts.	1	--	--	--	--	12	1983	48	1	1	--	--	--
										2	1			
5 Wildwood Manor E5132 Wildwood Ln Ironwood City	Manor	1	1	--	--	--	12	--	--	1	1	--	--	--
6 Mill Trace Apts. E5113 MacDonald Lane Ironwood City	Apts.	1	--	--	--	--	12	1983	48	1	1	--	--	--
										2	1			

Source: Estimates and forecasts by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessors records. Under attributes, "1" is an affirmation.

Numbers in the leftmost column list the number of observations by community name, alphabetically.

HCV indicates that Housing Choice Vouchers are available for qualifying low-income tenants.

Selected Inventory of Rental Housing Choices - Attached Units Only
 Gogebic County - Michigan Prosperity Region 1 - 2016

Exhibit F1.16

Name and Address	Building Type	HCV	Sen- iors	Stu- dents	Lake front	Down town	Min. Mo. in Lease	Yr. Opene d	Units in Bldg.	Bed- room	Bath room	Estimat. Sq. Ft.	Forecast Rent	Forecast Rent per Sq. Ft.
7 Pickard Place 101 N Lowell St Ironwood City	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	1920 1970	17	0	1	500	\$400	\$0.80
										1	1	500	\$350	\$0.70
										2	1	750	\$500	\$0.67
										3	2			
8 Ahonen Apartments 246 Ashland Ct Ironwood City	Apts.	--	--	--	--	--	12	--	12	1	1	700	\$420	\$0.60
										1	1	800	\$420	\$0.53
										2	1	800	\$650	\$0.81
										2	1	900	\$650	\$0.72
9 Woodland Court Apts. 661 E Ayer St Ironwood City	Apts.	1	--	--	--	--	12	--	--	2	1	--	\$460	--
										2	1		\$580	
# Villa Manor 126 W Arch St Ironwood City	Manor	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	--	1	1	--	\$390	--
# West Aurora St Ironwood City	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	1	1,500	\$500	\$0.33
# 209 E. Vaughn St. Ironwood City	Duplex	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	2	2	1	1,200	\$350	\$0.29
# Apt for Rent Ironwood City	Apts.	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	750	\$475	\$0.63

Source: Estimates and forecasts by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessors records. Under attributes, "1" is an affirmation.

Numbers in the leftmost column list the number of observations by community name, alphabetically.

HCV indicates that Housing Choice Vouchers are available for qualifying low-income tenants.

Cash or Contract Rents by Square Feet | Attached Units Only
 Forecast for New Formats | Townhouses, Row Houses, Lofts, and Flats
 Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1 | Year 2016

Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1			The City of Marquette (exclusively)		
Total Sq. Ft.	Rent per Sq. Ft.	Cash Rent	Total Sq. Ft.	Rent per Sq. Ft.	Cash Rent
500	\$1.21	\$605	500	\$1.46	\$730
600	\$1.11	\$665	600	\$1.33	\$795
700	\$1.03	\$720	700	\$1.22	\$850
800	\$0.96	\$765	800	\$1.12	\$895
900	\$0.90	\$805	900	\$1.03	\$930
1,000	\$0.84	\$840	1,000	\$0.96	\$960
1,100	\$0.79	\$870	1,100	\$0.89	\$975
1,200	\$0.74	\$890	1,200	\$0.83	\$990
1,300	\$0.70	\$910	1,300	\$0.77	\$1,000
1,400	\$0.66	\$925	1,400	.	<i>\$1,005</i>
1,500	\$0.63	\$940	1,500	.	<i>\$1,010</i>
1,600	\$0.59	\$945	1,600	.	<i>\$1,015</i>
1,700	\$0.56	\$950	1,700	.	<i>\$1,020</i>
1,800	\$0.53	\$955	1,800	.	<i>\$1,025</i>
1,900	.	<i>\$960</i>	1,900	.	<i>\$1,030</i>
2,000	.	<i>\$965</i>	2,000	.	<i>\$1,035</i>

Source: Estimates and forecasts prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA; 2016 ©.

Underlying data gathered by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Underlying data is based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessor's records.


Figures that are italicized with small fonts have highest variances in statistical reliability.



F₂

Home Values County and Places

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit F2.1

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Home Value Bracket

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Upscale Target Markets	Full Pockets Empty Nest E19	Status Seeking Singles G24	Wired for Success K37	Bohem- ian Groove K40	Full Steam Ahead O50	Digital Depend- ents O51	Urban Ambit- ion O52	Striving Single Scene O54
AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	All 71	Upscale	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Target Market	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	487	64	0	0	0	31	0	34	0	4
Gogebic COUNTY - Owners	195	8	0	0	0	1	0	9	0	0
< \$50,000	59	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
\$50 - \$74,999	50	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
\$75 - \$99,999	36	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
\$100 - \$149,999	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
\$150 - \$174,999	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
\$175 - \$199,999	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$200 - \$249,999	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$250 - \$299,999	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$300 - \$349,999	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$350 - \$399,999	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$400 - \$499,999	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$500 - \$749,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$750,000+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summation	195	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0
Med. Home Value	\$85,410	--	\$276,697	\$199,824	\$195,780	\$90,466	\$104,706	\$79,524	\$71,013	\$137,393

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due to data splicing and rounding, these figures might not sum exact or perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Median Home Values include a +20% boost and assumes new-builds; quality rehabs; and housing market recovery.

Annual Market Potential for Selected Target Markets - AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO

Exhibit F2.2

Number of Units (New and/or Rehab) by Home Value Bracket

Gogebic COUNTY | Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Years 2016 - 2020

AGGRESSIVE SCENARIO (Per In-Migration Only)	Total 71 Lifestyle Clusters	Moderate Target Markets	Colleges Cafes O53	Family Troopers O55	Humble Begin- nings P61	Senior Discount Q65	Dare to Dream R66	Hope for Tomor- row R67	Tight Money S70	Tough Times S71
Target Market	All 71	Moderate	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M
Year of Data	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015	2015
Gogebic COUNTY - Total	487	135	0	30	0	70	1	0	22	15
Gogebic COUNTY - Owners	195	4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
< \$50,000	59	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
\$50 - \$74,999	50	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
\$75 - \$99,999	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$100 - \$149,999	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$150 - \$174,999	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$175 - \$199,999	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$200 - \$249,999	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$250 - \$299,999	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$300 - \$349,999	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$350 - \$399,999	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$400 - \$499,999	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$500 - \$749,999	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$750,000+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Summation	195	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Med. Home Value	\$85,410	--	\$115,815	\$77,709	\$95,728	\$76,339	\$42,223	\$36,114	\$59,996	\$82,184

Source: Results of a Target Market Analysis prepared exclusively by LandUse|USA © 2016 with all rights reserved.

Note: Due data splicing and to rounding, these figures might not sum exact or perfectly match summary tables in the narrative report.

Median Home Values include a +20% boost and assumes new-builds; quality rehabs; and housing market recovery.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Households in Owner-Occupied Units
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010 Census	2010 ACS 5-yr	2011 ACS 5-yr	2012 ACS 5-yr	2013 ACS 5-yr	2014 ACS 5-yr	2016 Forecast	2020 Forecast
		Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.	Owner Hhlds.
Order	Region 1a - West								
1	Baraga Co.	2,659	2,483	2,474	2,433	2,525	2,367	2,280	2,280
2	Gogebic Co.	5,539	5,437	5,483	5,400	5,240	5,142	5,084	5,084
3	Houghton Co.	9,837	9,595	9,528	9,690	9,518	9,430	9,377	9,377
4	Iron Co.	4,559	4,536	4,400	4,417	4,419	4,557	4,701	4,850
5	Keweenaw Co.	910	819	749	875	863	874	886	898
6	Ontonagon Co.	2,801	2,889	2,899	2,831	2,777	2,724	2,693	2,693
Order	Region 1b - Central								
1	Alger Co.	3,228	2,982	2,936	2,936	3,029	3,049	3,068	3,088
2	Delta Co.	12,636	12,939	12,654	12,380	12,401	12,182	12,053	12,053
3	Dickinson Co.	9,118	9,070	9,023	9,074	9,159	9,059	8,999	8,999
4	Marquette Co.	18,992	18,448	18,080	18,230	18,106	18,154	18,203	18,251
5	Menominee Co.	8,313	8,707	8,604	8,572	8,596	8,525	8,484	8,484
6	Schoolcraft Co.	3,088	3,151	3,194	3,091	2,986	2,843	2,761	2,761
Order	Region 1c - East								
1	Chippewa Co.	10,140	10,407	10,444	10,144	10,021	9,913	9,848	9,848
2	Luce Co.	1,928	1,955	1,919	1,854	1,788	1,708	1,663	1,663
3	Mackinac Co.	3,937	3,957	3,873	3,735	3,774	3,816	3,858	3,900

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Households in Owner-Occupied Units
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a

Order	County Name	2010	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2020
		Census	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	Forecast	Forecast
		Owner	Owner	Owner	Owner	Owner	Owner	Owner	Owner
		Hhlds.	Hhlds.	Hhlds.	Hhlds.	Hhlds.	Hhlds.	Hhlds.	Hhlds.
	Gogebic Co.	5,539	5,437	5,483	5,400	5,240	5,142	5,084	5,084
1	Bessemer City	--	643	625	588	557	546	539	539
2	Ironwood City	--	1,871	1,870	1,861	1,741	1,690	1,660	1,660
3	Marenisco CDP	--	86	106	86	89	96	105	114
4	Wakefield City	--	643	669	714	693	616	575	575
5	Watersmeet CDP	--	200	156	128	151	143	138	138

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016. Owner- and renter-occupied households have been adjusted by LandUse|USA.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Median Home Value
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2020
		Census	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	Forecast	Forecast
		Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Median
		Home	Home	Home	Home	Home	Home	Home
		Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value	Value
Order	Region 1a - West							
1	Baraga Co.	\$86,500	\$84,700	\$83,100	\$84,000	\$86,500	\$91,725	\$99,611
2	Gogebic Co.	\$69,200	\$67,900	\$67,500	\$66,800	\$66,900	\$67,100	\$67,382
3	Houghton Co.	\$86,100	\$86,200	\$85,700	\$88,400	\$89,900	\$92,977	\$97,474
4	Iron Co.	\$75,700	\$75,400	\$75,100	\$75,100	\$75,800	\$77,220	\$79,255
5	Keweenaw Co.	\$81,800	\$87,000	\$99,500	\$101,700	\$101,400	\$101,400	\$101,400
6	Ontonagon Co.	\$75,300	\$75,000	\$73,100	\$72,600	\$69,300	\$69,300	\$69,300
Order	Region 1b - Central							
1	Alger Co.	\$111,500	\$114,700	\$113,600	\$117,100	\$117,200	\$117,400	\$117,681
2	Delta Co.	\$100,600	\$102,900	\$99,600	\$100,200	\$99,400	\$99,400	\$99,400
3	Dickinson Co.	\$87,800	\$88,600	\$87,000	\$85,500	\$86,800	\$89,460	\$93,329
4	Marquette Co.	\$125,100	\$127,700	\$126,300	\$126,600	\$127,200	\$128,409	\$130,121
5	Menominee Co.	\$97,300	\$96,700	\$96,700	\$95,300	\$94,400	\$94,400	\$94,400
6	Schoolcraft Co.	\$87,700	\$85,100	\$86,300	\$86,200	\$87,700	\$90,779	\$95,283
Order	Region 1c - East							
1	Chippewa Co.	\$103,100	\$103,700	\$102,400	\$101,600	\$101,500	\$101,500	\$101,500
2	Luce Co.	\$86,000	\$84,200	\$83,300	\$79,400	\$78,300	\$78,300	\$78,300
3	Mackinac Co.	\$126,100	\$126,600	\$121,500	\$119,300	\$119,100	\$119,100	\$119,100

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Median Home Value
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a

Order	County Name	2010 Census Median Home Value	2011 ACS 5-yr Median Home Value	2012 ACS 5-yr Median Home Value	2013 ACS 5-yr Median Home Value	2014 ACS 5-yr Median Home Value	2016 Forecast Median Home Value	2020 Forecast Median Home Value
	Gogebic Co.	\$69,200	\$67,900	\$67,500	\$66,800	\$66,900	\$67,100	\$67,382
1	Bessemer City	\$48,000	\$51,900	\$49,900	\$52,500	\$46,200	\$46,338	\$46,533
2	Ironwood City	\$60,600	\$59,400	\$54,900	\$52,300	\$49,000	\$49,147	\$49,353
3	Marenisco CDP	\$31,900	\$32,200	\$40,000	\$42,700	\$45,000	\$45,135	\$45,324
4	Wakefield City	\$55,600	\$56,400	\$56,400	\$53,900	\$54,300	\$54,463	\$54,691
5	Watersmeet CDP	\$66,200	\$65,500	\$49,500	\$47,500	\$67,700	\$67,903	\$68,188

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Median Home Value v. Median Household Income
71 Lifestyle Clusters (Mosaic|USA)
The State of Michigan - 2015



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and licensed to LandUse|USA through Sites|USA. Michigan estimates, analysis, and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA (c) 2016 with all rights reserved.

Exhibit F2.8

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Median Household Income
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2020	2014	2014
		ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	Forecast	Forecast	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr
		Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Median	Owner	Renter
		Household	Household	Household	Household	Household	Household	Household	Household	Household
		Income	Income	Income	Income	Income	Income	Income	Income	Income
Order	Region 1a - West									
1	Baraga Co.	\$40,541	\$40,541	\$40,541	\$41,189	\$40,935	\$40,935	\$40,935	\$44,493	\$21,921
2	Gogebic Co.	\$33,673	\$34,917	\$34,917	\$34,252	\$34,021	\$34,021	\$34,021	\$40,397	\$18,671
3	Houghton Co.	\$34,174	\$34,625	\$34,625	\$35,430	\$36,443	\$37,916	\$40,086	\$49,413	\$18,581
4	Iron Co.	\$33,734	\$35,390	\$35,551	\$34,685	\$35,689	\$37,150	\$39,303	\$39,480	\$18,082
5	Keweenaw Co.	\$38,872	\$39,821	\$42,406	\$39,038	\$39,180	\$39,380	\$39,661	\$42,805	\$24,583
6	Ontonagon Co.	\$35,269	\$35,269	\$35,269	\$34,620	\$35,365	\$36,438	\$38,000	\$38,271	\$13,629
Order	Region 1b - Central									
1	Alger Co.	\$38,262	\$38,262	\$38,348	\$37,586	\$39,211	\$41,620	\$45,261	\$43,477	\$21,219
2	Delta Co.	\$41,951	\$42,932	\$42,932	\$42,676	\$42,070	\$42,070	\$42,070	\$50,230	\$17,713
3	Dickinson Co.	\$42,586	\$43,651	\$44,272	\$44,136	\$44,350	\$44,652	\$45,077	\$49,577	\$26,204
4	Marquette Co.	\$45,130	\$45,495	\$45,495	\$45,622	\$45,066	\$45,066	\$45,066	\$57,713	\$20,322
5	Menominee Co.	\$41,332	\$42,014	\$42,014	\$41,739	\$41,293	\$41,293	\$41,293	\$47,221	\$21,075
6	Schoolcraft Co.	\$36,925	\$38,367	\$38,367	\$35,260	\$35,955	\$36,954	\$38,402	\$41,250	\$14,727
Order	Region 1c - East									
1	Chippewa Co.	\$40,194	\$41,108	\$41,114	\$41,637	\$40,828	\$40,828	\$40,828	\$50,771	\$21,298
2	Luce Co.	\$40,041	\$42,083	\$42,414	\$39,469	\$36,398	\$36,398	\$36,398	\$41,705	\$27,602
3	Mackinac Co.	\$39,339	\$39,339	\$39,339	\$38,704	\$38,690	\$38,690	\$38,690	\$43,654	\$28,137

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.


Exhibit F2.9

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Median Household Income
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a

Order	County Name	2010 ACS 5-yr Median Household Income	2011 ACS 5-yr Median Household Income	2012 ACS 5-yr Median Household Income	2013 ACS 5-yr Median Household Income	2014 ACS 5-yr Median Household Income	2016 Forecast Median Household Income	2020 Forecast Median Household Income	2014 ACS 5-yr Owner Household Income	2014 ACS 5-yr Renter Household Income
	Gogebic Co.	\$33,673	\$34,917	\$34,917	\$34,252	\$34,021	\$34,021	\$34,021	\$40,397	\$18,671
1	Bessemer City	\$28,412	\$28,173	\$29,286	\$27,372	\$30,671	\$30,671	\$30,671	\$53,971	\$14,904
2	Ironwood City	\$29,693	\$30,301	\$28,776	\$27,349	\$26,212	\$26,212	\$26,212	\$31,513	\$18,956
3	Marenisco CDP	\$27,500	\$35,625	\$35,625	\$37,500	\$38,750	\$38,750	\$38,750	\$48,750	\$28,611
4	Wakefield City	\$33,250	\$35,192	\$34,856	\$34,665	\$35,806	\$35,806	\$35,806	\$40,625	\$16,477
5	Watersmeet CDP	\$32,614	\$38,000	\$31,250	\$40,469	\$35,417	\$35,417	\$35,417	\$40,313	\$12,292

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Forecast Home Value per Square Foot v. Unit Size Attached Owner-Occupied Only Gogebic County - Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1 - 2016



Source: Estimates and forecasts by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessors records. Excludes 1 outlier.

Selected Inventory of Owner Housing Choices - Attached Units Only
 Gogebic County - Michigan Prosperity Region 1 - Year 2016

Name and Address	Building Type	Water front	Down town	Yr. Built	Units			Estimat. Sq. Ft.	Forecast Value	Forecast Value per Sq. Ft.
					in Bldg.	Bed Room	Bath Room			
1 Indianhead Mountain 2420 Tomahawk Trailside Wakefield City	Townhse.	--	--	1986	--	1	1	650	\$50,000	\$77
	Condo					1	1	650	\$60,000	\$92
						2	2	925	\$75,000	\$81
						2	2	925	\$80,000	\$86
						2	2	922	\$75,000	\$81
						2	2	922	\$80,000	\$87
						1	1	645	\$60,000	\$93
2 Chippewa Trailside #2484 2484-2485 Condos Wakefield City	Townhse.	--	--	1985	--	1	1	935	\$85,000	\$91
	Condo					1	1	940	\$85,000	\$90
						3	2	1,070	\$119,000	\$111
						3	2	1,075	\$120,000	\$112

Source: Estimates and forecasts by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Based on market observations, phone surveys, and assessors records. Under attributes, "1" is an affirmation.


Numbers in the leftmost column list the number of observations by community name, alphabetically.



G

Existing Households County and Places

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:


Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority




MSHDA
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Existing Households by Predominant Lifestyle Cluster
 Gobebe County - Michigan UP Prosperity Region 1a | Year 2015




Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and powered by Sites|USA, with results through year-end 2015. Analysis and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Existing Households by Predominant Lifestyle Cluster The City of Bessemer - Gogebic County, Michigan | Year 2015




Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and powered by Sites|USA, with results through year-end 2015. Analysis and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Existing Households by Predominant Lifestyle Cluster
 The City of Ironwood - Gogebic County, Michigan | Year 2015



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and powered by Sites|USA, with results through year-end 2015. Analysis and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Existing Households by Predominant Lifestyle Cluster The City of Wakefield - Gogebic County, Michigan | Year 2015



Source: Underlying Mosaic|USA data provided by Experian Decision Analytics and powered by Sites|USA, with results through year-end 2015. Analysis and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Households
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010 Census	2010 ACS 5-yr	2011 ACS 5-yr	2012 ACS 5-yr	2013 ACS 5-yr	2014 ACS 5-yr	2015 Forecast	2020 Forecast
		Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.
Order	Region 1a - West								
1	Baraga Co.	3,444	3,336	3,308	3,161	3,234	3,055	3,055	3,055
2	Gogebic Co.	7,037	7,302	7,268	7,234	7,070	6,916	6,916	6,916
3	Houghton Co.	14,232	13,991	14,016	14,130	14,029	13,941	13,941	13,941
4	Iron Co.	5,577	5,386	5,248	5,276	5,289	5,415	5,623	5,974
5	Keweenaw Co.	1,013	957	887	1,012	1,014	1,021	1,032	1,051
6	Ontonagon Co.	3,258	3,410	3,413	3,333	3,269	3,201	3,201	3,201
Order	Region 1b - Central								
1	Alger Co.	3,898	3,688	3,606	3,558	3,607	3,609	3,612	3,617
2	Delta Co.	15,992	16,339	16,038	16,071	15,885	15,695	15,695	15,695
3	Dickinson Co.	11,359	11,414	11,444	11,322	11,432	11,263	11,263	11,263
4	Marquette Co.	27,538	25,638	25,752	26,324	26,436	26,693	27,110	27,791
5	Menominee Co.	10,474	10,841	10,866	10,869	10,787	10,668	10,668	10,668
6	Schoolcraft Co.	3,759	3,621	3,673	3,651	3,590	3,495	3,495	3,495
Order	Region 1c - East								
1	Chippewa Co.	14,329	14,836	14,699	14,662	14,605	14,382	14,382	14,382
2	Luce Co.	2,412	2,473	2,447	2,404	2,427	2,345	2,345	2,345
3	Mackinac Co.	5,024	4,927	4,917	4,940	5,000	5,066	5,174	5,351

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Households
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a

		2010 Census	2010 ACS 5-yr	2011 ACS 5-yr	2012 ACS 5-yr	2013 ACS 5-yr	2014 ACS 5-yr	2015 Forecast	2020 Forecast
Order	County Name	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.	Total Hhlds.
	Gogebic Co.	7,037	7,302	7,268	7,234	7,070	6,916	6,916	6,916
1	Bessemer City	--	949	954	904	881	860	860	860
2	Ironwood City	--	2,691	2,660	2,726	2,607	2,529	2,529	2,529
3	Marenisco CDP	--	122	142	121	112	119	131	153
4	Wakefield City	--	878	880	871	887	845	845	845
5	Watersmeet CDP	--	255	178	150	199	189	189	189

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Total Housing Units, Including Vacancies
Fifteen Counties in the Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

		2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2016	2020
		Census	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	ACS 5-yr	Forecast	Forecast
		Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
		Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing
		Units	Units	Units	Units	Units	Units	Units
Order	Region 1a - West							
1	Baraga Co.	5,250	5,360	5,246	5,243	5,183	5,183	5,183
2	Gogebic Co.	10,849	10,813	10,807	10,741	10,763	10,798	10,848
3	Houghton Co.	18,575	18,602	18,618	18,608	18,624	18,646	18,678
4	Iron Co.	9,154	9,186	9,204	9,197	9,226	9,273	9,338
5	Keweenaw Co.	2,397	2,344	2,462	2,472	2,475	2,479	2,483
6	Ontonagon Co.	5,666	5,653	5,670	5,653	5,650	5,650	5,650
Order	Region 1b - Central							
1	Alger Co.	6,538	6,535	6,559	6,574	6,580	6,590	6,603
2	Delta Co.	20,198	20,186	20,212	20,155	20,212	20,304	20,432
3	Dickinson Co.	13,990	13,980	13,995	13,982	14,010	14,055	14,118
4	Marquette Co.	34,292	34,321	34,355	34,328	34,431	34,596	34,830
5	Menominee Co.	14,238	14,234	14,235	14,181	14,202	14,236	14,283
6	Schoolcraft Co.	6,244	6,279	6,297	6,302	6,317	6,341	6,375
Order	Region 1c - East							
1	Chippewa Co.	21,145	21,211	21,234	21,206	21,249	21,318	21,415
2	Luce Co.	4,346	4,335	4,352	4,333	4,339	4,349	4,362
3	Mackinac Co.	10,831	10,921	10,969	10,973	11,007	11,062	11,139

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Market Parameters and Forecasts - Total Housing Units, Including Vacancies
 Gogebic County and Selected Communities - Michigan Prosperity Region 1a


Order	County Name	2010 Census Total Housing Units	2011 ACS 5-yr Total Housing Units	2012 ACS 5-yr Total Housing Units	2013 ACS 5-yr Total Housing Units	2014 ACS 5-yr Total Housing Units	2016 Forecast Total Housing Units	2020 Forecast Total Housing Units
	Gogebic Co.	10,849	10,813	10,807	10,741	10,763	10,798	10,848
1	Bessemer City	1,194	1,179	1,119	1,115	1,120	1,124	1,129
2	Ironwood City	3,218	3,154	3,146	3,050	3,042	3,052	3,066
3	Marenisco CDP	186	199	184	150	158	159	159
4	Wakefield City	1,046	1,058	1,048	1,057	1,002	1,005	1,010
5	Watersmeet CDP	342	246	220	281	273	274	275

Source: Underlying data provided by the U.S. Decennial Census and the American Community Survey for 2010 - 2014 (1- and 5-year estimates). Analysis, interpolations, and forecasts by LandUse|USA; 2016.




Market Assessment County and Places

Prepared by:



LandUseUSA

Prepared for:

Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1

Michigan State Housing Development Authority



MSHDA
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSING
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Demographic Profiles - Population and Employment
 Gogebic County, Michigan with Selected Communities - 2010 - 2015

	Gogebic County	The City of Bessemer	The City of Ironwood	CDP Marenisco	The City of Wakefield	CDP Watersmeet
Households Census (2010)	7,037	888	2,520	113	818	178
Households ACS (2014)	6,916	860	2,529	119	845	177
Population Census (2010)	16,427	1,905	5,387	254	1,851	428
Population ACS (2014)	16,042	1,974	5,237	231	1,837	407
Group Quarters Population (2014)	1,617	29	120	0	135	0
Correctional Facilities	1,234	24	0	0	0	0
Nursing/Mental Health Facilities	246	0	117	0	114	0
College/University Housing	102	0	0	0	0	0
Military Quarters	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	34	5	3	0	21	0
Daytime Employees Ages 16+ (2015)	8,986	1,582	2,993	76	746	345
Unemployment Rate (2015)	3.5%	6.2%	4.2%	0.9%	3.0%	0.9%
Employment by Industry Sector (2014)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Agric., Forest, Fish, Hunt, Mine	3.7%	3.2%	2.8%	2.0%	5.6%	5.4%
Arts, Ent. Rec., Accom., Food Service	13.2%	16.1%	11.1%	29.0%	8.1%	40.3%
Construction	8.3%	5.3%	7.1%	5.0%	7.8%	4.3%
Educ. Service, Health Care, Soc. Asst.	23.4%	31.3%	19.7%	19.0%	25.8%	11.3%
Finance, Ins., Real Estate	2.3%	2.7%	2.8%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%
Information	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%
Manufacturing	12.5%	8.1%	17.6%	2.0%	15.4%	9.7%
Other Services, excl. Public Admin.	5.1%	6.2%	4.2%	7.0%	6.1%	1.1%
Profess. Sci. Mngmt. Admin. Waste	4.7%	6.3%	5.1%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%
Public Administration	7.2%	9.1%	4.1%	17.0%	7.6%	16.1%
Retail Trade	13.4%	10.5%	18.9%	19.0%	9.8%	10.2%
Transpo., Wrhse., Utilities	3.4%	0.5%	3.5%	0.0%	3.0%	1.6%
Wholesale Trade	2.1%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%

Source: U.S. Census 2010; American Community Survey (ACS) 2009 - 2014; and Applied Geographic Solutions (AGS) for 2015. Analysis and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Demographic Profiles - Total and Vacant Housing Units
 Gogebic County, Michigan with Selected Communities - 2014

Exhibit H.2

	Gogebic County	The City of Bessemer	The City of Ironwood	CDP Marenisco	The City of Wakefield	CDP Watersmeet
Total Housing Units (2014)	10,763	1,120	3,042	158	1,002	273
1, mobile, other	9,427	871	2,623	158	882	273
1 attached, 2	490	61	193	0	21	0
3 or 4	178	91	21	0	8	0
5 to 9	342	74	50	0	55	0
10 to 19	66	0	19	0	13	0
20 to 49	121	19	66	0	18	0
50 or more	139	4	70	0	5	0
Premium for Seasonal Households	16%	10%	3%	6%	4%	13%
Vacant (incl. Seasonal, Rented, Sold)	3,847	260	513	39	157	96
1, mobile, other	3,300	208	436	39	144	96
1 attached, 2	271	23	77	0	5	0
3 or 4	73	12	0	0	8	0
5 to 9	135	17	0	0	0	0
10 to 19	21	0	0	0	0	0
20 to 49	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 or more	47	0	0	0	0	0
Avail. (excl. Seasonal, Rented, Sold)	776	49	314	16	88	32
1, mobile, other	666	39	267	16	81	32
1 attached, 2	55	4	47	0	3	0
3 or 4	15	2	0	0	4	0
5 to 9	27	3	0	0	0	0
10 to 19	4	0	0	0	0	0
20 to 49	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 or more	9	0	0	0	0	0
Total by Reason for Vacancy (2014)	3,847	260	513	39	157	96
Available, For Rent	135	28	52	6	13	0
Available, For Sale	204	0	81	0	10	10
Available, Not Listed	<u>437</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>22</u>
Total Available	776	49	314	16	88	32
Seasonal, Recreation	2,973	198	155	17	69	64
Migrant Workers	4	0	0	0	0	0
Rented, Not Occupied	9	0	0	6	0	0
Sold, Not Occupied	<u>85</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Not Yet Occupied	94	13	44	6	0	0


Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2009 - 2014. Analysis and exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA; 2016.

Annual Average Daily Traffic Counts and Connectivity Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a | Year 2014

Highway Number	Annual Avg. Daily Traffic	Highway Directionals and Links	Other Major Cities on Route
Baraga County			
US-41	7,200	North to Hancock Southeast to Ishpeming	Marquette Green Bay, WI
M-38	4,000	East to Ontonagon West to Baraga	--
M-28	2,000	East to US-2 West to US-141	--
US-141	1,300	North to US-41 South to US-2	--
Gogebic County			
US-2	10,600	East to Iron River West to Wisconsin	St. Ignace Duluth, MN
US-45	3,000	North to Ontonagon South to Wisconsin	--
M-28	2,300	East to US-141 West to US-2	--
Houghton County			
US-41	26,600	North to Copper Harbor South to Baraga	Marquette Green Bay, WI
M-26	17,700	North to Copper Harbor South to US-45	--
M-203	4,500	North to Calumet South to Hancock	--
M-28	1,500	East to US-141 West to US-2	--
M-38	570	East to Baraga West to Ontonagon	--
Iron County			
US-2	7,500	East to Iron Mountain West to Wisconsin	St. Ignace Duluth, MN
M-189	4,100	North to Iron River South to Wisconsin	--
M-69	3,500	East to M-95 West to US-2	--
US-141	3,100	North to US-41 South to US-2	--
M-73	1,300	East to Iron River West to Wisconsin	--
Keweenaw County			
US-41	5,600	North to Copper Harbor South to Baraga	Marquette Green Bay, WI
M-26	870	North to Copper Harbor South to US-45	--
Ontonagon County			
US-45	3,200	North to Ontonagon South to Wisconsin	--
M-38	3,000	East to Baraga West to Ontonagon	--
M-64	2,700	North to Ontonagon South to Wisconsin	--
M-28	2,100	East to US-141 West to US-2	--


Source: Michigan Department of Transportation 2014 Annual Average Daily Traffic Counts (AADT).
Exhibit prepared by LandUse|USA, 2016.

Total PlaceScore™ v. Total Population Places in Gogebic County v. Others in Michigan Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a



Source: Based on a subjective analysis of 30 Placemaking criteria using internet research only, and have not been field-verified.
Analysis by LandUse|USA, 2016. Population is ACS 5-year estimates for 2010 - 2014.
The PlaceScore term and methodology is trademarked by LandUse|USA as-of January 2014, with all rights reserved.

Total PlaceScore™ per 1,000 Population
 Places in Gogebic County v. Others in Michigan
 Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a



Source: Based on a subjective analysis of 30 Placemaking criteria using internet research only, and have not been field-verified.
 Analysis by LandUse|USA, 2016. Population is ACS 5-year estimates for 2010 - 2014.
 The PlaceScore term and methodology is trademarked by LandUse|USA as-of January 2014, with all rights reserved.

PlaceScores™ - Local Placemaking Initiatives and Amenities
 (As Evident Through Online Search Engines)
 Selected Places | Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a

Primary County	Baraga	Gogebic	Iron
Jurisdiction Name	Village of L'Anse	City of Ironwood	City of Iron River
2010 Population (Decennial Census)	2,011	5,387	3,029
2014 Population (5-yr ACS 2010-2014)	2,077	5,237	2,979
City/Village-Wide Planning Documents			
1 City-Wide Master Plan (not county)	1	1	1
2 Has a Zoning Ordinance Online	1	1	1
3 Considering a Form Based Code	0	0	1
4 Parks & Rec. Plan or Commission	1	1	1
Downtown Planning Documents			
5 Established DDA, BID, or Similar	1	1	1
6 DT Master Plan, Subarea Plan	0	1	1
7 Streetscape, Transp. Improv. Plan	1	0	1
8 Retail Market Study or Strategy	0	1	0
9 Residential Market Study, Strategy	0	1	0
10 Façade Improvement Program	1	1	1
Downtown Organization and Marketing			
11 Designation: Michigan Cool City	0	0	1
12 Member of Michigan Main Street	0	0	1
13 Main Street 4-Point Approach	0	0	1
14 Facebook Page	1	1	1
Listing or Map of Merchants and Amenities			
15 City/Village Main Website	0	1	1
16 DDA, BID, or Main Street Website	0	0	0
17 Chamber or CVB Website	1	1	1
Subtotal Place Score (17 points possible)	8	11	14

This PlaceScore assessment is based only on internet research, and has not been field-verified.

Analysis and assessment by LandUse|USA; © 2016.

If a community's amenities and resources are not listed, then the challenge is to improve marking efforts and ensure that the resources are available and easy to find through mainstream online search engines.

The PlaceScore term and methodology is trademarked by LandUse|USA with all rights reserved.

PlaceScores™ - Local Placemaking Initiatives and Amenities

(As evident through Online Search Engines)

Selected Places | Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a

Primary County	Baraga	Gogebic	Iron
Jurisdiction Name	Village of L'Anse	City of Ironwood	City of Iron River
2010 Population (Decennial Census)	2,011	5,387	3,029
2014 Population (5-yr ACS 2010-2014)	2,077	5,237	2,979
Unique Downtown Amenities			
1 Cinema/Theater, Playhouse	0	1	1
2 Waterfront Access/Parks	1	0	1
3 Established Farmer's Market	1	1	1
4 Summer Music in the Park	1	0	0
5 National or Other Major Festival	0	0	0
Downtown Street and Environment			
6 Angle Parking (not parallel)	1	0	0
7 Reported Walk Score is 50+	1	1	1
8 Walk Score/1,000 Pop is 40+	0	0	0
9 Off Street Parking is Evident	1	1	1
10 2-Level Scale of Historic Buildings	1	1	1
11 Balanced Scale 2 Sides of Street	0	1	1
12 Pedestrian Crosswalks, Signaled	0	1	1
13 Two-way Traffic Flow	1	1	1
Subtotal Place Score (13 points possible)	8	8	9
Total Place Score (30 Points Possible)	16	19	23
Total Place Score per 1,000 Population	8	4	8
Reported Walk Score (avg. = 42)	50	75	63
Walk Score per 1,000 Population	24	14	21

This PlaceScore assessment is based only on internet research, and has not been field-verified.

Analysis and assessment by LandUse|USA; © 2016.

If a community's amenities and resources are not listed, then the challenge is to improve marking efforts and ensure that the resources are available and easy to find through mainstream online search engines.

The PlaceScore term and methodology is trademarked by LandUse|USA with all rights reserved.

PlaceScores™ - Local Placemaking Initiatives and Amenities
 (As Evident Through Online Search Engines)
 Selected Places | Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a

Primary County	Houghton	Houghton	Keweenaw	Ontonagon
Jurisdiction Name	City of Hancock	City of Houghton	CDP Copper Harbor	Village of Ontonagon
2010 Population (Decennial Census)	4,634	7,708	108	1,494
2014 Population (5-yr ACS 2010-2014)	4,622	7,897	102	1,457
City/Village-Wide Planning Documents				
1 City-Wide Master Plan (not county)	1	1	0	0
2 Has a Zoning Ordinance Online	1	1	1	1
3 Considering a Form Based Code	0	0	0	0
4 Parks & Rec. Plan or Commission	1	1	0	1
Downtown Planning Documents				
5 Established DDA, BID, or Similar	1	1	1	0
6 DT Master Plan, Subarea Plan	1	1	0	0
7 Streetscape, Transp. Improv. Plan	1	1	0	0
8 Retail Market Study or Strategy	0	1	0	0
9 Residential Market Study, Strategy	0	0	0	0
10 Façade Improvement Program	1	1	0	0
Downtown Organization and Marketing				
11 Designation: Michigan Cool City	0	1	0	0
12 Member of Michigan Main Street	0	0	0	0
13 Main Street 4-Point Approach	1	1	0	0
14 Facebook Page	1	1	1	1
Listing or Map of Merchants and Amenities				
15 City/Village Main Website	0	1	0	0
16 DDA, BID, or Main Street Website	0	1	1	0
17 Chamber or CVB Website	1	1	1	1
Subtotal Place Score (17 points possible)	10	14	5	4

This PlaceScore assessment is based only on internet research, and has not been field-verified.

Analysis and assessment by LandUse|USA; © 2016.

If a community's amenities and resources are not listed, then the challenge is to improve marking efforts and ensure that the resources are available and easy to find through mainstream online search engines.

The PlaceScore term and methodology is trademarked by LandUse|USA with all rights reserved.

PlaceScores™ - Local Placemaking Initiatives and Amenities

(As evident through Online Search Engines)

Selected Places | Michigan Upper Peninsula Prosperity Region 1a

Primary County	Houghton	Houghton	Keweenaw	Ontonagon
Jurisdiction Name	City of Hancock	City of Houghton	CDP Copper Harbor	Village of Ontonagon
2010 Population (Decennial Census)	4,634	7,708	108	1,494
2014 Population (5-yr ACS 2010-2014)	4,622	7,897	102	1,457
Unique Downtown Amenities				
1 Cinema/Theater, Playhouse	1	0	0	1
2 Waterfront Access/Parks	1	1	1	1
3 Established Farmer's Market	1	0	0	0
4 Summer Music in the Park	1	1	0	0
5 National or Other Major Festival	1	1	1	1
Downtown Street and Environment				
6 Angle Parking (not parallel)	1	0	1	1
7 Reported Walk Score is 50+	1	1	0	0
8 Walk Score/1,000 Pop is 40+	0	0	1	0
9 Off Street Parking is Evident	1	1	1	1
10 2-Level Scale of Historic Buildings	1	1	0	1
11 Balanced Scale 2 Sides of Street	1	1	0	1
12 Pedestrian Crosswalks, Signaled	0	1	0	0
13 Two-way Traffic Flow	0	0	0	1
Subtotal Place Score (13 points possible)	10	8	5	8
Total Place Score (30 Points Possible)	20	22	10	12
Total Place Score per 1,000 Population	4	3	98	8
Reported Walk Score (avg. = 42)	60	78	19	43
Walk Score per 1,000 Population	13	10	186	30

This PlaceScore assessment is based only on internet research, and has not been field-verified.

Analysis and assessment by LandUse|USA; © 2016.

If a community's amenities and resources are not listed, then the challenge is to improve marking efforts and ensure that the resources are available and easy to find through mainstream online search engines.

The PlaceScore term and methodology is trademarked by LandUse|USA with all rights reserved.