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WHEREAS, The Norway Area Joint Planning Commission notified each municipality contiguous to the Norway Area, the County planning commission, each public utility company and railroad company owning or operating a public utility or railroad within the Norway Area, for purposes of notification, of its intent to adopt a Norway Area Joint Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Norway Area Joint Planning Commission encouraged public participation through a Norway Area Citizen Survey and regular Norway Area Joint Planning Commission meetings; and

WHEREAS, The proposed Norway Area Joint Master Plan was submitted to the Norway City Council and Norway Township Board, who authorized distribution of the proposed plan; and

WHEREAS, The proposed Norway Area Joint Master Plan was distributed to each municipality contiguous to the Norway Area, the Dickinson County Planning Commission, each public utility company and railroad company owning or operating a public utility or railroad within the Norway Area, for purposes of notification, for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, On August 5, 2009, after proper public notice, the Norway Area Joint Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed Norway Area Joint Master Plan, during which members of the public were given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Norway Area Joint Planning Commission approved the Master Plan for adoption at a meeting held August 5, 2009; and

WHEREAS, The Norway City Council has determined that the draft of the Norway Area Joint Master Plan represents the long-range vision of the Norway Area.
THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, The Norway City Council hereby approves and adopts the Norway Area Joint Master Plan, as per the requirements of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, PA 33 of 2008, with the following modifications:

- Chapter 6, Page 15 shall read: Michigan Consolidated Gas Company serves the City of Norway and Norway Township.
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WHEREAS, The Michigan Planning Enabling Act, PA 33 of 2008, provides that the Norway Area Joint Planning Commission make and approve a Master Plan for the physical development of the community; and

WHEREAS, The Norway Area Joint Planning Commission notified each municipality contiguous to the Norway Area, the County planning commission, each public utility company and railroad company owning or operating a public utility or railroad within the Norway Area, for purposes of notification, of its intent to adopt a Norway Area Joint Master Plan; and
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WHEREAS, The Norway Area Joint Planning Commission approved the Master Plan for adoption at a meeting held August 5, 2009; and
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Chapter 1.0 Introduction and Historical Background

1.1 Joint Planning

Norway Area residents take pride in the scenic resources and small town community character that the City and the Township offer. The mission statements of the City of Norway and Norway Township are very similar in scope, focusing on providing efficient essential services while ensuring a high quality of life for residents. Residents and local government officials have worked together to plan for a livable and pleasant community.

There has been a recent trend across the country toward intergovernmental cooperation and the Norway Area has followed suit. In August 2007, the City of Norway and Norway Township passed resolutions forming a Joint Planning Commission under Public Act 226 of 2003. Public Act 226 provides for joint land use planning and the joint exercise of certain zoning powers and duties by local units of government and to provide for the establishment, powers and duties of joint planning commissions.

Local officials have agreed that there are many benefits to adopting a Joint Master Plan. The City of Norway and Norway Township already share a common heritage, cultural resources, natural resources, recreation opportunities, a school system, ambulance service and some of the same infrastructure. A joint plan will best address and manage regional resources that extend beyond jurisdictional boundaries. A joint plan can define a community-wide sense of place and character. Other positive aspects of a combined plan include: a reduced redundancy of services, making use of a shared expertise and presenting a unified front, sharing common resources and adopting a justifiable plan.

The Joint Master Plan will be used as a guide to manage the future growth of the Norway Area. To be a successful growth management tool, the plan should reflect the opinions of those that will be affected by land use decisions, the residents of the Norway Area. Community input promotes acceptance of the plan and garners support for future land use decisions made based on the plan.

1.2 Historical Background

Norway Township is located in the south-central portion of Dickinson County. The Township consists of about 89 square miles, about 11.7 percent of the total area of the county. The City of Norway is located in the southwest corner of Norway Township and is politically independent. The City consists of about 8.9 square miles, about 10 percent of the total area of the Township.

Dickinson County was the last of Michigan’s 83 counties to be organized. Initially, it was part of Menominee, Marquette and Iron Counties; in 1891 an act of the legislature established it as a separate county. Dickinson County
was named for Don M. Dickinson, a prominent Michigan democrat, who served as Postmaster General under President Cleveland.

It is uncertain whether the City and Township’s name originated from the Norway pine tree (*Pinosa resinosa*) that was prevalent during the time of settlement or from the home country of many of the area’s earliest inhabitants. The founding of the City coincides with sinking of the first test pit at the old Norway mine by Anton O’Dell in 1877. Following the platting of the town of Norway in 1878 by Carl Wendell, the Township of Norway was incorporated in 1881.

In 1891, a portion of the Township incorporated and became the City of Norway. Soon after the town was laid out, 40 businesses were under construction. Fire destroyed the business district in 1888. Around 1903, the rebuilt business district had subsided due to the extent of undermining and was moved southward to its present location.

The area developed around the iron ore mining industry. The Township lies on the historic Menominee Iron Range, the state’s second largest iron range. The range was discovered in 1873 by Edward Breitung, Thomas and Barley Breen, Dr. Nelson Hulst and several other explorers. This range contained 47 mines stretching from Waucedah to Crystal Falls. Various mines were located within the City and the Township, including the Norway, Perkins, Stevenson, Vulcan, Cyclops, Curry and Aragon Mines.

The Vulcan Mine, originally the Breitung Mine, was discovered by an exploration party led by Dr. Hulst in 1873. This was described as “the first body of good ore, large enough to make a mine of, ever discovered in the Menominee Range.” The Norway and Cyclops Mines were also the property of the Menominee Mining Company. When the Cyclops first opened in 1878, there were indications that the mine would become one of the largest operations on the Menominee Range but the ore deposits were becoming exhausted by 1881.

The Norway Mine also began operations in 1878 and was an open pit mine which later developed into an underground mine. Electric lights were installed in the winter of 1879 to facilitate open pit activity at the Norway Mine, making it the first mine in the Upper Peninsula to be supplied with electric lights. In 1882, the Penn Iron Mining Company took over both the Norway and Cyclops Mines, continuing the headquarters in Vulcan.

The Aragon Mining Company was formed in 1888 and raised the first ore from the mine in 1889. This marked the beginning of a prosperous 40-year production period. Rail lines were built to transport iron ore to lake ports. The mine proved to be the richest iron ore strike within the City and in 1909 the workforce peaked at about 360 miners. Extensive logging and sawmill
operations were launched in response to the demand for mining timbers to build new housing and businesses. Mining activity continued until closure of the last mine in 1945.

All that remains of the mining operations are the mine shafts and the piles of iron ore rocks. When mining operations ceased, the water pumps were removed, resulting in the underground mines being flooded. When the water level reached the surface, the open pit area of the Aragon Mine was filled, forming Strawberry Lake. The level of Lake Mary was also raised.

Although the principal early industry in the area was mining, the entire county contained abundant timber lands. Timber was floated along the Menominee River to Menominee and Marinette to be milled. The known logging companies that operated around the Norway area were the Hamilton and Merriman Company, the Quinnesec Logging Company and the Menominee River Logging Company. To supply the logging camps in the area, the New York Farm was established in 1866 along the Menominee River. This property originally covered several thousand acres and has been divided into smaller farms and small tract residential parcels.

The year 1920 marked the turning point in the conversion of Dickinson County’s economic structure from mining and lumbering to manufacturing by the arrival of the Ford Motor Company. In addition to numerous body plants, the Ford Motor Company also constructed a hydro-electric plant on the Menominee River, a chemical plant and other buildings. Peak employment was reached in the mid-1920s, with more than 7,500 employees on the payroll. After 31 years of operation, the Ford Motor Company closed operations in the County in 1951. The extensive facilities built by Ford have been converted into space for a number of diversified manufacturing and distribution firms.

Following the depletion of much of the area’s timber resources, farming families settled in the area as land prices and soil conditions were both favorable. Agriculture remains as a viable economic activity around the Norway Area.

1.3 Planning Overview
This Joint Master Plan is the result of extensive data collection and analysis providing a method to address issues in both the City of Norway and Norway Township. Community input, via a citizen survey, has played a critical role in the formation of this plan to ensure that it represents the needs of the residents. The initial sections of the plan present an analysis of the current conditions of the Norway area, including demographic statistics, economic climate and the existing land use. The remaining chapters of the plan are designed around the key issues highlighted by residents and community officials. Recommendations for how the Norway Area should address the issues are outlined. By analyzing the current conditions of the area and factoring in the desired community, the plan provides a clear view and
direction toward achieving the proposed goals. A future land use chapter will present the “preferred future” of how the Norway Area would like to grow and will include recommendations on how development will be carried out. The future land use discussion will also include a zoning plan, which will guide the implementation of a potential joint zoning ordinance for the Norway Area.

To summarize, this plan is intended for use as a guide by local officials when considering matters related to development and land use. Planning is a process that requires ongoing review and analysis. This plan will remain a work-in-progress and will require timely and thoughtful revision to be of the greatest benefit.
Chapter 2.0 Population

2.1 Introduction
Population change is a primary component in tracking a community’s past growth as well as forecasting future population trends. Population characteristics relate directly to housing, educational, recreational, transportation, health care, and future economic development needs of a community. The growth and characteristics of an area population are subject to changes in prevailing economic conditions.

Because communities do not exist in a vacuum, it is important to examine trends in the surrounding areas as well. Residents of one community may work in another community, send their children to school in a different place and travel to additional areas to purchase goods and services.

Demographics -- age, income, gender, education, and occupation, among other related factors -- shape the development of a community as well as its growth. Analysis of these trends and patterns are a useful tool to determine the needs and demands of the future population of the Norway Area. Included in this chapter is a thorough review of the current population, historic population trends, population projections, and age distribution. Concluding each section of this chapter is a description and explanation of foreseen impacts of the analysis.

2.2 Area Population Trends
Table 2-1 presents a comparison of historic population trends for all Dickinson County jurisdictions from 1960 to 2000.
## Table 2-1

### Historic Population Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>3,171</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>2,919</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>2,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1,257</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breen Township</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitung Township</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>4,483</td>
<td>5,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felch Township</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Iron Mountain</td>
<td>9,299</td>
<td>8,702</td>
<td>8,341</td>
<td>8,525</td>
<td>8,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kingsford</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>5,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagola Township</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waucedah Township</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Branch Township</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>23,917</td>
<td>23,753</td>
<td>25,341</td>
<td>26,831</td>
<td>27,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>7,823,194</td>
<td>8,881,826</td>
<td>9,262,044</td>
<td>9,295,287</td>
<td>9,938,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census for years cited.

The City has experienced gradually decreasing populations since 1960. That trend has reversed in the last decade. The City of Norway has experienced a small population growth from 2,910 persons in 1990 to 2,959 persons in 2000. The City’s 2000 population of 2,959 was 6.7% less than the 1960 population of 3,171.

During the same time period, Norway Township has experienced a sizeable population growth. In 1990 the Township’s population was 1,325 and the population increased by 23.7% to 1,639 in 2000. Individuals may be drawn to the Township by larger lots and the rural nature of the area.

Over the past fifty years, all of the townships in Dickinson County have experienced population increases, Norway and Breitung Townships in particular. The City of Iron Mountain has experienced a perceptible decline in population since 1960. This demographic change has been common throughout small towns in Michigan.

The population of Dickinson County has increased 3,555 persons, or 14.9% from 1960 to 2000. In 1970, the population of the County hit a 50-year low of 23,753. Since that low, the County’s population has seen a gradual increase.
but has yet to rebound to the high of 28,731 in 1940. Growth that occurred during this time can be attributed to increased industrial activity, led by Champion International’s location of a pulp and paper mill in Quinnesec.

The State of Michigan has experienced a population increase of 6.9% from 1960. The state has realized a small growth rate, as the upper Midwest has experienced large job losses and residents were being drawn to employment opportunities in the “Sunbelt.”

Population change is the result of a combination of natural increase and migration. When births within a community exceed deaths within a period of time, a positive natural increase is the result. Communities with younger populations tend to have high natural increases since the birth rates are higher. Those communities with a large number of older people tend to have a small natural increase; a negative natural increase is uncommon.

Net migration is the difference between the number of people moving into a community and the number of people moving out. Net migration is positive when more people move into an area than move out. Economically depressed areas often experience a significant out-migration as residents leave in pursuit of employment opportunities elsewhere.

Table 2-2
Components of Population Change, Dickinson County 1960-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live Births</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>3,536</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>1,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>-267</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Population Change</td>
<td>-164</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Michigan’s total net migration is also up from previous years but it remains much lower than in the early 1980s. 12 of the 15 counties in the Upper Peninsula lost population since the 2000 Census, Dickinson County being one of them.

Many counties in the Upper Peninsula tend to have high levels of domestic out migration. This largely reflects a movement of young adults to cities for education and employment that is only partially offset by in-migration of older adults and retirees. Dickinson County has had a minimal loss of population within the 2000-2006 time period.

2.3 Population Estimates

The U.S. Bureau of the Census, in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Management and Budget, prepares population estimates for years between decennial censuses. These estimates are based on formulas which calculate
for components of population change: births, deaths and migration. Local changes, such as major shifts in the employment market are also considered. County information is available for 2000-2006 population estimates.

Table 2-3
Population Estimates, Selected Counties, 2000-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alger</td>
<td>9,862</td>
<td>9,849</td>
<td>9,809</td>
<td>9,747</td>
<td>9,724</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>9,665</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>38,520</td>
<td>38,439</td>
<td>38,413</td>
<td>38,290</td>
<td>38,272</td>
<td>38,189</td>
<td>38,156</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>27,472</td>
<td>27,274</td>
<td>27,258</td>
<td>27,253</td>
<td>27,266</td>
<td>27,589</td>
<td>27,447</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>64,634</td>
<td>64,615</td>
<td>64,672</td>
<td>64,445</td>
<td>64,846</td>
<td>64,677</td>
<td>64,675</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td>25,326</td>
<td>25,255</td>
<td>25,115</td>
<td>25,094</td>
<td>25,091</td>
<td>24,892</td>
<td>24,696</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolcraft</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>8,779</td>
<td>8,759</td>
<td>8,873</td>
<td>8,779</td>
<td>8,744</td>
<td>8,779</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The populations of the counties listed above have remained relatively stable since the 2000 Census. Dickinson County experienced a slight decrease of 0.1% in population from 2000 to 2006.

2.4 Age and Gender

The age structure of a community’s population as well as the trend of the population (i.e. whether overall the community is getting younger, older or remaining about the same) can be an indicator of the types of facilities and services a community may be in need of. If trends suggest a younger population, the community may need to focus on school facilities, child care centers, playgrounds and other services utilized by a younger population. An aging population may require additional health care facilities, community services such as meals or transportation and specialized housing.

Table 2-4
Median Age, Selected Areas, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% Change 1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitung Township</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Iron Mountain</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kingsford</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: United States Bureau of the Census, Table DP-1, years cited.

The median age in the City of Norway and Norway Township was 38.6 years (Table 2-4). This compares with a median age of 40.0 at the county level and 35.5 years at the state level. The area’s population is significantly older than the state.
Examination of a community’s age structure is critical to a sound decision making process. This breakdown gives the Norway Area a sense of how the population is distributed for comparative and planning purposes. A detailed breakdown of the Norway Area’s age structure from 1990 to 2000 is presented in Table 2-5 and Table 2-6.

The percentage of the population in the Norway Area that is age 60 and older is higher than both the county and the state. The percentage of the population that is under the age of 19, otherwise known as the school age population is about the same as the county and the state. However, the group ages 20-24 is at a significantly lower level for the Norway Area and Dickinson County when compared to the State of Michigan. This data supports the theory that college aged individuals are more likely to pursue careers outside of the Norway Area and Dickinson County. Therefore, the Norway Area is experiencing an aging population due to the loss of younger residents combined with increases in middle and older age groups associated with an aging baby boomer population.

Table 2-5
Age Groups, Selected Areas, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-6
Age Groups, Selected Areas, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.5 Racial Composition

Consistent with the entire Upper Peninsula, the racial composition of the Norway Area is overwhelmingly white. The largest nonwhite racial group identified was the American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut category. Persons of Hispanic origin are not shown in Table 2-7 since they can be identified as any race. In 2000, 24 persons identified themselves as Hispanic in the Norway Area, up from five in 1990.

Table 2-7
Number of Persons by Race, Selected Areas, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race-One Race Only</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo &amp; Aleut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Educational Attainment

The educational attainment levels of persons 25 years and older are presented in Table 2-8 below. Among Norway Area residents who were 25 years or older at the time of the 2000 Census, nearly 14 percent did not have high school diplomas. This is higher than that of Dickinson County but lower than the state overall. A greater percentage of Norway Area residents had earned a high school diploma than was reported for the state and was at nearly the same level as the county. County and state populations reflected a higher percentage of persons possessing bachelors and graduate degrees, but the percentages of persons with at least high school diploma attainment were not appreciably different. These statistics likely reflect the educational requirements for the types of jobs available in the area.

Educational and training requirements have been increasing for workforce entrants. Employers who previously required little in the ways of formal education are now looking for employees with post-high school education, primarily due to the complexity of the equipment and methods being utilized in the modern workplace. A highly trained, educated workforce is an asset in attracting employers to a community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th Grade</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th-12th Grade, No Diploma</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or Professional Degree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate or Higher</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree or Higher</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Household Characteristics

Evaluation of the changes in household characteristics in a community can often provide valuable insight about population trends. Household relationships reflect changing social values, economic conditions and demographic changes such as increased life spans and the increasing mobility of our society.

The United States Bureau of the Census defines a household as all persons who occupy a housing unit, i.e., a single family, one person living alone, two or more families living together, or any groups of related or unrelated persons sharing the same living quarters. A family consists of a householder and one or more persons living in the same household who are related by birth, marriage or adoption. A non-family household can be one person living alone, or any combination of people not related by blood, marriage or adoption.

Household characteristics for selected areas are presented in Table 2-9.
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### Table 2-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>7,496</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>7,579</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>2,439,171</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>2,575,699</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-Couple Family</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>6,246</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>1,883,143</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>1,947,710</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>442,239</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>473,802</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>113,789</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>154,187</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family Households</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>3,137</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>980,160</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1,209,962</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder Living Alone</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>3,350</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>809,449</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>993,607</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 or Over</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>317,659</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>355,414</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10,633</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11,386</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,419,331</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,785,661</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1990 to 2000, the number of households in the Norway Area increased by about 11%. The number of households increased dramatically in the Township, by nearly 30%. By comparison, the number of households in Dickinson County increased by about 7% and the state of Michigan by about 10.7%. The Norway Area, as well as the county and the state, experienced a decrease in the average household size. The average household size in the Norway Area decreased from 2.55 persons per household to 2.46. A smaller average household size has been the trend in the state, as well as across the country. The number of female lead households remained about the same from 1990 to 2000, while the number households headed by single males increased slightly, by about 1.2%. The number of non-family households has increased about 4% from 1990 to 2000 in the Norway Area. This is due largely to an increase in the number of persons living alone.

Population density indicates how many persons live per square mile within a selected area. The City of Norway occupies an area of 8.8 square miles and has a 2000 population of 2,959 leading to a population density of 336.3 persons per square mile. In comparison, Norway Township occupies 89.3 square miles with a population of 1,639, with a population density of 18.4 persons per square mile. Typically Townships in the Upper Peninsula have a much lower population density than the surrounding cities as indicated in Table 2-10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Land Area in Square Miles</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Persons/Square Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>336.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitung Township</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>5,930</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Iron Mountain</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8,154</td>
<td>1,132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kingsford</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>1,290.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>766.4</td>
<td>27,472</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escanaba</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13,140</td>
<td>1,123.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gladstone</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5,032</td>
<td>1,118.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ishpeming</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>768.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manistique</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>1,119.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Marquette</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>19,661</td>
<td>1,724.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Menominee</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>1,826.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Munising</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>470.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Negaunee</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>331.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**2.8 Population Projections**

Population projections are useful for units of government for projecting future residential demands for public services. However, the major component of population change, in- and out-migration is very difficult to predict. This data depends heavily on future economic trends of the locality and other areas. The
other components of population changes, fertility and mortality data, have less of an impact on population change, particularly for smaller jurisdictions.

The Michigan Department of Management and Budget most recently prepared baseline population projections to the year 2020 for counties in 1996. The projections are based on a formula that utilizes the three main components of population change; birth, death and migration.

The Census Bureau released state population estimates as of July 1, 2008. The data show annual changes through births, deaths, and domestic and foreign migration. Estimates indicate that Michigan lost more than 46,000 residents from July 1, 2007 to July 1, 2008, while the state lost roughly 44,000 residents in the previous two years combined. The available population projections in Table 2-11 were prepared in 1996. Due to Michigan’s continued population decline, the projections may not reflect an accurate population estimate. If the state maintains its losses for another year, its population could fall below 10 million for the first time since 2000. According to the Census Bureau, Michigan currently has 10,003,422 people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>26,831</td>
<td>27,161</td>
<td>27,472</td>
<td>27,589</td>
<td>27,746</td>
<td>27,942</td>
<td>28,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alger County</td>
<td>8,972</td>
<td>9,847</td>
<td>9,862</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>10,114</td>
<td>10,192</td>
<td>10,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta County</td>
<td>37,780</td>
<td>35,582</td>
<td>38,520</td>
<td>38,189</td>
<td>39,004</td>
<td>39,244</td>
<td>39,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette County</td>
<td>70,887</td>
<td>65,427</td>
<td>64,634</td>
<td>64,677</td>
<td>68,393</td>
<td>67,016</td>
<td>66,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee County</td>
<td>24,920</td>
<td>24,537</td>
<td>25,326</td>
<td>24,892</td>
<td>21,497</td>
<td>20,565</td>
<td>19,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolcraft County</td>
<td>8,302</td>
<td>8,706</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>8,779</td>
<td>8,926</td>
<td>8,970</td>
<td>8,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>9,290,215</td>
<td>9,556,063</td>
<td>9,956,689</td>
<td>10,100,833</td>
<td>10,121,298</td>
<td>10,284,960</td>
<td>10,454,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>248,709,873</td>
<td>262,073,000</td>
<td>281,421,906</td>
<td>287,082,000</td>
<td>299,194,000</td>
<td>311,833,000</td>
<td>324,668,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alger County</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta County</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette County</td>
<td>-7.70</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee County</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-4.34</td>
<td>-4.78</td>
<td>-21.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schoolcraft County | 4.87 | 2.26 | -1.39 | 0.49 | 0.49 | -0.46 | 7.55
State of Michigan | 2.86 | 4.19 | 1.45 | 1.62 | 1.62 | 1.65 | 12.53
United States | 5.37 | 7.38 | 4.22 | 4.12 | 4.22 | 4.12 | 30.54


The population forecast for Dickinson County projects a steady growth trend, with a 4.71 percent increase from 1990 to 2030 and an average 5-year increase of 0.77 percent. The County’s projected increasing population trend is the third highest among the counties in the central Upper Peninsula. Marquette and Menominee Counties are the only counties in the central Upper Peninsula predicted to experience a population decline.

Updated population projections released by the Census Bureau for each state forecast that Michigan will only grow by 7.6% between 2000 and 2030, while the U.S. as a whole is projected to grow by 29% in the same period. Michigan’s outmigration to other states has been considerably higher than the national average, leading to the lower predicted growth rate. These population projections do not take into account several factors that may contribute to a higher rate of growth for Michigan. In addition to making cities more attractive to residents, improvements to the economic climate in Michigan should decrease the rate of outmigration. Michigan may experience an increase in return-migration. Michigan could benefit from an influx of Michigan natives looking to return to the area. Congestion and high housing costs may slow growth for some of the states predicted to go through rapid growth, leading more people to Michigan.

2.9 Issues and Opportunities
- The City of Norway has not experienced a significant population change since 1960, while Norway Township has gone through a period of considerable growth in the same time period.

- Significant growth observed within the Township and any future growth within the City may create opportunities for economic development. If the Township continues to grow as expected, potential development may result in the loss of open space and agricultural land. The City and the Township must continue to work jointly to enhance local services and facilities.

- The Norway area’s declining population of young children and young adults coupled with an increasing elderly population is a common trend throughout the state, as well as the United States as a whole. An increased national mean age has evolved from advances in health care
and an aging baby-boomer population and may require additional health care services to aid the aging population.

- The median age of City and Township residents was identical, at 38.6 years according to the 2000 Census, which is slightly younger than the county, but significantly higher than the state. The number of college age persons (20-24) remaining in the Norway Area has been decreasing. As the community ages, demand for senior housing, entertainment and health care will need to increase to meet the needs of an older population.

- Nearly 87 percent of adults over 25 in the Norway Area have a high school diploma or higher, which is slightly lower than the county but higher than the state. The number of residents in the Norway Area with a bachelor’s degree or higher is slightly lower than the county, but significantly lower than the state overall. This may be attributable to the types of jobs currently available in the area and their educational requirements.

- Observing the aging trends of the Norway Area presents the need to find new ways to attract younger families and individuals to the area to support an aging community. Attracting businesses which provide jobs for young people will encourage a younger demographic to settle and remain in the Norway Area.
Chapter 3.0 Economic Base

3.1 Introduction

Central to a community’s stability and growth is its economic base. Two major sectors make up an economy: a basic or export sector that provides goods and services for markets outside of the community, and a non-basic sector that provides goods and services for local consumption. Economic vitality and balance rely heavily on the creation and retention of local basic sector jobs.

The changes in population of an area are generally closely related to changes in the amount of economic activity in the area. The segment of the population that is most closely related to the economy is the labor force, which is defined as residents 16 years of age and older, that are either employed at one or more jobs or are actively seeking employment. The employed portion of the labor force provides the primary economic support of the total population.

The factors that influence the economic base in a community extend beyond its boundaries, increasingly so as the effects of the global economy are realized. Therefore, this chapter will not only include information that is specific to the Norway Area, but it will also include comparative data from the county, region, and state.

Much of the economic information presented is available only at the county level. Even where information is available at the local level, Norway Area figures may not accurately reflect the local economy due to the high degree of personal mobility.

3.2 Area Economy

The 2007 state equalized valuation (SEV) for the City of Norway was $59,569,439. The 2007 SEV for Norway Township was $59,705,800. Dickinson County’s SEV was $1,001,448,796. The Norway Area represents about 12% of the total SEV for Dickinson County.

Historically the local economy has been closely related to natural resources and natural features. Ore reserves along the Menominee Iron Range were mined in and around the Norway Area following the sinking of the first test pit in 1877. Mining activity continued until about 1845. Old shafts that once provided access for underground mining operations are still visible today.

The proximity and abundance of forest products are an available source of raw material for area paper mills, lumber mills and the wood products industries. Agriculture, which once dominated the rural landscape, is a primary source of income for very few residents.

Tourism is an important and growing industry throughout the Upper Peninsula. What was once a short business season has become year round
due to the popularity of winter sports such as snowmobiling, downhill skiing, cross-country skiing, ice fishing and snowshoeing. The area is abundant with opportunities for hiking, kayaking, canoeing, bird watching and many other outdoor activities. Increasing tourism has resulted in the emergence of new businesses such as motels, campgrounds, restaurants and specialty shops and services. Today’s tourists are more likely to travel frequently, take shorter trips and stay closer to home. Transportation accounts for the largest portion of the average budget for travel. Places that provide attractions with historic, cultural and environmental features have become increasingly popular.

Organizations such as the Norway Downtown Business Association, the Norway Downtown Development Association, the Dickinson County Area Chamber of Commerce, and the Dickinson Area Economic Development Alliance devote time and resources to promote, expand, and attract businesses and industry. Norway’s Downtown Business Association has the leadership role in planning annual events such as the Leif Ericson Parade, the citywide garage sale held in May, and the Scandinavia Christmas festivities.

The Downtown Development Association was formed in 1992 and uses tax increment financing (TIF) revenues from a designated district for infrastructure improvements within the district. Past efforts of the DDA resulted in construction of a playground on the east side of the City (Third Ward), repair of the time and temperature sign at the junction of US-2 and Main Street in partnership with the DBA, mapping of municipal utilities, utility extensions for a motel development of the City's west side, financing the Norway Spring Subdivision, and assisting in the purchase of the Northland building. The DDA is completing design of a website to market the businesses, services and attractions of the area. A major streetscaping project within the central business district was completed in 2000. The cost of the project was estimated at $750,000. Improvements were made to both the physical and visual character of streets, sidewalks, parking lots, pedestrian arcades, public facilities, and public rights-of-way. Underground utility upgrades were completed concurrently.

With a mission to “spearhead the development, attraction, expansion and retention of industries and business in the region, thereby enhancing the economic climate and quality of life of the Dickinson County Area,” the Dickinson County Economic Development Alliance was created through efforts of the county, Dickinson County Chamber of Commerce and the Dickinson County Area Industrial Development Corporation. The City of Norway and Norway Township are among several entities that provide financial support to the organization.

Northland Grocers, an area wholesale food distributor since 1951, went out of business in 1996 leaving its 191,000 square foot Norway warehouse facility vacant. Ownership of the property was secured from a local bank by the City.
Through combined efforts of the City and Michigan Economic Development Corporation, a $300,000 Community Development Block Grant was secured for infrastructure improvements necessary to accommodate the needs of Kiser-Johnson & Company, a firm specializing in hydroelectric repair services.

The Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park in the Township offers direct access to US-2 and has municipal water service. Several businesses including Vulcan Wood Products, United Abrasives Inc., Patton Archery MFG, Tandem Truck Repair and Lumberjack Hardwoods are currently located in the industrial park. The Township was the beneficiary of a Community Development Block Grant in the 1980s to provide sewer service to the area.

The local labor market area, which includes portions of Wisconsin, includes large and small employers engaged in diverse enterprises. Unlike many counties in Upper Michigan that are prone to high unemployment periods caused by seasonal labor requirements or market conditions affecting a single industry, Dickinson County has experienced relative stability due to the diversity of the existing economic base.

Use of the internet for selling and buying merchandise is rapidly changing the way many retailers do business. The tremendous growth of the internet, with the increased opportunities it offers, has created a heightened interest in e-commerce. This presents both challenges and opportunities for local retailers. The Norway Area is already a step ahead with the City providing internet service throughout the City and into some portions of the Township. Improving broadband service to underserved areas is a priority for the City.

### 3.3 Civilian Labor Force Characteristics

The civilian labor force consists of persons currently employed and those currently seeking employment, excluding persons in the armed forces and those under the age of 16 years. Shifts in the age and sex characteristics of residents, seasonal changes, and employment opportunities can all cause fluctuation in the number of persons in the labor force.

In 2000, the percentage of persons within the City age 16 years and older who were in the labor force (labor force participation rate) was 59.9 percent. Within the Township the labor force participation rate was slightly higher, at 64.9 percent. This compares to Dickinson County’s labor force participation rate of 61.1 percent. Labor force participation at the state level during the same period was 64.6 percent. Table 3-1 provides comparative labor force data.

From 2000 Census information, 6.9 percent of the City’s civilian labor force was unemployed compared with a rate of 3.5 percent for the Township. During the same period, Dickinson County’s rate was 5.6 percent while Michigan recorded a rate of 5.8 percent. Unemployment data compiled by the Michigan Employment Security Agency are provided in Section 3.6.
### Table 3-1
Civilian Labor Force Employment Status, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 16 Years and Over</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Civilian Labor Force</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed Forces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Labor Force</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Workforce participation by females is presented in Table 3-2. The percentage of women with children in the workforce greatly increased from 1990 to 2000; a similar increase was recorded for Dickinson County and the State of Michigan.
### Table 3-2
#### Labor Force Participation of Women 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women 16 Years and Older</td>
<td>1,25</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>1,23</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women w/Children Under 6 Years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women w/Children 6-17 Years</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Labor Force</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Employment by Industry Group

Table 3-3 provides comparative data derived from the 2000 Census using the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) manual. This system allows for a classification of establishments by the type of industrial activity in which they were engaged. The census data used were collected from households rather than businesses, which may be less detailed in some categories.

The three leading employment sectors for the Norway Area were construction; education, health and social services; and transportation and public utilities. Persons employed in construction in the Norway Area labor market were employed at higher rates than Dickinson County and slightly higher than the State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Economic Division</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Public Utilities</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance &amp; Real Estate</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Management Service</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, Health and Social Service</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, Rec &amp; Food Service</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3.5 Employment by Place of Work

Census information indicating where Norway Area residents are employed is presented in Table 3-4. 88.3% of the City’s and 89.4% of the Township’s working age population were employed in Dickinson County at the time of the 2000 Census. Of those working outside the county, the majority were employed outside Michigan. This reflects the interstate aspect of the local labor market area. The majority of these workers most likely work just across the state border in Wisconsin.
Table 3-4  
Workers Age 16 and Over, Place of Work, Selected Areas, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th></th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residents Employed</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Dickinson County</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Outside Dickinson County</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked in Michigan</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked Outside Michigan</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Commuting times for Norway Area residents are presented in Table 3-5. About 97% of Norway Area workers are employed outside of the home. About 27% of residents with jobs outside of their home worked within 10 minutes of their residences in 2000. Only 10% of City residents and about 18% of Township residents reported a commute time of more than 30 minutes, compared with 11.5% of Dickinson County workers and 27% of Michigan workers. About 3% of Norway Area workers reported working at home, which is comparable levels reported at the County and State levels.

The workplace as we have come to know it has been greatly influenced by technological advancement and economic globalization. It has been predicted that one-third of the 21st Century workforce will be independent regarding location; telephone and internet services will be the only requirements. Due to the mobile workforce, areas that can offer quality living environments will be the locations of choice for these types of work arrangements.

Table 3-5  
Travel Time to Work, Residents Age 16 and Older, Selected Areas, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence to Work Time</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers 16+</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Out of the Home</td>
<td>1,197</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 Minutes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Minutes</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 Minutes</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 Minutes</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 Minutes</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 Minutes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 Minutes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-5
Travel Time to Work, Residents Age 16 and Older, Selected Areas, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence to Work Travel Time</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 Minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 Minutes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 59 Minutes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 89 Minutes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Minutes or More</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at Home</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 3.6 Unemployment

County unemployment and labor force data are collected and analyzed by the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth. Unemployment data is not available at the sub-county level. United States Bureau of the Census data was used prior to 1965 in the computation of unemployment figures.

Historical labor force and unemployment data is presented in Table 3-6 for selected areas. Dickinson County, has generally recorded lower unemployment rates than the remainder of the Upper Peninsula. However, local unemployment rates are frequently higher than those documented by the state overall.

Table 3-7 provides labor force and unemployment data for all fifteen counties in the Upper Peninsula for 2008. Dickinson County has an unemployment rate of 7.1 percent for 2008. Dickinson County’s unemployment rate remains lower than the State of Michigan’s rate of 8.4 percent. The civilian labor force in Dickinson County has decreased slightly from 2000 (13,950) to 2008 (13,494), suggesting a slight economic downturn. The unemployment rate in Dickinson County has averaged about 5.7 percent since 2000.
### Table 3-6

**Labor Force and Unemployment, Selected Areas, 1965-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dickinson County Labor Force</th>
<th>Unemployment Rates (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>9,975</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>10,875</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>11,125</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12,775</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13,850</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13,518</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>13,253</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13,188</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13,504</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13,718</td>
<td>831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13,756</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13,695</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13,494</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth, for years cited.
*Indicates that employed and unemployed as published differ from total labor force by 25.

### Unemployment Rate, Selected Areas, 1965-2008

![Unemployment Rate Chart](chart.png)
Table 3-7
Labor Force and Unemployment, Upper Peninsula Counties, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Total Labor Force</th>
<th>Unemployment Rates (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alger</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraga</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>4,316</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td>15,811</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>17,529</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>18,165</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>19,878</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>13,494</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>14,519</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogebic</td>
<td>7,064</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>7,735</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>15,903</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>17,302</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>5,387</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keweenaw</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luce</td>
<td>2,476</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinac</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>6,359</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>33,413</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>35,961</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td>12,049</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>12,903</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontonagon</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolcraft</td>
<td>3,462</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3.7 Major Employers
Local retail and service industry establishments make up a large portion of the Norway Area’s employment base. Major manufacturing employers found within the City include North Star Print Group and Loadmaster Corporation. Public entities such as the Norway-Vulcan Area Schools (101 employees) and the City of Norway (31 full-time employees) are significant to the local economy.
Multi-Color Corporation is among the leading label printers in the nation and owns the former Norway Gravure Plant in the City. Started in 1948 as Roto-Craft, a rotogravure plant serving food, beverage, confection, household products and petroleum industries, the operation was relocated to an expanded facility and renamed Norway Gravure three years later. It was purchased by Gugler Lithographic; now known as NorthStar-Milwaukee in 1953. About 100 persons are employed at the Norway facility.

Loadmaster Corporation is a specialty metal fabricator. The firm has been in business for about 60 years and moved to Norway in the early 1990s. Primarily, the company’s workforce of 75 produces refuse units for truck mounting. Products of the company are marketed worldwide.

The paper industry is among the leaders in terms of importance to the regional economy. Area paper mills in Quinnesec (Breitung Township) and Niagara (Marinette County, Wisconsin) are major economic forces in the region. Both provide large markets for the local forest products industry and have extensive land holdings in the area. New Page Corp. announced the closure of the Niagara mill during the summer of 2008, 319 area employees were affected by the mill closure.

Groundbreaking for the Champion International paper mill began in 1981 with production beginning in 1986. Major capital investments since include the addition of a paper machine in 1990 and new coaters in 1997. Coated paper and pulp are produced at the facility with a labor force of approximately 580. In May 2000, Champion International Corporation was merged with the world’s largest paper maker, Verso Paper.

Other forest products-based area employers include Louisiana-Pacific’s waferwood plant in Sagola, with about 150 employees, the Aspen Lumber Company in Sagola with about 40 employees, Goodman (Wisconsin) employs about 275 and several area sawmills and manufacturers of wood products provide a significant number of jobs in the forest products industry.

Dickinson County is home to several large construction companies with markets extending into other states. MJ Electric, Bacco Construction, Cable Constructors and Gundlach-Champion are a few of the area’s major construction businesses.

Several non-paper manufacturing companies also exist in the area, including Grede Foundries, Inc. with more than 500 employees, LoDal, Inc. with about 70 employees and Nelson Paint with approximately 65 employees.

The healthcare industry is growing in response to rapidly changing technologies and treatments and due to the overall aging of the population. Dickinson Memorial Hospital, the Veteran’s Administration Hospital, HCR
Manor Care, and Northpointe Behavioral Health employ over 1,000 persons combined.

### 3.8 Income

A comparison of state and local income averages and trends is helpful in determining wealth that is available locally for expenditures on goods and services. Income figures also reflect the wages and salaries paid to local workers.

Annual household incomes for the Norway Area, county and state are compared in Table 3-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (dollars)</td>
<td>$31,059</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


10.5 percent of households in the City and 9.9 percent of the households in the Township fell below the $10,000 income level, which compared to 10.1 percent for the County and 8.3 percent for the state. The Norway Area and Dickinson County followed a similarly distributed pattern of income level. The $50,000 and above levels made up over a quarter of households within the City and
38.5 percent of the households in the Township, compared with 31 percent of county households and 35 percent of households statewide.

Further income analysis is provided in Table 3-9 using per capita, median household and median family incomes. Per capita income is derived from the total income reported in a given community divided by the total population. Household income is derived from all households including families. Family income includes that of married-couple families and other households made up of persons related by blood, marriage or adoption. It does not include persons living alone, unrelated persons sharing living quarters or other non-family households.

Income information from the 2000 Census was gathered in 1999. Using the U.S. Department of Commerce inflation rate of 1.8 for the period, an adjustment for inflation is shown in order to compare 1989 incomes with 1999 income data gathered during the 2000 Census. A 1989 income would have to increase by a factor of 1.8 by 1999 just to keep pace with inflation. Data contained in 2000 Census data reflects actual 1999 incomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$11,232</td>
<td>$17,681</td>
<td>$11,026</td>
<td>$19,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$21,875</td>
<td>$31,059</td>
<td>$27,312</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$26,215</td>
<td>$37,533</td>
<td>$32,171</td>
<td>$49,141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Using state incomes as a standard of comparison, both per capita and household incomes increased at the City and Township level from 1989 to 1999. At the City level, per capita income rose from 79.3 percent of the statewide average in 1989 to 79.8 percent in 1999. At the Township level, per capita income rose from 77.9 percent of the statewide average in 1989 to 89.9 percent in 1999.

In general, incomes in the Norway Area are 80 to 90 percent of those for the state overall, and in the Township incomes are significantly higher than those in Dickinson County.

### 3.9 Poverty Levels
Poverty levels are determined by the United States Bureau of the Census based on a complex formula that includes 48 different thresholds that vary by family size, number of children within the family and the age of the householder. The data provided in Table 3-10 is based on 1999 incomes as gathered for the 2000 Census. The annual income poverty level for a family of two was $11,060; for a family of three, $13,880. The average household size in 2000 was 2.30 for the City and 2.62 for the Township.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Rates Percent Below Poverty Level, Selected Areas, 1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rates by Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Children Under 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Children Under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families w/Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 18 and Older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons 65 and Older</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Poverty rates for all individuals in the City were 10.8 percent, the Township reported a lower rate of 8.3 percent. Comparable rates were recorded at the county and state level. Among older persons, poverty rates for the Norway Area exceeded that of both the county and the state. Since the 1960s the poverty rates for the elderly have fallen dramatically most likely due to assistance programs. Children represent a disproportionate share of the poor in the United States; they are about 25 percent of the total population, but 35 percent of the poor population. Female-headed households across the state experienced high rates of poverty, especially those households with children under five.

### 3.10 Issues and Opportunities

- The wealth of natural resources in the Norway Area provides raw materials for a variety of industries and offers a wide array of outdoor recreational opportunities which support the local tourism industry. The potential for expansion in these industries may exist.

- Significant increases in the number of women with children in the labor force affect the needs for child care, educational and recreational programs and facilities. Changes in the working environment to
accommodate family needs of both men and women, such as flexible
days and hours of work, job sharing, etc. may in turn affect commuting,
transportation and shopping patterns.

- The Norway Area boasts a diverse economy, with several large employers
in the manufacturing and service sectors. The local economy also
contains a large and diverse array of small and mid-sized firms. The
recent closure of the Niagara mill will affect about 319 employees from
the surrounding area. Those employees may be in need of education and
re-training to assist in finding alternate employment opportunities.

- About 90 percent of the Norway Area’s labor force works within
Dickinson County. About 90 percent travel less than 30 minutes to
reach their place of employment.

- Local unemployment rates are generally lower in Dickinson County than
those rates elsewhere in the Upper Peninsula, although unemployment is
higher than the state and national levels. The lower unemployment rate
is a direct reflection of economic diversity.

- Incomes in the Norway Area are 80 to 90 percent of those for the state
overall, and in the Township incomes are significantly higher than those
in Dickinson County.

- Poverty rates for the Norway Area were comparable to the county and the
state. Female householders, especially those with children experience
much higher poverty rates than any other group. Programs directed
toward female heads of households may be needed to help alleviate
poverty in the area.
Chapter 4.0 Natural Features

4.1 Introduction
A direct relationship exists between an area’s natural features and the development that occurs in that area. Often, communities are established, or grow and shrink based on one or more natural features and resources. In the case of the Norway Area, the presence of both iron ore and pine forests were critical to the early development of the region. Mining and logging were mainstays of the early local economy. These natural features are often interrelated and disturbance in one area has the potential to affect other areas. An understanding of these relationships is important for effective community planning.

4.2 Geology and Bedrock Geology
Among the primary factors which make geology important to a community’s development is the ability to supply groundwater. The quality and quantity of groundwater are influenced by the types of bedrock in which it is found and also influenced by the layers through which the water passes before it is extracted. Bedrock geology consists of solid rock formations found below the soil formed during the early periods of the earth’s evolution. These formations have undergone extensive folding, uplifting, eroding, and weathering during the millions of years that have since passed, and are now overlain by surface geology and soil.

Certain types of bedrock increase the potential for groundwater contamination, particularly when the bedrock is close to the surface. When bedrock is close to the surface, the opportunity to filter out contaminants is diminished. This situation increases the potential for polluted runoff to enter the groundwater table. Bedrock at or near the surface also increases construction costs. Buildings must be constructed without basements and in some cases, blasting is required for utility and street construction or even for building site preparation.

The bedrock of the Norway Area is complex and changes over short distances due to the tilted strata that have been subject to folding, faulting and erosion over time. Bed rock of this type is where iron ore deposits are located. Precambrian rocks form the bedrock beneath the City and the Township. It is believed that these formations are more than 500 million years old. The northern two-thirds of the Township consist primarily of bedrock. The Norway Area’s bedrock is comprised of several identified formations including the Munising, Michigamme, Chocolay and Menominee groups. The Munising formation is a potentially quality groundwater source the Michigamme, Menominee and Chocolay group, while more variable, generally provide reliable groundwater as well. Map 4-1 presents the geology of the Norway Area.
4.3 Surface Geology

Surface geology is also an important factor in terms of the ability to filter contaminants, the ability of the soil to support structures, roads, etc. and the suitability of a site for various uses. Glacial till, for example, often includes gravel and boulders which can make building difficult and lower soil productivity. On the other hand, such gravel deposits are an important source of material for road construction and other uses.

The Norway Area’s surface geology is identified as sandy glacial till, glacial till, and glacial lake plain. Some areas of exposed bedrock caused by glacial scouring exist as well. Sandy glacial till contains large amounts of sand and gravel, which increase the availability of groundwater. These deposits are found over the northern one-half of the City, although areas along Pine Creek Road beyond Pollard’s Dairy are known to have deep wells of limited capacity.

A band of fine glacial till spans the City immediately south of the area of the coarser sand glacial till. Deposits of this type are characterized by a thin layer of poorly sorted clay and boulder till overlaying the bedrock. Its groundwater producing potential is considered to be poor. Glacial lake plain is found in the southern area of the City and consists mainly of sand with varying amounts of silt and clay. Permeability is determined by the silt and clay content. Higher concentrations of silt or clay impede drainage, low concentrations provide moderate to highly permeable conditions.

As previously mentioned, the northern two-thirds of the Township is predominately bedrock. The bedrock appears at or near the surface in areas where the glaciers scoured the landscape and did not leave behind any deposits. Sandy glacial deposits occur in the southern third of the Township. These glacial till areas contain large amounts of sand and gravel, which increase water availability, as compared to that of other glacial till areas. The southern and northern portions of the Township contain deposits of a glacial lake plain. In general, the deposits are sandy and serve as water supplies for domestic wells.

4.4 Soils

Soil is the surface layer of the land that was formed through the interaction of many factors. Physical, chemical and mineral composition of the parent material combined with climate, plant and animal life on and in the soil are major factors. Other factors include time and relief, or lay of the land.

Parent materials in Dickinson County are the result of glacial deposition or outwash from meltwater. Glaciers moving over bedrock material, whose massive pressure and slow movement turn the solid rock into extremely fine-ground material. The different types of soil created from the contractions of these glacial sheets were deposited throughout the area in no particular order.
The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Soil Conservation Service published the “Soil Survey of Dickinson County, Michigan” in August 1989. Most of the field work was completed by 1984. Soils are grouped into associations based on common characteristics such as drainage, slope, and texture. The soils in these associations respond similarly to the various uses to which they may be subjected. Development should be planned in such a way as to take into account the suitability of the soils in the project area. For example, residential subdivisions should avoid areas of shallow and/or poorly drained soils or areas where the water table is close to the surface, since such soils are unsuitable for septic drain fields and problematic for roads. Soil types found within the Norway Area are identified on Map 4-2.

About 80 percent of the City and a large portion of the Township, including most of Vulcan are covered by soils of the Pemene-Emmet-Cathro associations. These soils are nearly level to hilly, well drained and very poorly drained, loamy and muck soils that formed in ice-contact drift, glacial till, and organic deposits. Concerns within cultivated areas relate to drought, water erosion and wind erosion. Slopes may present building limitations and affect on-site septic systems for those areas not within the City’s wastewater collection/distribution system. Slow percolation rates and ponding may be additional factors in some areas containing these soils.

Most of the remainder of the City and about 25 percent of the Township are covered by soils of the Mancelona-Rubicon association which are characterized as nearly level to rolling, somewhat excessively drained and excessively drained, sandy soils that formed in glacial outwash. Concerns in cultivated areas include drought, water and wind erosion and organic matter content. Since these soils are primarily sandy, limitations for septic tanks are generally severe. Sandy soils permit rapid percolation not conducive to the adequate filtering of effluent.

A tiny portion of the City’s west side and the southwest corner of the Township contains Pence-Vilas association soils. These soils are nearly level to rolling, well drained and excessively drained, loamy and sandy soils that formed in glacial drift and outwash. Building limitations are primarily related to slope; sandy soils provide poor filtration for on-site septic systems.

Slightly less than half of the Township contains the Pemene-Emmet-rock outcrop association. This area consists of rock outcrop and is gently rolling to hilly, with well-drained loamy soils that formed in ice-contact drift and glacial till. The primary use of this association is woodland. Seedling mortality, an erosion hazard and equipment limitation due to rock outcrops and slopes are the major management concerns in this association.
Impermeable soils do not allow effluent to filter through the underlying soil; highly permeable soils allow effluent to pass through rapidly. In both instances, the conditions impose limitations on building development requiring on-site septic systems.

Soil limitations for building site development include the presence of shallow bedrock that can make the construction of basements difficult; wetness, which can result in wet basements or unstable support for foundations; or steep slopes, which increase the potential for structures to slide.

Construction and maintenance of roads are affected by a soil’s shrink-swell potential, frost action potential, depth to bedrock or water table, and slope. As with other soil constraints, construction techniques are available to overcome many limitations, however, they may be costly. Moreover, more frequent maintenance may be required to sustain a good condition.

Prime farmland, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is the land that is best suited to food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. It may be cultivated land, pasture, woodland, or other land, but it is not urban and built-up land or water areas. Most of the prime farmland soils are in the northern one-half of the City. There are substantial areas scattered throughout the Township which may have potential for agricultural uses as well. The Township has a large percentage of forested area. Soil types can impose limitations on logging activities, especially when combined with steep slopes.

Areas not rated for use include water, pits and dumps, mine pits, udorthents (original soil removed), and aquents (sandy or loamy marshes) and histosols (organic marshes). Aquents and histosols are generally not suitable for development; areas containing pits, dumps and udorthents require site specific assessment.

4.5 Topography

The unique character of an area is derived from the physical features of its landscape. Topography describes this character in terms of elevation above mean sea level. This reveals the size and shape of watersheds and places to avoid with development because of grades in excess of recommended standards.

Steep topography or slopes of 10 percent or greater (a rise in gradient of more than 10 feet in a horizontal distance of 100 feet) can be aesthetically attractive for residential development and some commercial establishments. However, the steep grade increases the likelihood of soil movement or slides, and the weight of structures is an added force that encourages this movement. In addition, there is an added expense if development occurs on the sloping surface itself. Excavation of a hillside and/or construction of retaining walls can greatly increase building costs. There is also a problem of erosion as the
water rushes down the steep grades. Natural water courses provide the pathway for such water and should be maintained in this capacity. Soil disturbance of one or more acres or within 500 feet of a lake or stream generally requires a permit as authorized under Part 91 (Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control) of the Natural Resources Environmental Protection Act.

Elevations in the City range from approximately 938 to 1278 feet above sea level with hilly terrain common in most areas. Elevations in the Township range from approximately 820 to 1476 feet above sea level. Norway Mountain, in the Township, rises about 400 feet around the surrounding area (Map 4-3).

4.6 Water Features

Over 70 percent of the earth’s surface is water. Water features, i.e. lakes, streams and rivers have important functions as natural resources. Among those important functions is as the source of water for residential and commercial development. According to a 1999 Michigan Department of Environmental Quality publication, surface water serves as a drinking water source for approximately 50 percent of the state’s population. Sufficient amounts of surface water are necessary for many industries and for the generation of electricity. Surface water features are also important for recreational use and often add scenic beauty to an area.

Water features within and adjacent to the Norway Area include several small lakes. The largest is Hanbury Lake; Strawberry Lake, site of the abandoned Aragon iron ore mine, is the largest lake found entirely within the City. Both of these lakes contain multiple fish species and are popular sports fishing locations. The level of Strawberry Lake is artificially maintained through mechanical pumping with excess water discharged into White Creek. This action controls the area’s water table protecting against basement flooding while increasing the flow volume of White Creek that benefits wastewater treatment operations downstream. Immediately to the east of Strawberry Lake are two small unnamed water bodies. Lake Mary is situated between U.S. 2/41 and the Norway-Vulcan School. Lake View is a short distance southeast of Lake Mary. Two unnamed water bodies are located near the City’s western boundary.

Hanbury Lake is located in the Township and borders the southeastern portion of the City. Pine Creek crosses through the northeastern portion of the City and joins the Sturgeon River in Waucedah Township. White Creek begins in the western portion of the City north of Kimberly Road and flows generally east and then south nearly parallel to Brown Street. It eventually empties into the Menominee River. It has served as a drainage outlet for farmland and wastewater discharge. Water Works Creek originates in the northwest part of the City (Section 31) and flows into Pine Creek north of CR 573. Watersheds, or basins, collect and drain water to a common point within a topographically defined area. The Norway Area lies within three sub-
watersheds of the Menominee River Basin: the Pine Creek, the Fumee Creek and the Sturgeon River. Most of the developed area of the City is within the Fumee Creek sub-watershed. The northern portion is within the Pine Creek sub-watershed and a small section in the southeast falls with the Sturgeon River sub-watershed. The southern portion of the Township lies in the Menominee River Basin and the northern portion is drained by the Sturgeon River.

Marshes are found in the northern portion of the Township. Marshes are low areas of level or nearly level poorly drained soils. Marshes are exceedingly important, providing a natural habitat for species as well as recharging the Township’s groundwater supply.

4.7 Floodplains and Wetlands
Floodplains and wetlands are important from a planning standpoint due to their potential limitations on future development. With floodplains, it is important to also consider their possible impact on existing development. These important storage areas affect the discharge characteristics of streams. Loss of floodwater storage areas to development causes rainfall to run off more rapidly and increases the potential for flooding. A plain that may be submerged by flood waters defines a floodplain; areas between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is at, near, or above the land surface for a significant part of most years define wetlands. A wetland area may be referred to as a swamp, bog or marsh and is normally characterized by the presence of water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support wetland vegetation and aquatic life. Wetland areas help to improve water quality by filtering pollutants and trapping sediments.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency determines flood hazard areas in consonance with its administration of the National Flood Insurance Program. Norway does not currently participate in the flood insurance program. A 1975 assessment by the Federal Insurance Administration, a division of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, identified areas next to Hanbury Lake, White Creek, Water Works Creek and Pine Creek as “Special Flood Hazard Areas.” Although flooding hazards were indicated, no base flood elevations were determined. Any development occurring in wetland areas is subject to the regulatory authority of the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality.

4.8 Mineral Resources
The extraction of iron ore along the Menominee Range began in 1877 and ceased in about 1945. In all, 37 sites were mined along the range extending from Waucedah west into Iron County. Mining locations in the Norway Area included Curry, Cyclops, Aragon, Brier Hill, West Vulcan, Norway, Stephenson, Munro, Perkins and Waverly.
Some of the City’s gravel/fill supply is obtained at former mining locations. There is no commercial activity associated with these pits currently. The Dickinson County Road Commission operates a gravel pit in the northwest portion of the Township.

A former quarry is found east of Strawberry Lake in Section 9, T39N, R29W. The site was visited in 1998 in connection with a hard and soft stone feasibility study completed by H. James Bourque and Associates for the state of Michigan. It was determined that the site with its mostly pink dolostone was not feasible as a potential source of dimension stone.

4.9 Scenic Sites

An abundance of scenic sites are found within the Norway Area’s hills, forests, rivers and lakes. While determining scenic value is highly subjective, the natural environment and general rural nature of the area contribute significantly to the overall quality of life. A listing and brief description of the most prominent scenic sites in Norway Area includes the following:

**Carney Lake**
Encompassing 117 acres, this natural area is an excellent spot for perch and walleye fishing. There is also a boat launch, swimming beach, 11 campsites, water and toilets.

**Dickinson County Fairgrounds**
Encompassing 77-acres, this facility is home to the annual county fair. The event is run for five successive days coinciding with Labor Day weekend. Other times of the year, the facility hosts stock car racing and horse shows.

**Fumee Creek**
Rock outcrops, trails and a beautiful 25-foot waterfall are among the features at this Michigan Department of Transportation facility along US-2 west of the City.

**Fumee Lake Natural Area**
This scenic area encompasses more than 1,000 acres just north of Quinnesec. Fishing is not permitted; activities such as hiking, canoeing, cross-country skiing, and biking are allowed within designated areas.

**Hanbury Lake**
Located on US2 between Norway and Vulcan, this county-owned 28-acre park includes nearly 4,000 feet of shoreline

**Marion Park**
City-owned and managed, this recreational complex is situated in a scenic area close to the southern corporate boundary.
Norway Mountain
Found just east of the City’s corporate limit in Norway Township, this site is a winter sports area with an outstanding vantage point for viewing.

Piers Gorge
Located on the Menominee River about one mile south the City’s corporate limit, Piers Gorge features rapids and cascading water with a walking trail along the course of the river. It is considered one of the most challenging stretches of whitewater for kayaking in the Midwest.

Pine Creek Road
County Road 396 from Iron Mountain to Norway features farms, forests, wildlife and rock outcrops along its course.

Strawberry Lake
This 30-acre City-owned recreation area features a walking trail, fishing piers, unique playground, ball field and other amenities.

Sturgeon Falls Power Dam
This site includes about 100 acres and features an extensive backwater area good for fishing. It is located in the Township about 3 miles south of Vulcan.

An extensive description of scenic and recreation areas is presented in Chapter 8.

4.10 Climate
About 70 percent of the area’s annual precipitation, or around 21 inches, is received during the period April through September. On average, August is the wettest month and February the driest. Afternoon showers and thunderstorms produce most summer precipitation. Annual snowfall averages around 64 inches. About 15 inches, the most of any month, falls in December. Average annual precipitation in the area from 1950 to 1980 was 30.36 inches.

The area’s interior location reduces the effect by the Great Lakes. Increased cloudiness in the fall and winter months, however, is attributable to the influence of the Great Lakes. The cloud cover tends to moderate temperatures. A growing season, or freeze-free period, averages 112 days. May 28 and September 17 are the average dates of the area’s last and first freezing temperatures. January and July are the coldest and warmest months respectively. The mean annual temperature from 1950 to 1980 was 53 degrees Fahrenheit. July is the warmest month, with an average daily maximum of 79.6 degrees; the average daily maximum and minimum temperatures in January, the coolest month, were 23 and 3.2 degrees respectively.
4.11 Issues and Opportunities

- The bedrock lying beneath the Norway Area is linked to the Area’s development as a result of the iron ore contained within the bedrock. Original settlement and land uses were directly related to the Area’s natural features and resources.

- Adequate groundwater supplies are contained within the bedrock underneath the Norway Area. Soil suitability and steep slopes make some areas less suitable for future development. Land stability in and around former mining sites is a factor to be considered in all development or redevelopment plans.

- The City contains prime areas for agriculture uses as does the southern half of the Township.

- The climate of Dickinson County presents a variety of challenges. Examples include: the need for snow removal from streets and parking lots, building codes which provide adequate support for snow loads and a short growing season which limits the type of crops which can be grown. The local climate may be attractive to a number of people and can be suitable for businesses or industries which specialize in certain types of goods or services.

- The natural features of the Norway Area are important to the local quality of life. Scenic and natural areas have been identified throughout the Norway Area. These areas present many possibilities for outdoor recreation. Preservation of these natural areas will be crucial in order to maintain these opportunities.
Chapter 5.0 Land Use

5.1 Land Use Patterns

Patterns of land use evolved from economic necessity. The economy was firmly linked to trade routes that followed natural features such as lakes and streams. The general historic land use patterns which are common to the Upper Peninsula are reflected in the land use patterns that have developed in the Norway Area. Settlements were established at, or close by, active points of commercial activity.

Following the discovery of iron ore along the Menominee Range in 1873 the area experienced a population boom due the availability of mining-related work. As more people settled in the area, farming also developed into an important use of the land. Residential and commercial development occurred in areas not excavated for mining activity, but in close proximity. Neighborhoods were established in short order to provide housing, churches, schools and stores needed by the residents.

Railroads were constructed to transport iron ore to lake ports such as Escanaba for delivery to steel mills at the lower end of the Great Lakes. Completion of rail lines provided transportation for products other than iron ore such as lumber and the supplies necessary to sustain a community and its people. The importance of railroads is evident in the settlement patterns that followed their construction.

An abundance of cheap land became available following the removal of valuable timber resources during the lumbering boom. Families interested in farming were attracted by the affordable land. Where good soil conditions existed, agriculture was successful. Agriculture remains an important industry today only on a much more limited basis.

Natural features and cultural influences were also important determinants of how land was used. Rugged terrain and swampland, for instance, were not inviting for the establishment of settlements. Cultural influences are reflected in the types of buildings constructed, local commercial practices and community traditions and activities.

Low density development that starts at the edges of cities and towns and spreads outward is referred to as “sprawl.” Development of this kind is often poorly planned and designed without regard to the impact on the surrounding area. Beyond consuming a lot of land, sprawl impacts traffic patterns and volume, air quality, the economic health of downtown areas and the overall character of a community. To some degree, governmental policies and practices encourage sprawl because of requirements regarding lot size, setbacks, etc. It is important that communities have a full understanding of how such land uses may affect them.
5.2 Factors Affecting Land Use

Land use is never a static process; change is always occurring. Decisions affecting land use can come from a variety of sources. Changes in land use have been the result of various decisions made by individuals, families, businesses, or governmental/public agencies. It is important to note, however, that land use changes cannot be attributed to a single set of decisions made by one group or individual. Rather it is a combination of decisions made by a number of individuals, organizations, or public agencies.

Location tends to be the most important factor for home buyers and commercial interests. The availability of public and private services, accessibility, existing conditions of the area, and price are other important considerations. Speculators may purchase, hold or sell property based on an anticipated future profit. Land developers, too, attempt to anticipate market conditions, i.e., supply and demand for housing, goods and services, or industrial needs. They strive to accurately assess the type, scope, and optimum time of development that will produce a profitable outcome.

Owners of business and industrial concerns decide to start, expand, or close their operations based on economic probability. Many factors may be considered in determining economic feasibility including supply and demand for the goods or services produced, cost and quality of transportation, and site availability. Local decisions have a bearing on these factors.

Generally, the immediate self-interest of the individual or organization making a land use decision supersedes what impact the use may have on the surrounding lands. Decisions determined in this fashion can potentially result in incongruous or incompatible development since the community’s overall pattern of development is not necessarily among the factors considered. Laws and regulations have been enacted giving local units of government the means to deal with land use issues. These legal tools allow federal, state and local governments to address the overall compatibility and appropriateness of development and land use.

Federal legislative actions have created a number of loans and grant programs for community facilities, water and wastewater systems, housing, economic development, and planning. Drinking water standards, air quality and many other environmental factors are addressed in federal regulations. Although these laws, regulations and programs do not usually directly affect land use and development, they have a major indirect effect. For example, a community that lacks sufficient sewage disposal capacity to serve industrial uses may be able to obtain federal funding to assist with expansion of its sewer treatment facility, which in turn, may lead to industrial development.
The traditional role of the state has been limited to providing the enabling legislation for local units of government to regulate growth and development through planning and zoning. The State of Michigan does, however, regulate land use and development in regions of environmental concern including wetlands, floodplains and coastal areas. This can have a direct effect on local land use. The state also enforces standards for municipal water systems and wastewater systems that are at least as strict as federal standards. A community’s ability to provide water and wastewater treatment systems is directly affected by these regulatory standards.

Local governments can exert the most effective influence on land use changes through zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, building codes, and public investment in roads, water and sewer systems, parks, etc. Local planning efforts that seek to define the most desirable and appropriate uses for the various parts of a community, and anticipate and prepare for growth, can serve to guide future land use decision-making. Both the City and the Township utilize zoning ordinances to regulate land use. A joint zoning ordinance is a possibility for the future.

Other factors affecting land use include the existing transportation system, taxation, land values, natural features, changing technology, and market conditions. Changes in lifestyles, family size, shopping preferences, and customer attitudes also affect land use decisions. Mobility is greater than at any previous time, families are smaller, and life expectancies have increased. These changes are reflected in employment patterns and housing and shopping preferences. From a land use standpoint, some pertinent issues are the preferences for larger homes situated on larger parcels, the apparent willingness to endure longer commuting distances to work, and the growing market for housing specifically designed for elderly residents - particularly those residing for only part of the year.

The transportation system that serves a community determines how quickly and easily raw materials and finished goods can be received and shipped. It also is directly related to product cost, a crucial factor for business. The expanding network of roadways in the U.S., together with the proliferation of private automobiles, has enabled residents of rural areas to commute to larger communities for employment and shopping, and has increased the accessibility of many areas to tourists. This increased mobility has, in many cases, facilitated development of strip commercial areas, large shopping malls, and suburban residential development. Referred to as “urban sprawl,” such development frequently converts open space and agricultural land to more intensive uses.

Taxation and land values play a part in many land use decisions. Families may move from urban areas because they feel they are willing to trade off lower taxes and/or user fees for the lack of municipal services and increased...
distance from employment, shopping, and schools. Land values in rural areas may also be lower, thus more attractive to residents. Commercial and industrial enterprises are generally less willing to forego municipal services such as water and sewer. They are also more likely to locate in areas of concentrations of population rather than in very rural areas. Tax rates and land values are important considerations for businesses as well.

Changing technology, including computer networking, cellular telephones, facsimile machines, voice mail, teleconferencing, video conferencing, and electronic mail provide businesses with location options that were previously not practical. Often, the quality of life associated with these rural locations is an additional attraction.

5.3 Current Use Inventory

The Michigan Resource Information System (MIRIS) provides comprehensive information on the use of land. Continuation of the inventory process is enabled through P.A. 204 of 1979 which calls for Michigan’s landscape to be identified, classified and mapped every five years. While the information has not been updated since being completed in 1989, it nonetheless provides good information for planning purposes. Precise acreage by category within the City and the Township is contained in Table 5-1. Map 5-1 presents an orthophoto, or aerial photo of the Norway Area, providing an accurate representation of the earth’s surface. Map 5-2 illustrates updated land uses based on an interpretation of 1998 digital orthophotos and MIRIS data.

Current land use patterns are described in ten broad categories. Land uses were determined from aerial photographs sufficiently detailed to identify the existing use of every 2.5 to 5.0 acres of land in the state. Field verifications supplemented the identification process as warranted.

Descriptions of each of the ten broad land use categories and an analysis of inventory results are contained in the succeeding paragraphs.

**Agricultural Lands:** Defined as lands which are used for the production of food and fiber. More than 1,670 acres or 29 percent of the City’s total area was identified in this classification. Over 7 percent of the Township’s land area, or 4,487 acres was identified in this category.

**Forest Land:** Forest land is defined as having at least 10 percent stocked by forest trees of any size, or formerly having such tree cover, and not currently developed for non forest use. The 1,718 acres of land identified in this classification constitute about 30 percent of the City’s total land area. The Township is overwhelmingly forested with 44,899 acres or nearly 78 percent of land classified as forested.
Residential: Residential land uses ranges from high density, represented by the multiple-unit structures of urban cores to low density, where houses are on lots of more than one acre. About 12 percent, or 688 acres, of the City's land is classified as residential, while only 0.4 percent or 255 acres of the Township’s land is residential.

Other Urban: Land areas that are used intensively but not covered by residential, commercial or industrial structures are classified as other urban. This classification includes 59 acres, or about 1 percent of the City’s land area and 1,327 acres or about 2 percent of the Township’s land area.

Industrial: Industrial areas include a wide array of uses from light manufacturing and industrial parks to heavy manufacturing plants. The City is comprised of

Upland Field: These are open or range lands characterized by grasses and shrubs, but not including those lands showing obvious evidence of seeding, fertilizing or other agricultural practices. Nonforested lands inventoried included 887 acres covering nearly 16 percent of the City’s land area. The Township is made up of nearly 2,195 acres of upland field, representing 3.8 percent of the total land area.

Water Bodies: Streams, impoundments, and lakes are included in this classification. Less than one percent of the City was classified as predominately or persistently water covered. About two percent of the Township is recognized as a water body.

Wetlands: Wetlands are defined as those areas between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is at, near or above the land surface for a significant part of most years, and include marshes, mudflats, wooded swamps and wet meadows. About 395 acres of wetlands were identified within the City and nearly 3,150 acres in the Township.

Barren Land: Barren land includes bare exposed rock, beaches, riverbanks and sand dunes. There was no barren land identified within the City limits. About 326 acres, or less than one percent of barren land was found in the Township.
Table 5-1  
Current Use Inventory, Norway Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>City of Norway Acreage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Acreage</th>
<th>Norway Township Acreage</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>1,670.357</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>4,487.133</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forested</td>
<td>1,718.175</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>44,899.170</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>688.335</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>254.759</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Urban</td>
<td>59.219</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,326.887</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>88.214</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>273.253</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial-Service-Institutional</td>
<td>147.194</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.473</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Field</td>
<td>887.503</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>2,085.507</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>35.719</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1,226.858</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>395.029</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3,149.879</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>326.541</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>5,689.445</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,044.457</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.4 Residential Land Use

Residential land use includes single family homes, multi-family homes and mobile homes. As discussed in Chapter 7, much of the development in the City is a bit older than that of the Township, due to the City being one of the first settlements in the County. About 70% of the City’s housing stock was built before 1960, while only 42% of the Township’s and 51% of the County’s housing stock was built before 1960.

Residential living preferences changed significantly after World War II and accelerated in the 1970s. During World War I, the Depression and World War II, new housing starts dropped to near zero. After World War II however, the surge in housing construction was unprecedented. The widespread development of suburban housing that got under way in 1946 was inspired by the typical American pattern of rural settlement, where each farmhouse stands alone on its own ground, often out of sight of any neighbors. The typical suburb consists almost entirely of single-family detached homes surrounded by their own lawns, gardens, sheds and centered on lots that provide at least minimum separation from neighbors, even in low income and middle income districts.

Average new homes built within the last decade typically have two or more stories, three bedrooms, two and a half baths, central heating and air conditioning and a garage. These homes are 46 percent larger than those homes built in the mid 1970s. Low density settlements prevail in suburban areas. As shown in Table 5-2, the City had six new home permits issued in 2007 and the Township had five new home permits issued. Total construction costs for all residential permits issued in the City and the Township totals over $1,588,625.00 in 2007.
## Table 5-2
**Residential Permits Issued, Selected Areas, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Home</th>
<th>Alterations</th>
<th>Accessory Buildings</th>
<th>Demolitions</th>
<th>All Other Structures</th>
<th>Special Inspections</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Norway</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$910,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norway Township</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$678,095.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breen Township</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$115,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breitung Township</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,424,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felch Township</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$582,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Iron Mountain</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$870,669.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Kingsford</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$784,099.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sagola Township</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$819,195.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Dickinson County</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,184,296.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Residential development within the City is concentrated in an area extending north just beyond the Wisconsin Central Railroad to the southern corporate limit east of Stephenson Street to the eastern extremities close to the US-2 corridor.

More typical of urban settings is the general area 2 blocks west and 5 blocks east of Brown Street, extending to the southern corporate limit and north to 10th Avenue where curbs, sidewalks and wider streets and intersections are common. Like conditions are found in some areas east of Section Street along Maple, Chestnut, Walnut, Oak, and Ash Streets. This is considered compact development (as opposed to auto-dependent sprawl development) characterized by residential areas that surround the downtown principal commercial district. In such areas it is feasible to walk or bike to reach shopping and public buildings including schools, and gain a greater measure of public service efficiency because of the intensive development.

Significant residential development is found in and around Curry Road and in areas north of the Wisconsin Central Railroad north to 16th Avenue. These areas contain some narrow, winding streets that intersect at a variety of angles. Some streets do not provide outlets due the severity of slopes occurring naturally or due to mining activities. Roadways generally do not include curbing or sidewalks. As road reconstruction occurs, curbing and sidewalks may be added.
The City has taken steps to revitalize older neighborhoods. Vision 2020 is a cooperative effort between the Menominee River Habitat for Humanity and Neighborhood Partnership Program of Dickinson County. The Third Ward neighborhood in Norway has been selected as one of two neighborhoods in Dickinson County. The program looks to make improvements in neighborhood parks, housing and infrastructure.

As discussed in Chapter 7, most of the residential land use within the Township is comprised of single-family dwelling units. There are few mobile homes located in the Township, with a decrease since 1990. There are few multi-family units in the Township, mainly located in Vulcan. Seasonal dwellings comprise 17.0 percent of the total housing units and are scattered throughout the Township.

Within the Township, residential development has been increasing steadily. More recent development includes homes along the WPA Road and down County Road 573 and Lower Pine Creek Road. New homes are also being built on the Menominee River off of County Road 577. There is also a new subdivision located below Norway Mountain, along Ski View Drive. Five current developments in the Township are in the process of being filled in with new homes.

There is potential for a new residential development to occur along the west side of the Menominee River. The land is currently zoned industrial. A buffer zone would need to be added to serve as a barrier between prospective homes and any industrial uses.

Currently the Township does not have curbs and sidewalks, which is typical for Townships in the Upper Peninsula. However, several roads do have buried utilities. Future residential development could consider building wider roads that would include a bike lane or walking paths. As with many residential areas located outside of a more “urban” center, there is a concern with sprawl. Zoning for increased density can help dictate the location of future development. Uniform and consistent regulations between the City and the Township can help guide the future residential development.

5.5 Commercial Land Use
The majority of commercial development in the City is concentrated along US-2 from Belgiumtown Road eastward to Section Street. The greatest amount of commercial development along US-2 has occurred to the west of the City limits. Besides the business advantages of locating along the high traffic volume corridor, the availability of large land parcels that meet access and parking requirements increases the desirability to locate here. There has been a small amount of commercial development in the Township along the US-2 corridor,
limited to the area between Loretto and Vulcan. There are no local stores within the Township.

The central business district in the City is located on Main Street and extends east to Norway Street and west to Iron Street. Attracting businesses to locate in the downtown area in the City is a necessity. There are several buildings available for commercial use. Several businesses that residents have indicated an interest in for the Norway Area include: a woodworking store, furniture making, collectibles, and an antique store, with the potential to rent out table by table to individual sellers.

The Norway Area has experienced difficulties with small local businesses that cannot compete with the larger box stores that have been developed along US-2 to the west, with the majority being located in Iron Mountain. Widespread use of the internet and online auction sites such as EBay, have also impaired small businesses. The opportunity for high tech businesses exists within the Norway Area principally due to the high speed internet services offered by the City.

Table 5-3 lists the commercial permits issued in Dickinson County for 2007. As shown below, Breitung Township and the City of Iron Mountain account for $7,527,398 out of $9,647,273 or 78 percent of the commercial permits issued for the County in 2007.

### Table 5-3
**Commercial Permits Issued, Selected Areas, 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alterations</th>
<th>Demolitions</th>
<th>Accessory Buildings</th>
<th>All Other Structures</th>
<th>Special Inspections</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$765,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breen Township</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitung Township</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,222,041.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felch Township</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Iron Mountain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,305,357.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kingsford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$989,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagola Township</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$88,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Dickinson County</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$9,647,273.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.6 Agricultural and Forestry Land Use
The most recent agricultural census that data is available was completed in 2002 and provides information by county. In total, 146 individual or family farms were operating in the County in 2002, up 9 percent from 1997. Farm acreage decreased 5 percent from 1997 to 2002, to 28,658 acres. The average market value of production for each farm also decreased 9 percent from 1997 to 2002. The average farm produced $25,798 in 2002 but produced $28,324 in 1997. The average age of farm operators has also been increasing over the years, which potentially affects the future of agricultural land use. One of the biggest issues facing farmers is the reality that no one is taking over once the farmer retires. Much of this prime farmland could potentially be lost to development.

Currently much of the City’s land area north of the platted areas in the urban center is reserved for resource production. As the number of farming operations in the Norway Area continues to decline, this coveted land is available for other uses. Land in the northern portion of the Township is also designated as resource production or as timber production. This type of land is in high demand for residential uses. The City is currently considering rezoning much of this land, especially that adjacent to transportation corridors to Rural Residential. The conversion of agricultural and open land to rural residential usage is a trend that began in the early 1990s and is likely to continue.

Agricultural uses are located primarily in the southern portion of the Township, south of US-2 and adjacent to County Road 573. There are currently two dairy farms in the Township and several small beef farms. The number of farms in the Township has also been on the decline, with some open land being converted to residential subdivisions.

The Norway Area may have an opportunity to realize potential in new forms of alternative energy that can be derived from open land or from forest products. Switchgrass is a versatile and adaptable plant that can grow and thrive in many weather conditions, lengths of growing seasons, soil types and land conditions. Its distribution spans south of latitude 55°N from Saskatchewan to Nova Scotia and south over most of the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. There is also potential in cellulose, wood fiber and wood chips to be utilized as biofuels.

For the remaining smaller farms, a farmer’s market within the City could be viable and used to promote locally grown products.

5.7 Industrial Land Use
The 180-acre Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park fronts US-2 in Norway Township. City water, three phase power and natural gas are available. Municipal wastewater services do not extend to the site. Although the Wisconsin Central
Railroad runs through the site, there is no siding for service. Internet usage is available at the park through private services. The extension of sewer services to the industrial park could increase the potential for new businesses to locate in the Norway Area.

Several businesses occupy the industrial park, including: Patton Archery MFG, Inc., Lumber Jack Hardwoods and Sturgeon Millwork and Lumber, United Abrasives Inc., Starship Enterprises, and Vulcan Wood Products. Several sites are available for development within the industrial park. On the north side of the railroad tracks, a 17-acre parcel and a 4-acre parcel are available. On the south side, an 80-acre parcel and a 65-acre parcel are available.

The City also has land that is zoned industrial. Land south along the Canadian National Railroad is zoned Industrial One. Most of the City’s industrial land use is found along and north of 9th Avenue, west of Norway Street. Multi-color Corporation and Loadmaster are located in this industrial area. Businesses currently located in the area could possibly be expanded. Within the industrial district in the City, storm water improvements are needed and several of the roads need to be paved. Currently the route in and out of the industrial district along Railroad Avenue is being repaired to provide easier access.

5.8 Public and Quasi-Public Land Use

Public land uses in the City include the municipal complex, parks and recreation facilities, schools and other public buildings, discussed in detail in Chapter 6. Land surrounding Strawberry Lake is zoned for park/recreation as is land north of Hanbury Lake.

Public land uses within the Township include the Norway Township cemetery and the Norway Township Hall. Also included is the East Vulcan Playground, Dickinson County Fairgrounds, Marion Park, amongst additional recreation facilities mentioned in Chapter 8. The majority of land zoned as public land is located in the southern portion of the Township east and west of Highway 8. State owned lands include approximately 29,000 acres of the Copper Country State Forest. The City also owns tracts of land within the Township.

Quasi-public land generally consists of churches and other privately owned facilities that are open to the public. These types of facilities contribute to the quality of life in a community.

5.9 Contaminated Sites

The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) maintains a listing of sites identified as containing contaminants. Environmental contamination means the release of a hazardous substance, or the potential...
release of a discarded hazardous substance, in a quantity which is or may become injurious to the environment, public health, safety or welfare.

The presence of hazardous substances at these sites may restrict future development. Sites of environmental contamination in the Norway Area are listed in Table 5-4 below. The Site Assessment Model (SAM) scores are based on a numeric scale reflecting the degree of contamination in ascending order from 0 to 48.

### Table 5-4
**Sites of Environmental Contamination, Norway Area, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name*</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contaminants</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>SAM Score**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old City Landfill</td>
<td>220003</td>
<td>512 9th Street, Norway</td>
<td>Acid Wastes</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Abrasives, Inc.</td>
<td>22000011</td>
<td>Section 13, T39N, R29W, Vulcan</td>
<td>Lead and Zinc</td>
<td>Interim response in progress</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Site name does not necessarily denote the party responsible for contamination.

Leaking underground storage tanks have resulted in more stringent requirements for the placement of storage tanks. Many aging fuel tanks that complied with the guidelines in place at the time of installation have deteriorated. Fuel may then be able to enter the surrounding soil. Three sites are listed by the MDEQ in the Norway Area in Table 5-5. These sites will remain listed until corrective action plans begin.

### Table 5-5
**Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, Norway Area, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00008363</td>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>PO Box 99, Norway, MI 49870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00006104</td>
<td>Citgo Quick Food Mart</td>
<td>626 Brown St Norway, MI 49870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00021527</td>
<td>MultiColor Corporation</td>
<td>512 Ninth Avenue Norway, MI 49870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 5.10 Abandoned Mining Sites

There are several former mining sites located in the Norway Area. Detailed records are incomplete for some of the mines, including information about shaft depth, exact location, extent of excavation and proximity to the surface.

Any potential development hazards near the former mine sites should be carefully considered. Areas around openings and pits may be weak and subject to collapse; supporting timbers for tunnel walls and roofs may be dangerous due to rot and decay. Advanced precautions apply to all types of development. Information regarding former mining sites is presented in Table 5-6.
## Table 5-6

### Abandoned Iron Mining Sites, Norway Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates of Operation</th>
<th>Production Tonnage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aragon Mine</td>
<td>NE ¼ of Section 8 &amp; N ⅛ of NW ⅛ of Section 9, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1889-1929</td>
<td>10,898,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brier Hill Mine</td>
<td>S ⅛ of NW ⅝ of Section 9, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>Not available*</td>
<td>14,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry Mine</td>
<td>W ⅞ of NE ⅝ of Section 9, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1879-1892*</td>
<td>416,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclops Mine</td>
<td>SW ⅞ of SE ⅜ of Section 5, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1878-1892*</td>
<td>286,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munro or Section 6 Mine</td>
<td>NW ⅞ of SE ⅝ &amp; NE ⅛ of SW ⅛ of Section 6, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1903-1922</td>
<td>576,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Mine</td>
<td>N ⅞ of SE ⅝ of Section 5, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1878-1892*</td>
<td>1,291,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Mine</td>
<td>SW ⅝ of SW ⅜ of Section 4, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson Mine</td>
<td>NW ⅝ of SW ⅜ of Section 4, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1879-1887</td>
<td>39,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulcan Mine or West</td>
<td>Parts of Section 9, 10 &amp; 11, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>1877-1892*</td>
<td>1,668,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulcan Mine or Breitung Mine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly Mine</td>
<td>Section 6, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Penn Mines (the Brier Hill, Curry, Cyclops, Norway and West Vulcan Mines were operated under the Penn Iron Mining Company after 1892)</td>
<td>Sections 5, 9, 10 &amp; 11, T39N, R29W</td>
<td>189301929</td>
<td>11,644,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.11 Land Use Trends

Growth, as measured in terms of state equalized valuation (SEV), is shown in Table 5-7 for all governmental units in Dickinson County. The City’s total SEV increased from $43,728,750 in 2000 to $59,705,800, representing a 36.5% increase. The Township’s total SEV increased from $33,443,800 in 2000 to $51,569,439 in 2007, a 42.7% increase. Breitung Township and the City of Iron Mountain show comparable increased, while Breen Township has increased 92.8%. For the County, the total valuation has increased 45.6% from 2000 to 2007.

Table 5-7
State Equalized Valuations, Dickinson County, 2000 & 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>$39,445,875</td>
<td>$4,282,875</td>
<td>$43,728,750</td>
<td>$54,999,700</td>
<td>$4,706,100</td>
<td>$59,705,800</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>$33,443,800</td>
<td>$2,683,225</td>
<td>$36,127,105</td>
<td>$49,338,304</td>
<td>$2,231,135</td>
<td>$51,569,439</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breen Township</td>
<td>$10,482,670</td>
<td>$2,103,200</td>
<td>$12,585,870</td>
<td>$22,383,100</td>
<td>$1,884,100</td>
<td>$24,267,200</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitung Township</td>
<td>$156,791,300</td>
<td>$69,296,000</td>
<td>$226,087,300</td>
<td>$255,232,700</td>
<td>$98,307,900</td>
<td>$353,540,600</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felch Township</td>
<td>$15,462,640</td>
<td>$4,960,846</td>
<td>$20,423,486</td>
<td>$29,337,450</td>
<td>$5,864,350</td>
<td>$35,201,800</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Iron Mountain</td>
<td>$145,453,900</td>
<td>$20,426,500</td>
<td>$165,880,400</td>
<td>$205,731,557</td>
<td>$23,641,700</td>
<td>$229,373,257</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kingsford</td>
<td>$97,200,500</td>
<td>$11,810,800</td>
<td>$109,011,300</td>
<td>$113,941,700</td>
<td>$9,841,300</td>
<td>$123,783,000</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagola Township</td>
<td>$29,267,900</td>
<td>$11,206,200</td>
<td>$40,474,100</td>
<td>$51,678,100</td>
<td>$16,026,600</td>
<td>$67,704,700</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waucedah Township</td>
<td>$23,880,150</td>
<td>$1,810,500</td>
<td>$25,690,650</td>
<td>$42,874,700</td>
<td>$2,078,800</td>
<td>$44,953,500</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Branch Township</td>
<td>$4,019,200</td>
<td>$3,588,034</td>
<td>$7,607,234</td>
<td>$8,305,150</td>
<td>$3,044,350</td>
<td>$11,349,500</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>$555,448,015</td>
<td>$132,168,180</td>
<td>$687,616,195</td>
<td>$833,822,461</td>
<td>$167,626,335</td>
<td>$1,001,448,796</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dickinson County Equalization Department, 2008.
5.12 Issues and Opportunities

- Zoning and supplementary ordinances can assist local units of government in guiding current and future development.

- The availability of public and private services, accessibility, existing conditions of the area, and price are other important considerations for residential development.

- The City has taken steps to make improvements in older neighborhoods, such as the Vision 2020 project to revitalize infrastructure, parks and housing in the Third Ward. Residential development continues to expand in the surrounding Townships, due to the availability of larger lots.

- Commercial land use is concentrated along the US-2 corridor and in the City’s downtown area. Access management standards should be followed to alleviate traffic and safety concerns.

- Currently local businesses are experiencing difficulty competing with “box stores” located in to the west in Iron Mountain. Business should be encouraged to fill in vacant locations within the central business district. High tech businesses could be attracted to the Norway Area to utilize the high speed internet services.

- Agricultural land continues to be converted for residential development, a trend that is likely to continue as homebuyers seek larger homes on lots outside of the typical “urban center.” A farmer’s market within the City could be viable and used to promote locally grown products.

- Sites are available in the Norway Area for industrial use. Expanding sewer services to the industrial park may help attract new business. Road improvements surrounding industrial districts will increase access to industrial properties.

- Cleanup of contaminated sites is beneficial to the environment, removing the source of the contamination and reducing the exposure potential now and into the future. Contamination that remains in the ground can infiltrate into structures and may travel offsite onto other properties. Any development in close proximity to former mining sites will need to be thoroughly evaluated before proceeding.

- Property valuation increases in the Norway Area show a similar pattern to the rest of the County. In general, the Townships are experiencing a large growth rate, possible due to the increase in residential development in outlying areas.
Chapter 6.0 Community Facilities and Services

6.1 Introduction
Services and facilities provided by local governments are vital to the community’s progress and well being. Services may include police and fire protection, water supply and solid waste and wastewater disposal. Community facilities include libraries, schools, cemeteries, parks and other recreational facilities. This chapter will focus on the shared facilities and services in the Norway Area and consider future possibilities. This chapter will also examine the services and facilities available to residents in the City of Norway and Norway Township. This will not be an exhaustive study of these services and facilities but will provide a guideline for future decision making.

6.2 Joint Services

Fire Protection
A 7,500 square foot fire station was constructed in 2001 at the northwest corner of Curry Road and US-2. The four-bay building includes a meeting room and apparatus storage area. Staffing for the fire department is made up of paid-on-call personnel. Currently the City’s firefighting force includes between 30 and 35 persons.

Fire protection is provided to Norway Township and Waucedah Township by the City of Norway through annual agreements. Norway Township’s agreement amount from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009 is $63,433. Waucedah Township’s amount for the same time period is $22,388. Firefighters live throughout the area and can reach a scene, depending on location in one minute. The average response time by truck, according to the Norway Fire Department, is about 5 minutes for a truck to reach Vulcan, about 7 minutes for the Lake Mary area and about 5 minutes to the River Meadows subdivision. There are mutual aid agreements with communities surrounding the Norway Area.

Current fire equipment includes:
- 1985 Ford C-8000 Truck
- 1984 Chevy Pickup
- 2001 Ih Truck/Tanker
- 2007 Int’l/4000 Series Tanker Pumper

The fire department currently has a Jaws of Life set that was donated to the department. A new set could be acquired through grant funding.

The adequacy of fire protection is evaluated by the Insurance Service Office (ISO) Commercial Risk, Inc. The Grading Schedule for Municipal Fire Protection is used by insurance grading engineers in the classification of fire defenses and physical conditions of municipalities. Grading obtained under the schedule is used throughout the United States in establishing base rates for fire insurance.
While the ISO does not presume to dictate the level of fire protection that should be provided by a municipality, the findings of its Municipal Survey Office are frequently used by municipal officials in planning improvements to their fire departments. The grading is obtained by ISO based upon analysis of fire department equipment, alarm systems, water supply, fire prevention programs, building construction and distance of hazard areas from the fire station.

The City’s assigned fire insurance rating is seven (7). The community of Vulcan has a class rating for fire insurance of seven (7). The outlying areas have a rating of seven (7). In rating a community, total deficiency points in the areas of evaluation are used to assign a numerical rating of 1 to 10. The best protection is a 1; a community that is basically unprotected would be a 10. Where a single number is assigned, all properties within the classification receive the rating. Where more than one classification is indicated, the first number applies to properties located within five (5) road miles of the responding fire department and within 1,000 feet of a fire hydrant.

**North Alert Ambulance Authority**
The North Alert EMS Ambulance Authority was incorporated in 2003 pursuant to the provisions of the Emergency Services to Municipalities Act, Public Act 57 of 1988. The City, Township and Waucedah Township are members of the Authority, for the purpose of: contracting with and/or entering into agreements to provide ambulance and emergency medical care services within the service area, contracting with and/or entering into agreements to provide ambulance operations, staffing needs and other actions and promoting interest in and to further the development of first aid and rescue work within the service area.

Membership includes seven representatives. One member is appointed by each of the following entities: governing bodies of the Townships of Norway and Waucedah and the City of Norway, County Emergency Preparedness Agency, Fire Chief of the City and President of the local volunteer EMS group.

**Norway Area Utilities Authority**
The Norway Area Utilities Authority covers the water and sewer systems for the City and the Township. The five-member authority consists of three City appointees and 2 Township appointees and was established in 1977. This action was concurrent with the expansion of the sewage treatment plan and installation of sanitary sewer lines in the City and in the Vulcan area. The City owns the water infrastructure and the authority owns the sewer infrastructure.

- **Wastewater Treatment**
The City’s wastewater treatment facility was constructed in 1968 beside White Creek in Norway Township. Improvements were made in 1978 using funding from the Environmental Protection Agency. These improvements included the
separation of combined sewers, additional plant equipment, expansion of sludge drying beds and extension of sanitary sewers in some areas of the City.

Three City employees and one supervisor operate the facility. The facility has an average flow of 500,000 gallons per day and is operating well within its capacity. Three of the system’s five lift stations are found in the Township. With proper maintenance, the system should adequately meet demand for many years. The system is operating at 50% hydraulic capacity but is pushing the limit on its organic capacity. Regular maintenance is performed on the system. A major project for the system is planned within the next five years. This upgrade may include adding a grit removal system and redoing the clarifiers to obtain better aeration for the blowers. Potable water will be removed from the system, and instead will use grey water or well water.

Pursuant to Act 425, water and sewer services were extended to the Woven Hearts development in July 1995. Under the Act, the Township was able to transfer land to the City without going through an annexation procedure.

The current sewer usage rate is $6.75/1,000 gallons. Norway Township customers pay the same monthly fixed charge but a higher monthly service charge as shown in Table 6-1. Residents can anticipate the rate costs to increase by the cost of living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1</th>
<th>Wastewater Service Charge, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meter Size and Service Ratio</td>
<td>City of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4” meter (1.0)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1” meter (1.4)</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ½” meter (1.8)</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2” meter (2.9)</td>
<td>$43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3” meter (11.0)</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4” meter (14.0)</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6” meter (21.0)</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8” meter (29.0)</td>
<td>$435.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Norway, 2008.

- **Public Water Supply**
  Surface water drawn from the then City-owned Fumee Lake served as the City’s water supply prior to conversion to an underground supply system in 1988. The community of Vulcan is also provided municipal water service through this system. In 1992, the lake and surrounding areas were sold to Dickinson County and developed as a non-motorized scenic area.

  The City’s well site is founded on a 21-acre parcel immediately south of the Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park in Section 14. A 35 foot right-of-way provides through access to property owned by Norway Township where access is permitted via an easement granted in 1987.
The city has one existing well field with three type I wells that provide the municipal water supply. The field is located in the Township about three miles to the southeast of the City, about one mile upstream from the convergence of the Sturgeon River with the Menominee River. Water delivered to the site’s pump house enters a single main the supplies the distribution system. Proper fluoridation levels are maintained through daily sampling and testing. The current water usage rate is $3.50/1,000 gallons. Residents can anticipate the rate costs to increase by the cost of living. Service charges and well information are provided in Tables 6-2 and 6-3 below. A standby generator insures that pumping capability will continue in case of a power outage.

A system upgrade was completed in 2002. Additional capacity was realized as the smallest producing well was taken offline and replaced with a 10” diameter well with a 600 gallon per minute capacity. Storage tanks of 750,000 and 178,000 gallons are used in conjunction with the water system. The larger tank, constructed in 1997, is located on the City’s east side near Norway Mountain. The smaller is known as the high pressure tank and is found on West 14th Avenue. In the future, additional well capacity may be necessary, possibly in the Norway Mountain area and on the west side of the City, where a storage tank would be necessary for adequate fire pressure.

Table 6-2
**Water Service Charge, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size and Service Ratio</th>
<th>City of Norway/Norway Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4” meter (1.0)</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1” meter (1.4)</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ½” meter (1.8)</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2” meter (2.9)</td>
<td>$43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3” meter (11.0)</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4” meter (14.0)</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6” meter (21.0)</td>
<td>$315.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8” meter (29.0)</td>
<td>$435.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Norway, 2008.

Table 6-3
**Well Field Data, City of Norway**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well #1</td>
<td>8 inch</td>
<td>140 feet</td>
<td>415 gallons/minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well #2</td>
<td>10 inch</td>
<td>139 feet</td>
<td>600 gallons/minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well #3</td>
<td>10 inch</td>
<td>184 feet</td>
<td>600 gallons/minute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Norway, 2008.

**Wellhead Protection Program**

A wellhead protection program (WHPP) was completed for the City of Norway in 2004. The WHPP was developed to aid the City in providing the best and most manageable program to protect the quality of the Type I potable groundwater supply.
Hydroelectric Power Plant
In 1947, the City purchased the Sturgeon Falls Power Dam from the Penn Iron Mining Company. The dam is located in the Township on the Menominee River about one mile downstream from where it is joined by the Sturgeon River. An area of 440 acres is impounded by the project. The plant consists of a concrete single arch dam with no spillway, was constructed in 1905 to supply electrical power to the Vulcan Mine. About 129 acres is owned by the City on the Michigan side of the site. Across the Menominee River in Wisconsin, the City owns about 40 acres. It is operated in a modified peak mode, based on the wilderness shores agreement with WE Energies.

The City is in the process of a hydro upgrade project to increase efficiency by up to 85 percent and allowing the utility to stabilize energy costs to customers. There are four major components to the project:

• **Turbine replacement**
The left turbine pit contains four bays, three of which housed double runners connected by a single horizontal shaft connected to Generator No. 1. The fourth bay was disused for many years. In May 2008 new single-runner generating units were installed in all four bays of the left turbine pit. Each new generating unit has a diameter slightly larger than the double-runner unit it replaced. The right turbine pit is also divided into four bays. The left two bays contain two sets of double runner units connected by a single horizontal-shaft to Generator No. 2. These double-runner units will be replaced with single-runner units. The two right bays of the right turbine pit contain two vertical-shaft runners, which will remain unchanged.

• **Underwater steel replacement**
In May 2007 underwater steel structures that support the trashracks, stoplog gates, and gantry crane were replaced along the full length of the trashrack and stoplog structure, spanning intakes for all generating units. The approach taken in replacing the structural steel was to replicate the original design using heavier structural steel that is larger in cross section than the steel that was removed. The replacement steel is located 24 inches upstream from the original installation to permit installation into an unobstructed area. Steel replacement included all steel upright support beams, all cross-tying supports, trashrack supporting trusses, and walkway supports.

• **Steel gantry crane system replacement**
Replacement of the steel gantry crane system began on February 25, 2008, and is approximately 90 percent complete. This design is similar in function and type to the system removed. It consists of a fixed frame running the length of the No. 1 and No. 2 unit turbine pits, with a traveling hoist operating on an “I” beam under-hung from the gantry framework. The rating of the new system is
10 tons, which is believed to be approximately equal to the rating for the old system.

- **Turbine pit stabilization**
  A turbine pit stabilization plan was developed to mitigate stability impacts resulting from relocation of the stop log gates 24 inches upstream. The stabilization plan provides for acceptable factors of safety during the dewatered condition. The stabilization plan calls for installation of epoxy-coated steel rods into sound rock beneath the turbine pits.

Operation of the facility is subject to licensing requirements of the Federal Emergency Regulatory Commission. In accordance with FERC licensing requirements, unless posted otherwise, the hydro project area is open for public recreation uses such as hunting, boating and fishing. The City’s license was renewed in 2003. The structural and mechanical condition of the facility is considered sound, with a useful life well into the future. The Sturgeon Falls Dam is one of eight FERC-licensed hydro electric projects along the Menominee River.

Municipal employees maintain the City-owned distribution system, provide customer service and are dispatched for emergency repairs. These functions are provided by a line/distribution crew. Some areas of the City are served by WE Energies. Township residents receive electrical power from the City and WE Energies. Some of the electricity distributed may originate from the hydro plant via WE’s distribution network.

**Education**
The first public school in Norway was opened in 1879 with classes held in a carpenter shop owned by the Menominee Range Mining Company. Today, following the consolidation in 1964 of Norway City Schools, Norway Township, Waucedah Township and Faithorn, the Norway-Vulcan Area Schools serves nearly 900 students from a two-county area. There is a staff of 55 teachers and 46 support personnel. The student to teacher ratio is very low, with about 20 students to each teacher.

The modern kindergarten through 12th grade campus is located on a 30 acre site nestled between neighborhoods, forests and lakes. Constructed in 1991 with additions in 1993 and 2000, facilities include three gymnasiums, centralized media center and the 684 seat Norway-Vulcan Fine Arts Center. The Norway-Vulcan Fine Arts center is an air-conditioned facility which was completed in 2001 at a cost of nearly $4 million. The Pine Mountain Music Festival presents both opera and symphony concerts at the FAC during the summer. The school district offers a full range of extra-curricular activities that are highly competitive, including music and athletics.
Norway Elementary School and Vulcan Middle School received “A” grades on school report cards for the 2007-2008 school year from the Michigan Department of Education. In 2007, U.S. News and World report recognized Norway High School with a Bronze Award in its list of America’s Best High Schools. Norway placed in the top 9% of nearly 19,000 schools. All three schools in the district have met their Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) according to the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The AYP is based on MEAP test results, participation in MEAP tests and attendance or graduation rates.

**Recreation**

A number of recreational facilities are shared by the Norway Area. The City and the Township have a wide range of recreational facilities that are discussed in detail in Chapter 8. As mentioned above the Norway-Vulcan School District also offers a variety of recreational programs for children and adults.

**CITY OF NORWAY**

**City Hall**

The current 14,500 square foot administration/police facility was completed in 2002 on the site of the former City Hall, constructed in 1907. The new facility houses the city manager, clerk, assessor, treasurer and the police department. Various meetings are held in the lower level, including City Council meetings in the Brackett Memorial Conference Chambers. An additional conference room is available for group meetings.

**Police Department**

The City of Norway’s police department consists of a chief, four full time officers and one part-time officer. The Police Department is located at 915 Main Street in the administrative building. The department offers a full range of services, including: patrol; accident investigation; criminal and juvenile investigations; community relations and crime prevention. The Officers have also been given specialized assignments to include: crime scene investigations, firearm instruction, tactical assignment of the Dickinson County’s Critical Incident Response Team (CIRT), member of the Dickinson County Domestic Violence Executive Board, participant member of the joint law enforcement drug team of Kingsford, Iron Mountain, Norway, and Dickinson County (KIND) assistance team.

Officers of the Norway Police Department also provide instructions for Snowmobile Safety Classes; Hunter’s Safety; as well as conducting initial screening for permits for weapon purchase and follow-up weapon safety inspections, as well as offers a "Citizen Ride-along Program." The Norway Police Department will conduct security surveys for business and residents, and provide handout materials to address the concerns of burglary and robbery prevention.
Department of Public Works

The public works facility is located on the north side of 10th Avenue and was built in 1992. The City’s salt shed is on the south side of 10th Avenue along with the old DPW building and two older storage buildings. The use of the older buildings is limited to cold storage due to their overall condition.

Sufficient land area exists at the current facility to accommodate future expansion/replacement. Ideally, all utility operations would be consolidated into one building, which would need to be expanded. Currently the electric building is located on a separate property. Expansion of the existing warm storage building is necessary and a new cold storage shed and salt shed are also needed.

City crews collect garbage weekly. Residential customers currently pay $11.00 monthly. The current commercial user rate is $17.25 per month. By ordinance, residential users are allowed 100 gallons of trash per week and commercial customers are permitted 150 gallons. This equates to a charge of $.11 per gallon of trash. User rates may be raised in the future due to anticipated cost of living increases.

The City has initiated a voluntary recycling program. Recycling collection containers have been set up at the DPW building on 10th Avenue. Residents may drop off their recyclables Monday through Friday from 7:00am to 3:30pm. Items collected are metal/tin cans (no aluminum), plastic and glass. Certain types of hazardous waste are accepted at the Dickinson County Solid Waste Processing Facility in Quinnesec.

The City also has a compost site located next to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. The compost site accepts grass, leaves and brush less than 4” in diameter.

Cable Television

The City started to provide cable television service in 1953. Five satellite dishes are located on a hillside north of 14th Avenue. Road access (TV Hill Road) to the site is difficult during winter months due to the steep grade. The first service expansion outside of the City occurred in 1981, extending from White Creek to US-8 in the Township. This service area includes some 54 miles of cable and more than 1,600 customers, most within the electrical service area.

The City employs two technicians to operate the system and provide customer service. City cable rates are lower than comparable services offered through private companies. Customers outside the City limits are charged slightly higher rates. Cable customers may choose from a basic cable package or an extended basic package with one premium channel.
A system upgrade is planned for the fall of 2008, being completely implemented by 2009. Upgrades include 50 or 70 channel packages, along with HP and digital offers.

**Internet**
The City also provides high speed internet to residents and to large and small commercial enterprises within the City. For residential customers, the City offers up to two email addresses per account, free installation and a lifetime warranty on the modem provided. This service began in 2001. Township residents able to receive cable through the City may also purchase internet service.

The City has upgrades planned for internet services to improve speed and efficiency. Internet services will be tapped into a fiber line to offer a wide range of bandwidths and direct fiber links. Future expansions could include further extension of fiber optic lines to offer service to underserved areas.

**Zoning Administration**
The City’s Zoning Ordinance is administered by the City Manager. Requests for site plan review are heard by the Planning Commission. Requests for variances to current zoning requirements are heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals. A zoning compliance permit from the City is required to receive a building permit from Dickinson County.

**Jake Menghini Museum**
Located at 105 O Dill Road in Norway, the Jake Menghini Historical Museum is open on a limited basis from early June through the celebration of Leif Ericson Day in early October. The museum displays items from Jake Menghini’s personal collection of local historical artifacts. The exhibits change yearly. A part-time paid director assisted by local volunteers provides museum staffing. Purchase of the former private museum was made possible through the Curtis J. Brackett Memorial Fund and subsequently given to the City. A nine-member Museum Board is appointed by the City Council.

**Curtis J. Brackett Memorial Fund**
This fund was established in 1982 to benefit the citizens of Norway at large and is administered by a three member Board of Directors independent of the City administration. Distribution of fund resources is determined by the Board.
longer rents the Hall to the public, partially due to the limited parking that is available. Township records are also stored at the Town Hall.

The council room serves as the gathering place for all Township governmental business. The room has limited audience seating for about 30 people. The Hall has been weatherized and heating improvements have been made. The Hall is partially accessible, with several ramps.

The U.S. Postal Services rents one of the rooms on the first floor of the Township Hall. The other room, formerly rented to the Vulcan Barber Shop, has been converted to a computer room/office for the Treasurer and Assessor.

The Township currently owns a piece of property in East Vulcan which could be considered as a future site for a new Township Hall. Ideally, a new hall would be fully handicap accessible, with all rooms on one floor and with expanded parking.

**Cemetery**

The Township has owned and operated a cemetery since 1880. The Norway Township Cemetery currently covers about 60 acres and is utilized by residents and non-residents. At present, the cemetery is about 60% full. The Township owns about 80 acres of property east of the current cemetery, some of which could be used for future expansion. Over 1,200 veterans have been laid to rest in the cemetery.

**Police Protection**

The Township’s police protection is provided by the Dickinson County Sherriff’s Department and the Michigan State Police. Both of these law enforcement agencies are located in Iron Mountain, about 10 miles west of the Township.

**Industrial Park**

The 180-acre Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park fronts US-2 in Norway Township. City water, three phase power and natural gas are available. Municipal wastewater services do not extend to the site. Although the Wisconsin Central Railroad runs through the site, there is no spur. Internet usage is available at the park through private services.

Several businesses occupy the industrial park, including: Patton Archery MFG, Inc., Lumber Jack Hardwoods and Sturgeon Millwork and Lumber, United Abrasives Inc., Starship Enterprises, and Vulcan Wood Products. Several sites are available for development within the industrial park. On the north side of the railroad tracks, a 17-acre parcel and a 4-acre parcel are available. On the south side, an 80-acre parcel and a 65-acre parcel are available.
Zoning Administration
The Township’s Zoning Ordinance is administered by the Township Supervisor/Zoning Administrator. Requests for site plan review are heard by the Planning Commission. Requests for variances to current zoning requirements are heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals. A zoning compliance permit from the Township is required to receive a building permit from Dickinson County.

Compost
The Township currently maintains a composting site near the cemetery.

6.3 County and Additional Public Facilities

Dickinson County Road Commission
County and local roads are maintained by the Dickinson County Road Commission as set forth in Act 51, the Michigan Transportation Act. State trunklines are maintained by the Road Commission in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Transportation. Storage and maintenance facilities are located in Felch and Iron Mountain.

Dickinson County Airport
Ford Airport in Kingsford is operated by Dickinson County. The airport area includes 713 acres found within portions of Kingsford and Breitung Township.

Facilities at the airport include a passenger terminal building, hangar facilities (county and private), a maintenance building that also houses a crash/rescue vehicle, a sand storage building, a 6,500 foot primary runway, and a 3,800 foot secondary runway. Northwest Airlink operated by Mesaba Airlines became the new commercial provider for Ford Airport in June 2008.

Ford Airport serves the greater Dickinson County Area which includes the cities of Iron Mountain, Kingsford and Norway in Michigan and the bordering communities of Aurora, Florence and Niagara, WI. Its service area also includes portions of Iron and Menominee counties in Michigan and portions of Florence and Marinette counties in Wisconsin. Offering both scheduled and charter air service, Ford Airport is also the primary air cargo center for the Upper Peninsula.

Law Enforcement
The cities of Iron Mountain and Kingsford, the Dickinson County Sheriff’s Department, and the Iron Mountain Post of the Michigan State Police all provide full-time law enforcement services within the county. Jail facilities are located at the Dickinson County Correctional Facility in Iron Mountain. The 68-bed facility is operated by the Dickinson County Sheriff’s Department.
**Building Permits and Code Enforcement**

Building permits are issued by the Dickinson County Construction Code Commission. A City or Township-issued zoning permit must be secured before a building permit is issued. Building, mechanical, plumbing and electrical inspections are done by authorized employees or agents of the Dickinson County Construction Code Commission. Soil and sedentary control permits are also available.

**Dickinson County Fairgrounds**

This facility is across from Marion Park on the east side of US-8 in Norway Township. It covers 77 acres and is the site of the annual Dickinson County Fair that runs for a five-day period encompassing the Labor Day weekend. Camping facilities are available during the fair. Other summer activities at the facility include stock car racing and horse show events.

**Dickinson County Memorial Hospital**

Construction of the new Dickinson County Memorial Hospital on the north side of US-2 near Iron Mountain’s eastern corporate limit was completed in 1996. The 96-bed facility provides acute care to medical, surgical, pediatric, obstetric, and emergency patients. The Dickinson Medical Building was completed in 1997 alongside the hospital and provides an array of specialty services and an after-hours clinic. Medical specialists from nearby regional centers offer services in the hospital’s Gust Newberg Clinic.

**Library**

Residents in the Norway Area are provided library services by the Dickinson County Library. The Solomonson Library, or Norway Branch Library, is located at 620 Section Street and was constructed in 1978. In addition to regular hours of operation, the branch has evening hours Monday and Wednesday and hours on Saturday. The branch also offers a variety of children’s programs, public computer, and copier.

The main Dickinson County Library is located at 401 Iron Mountain Street, in Iron Mountain. The library is headquarters for the Mid-Peninsula Library System which offers library services among the eight member-libraries throughout the Upper Peninsula. The Dickinson County Library also provides bookmobile services along scheduled routes to Norway Area residents.

**Veterans Affairs Medical Center**

The six-story, 63-bed Veterans Administration Hospital was opened in 1950 in Iron Mountain. Its service area includes the entire Upper Peninsula and eleven counties in northeastern Wisconsin. Services have been enhanced through the establishment of Community Based Outpatient Clinics at six locations within the service area and completion of a new ambulatory care addition in 1997. The facility also contains a 40-bed Nursing Home Care Unit. Most services are provided on an outpatient basis.
Animal Shelter
The Spring Lake Humane Society, a nonprofit organization, currently operates an animal shelter at W-8459 Shelter Drive in Breitung Township. Operating revenues are derived from charitable sources and annual appropriations from Dickinson County. Two full-time employees, augmented by volunteers, constitute shelter staff. The shelter facility is about 35 years old and has capacity to temporarily house 14 dogs and 22 cats.

Spring Lake Animal Shelter has acquired 4 ½ acres of land to build a new shelter. The land is located at the corner of Lincoln Street, U.S. 141 and Breitung Cutoff Road in Breitung Township. Officials hope to begin construction on the new facility this year. Officials are looking at the size of the facility to be about 8,000 square feet with an exposed basement, with room to accommodate about 100 cats and 2 dozen dogs.

Private Schools
The Holy Spirit Central School near Saginaw Street offers childcare besides preschool and K-8 instruction. Constructed in 1963, the single story building includes eleven classrooms. Enrollment in recent years has been about 50 students.

Dickinson-Iron Intermediate School District
Technical education, early childhood education, special education, and general services are provided by the Dickinson-Iron Intermediate School District, a consortium of the six public school districts in the two-county area. Beyond direct and support services to students, the ISD provides support services to teachers and administrators in professional development and regulatory compliance. The Dickinson-Iron Intermediate School District’s offices are at 1074 Pyle Drive in Kingsford.

Post-Secondary Training Institutions
Bay de Noc Community College in Delta County offers instructional programs in vocational and technical fields, and many associate degree opportunities. A new 42,000 square foot technical training center was completed in early 2000. Bay College was one of eight community college sites across the state chosen to receive a Michigan Technical Education Center (M-TEC) grant to provide flexible, up-to-date training to increase the number of skilled workers needed in the area.

Since the early 1970's, Bay College has had a presence in Dickinson County, where in those early years courses were offered to assist students enrolled in nursing degree programs. Facility limitations severely restricted course offerings through the early years. However, enrollment increases supported the notion that interest in higher education in Dickinson County remained strong. In 2003, the College leased a 20,000 sq. foot facility on Carpenter Avenue with eight traditional classrooms, a computer lab and office space for personnel.
At the same time, Dr. Theodore and Eleanor Fornetti donated a 25-acre parcel on the north side of Iron Mountain. The voters in Dickinson County approved a one mill tax increase to support the construction, maintenance and operation of a new 67,000 sq. ft. facility, matching the State of Michigan’s construction funds of $6 million. Groundbreaking was held in the spring of 2006 and the facility opened in the fall of 2007. Through a unique contractual relationship with the Dickinson County Board of Commissioners, the College has been able to move forward in offering a strong core of transfer degrees and occupational programs to support the local workforce.

A limited number of classes are available locally through Northern Michigan University.

Northeast Wisconsin Technical College based in Marinette provides some classes in Niagara. The courses are primarily technical and are offered based on local demand.

Post-secondary educational facilities within the region and approximate distances from Norway include:

- Bay West, Iron Mountain - 9 miles
- Bay de Noc Community College, Escanaba - 45 miles
- Northern Michigan University, Marquette - 80 miles
- Michigan Technological University, Houghton - 120 miles
- Finlandia University, Hancock - 123 miles
- Gogebic Community College, Ironwood - 135 miles
- University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, WI - 90 miles
- University of Wisconsin-Marinette, WI - 75 miles
- Northland Baptist Bible College in Dunbar, WI - 40 miles

**Elderly Services**
Norway Senior Center at 608 Main Street provides congregate and home delivered meals, chore services, and a variety of health screenings, craft classes, games and entertainment for senior citizens. Additionally, the center is headquarters for the Easter Seal Loan Closet that makes equipment such as wheelchairs, walkers, canes, commodes, etc., available to persons of all ages stricken with short term illnesses. The center is open from Sunday through Friday of each week during daytime hours.

**Telephone Service**
AT&T, Borderland Communications, Niagara Telephone Company and several other providers, offers local telephone service in Dickinson County. Long distance service is available from several providers. The City may begin to provide local and long distance services after the VIP upgrade.
**Natural Gas Service**
Michigan Consolidated Gas Company serves the City of Norway and Norway Township.

**Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling**
Solid waste is processed at the Dickinson County Solid Waste Management Authority’s transfer facility in Quinnesec. It is operated by the Great American Disposal Company. Wastes are transported to the Wood Island facility in Alger County for final disposal.

Two licensed Type III landfills are found in the county for the disposal of low-hazard industrial waste. Both are in Breitung Township. Champion International Corporation (now Verso Paper) uses a 90-acre site; New Page maintains a licensed 68-acre facility.

A drop-off area is provided for yard wastes such as grass, leaves, and small branches. These materials are processed for composting. Glass, steel cans, HDPE (#2) and PET (#1) plastics, newsprint, mixed paper, corrugated cardboard, miscellaneous metal items and tires are accepted at the drop-off center that is open daily and Saturday mornings.

**Postal Service**
All mail delivery within the City is handled through the U.S. Post Office located at 520 South Main Street. Mail delivery for Norway and Waucedah townships is also handled through this facility.

**Michigan Department of Natural Resources**
The Department of Natural Resources maintains a field office on US-2. The staff includes forestry, wildlife, waterways, fire management and administrative support personnel. Equipment used in conjunction with construction projects and fire control is stored and maintained at this facility.

### 6.4 Issues and Opportunities
- Fire protection is provided to the Township and Waucedah Township by the City through annual agreements. The department is able to provide efficient fire protection to the area. A new Jaws of Life set would be beneficial to the department, and could be obtained through grant funding.

- The wastewater treatment facility capacity is adequate for current demand. Regular maintenance is performed on the system, with a major system upgrade planned within the next several years.

- Three wells provide the water supply to the Norway Area. A system upgrade was completed in 2002, providing additional capacity. With
continued residential development, additional well capacity may be needed and another upgrade necessary.

- Power from the Sturgeon Falls hydro plant provides power to much of the Norway Area. The structural and mechanical condition of the facility is considered sound, with a useful life well into the future. The City’s electric utilities substation upgrade will increase efficiency improve distribution throughout the whole system, taking full advantage of the available hydro system.

- The City has a modern City Hall and police department facility that adequately meet current needs and future requirements. The Township Hall was built in 1905, has very limited parking and is not fully accessible. A new Township Hall could be constructed on Township-owned property in East Vulcan.

- The Norway Police Department offers a full range of services, provided by a chief, four full-time officers and one part time officer. The department could be expanded in the future to encompass the Township as well as the City.

- The City’s Department of Public Works buildings are in need of expansion and repair. Ideally, all utility operations would be consolidated into one building. Expansion of the existing warm storage facility is needed as well as a new cold storage shed and salt shed.

- The City provides cable and internet services to much of the Norway Area. A cable system upgrade is planned for the fall of 2008. Cable and internet services could be used as a marketing tool to drawn in commercial and residential development. The City’s cable services will be current with the existing market with the new digital and HD services upgrades as well as the potential for local and long distance phone services. Continued expansion of broadband services to underserved areas is a priority.

- The Township has owned and operated the Norway Township Cemetery since 1880. The cemetery is utilized by both City and Township residents.

- The Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park has ample space available for new businesses. Sewage treatment must be done with on-site systems. A possible extension of the municipal sewer system may attract new business to the park.
At this time, zoning administration for the City and Township are handled by two distinct zoning ordinances and zoning administrators. Consolidation of the two ordinances and hiring one zoning administrator to enforce the ordinance is a possibility for the future. Consolidating duplicate services may increase efficiency and save funds.
Chapter 7.0 Housing

7.1 Introduction

Housing is one of the key factors to consider when planning for a community’s future. The location and type of housing available establishes where public infrastructure must be provided. The placement of a community’s housing also determines the costs associated with public services. Furthermore, the location of new housing can be settled on in part by the availability of public infrastructure and services. Housing characteristics can also reveal information about a community’s history and its economic and social situation.

The cost of housing and the type of housing available are typically determined by market factors. Outside of operating a housing authority or possibly serving as the developer of residential property, local units of government do not usually become directly involved with providing housing. Through zoning and other land use controls, the provision of infrastructure and services and efforts to attract new residents to a community, local governments can have a powerful impact on housing in a community.

In addition to migration, commuter trends, the cost of land and construction, and other housing related elements, there are several key non-housing factors that can influence an area’s housing market. Public safety, or a lack of, can influence where people choose to buy a home and raise a family. Quality education is one of the primary locational factors for families with school-age children. Area access to employment, shopping and other entertainment needs factor into the purchase of a home.

Nationwide trends in 2008 indicate a rapid decline in housing prices. Prices of single family homes have fallen 14.1% nationwide through the first quarter of 2008. New home sales in the United States may remain relatively weak for some time, as the housing industry struggles with falling prices and rising mortgage foreclosures. From 1960 to 2005, the rate of homeownership nationwide was on the rise. From 2005 to 2008, the rate of homeownership has been steadily decreasing, while the number of households renting has been steadily increasing nationwide. While personal income is a major factor for many when deciding to rent or own their home, other considerations make renting a preferred choice for many households.

Information presented in this chapter will provide area officials with the most recent housing data available, including structure and occupancy characteristics. This information will help assess housing needs and determine the appropriate course of action to address housing needs in the Norway Area.
7.2 Housing Characteristics

Trends
According to the 2000 Census, a total of 1,394 housing units were recorded in the City and 766 housing units were recorded in the Township (Table 7-1). In 1990, a total of 1,311 housing units were recorded in the City and 656 units in the Township. This represents a 6.3% increase within the City and a 16.8% increase within the Township.

From 1990 to 2000, the number of housing units in Dickinson County increased from 12,902 to 13,702 units, representing a 6.2% increase. The State of Michigan experienced a 10.0% increase in the number of housing units during the same time period. Between 1990 and 2000, the housing stock nationwide was also growing at a rate of 10.0%.

The increase in housing units within the City and the more significant growth within the Township follows the trend nationwide. Most urban areas, large and small, have seen new housing develop at a greater rate in the surrounding townships.

Occupancy and Tenure
According to the 2000 Census and presented in Table 7-1 below, 92.8% of the City’s housing units were occupied and 80.8% of the Township’s housing units were occupied, with the remaining 7.2% and 19.2% listed as vacant respectively. Nearly 20% of the City’s vacant units and nearly 90% of the Township’s are shown as being utilized for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use, significantly increasing the occupancy rate for year-round housing. It would be expected that a much higher proportion of seasonal residences would be found outside the City limits, and the figures for the Township confirm that trend. County-wide, nearly 17% of the housing units were vacant, but the vast majority of these were also for seasonal use.

Over 70% of the Norway Area’s housing units were occupied by their owners. The City exhibits a much higher renter occupied rate, 22.5% compared to a rate of 10.2% for the Township. The proportion of renter-occupied housing is typically higher in cities than in rural townships, due to the presence of infrastructure needed to support multi-family developments. The proximity to shopping, health care and other services may also be a factor in the location of multi-family housing.
### Table 7-1
**Total Housing Units, Occupancy and Tenure, 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Rent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Sale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented or Sold, Not Occupied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal, Recreational or Occasional Use</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Migrant Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vacant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census Bureau Table H8-Vacancy Status, 2000 Dataset SF 3, Table H7-Tenure, 2000 Dataset SF 3, Table DP-4 Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics, 2000 Dataset SF 3.

### Units in Structure
As presented in Table 7-2, the 2000 Census reports that within the City of Norway, about 80% of the housing stock consisted of single family homes. Norway Township reported that nearly 90% of its housing stock was single family homes. This represents a 0.9% decrease for the City and a 9.5% increase for the Township since 1990. Dickinson County exhibited similar statistics, with 82.0% of its housing stock being single family homes, a 6.8% increase since 1990. The Township reported a significant decrease (10.7%) in the number of mobile homes, boats and RV’s, while the City remained nearly the same from 1990 to 2000.
Table 7-2
Percent Historic and Current Housing Types by Unit, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Government</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Mobile Homes, Boat, RV, etc.</th>
<th>Single Family</th>
<th>Multi-Family</th>
<th>Mobile Homes, Boat, RV, etc.</th>
<th>% Change 1990-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.9 +0.8 +0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>+9.5 +1.3 -10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>+6.8 0.0 -6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>+1.7 -1.0 -0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table DP-4 Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 Dataset SF 3, Table H020 Units in Structure-1990 Dataset SF 3.

Age of Housing
As presented in Table 7-3, about 70% of the City’s housing stock was built before 1960, while only 42% of the Township’s and 51% of the County’s housing stock was built before 1960. Only 18% of the City’s housing stock was built after 1980, while 31% of the Township’s and 19% of the County’s housing stock was built after 1980. Again, this data follows the nationwide trend of an increase in new homes being built outside of the city limits. Many new homeowners are looking for larger homes on larger lots and oftentimes, surrounding townships have the space. The higher proportion of older homes in the City reflects the City’s heritage as one of the early mining communities in the area.

While an older housing stock is not necessarily inadequate or of poorer quality than newer structures, it is more prone to deterioration if not properly maintained. Since a relatively large number of householders are over the age of 65 (Table 7-4,) when maintenance may also become increasingly difficult, some of the City’s housing stock may be vulnerable. Older housing units often lack the amenities desired by more affluent, younger households, such as multiple bathrooms, large bedrooms, family rooms and large garages. These older units often have narrow doorways, steep stairs and other features which make them difficult for older residents to enjoy, and increased maintenance demands may also make these homes less desirable to an aging population.
Table 7-3
Housing Units by Year Structure Was Built

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Government</th>
<th>% 1999 to 2000*</th>
<th>% 1995 to 1998</th>
<th>% 1990 to 1994</th>
<th>% 1980 to 1989</th>
<th>% 1970 to 1979</th>
<th>% 1960 to 1969</th>
<th>% 1950 to 1959</th>
<th>% 1940 to 1949</th>
<th>% 1939 or earlier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table H34-Year Structure Built, 2000 Dataset SF 3.
*To March 2000

Household Type

The United States Bureau of the Census categorizes households into three types: family, non-family and group quarters. As shown in Table 7-4, in 2000, 63.1% of the City’s residents and 74.4% of the Township’s residents lived in family households, compared to 66.6% for Dickinson County and 68.0% for the State. A family household consists of a householder and one or more persons living in the same household who are related by birth, marriage or adoption.

The number of residents living in non-family households was higher for the City (36.9%), than the Township (25.6%), and slightly higher than at the County (33.4%) and State (32.0%) levels. The majority of non-family households represent persons living alone.
Table 7-4  
Households by Type, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/ Own Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 Years</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple Family</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/ Own Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 Years</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/ Own Children</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family Households</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table DP-1 Profile of General Demographic Characteristics, 2000 Dataset SF 1.

Information on household type and relationship was also presented in Table 2-9, in Chapter 2. This data illustrates that the number of family households, especially married-couple families, has decreased over the past decade. At the same time, the number of non-family households has increased.

The number of people living in a household, as well as the age and relationship of those people, all influence the type of housing needed in a community. The general trend across the country has been to build larger homes, often with multiple levels and on large lots. At the same time, the population is aging and households are getting smaller.

**Household Size**
The number of persons in a household has been decreasing in the United States over the past several decades, and the Norway Area is no exception as shown in Table 7-5 below. The average household size in the Norway Area decreased from 2.55 persons per household to 2.46.
Table 7-5
Persons Per Household, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau  Table DP-1 Profile of General Demographic Characteristics, 2000 SF 1 and Table DP-1 General Population and Household Characteristics, 1990 Dataset STF 1.

As discussed in Chapter 2, a smaller average household size may be attributed to several factors, including families having fewer children, an increase in the number of single parent families and increasing numbers of elderly residents living alone and remaining in their own homes.

Housing Values and Rent
In 2000, the U.S. Bureau of the Census reported that the median housing value in the City was $53,800, a marked increase from the 1990 level of $37,100, but considerably lower than the 2000 median housing value of $88,000 in the Township, as shown in Table 7-6. The Township median housing value was also substantially higher than Dickinson County ($64,600).

Table 7-6
Median Housing Values, 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>$37,100</td>
<td>$53,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>$46,500</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>$42,900</td>
<td>$64,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>$60,600</td>
<td>$115,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Gross rent refers to the total cost of rent plus basic utilities. This is differentiated from contract rent, which represents only the actual cash rent paid or (in the case of vacant units) the rent asked for a unit. Gross rent in the Norway Area has increased dramatically since 1990, from an average of $340 to an average of $418, which is still significantly lower than the statewide average of $546.
### Table 7-7

**Median Gross Rent, 1990-2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>$346</td>
<td>$436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>$333</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>$546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 7.3 Financial Characteristics

As discussed in Chapter 3, median incomes in the Upper Peninsula are significantly lower than statewide averages. While this can be offset somewhat by lower housing costs locally, the ability of local households to afford housing is impacted by these lower incomes.

A common method used to gauge the affordability of a community’s housing stock is the percentage of income spent on housing related expenses. Ideally, housing costs (mortgage, taxes, etc.) should consume no more than 25 to 30 percent of gross household income. Income levels are presented in Table 7-8. Tables 7-9 and 7-10 below show percentages of income directed to the cost of housing. Although the Census data is limited, it does illustrate the greater impact housing costs have on lower income households.

### Table 7-8

**Income Levels, Selected Areas, 1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita Income</strong></td>
<td>$11,232</td>
<td>$17,681</td>
<td>$11,026</td>
<td>$19,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$21,875</td>
<td>$31,059</td>
<td>$27,312</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Family Income</strong></td>
<td>$26,215</td>
<td>$37,533</td>
<td>$32,171</td>
<td>$49,141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-9
Monthly Owner Costs as a Percentage of Household Income, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Owner Costs as a % of Household Income</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15.0%</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 to 19.9%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 to 24.9%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0 to 29.9%</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0 to 34.9%</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0% or more</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Computed</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table DP-4 Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 Dataset SF 3.

Table 7-10
Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Rent as a % of Household Income</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15.0%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 to 19.9%</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 to 24.9%</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0 to 29.9%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0 to 34.9%</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0% or more</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Computed</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table DP-4 Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 Dataset SF 3.

### 7.4 Selected Housing Characteristics

Substandard housing information is presented in Table 7-11. Housing units lacking complete plumbing (hot and cold piped water, flush toilet and bathtub or shower) or complete kitchen facilities (an installed sink, range or other cooking appliance and refrigerator) are considered substandard. Less than 1% of the Norway Area’s housing units were considered substandard in 2000.
### Table 7-11
**Conditions of Housing Units, 1990-2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Lacking Complete Plumbing</th>
<th>Lacking Complete Kitchens</th>
<th>No Telephone Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Michigan</td>
<td>32,492</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table DP-4 Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics, 2000 Dataset SF 3. Table DP-5 Housing Characteristics, 1990 Dataset STF 3.

The type of heating fuel utilized in occupied housing units is presented in Table 7-12 below. Utility gas is the most common means of heating in the City, with over 85% of the City’s housing units heated in this manner. This reflects the availability of gas throughout the City as well as its cost effectiveness. Nearly half of the Township’s housing units are heated by utility gas, with 32.6% heated by bottled gas. Bottled gas, fuel oil and wood were more commonly used in the Township than the City, reflecting the rural nature of the area. Countywide, utility gas was also used in the majority of homes.
Table 7-12
Occupied Housing Unit Heating Fuel, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>City of Norway</th>
<th>Norway Township</th>
<th>Dickinson County</th>
<th>State of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Gas</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottled, Tank or LP Gas</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Oil, Kerosene, etc.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal or Coke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fuel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Fuel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau Table DP-4 Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 Dataset SF 3.

7.5 Private Housing Developments

New residential development is occurring throughout the Norway Area where large lots are available, as discussed in Chapter 5. New home constructions for the City, Township and several other Dickinson County municipalities for 2007 are presented in Table 7-13 below. The values shown are derived from construction cost estimates provided by permit applicants. Building permits for alterations are issued at a much higher rate than those for new construction. Alterations can range from simple projects, such as the addition of a deck, to extensive projects that increase the actual living area of a home. Alterations generally indicate an effort on the part of the homeowner to maintain and improve the residential property.

Table 7-13
Residential Building Permit Activity, Selected Areas, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Government</th>
<th>New Homes</th>
<th>Alterations</th>
<th>Accessory Buildings</th>
<th>All Other Structures &amp; Demolitions</th>
<th>Total Construction Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Norway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$910,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Township</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$678,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breitung Township</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,424,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Iron Mnt.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$870,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kingsford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$784,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6 Public Housing Developments
There are three publicly funded multi-family housing developments in the Norway Area, all located in the City. These units offer barrier-free accommodations and rent subsidies that are determined by tenant income.

Table 7-14
Subsidized Housing, Norway Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Name</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Lake</td>
<td>Medallion Management</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1230-1231 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Apartments</td>
<td>Medallion Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1025 Norway Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluff’s Edge</td>
<td>UPCAP Services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ranch Road and Rochon Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7.7 Public and Private Housing Assistance Programs
Housing rehabilitation, weatherization (insulating, caulking, window replacement, etc.) and home purchasing assistance programs are provided through the Dickinson-Iron Community Service Agency. Applicants must meet eligibility guidelines to qualify. In addition to providing residents with safer and more comfortable living conditions, the programs help to maintain the aging housing stock in the area, in situations where homeowners may otherwise be unable to prevent deterioration.

The Menominee River Habitat for Humanity chapter was founded in 1992. The chapter includes all of Dickinson County and Niagara, Wisconsin. Applications are evaluated based on family income, current home conditions, willingness of the applicant to participate in a home building project through “sweat equity,” and additional factors. Habitat home projects are constructed by community volunteers and homeowners-to-be on donated land parcels. The local chapter has completed several home building projects in Dickinson County and will be completing a project in the City of Norway in 2008.

The City has taken steps to revitalize older neighborhoods. Vision 2020 is a cooperative effort between the Menominee River Habitat for Humanity and Neighborhood Partnership Program of Dickinson County. The Third Ward neighborhood in Norway has been selected as one of two neighborhoods in Dickinson County. The program looks to make improvements in neighborhood parks, housing and infrastructure.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides housing assistance through its Rural Development Program. USDA provides homeownership opportunities to rural Americans, as well as programs for home renovation and repair. USDA also makes financing available to elderly,
disabled, or low-income rural residents of multi-unit housing buildings to ensure they are able to make rent payments.

The Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) provides financial and technical assistance through public and private partnerships to create and preserve safe and decent affordable housing, engage in community economic development activities, develop vibrant cities, towns and villages, and address homeless issues. MSHDA provides assistance with Neighborhood Preservation, Rental Rehab and Homeowner Rehab programs as well.

### 7.8 Issues and Opportunities

- The general trend in housing has been to build larger homes, often with multiple levels and on large lots. The number of housing units in the Norway Area has increased since 1990, especially within the Township, where larger lots are available. Providing infrastructure where feasible could aid in future development.

- About 22% of the City’s housing units and 10% of the Township’s housing units are renter-occupied, an increase over 1990 Census figures. Identification of rental units could be monitored through a rental inspection program.

- About 70% of the City’s housing stock was built before 1960. Maintaining the aging housing stock within the City is essential. About 85% of the housing stock in the Norway Area consists of single family homes. The number of people living in a household, as well as the age and relationship of those people, all influence the type of housing needed in a community. With the decrease in household size and increase in the number of non-family households, continued efforts to provide diversified housing options in the Norway Area will be important.

- Median housing values in the Norway Area have increased dramatically since 1990, while gross rent has also increased, but still remain lower than the State average. Higher rent has a significant impact on lower income households. Rental assistance programs could be pursued to curb the impact of higher housing costs.

- Less than 1% of the Norway Area’s housing units are considered to be substandard, a decrease from levels reported in 1990.

- Utility gas is utilized for heating in over 85% of homes in the City and nearly 50% of the homes in the Township. An expansion of natural gas service could be beneficial to future residential development. A larger main would be necessary, particularly if expanding west in the Norway Area.
• New housing development is occurring on bigger lots wherever available, in order to accommodate larger homes. The zoning ordinance is the chief regulatory tool to guide development. A review and revision of the City’s and Township’s zoning ordinances may be beneficial to guide future development.
Chapter 8.0 Recreation

8.1 Introduction
Information provided in this chapter is intended to provide current and comprehensive data to guide Norway Area decision makers regarding future park development and/or acquisition. Existing parks and other recreational facilities and events are discussed in the context of location, features and use. Requirements set forth under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 will also be presented.

The City of Norway’s current five year Recreation Plan was updated and adopted in 2008 to provide for the development of recreational activities, programs and facilities in the City. The City Manager met with several focus groups representing a wide range of residents and two public hearings were held to obtain citizen input. Norway Township’s five year Recreation Plan was last revised in 2002 and will need to be updated to remain current with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR).

There is a diverse array of both private and public recreational facilities within the Norway Area. Recreation related to tourism is vital to area economics and is an expanding industry nationwide. Attractions and facilities located in close proximity to the Norway Area present many opportunities for active and passive recreation. The Norway Area is rich in natural resources, drawing a growing number of visitors each year. Heritage based tourism and ecology based tourism are becoming increasingly popular. Having adequate recreational facilities to meet the needs of visitors and as well as residents, is vital to the community.

8.2 City of Norway Organizational Structure
The City’s current organizational structure for recreation is detailed below:
8.3 City of Norway Volunteer Organizations

The City provides and maintains recreational facilities for users but does not provide programming. Those recreational uses that require organizing and scheduling are guided by community volunteers. City officials maintain an oversight role to insure equitable usage among various groups and that timely and necessary maintenance is completed. Facilities are open without fee to the general public within established hours of operation.

The City has had a long and successful relationship with both community and school organizations. Community organizations include the Downtown Development Association (DDA), Norway Area Business Association, Kiwanis, Women’s Club, Masonic Lodge, Moose, Senior Center, Brackett Fund, Lions Club, Little League, SAY Soccer, Oak Crest Golf Club, Norway Area Community Fund, and local Churches. The school partners include the Athletic Boosters, K-Club, Youth Advisory Committee, and various grades and classes through individual projects. The City has also developed an Adopt-A-Park program with these various groups which have been quite successful.

Along with the support from various community groups, the City has received both corporate and individual donations which have been extremely helpful with ongoing activities and projects. There is a tremendous amount of support from the community in the parks and recreation program.

8.4 City of Norway Recreation Inventory

Public recreational facilities found within the City’s corporate limits, plus those owned by the City in adjacent Norway Township are described below. Combined, these facilities provide park and open space acreage well in excess of standards established by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) for the community’s population. Area facilities are listed in Table 8-1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment</th>
<th>DNR Grant History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway Hill Park</td>
<td>~1</td>
<td>Small, unfenced playground area features several play apparatuses appropriate for young children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Ward Park</td>
<td>~1</td>
<td>Unfenced park with paved basketball court, numerous types of play equipment, benches, pavilion, accessible restrooms and a small parking area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Lake Recreation Area</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Two accessible fishing piers, an accessible restroom facility, a walking trail, tables and benches, a ball field, BMX track, and a parking area. Knights Kingdom, a specially designed play area for youngsters. Usage is year-round as the trail is utilized for cross-country skiing and an area is flooded for ice skating near the restrooms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1990 Project No. TF90-344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Shell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Installed bench seating at this open area alongside City Hall can accommodate about 60 persons.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Menghini Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>A variety of historical items are on display at this former stage coach stop log building.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>This area has been used for many years for sledding. Although not designated as a park facility, it has served the community during periods of snow cover for a long period of time. The area used covers several acres</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Park</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Three ball fields, two soccer fields, a large picnic area with tables, play equipment for youngsters, two grade-level pavilions, horseshoe courts, two tennis courts, accessible restrooms and a storage building. It is located just south of the corporate limits in Norway Township on the east side of US-8. A paved pathway leads to the park from the south City limit.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1977 Project No. 26-00931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985 Project No. 26-01380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Myr Natural Area</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wetland nature area including a creek, plantings and natural wildlife viewing stations.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-1
City of Norway Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Accessibility Assessment</th>
<th>DNR Grant History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oak Crest Municipal Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>This 18-hole course is adjacent to Marion Park. The facility operates with the revenues it generates from members and guests under the aegis of City administration and City Council.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobile Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td>Designated Trail #2 is an east-west route that passes through the City just north of the Wisconsin Railroad. A southern branch winds through the City and eventually connects with the Wisconsin system</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanbury Lake</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>This is a county park with its entrance at the southeast corner of the City. It features 3,720 feet of lake frontage, a boat launch, picnic amenities, horseshoe courts, play equipment, modern restrooms, a nature trail and a large playfield within its 28 acres.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1983 Project No. TF718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Park (Main Street)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped area with park benches.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1986 Project No. 26-01471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>A registered historical marker, this natural spring is located next to US 2.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5 City of Norway Capital Improvement Schedule
The City of Norway Parks and Recreation Committee, through the capital improvements schedule, developed a number of necessary and valuable recreation projects to enhance the quality of life for all demographic groups. The Committee has also recognized the need for maintenance improvements to existing facilities that are not specifically reflected in the City’s capital plan. These maintenance improvements are performed by City staff with the volunteer assistance from the community and the local school district.

The capital improvements schedule highlights the City’s top priorities as follows:

Priority #1
- Norway Myr Improvements – The Norway Myr is a 23 acre conservation park developed in 2007 through a US Department of Agriculture Wetland Mitigation Program. The top priority for this park is to develop a parking lot and outdoor educational area for the residents and school groups for field trips. An additional trail extension is required to connect the parking lot with the 23 acre Myr.
Public Tennis Court Improvements – The City currently has 4 outdoor public tennis courts which are in extremely poor condition. The courts are in such disrepair that the High School Tennis Team cannot schedule home meets in 2008.

Irrigation to Senior League Field and Soccer Field – The soccer fields were improved in 2007 and irrigation is necessary to ensure good playing surfaces for the soccer teams. The outfield of the senior league field is also in need of irrigation.

3rd Ward Park Improvements – New bathrooms are scheduled for construction in 2008 at the 3rd Ward Park. There are currently no bathroom facilities in this location for the children using the park. The 3rd Ward Park improvements have been an ongoing project through the Vision 2020 program for the neighborhood.

Urban Forestry Program – The City completed the first round of the Urban Forestry Program in 2007 funded in part by the DNR Urban Forestry Grant. As part of this program, the City is preparing to install a nursery to ensure the replanting of boulevard trees.

Priority #2

Trail Extensions – The City owns and operates a municipal golf course near its Marion Park. Plans have been developed to extend a walking trail from the park and golf course to the Piers Gorge Park located on the Menominee River. The Piers Gorge is a class 4 rapid and is the only such rapids in the Midwest. The trail would also provide a single trail connection from Piers Gorge into the City and to the Norway Myr.

Tennis Courts – Following the reconstruction of the 4 existing tennis courts and at the request of the Norway Schools, plans are being developed to construct an additional 4 courts. The 8 courts would provide the necessary court layout for tournaments.

Other Priorities

Construct a pavilion and bathrooms which will service both the tennis courts and soccer fields.

Miscellaneous trail extensions per the non-motorized trail plan creating a complete loop around the City and connecting with the Dickinson County Bike Path Plan.

Other miscellaneous park improvements to Strawberry Lake, Sledding Hill, etc.

8.6 Norway Township Organizational Structure

The Township’s current structure for recreation is detailed below. The seven-member Planning Commission has been designated by the Township Board to prepare a Township recreation plan as well as to make recommendations and suggestions to the Township Board on improvements to recreation opportunities within the Township. The Township Board is responsible for
8.7 Norway Township Recreation Inventory
Norway Township owns one recreational site. The East Vulcan Playground is maintained by seasonal/part-time employees. The Township would like to continue to expand the East Vulcan Playground facilities. There is potential for a walking trail along the 5 acres located above the parking lot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DNR Grant History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Vulcan Playground</td>
<td>~9</td>
<td>Community park features a picnic area, playground equipment, volleyball court, baseball field and a basketball court. Other facilities include a hard surface multi-purpose area and a parking area.</td>
<td>2005 Project No. LW04-024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.8 Norway Township Capital Improvement Schedule
The Township would like to continue to expand the East Vulcan Playground facilities. There is potential for a walking trail to be developed along the 5 acres located above the parking lot. Additional recreation areas could be created on portions of 80 acres of land owned by the Township behind the cemetery.

8.9 Area Recreation Inventory
The surrounding area boasts a wide variety of recreational opportunities, presented in Table 8-3 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DNR Grant History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norway-Vulcan Area Schools</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Community play field including the football field and track and 3 indoor basketball courts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway Mountain</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Five lifts serve the seventeen trails at this private winter sports facility. Norway Mountain also has a 3k mountain top snowshoe trail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piers Gorge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognized as one of the most challenging sections of whitewater in the Midwest, with Class IV rapids, this scenic area on the Menominee River provides many excellent viewing vantage points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumee Falls Roadside Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Found along the north side of US-2 in Quinnesec, this Michigan Department of Transportation facility features tables, water, primitive toilets and an improved viewing area of the small falls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Antoine</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>County park features swimming, camping, and picnicking. Other park facilities include a boat launch, play field, concession stand, bathhouse, and tot lot.</td>
<td>1973 Project No. 26-00422 1984 Project No. 26-01327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Lake Community Center</td>
<td></td>
<td>A gymnasium, swimming pool, meeting rooms, game areas, racquet ball courts, and an exercise area provide many recreational opportunities at this county-owned facility in Iron Mountain.</td>
<td>1989 Project No. BF89-464 1999 Project No. CM99-043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Ice Arena</td>
<td></td>
<td>This facility in Iron Mountain features an indoor ice sheet for hockey, figure and open general recreational ice skating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Fumee Natural Area</td>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Natural area owned by Dickinson County. Hiking, sightseeing, mountain biking, horseback riding and cross-country skiing activities are the predominant activities in this unique area.</td>
<td>1994 Project No. TF94-265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Mountain Ski Jumping Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>This facility includes a 120-meter jump and holds an annual event that attracts internationally renowned jumpers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Mary</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>This community park has picnic tables, bocce ball courts, volleyball court, swimming beach, horseshoe pit, restrooms and a groomed cross-country ski trail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>This DNR-owned boat access site includes a hard-surfaced boat ramp, toilets and a parking area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8-3
#### Area Recreation Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>DNR Grant History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County Fairgrounds</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>The primary purpose of this facility is for the annual county fair held each September. Site features an arena, covered grandstand, race track, and a number of buildings. Stock car racing is held here through summer months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon Falls DNR Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>A hard-surfaced boat launch, courtesy pier, parking and pit toilets are provided at this DNR facility on the Sturgeon River.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Mountain Iron Mine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Located on the north side of US-2 in Vulcan, this private tourist facility offers guided tours via an underground railroad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Country State Forest</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>A state forest operated by the MDNR located in Dickinson and Baraga counties. Hunting, fishing, hiking and additional outdoor recreation opportunities available.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carney Lake Campground</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>A rustic site operated by the MDNR about 16.3 miles SE of Iron Mountain. The 16-site campground offers camping, picnicking, swimming, fishing and a boat launch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriman East Pathway</td>
<td></td>
<td>The 9.5 mile long MDNR trail located at Mitchell Creek provides an opportunity for hiking, biking and cross-country skiing 13 miles NE of Iron Mountain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Lake Public Access Site</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>A MDNR public access site located in the north-central part of Norway Township with a boat launch and four campsites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 8.10 Park Accessibility Requirements

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) identified specific standards that would ensure that persons with disabilities would have an equal opportunity to participate fully, live independently and be economically self-sufficient with society. The ADA consists of five sections: Employment, Public Accommodations, Transportation, State and Local Government Operations and Telecommunications.

Title II of the ADA, Public Accommodations, pertains to the level of accessibility and equal provisions of service at publicly owned recreation sites. This title states that discrimination against persons with disabilities is prohibited in all services, programs or activities provided by public entities. The ADA requires that “reasonable accommodations” be made to the needs of the estimated one in five people who are disabled nationwide. All public and private providers of goods and services, as well and employers, must remove all structural and communication barriers from facilities or provide alternative access where feasible.
8.11 Historical Resources

Heritage tourism, or tourism oriented toward the cultural legacy of an area, is becoming increasingly popular. Heritage tourism involves visiting historical sites to gain an appreciation of the past. Special historical significance is recognized through listings of the State or National Register of Historic Places. Properties may receive designation from both. Identification and preservation of historical sites can enhance a community’s awareness of its past. Area historical sites are listed below.

Jake Menghini Museum
Located in the City, the Jake Menghini Historical Museum is open on a limited basis from early June through the celebration of Leif Ericson Day in early October. The museum displays items from Jake Menghini’s personal collection of local historical artifacts. The exhibits change yearly.

Norway Spring
Found along US-2 west of the City, this artesian well was created because of drilling by the Oliver Mining Company in 1903. A 1,094 foot hole cut through several steeply dipping porous strata that tap water at higher elevations. Pressure caused by the elevation difference is released through the drilled hole, which creates the artesian well. A marker was erected at the site in 1966, the same year that it was officially recognized for its historic significance.

Iron Mountain Iron Mine
Also known as the Vulcan Mine and the Breitung-Vulcan Mine, this site was placed on the State Register in 1990. It is found in the heart of the Menominee Iron Range and was one of its most significant mining operations. This Township site serves as a museum and tourist attraction.

Ardis Furnace
Once crucial to the economy of the region, the Ardis Furnace is a significant site relating to the economic vitality of the entire Upper Peninsula region. Though the furnace is mostly destroyed, these ruins stand as a monument to a pioneer genius and one man's attempt to rescue the Marquette Iron Range from despair. The Ardis Furnace is currently owned by the City of Iron Mountain and the Menominee Range Historical Foundation. The site was listed on the State Register in 1971 and on the National Register in 1972.

Carnegie Public Library
Found in Iron Mountain, this building has been home to the Menominee Iron Range Museum since 1971. It was listed on the State Register in 1977, with a marker erected in 1979.

Chapin Mine Steam Pump Engine
Better known as the Cornish Pump, the Chapin Mine Steam Pump Engine is a significant feat of engineering as the largest steam pump of its type in America at the time of its construction. The pump is currently preserved as a historical monument to mining activity in the Iron Mountain area and was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1981.

Dickinson County Courthouse and Jail
Erected between 1896 and 1897, the courthouse and jail were designed by Iron Mountain architect James E. Clancy and proudly proclaimed the existence of a new county government in the state. It was listed on the State Register in 1977, with a marker erected in 1979.

Immaculate Conception Church
This Roman Catholic church is closely associated with Italian immigrants who came to Iron Mountain seeking employment in the Iron Mines. It is listed on both the State and National Registers and continues to be used for services.

Joseph Addison Crowell House
The Joseph Addison Crowell House is significant for its association with Dr. Joseph Crowell, the first of two physicians to practice general surgery in Iron Mountain. The site has been listed on the State Register since 1979.

Menominee Range Informational Designation
A marker erected in 1958 identifies this site at Fumee Park near Quinnesec. The marker provides information regarding the discovery of iron ore on the Menominee Iron Range. The site was listed on the State Register in 1956.

Quinnesec United Methodist Church
The expansion of U.S. 2 necessitated the moving of this simple rectangular clapboard church from its original site. A series of additions over the years have destroyed the building’s architectural integrity, but it retains historic significance both as the oldest church in Dickinson County and as one of the few remaining landmarks of Quinnesec, the oldest town on the Menominee Range. It has been listed on the State Register since 1977.

Other sites
Also noted for historic significance but no longer in existence is the Asselin Dairy Milk Bottle in the City and the Dickinson Inn in Iron Mountain.

8.12 Joint Recreation Authority
Michigan Public Act 321 of 2000 provides for the establishment of a recreational authority by two or more municipalities. The municipalities may establish a recreational authority for the purposes of acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance or improvement of various recreational infrastructures, including nonmotorized trails. Joint recreation authorities are also permitted to apply for grant funding. In this era of tight state and municipal budgets,
combining of services can save local governments money and improve efficiency. By planning on a regional basis, duplication of expensive recreation facilities can be avoided and all communities involved are given a greater voice in planning facilities to best serve the region.

A joint recreation authority could promote community and quality of life through leisure activities provided by the Norway Area. A joint recreation authority would also be able to promote partnerships with community organizations, leveraging resources that can help meet growing demands for recreational and community services. Collaborating on community wide recreation and promoting citizen involvement can help to create value in leisure activities and strengthen the social foundation of the area.

The recreation authority could be formed to provide recreational programming for the Norway Area. With this option, the municipalities would continue to own and operate their own parks and recreation facilities. Should the City and Township decide to form a joint recreation authority, developing articles of incorporation would be the first step in the process. There is also potential to coordinate with the school district to enhance programming opportunities. Additional partnerships could be formed with Oak Crest Golf Course and Norway Mountain for recreation programming.

8.13 Issues and Opportunities

- Natural features throughout the Norway Area provide a variety of year-round active and passive recreational opportunities for residents and visitors.

- The City has an updated 5-year recreation plan approved by the MDNR, which allows the City to apply for MDNR Trust Fund grants. The City has identified several priorities for recreational development. Grant funding should be pursued to begin the proposed improvements. The Township’s 5-year recreation plan expired in 2007 and is in need of an update for the Township to be eligible for MDNR grant funding.

- The City has completed the first round of the Urban Forestry Program and is preparing to develop a nursery to replenish trees along the boulevard, further promoting green initiatives.

- Both the City and the Township have placed trail development and maintenance on their list of recreation priorities. Green infrastructure crosses community boundaries and development of a trail system can be accomplished effectively through joint planning. Development and maintenance of non-motorized trails improve the “walkability” of a community.
• All current and future recreation sites should be developed to achieve maximum benefits for all users, including compliance with the ADA. This could include the upgrade of play areas, removal of uneven surfaces and sidewalk obstructions, and procurement of additional wheel-chair accessible picnic tables. Creation of new recreation areas to address the interests of the younger and senior generations and those with special needs is necessary.

• The Norway Area possesses numerous historical sites, recognized by the State and National historic registers. Grant funding could be pursued to restore and preserve these pieces of cultural history. With the increasing popularity of heritage tourism, promotion of cultural attractions could bring a boost to tourism and to visits from residents.

• The City and Township currently share many recreation resources. The City owns several recreation sites in the Township. A joint recreation authority could be formed to combine resources and efficiently provide recreation services. Partnerships for programming could also be initiated with the school district, golf course and ski hill.

• Both the City and the Township are zoned communities. An update to both communities’s zoning ordinances or the development of a joint zoning ordinance should provide for adequate green space and area zoned for parks.
Chapter 9.0 Transportation

9.1 Introduction
Communities depend on the effective movement of people and goods to sustain a functioning economy. Broadly speaking, a transportation system can be defined as any means used to move people and/or products. A major goal of a transportation system is to move goods and people through and within local, regional, national and international economies safely and efficiently. Transportation efficiency is a key factor in decisions affecting land use and development.

A region’s employment base and quality of life is closely linked to the effectiveness of the transportation system. A compilation of needs, goals and policies is necessary to guide the future development of various modes of transportation including: highways, local roads, public transportation, railroads, airports, marinas, and non-motorized trail systems. Transportation services and facilities must be maintained and developed to achieve a community’s overall vision.

Roads and other transportation systems have been largely influenced by the physical barriers present, such as rivers, lakes, swamps and rugged terrain. Transportation routes were established along areas presenting the least physical resistance.

An inventory of the existing transportation facilities in the Norway Area, along with a discussion of future transportation needs and concerns is presented in this chapter. Descriptions of the various elements of the road system, port facilities, airport and air service, railroad facilities, public transit service, and inter-community transit service are included. Identification and prioritization of vital traffic corridors has become an increasingly important part of regional commerce enhancement.

9.2 Road System
One of the most important elements in the physical structure of a community is its road system. The basic objective of a road system is to accommodate vehicular movement safely and efficiently.

Michigan Public Act 51 of 1951 requires that all counties and incorporated cities and villages establish and maintain road systems under their jurisdiction, as distinct from state jurisdiction. Counties, cities and villages receive approximately 61 percent of the funding allocated through Act 51 for local roads with the remaining 39 percent earmarked for state highways under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation.

Map 9-1 depicts roads according to Act 51 classifications.
State Trunkline Highway
The state trunkline system includes state and federal highways which connect communities to other areas within the county, state and out state locations. These roadways provide the highest level of traffic mobility for the traveling public. More than half of the total statewide traffic is carried on the highway system, which comprises only 8 percent of the Michigan roadway network length. State highways are designated with the prefix “M,” federal highways with “U.S.”

Portions of US Highways 2 and 8 are located in both the City and the Township. Highway US-2 passes through the City in an east-west direction for 3.2 miles; it passes through the Township for 3.2 miles as well. US-8 extends from the south corporate limit to US-2 for approximately 0.426 miles. US-8 is an east-west highway but runs north-south within the Township for 1.786 miles. Within Dickinson County there are 84.4 miles of state trunkline.

Act 51 requires the state transportation department to bear all maintenance costs consistent with department standards and specifications for all state highways including those within incorporated cities and villages. Since the City’s population is less than 25,000, cost sharing requirements for construction and reconstruction associated with opening, widening or other state highway improvements are not applicable.

There are 4,275 miles of state highway that compose the Priority Commercial Network (PCN). State highways given this designation are recognized for their importance to agriculture, forestry, wholesale trade, manufacturing and tourism. Highway US-2 is included in the Priority Commercial Network.

County Road System (Primary and Local)
Act 51 requires that all roads, streets and highways included in the county primary road system are known as county primary roads. The mileage of each road system is used as the basis for computation of road funding.

Primary roads are considered those of the greatest general importance to the County. All other roads not classified as primary are considered local. The local road system contains the most miles in the Dickinson County road system, but has the lowest level of traffic.

The county road system does not include roads within the City. There are 58.4 miles of county roads which are maintained as year-round roads within the Township.

Major Street System
A system of major streets in each incorporated city or village is approved by the State Transportation Commission, pursuant to Act 51. Major streets are selected by the city or village governing body on the basis of greatest general
importance to the city or village. Streets may be added or deleted from the system subject to approval of the State Transportation commissioner.

The City’s 11.69 miles of designated major streets include the following:
- Curry Road
- Eleventh Avenue
- Fourth Avenue (Kimberly Road)
- Forest Drive
- Main Street
- Ninth Avenue west of Main
- Pearney Lane
- Pine Creek Road
- Railroad Avenue
- Scenic Drive
- Section Street
- Sixteenth Avenue
- Stephenson Avenue

**Local Street System**
Those city or village roads, exclusive of state trunklines, county roads and those included in the major street system constitute the local street system. The City has 26.7 miles of designated local streets. The process of approval, additions and deletions is the same as with other road system designations.

9.3 Private Roads
Private roads have not been an issue in the City. All new roads are required to be built to City specifications. Where private roads do exist in the Norway Area, it is important to assess the capability to accommodate fire and emergency vehicles. Private roads exist throughout the Township. Maintenance is the responsibility of the landowners along the private road. Zoning ordinance updates may need to include language requiring private roads to be built to Dickinson County Road Commission specifications.

9.4 National Functional Classification
The National Functional Classification is a planning tool developed by the Federal Highway Administration in the 1960s and is utilized by federal, state, and local transportation agencies. Under this system, streets and roads are classified according to their function along a continuum that indicates the greatest mobility/greatest access to property. Roads that provide the greatest mobility are classified as principal arterials. Minor arterials, major collectors, and minor collectors follow in this continuum. Roads classified as local provide the greatest access to property. The placement of roads into these categories is determined by the relationship to traffic patterns, land use, land access needs, and traffic volumes. This classification applies rural or urban designations based on the population of a community. Communities with populations of
fewer than 5,000 are considered rural; those of 5,000 or more are categorized as urban.

The major difference between the functional classification scheme and the one established by Act 51 is that the functional classification breaks down a county road system into more categories. All roads in the functional road classification that are arterials (principal or minor) and collectors (major and minor) are considered either state trunklines or primary roads in a county road system under Act 51. The main reason for breaking a county road system in functional classifications is to provide a more useful tool for planning purposes.

**Principal Arterial**
The main function of a principal arterial road is to move traffic over medium distances quickly, safely, and efficiently. Often arterials are used for long interrupted travel between regions or major economic centers. US-2 throughout the City and Township would be included in this class of roadway.

**Minor Arterial**
Roads meeting this classification move traffic over medium distances within a community or region in a moderate to quick manner. They distribute traffic between collector roads and principal arterials. Brown Street (US-8) within the City meets this classification and the stretch of US-8 within the Township meets this criteria.

**Collector Road**
A collector road provides access between residential neighborhood and commercial/industrial areas. Its function is to provide a more general service, i.e., area-to-area rather than point-to-point. A collector usually serves medium trip lengths between neighborhoods on moderate to low traffic routes at moderate speeds and distributes traffic between local and arterial roads. Usually, this involves trips from home to places of work, worship, education and where business and commerce are conducted. Main Street north from US-2 to 16th Avenue and continuing northeasterly as Pine Creek Road, 4th Avenue and Upper Pine Creek Drive fall meet this classification. Main Street, Cedar Street and Spruce Road within the Township are collector roads.

**Rural Local Road**
The predominant function of this classification of a road is to provide direct access to adjacent land uses. A local road serves as the end for most trips within a community. All streets that are not classified as arterials or collectors are classified as local roads.

**9.5 Bridges**
There are three bridges on county roads within the Township. They are listed in Table 9-1 below. Bridge inspections are conducted each year by the Dickinson County Road Commission consistent with state requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Span</th>
<th>Weight Limit</th>
<th>Condition/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Road 577 Sturgeon River</td>
<td>Steel Stringer</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>160 feet</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Built in 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 5 Road Pine Creek</td>
<td>Steel Plate Girder</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
<td>10 Tons</td>
<td>Reconstruction completed in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet Mine Road W. Branch Sturgeon River</td>
<td>Timber</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>46 feet</td>
<td>5 Tons</td>
<td>Built in 1978, Scheduled for reconstruction in 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dickinson County Road Commission, 2008.

9.6 Condition of Roads

Roads under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation are evaluated using standard criteria such as pavement condition, ride quality, friction and rutting. Surface conditions are determined by the amount of deterioration such as cracking, faulting, wheel tracking, patching, etc. Determining ride quality is subjective, but is based on the degree of comfort experienced by drivers and passengers.

Road condition evaluations are completed using Pavement Management System (PASER) ratings. PASER uses visual inspection to evaluate pavement surface conditions. Deterioration of road surfaces has two general causes: environmental, due to weathering and aging and structural, caused by repeated traffic loadings. Roads are rated on a scale of 1-10; 1 (failed), 2-3 (poor), 4-5 (fair), 6-7 (good), 8 (very good), 9-10 (excellent).

The City completed surface condition evaluations for roads within the City limits in 2008. A sample of surface conditions evaluations for several roads within the City in 2008 were as follows:

- US-2 from C Street to Brown Street-good
- US-2 from Brown Street to Norway Street-fair
- Brown Street from Saginaw to 5th Avenue-good
- Brown Street from 5th Avenue to US-2-good
- Upper Pine Creek Road to US-2-poor
- Kimberly Road from Brown Street/US-8 to Saginaw Street-fair
- Main Street from US-2 to 8th- very good

The Township completed surface evaluations in 2007. A sample of surface conditions evaluations for several roads within the Township were as follows:

- Central Avenue from Market Street to Main Street-poor
- County Road 573 from City/Twp line to Stone Cliff Drive-poor
- County Road 577 from Spruce Street to CN Railway-good
• Main Street from Market Street to Pine Street—poor

9.7 Financing

Public Act 51 of 1951 governs state appropriations for most Michigan transportation programs, including state and local highway programs and state and local public transportation programs. There are primarily two sources of state-generated transportation revenue: motor fuel taxes and vehicle registration taxes. These two revenue sources generated approximately $2 billion dollars in FY 2006-07. Act 51 creates the Michigan Transportation Fund (MTF) as the primary collection and distribution fund for this revenue.

Act 51 directs MTF revenue to other state transportation funds, to special program accounts, and to local units of government. The effect of the MTF distribution formula is to allocate state restricted transportation revenue between highway programs and public transportation programs, and highway program funds between MDOT and local road commissions.

Michigan Transportation Fund (Act 51)
Michigan Transportation Fund revenues distributed to the City for the fiscal year 2007, totaled $302,896.03. Townships do not directly receive Michigan Transportation Fund revenues. The Dickinson County Road Commission received $2,817,888.07 in 2007. The County Road Commission funds are then divided amongst two primary road funds and two local road funds and used when needed.

Table 9-2 identifies funding sources for the complete Michigan transportation budget. The gross majority of transportation money comes from federal and state sources.

Table 9-2
Revenue Supporting Michigan’s FY 2006-2007 Transportation Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>% of Total Gross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>$2,225,029,000</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$1,169,336,300</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$47,500,000</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Appropriation</td>
<td>$3,441,865,300</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Michigan Transportation Economic Development Fund
Enacted in 1987, the Michigan Transportation Economic Development Fund (TEDF) was created to assist in the funding of highway, road and street projects necessary to support economic growth. The TEDF is governed by the mission “to enhance the ability of the state to compete in an international economy, to serve as a catalyst for economic growth of the state, and to improve the quality of life in the state.” MDOT, county road commissions and all city and village street agencies are eligible to apply for funds. Several types of projects are appropriate for funding, including:
• Category A: target industry development and redevelopment
• Category C: reduction of traffic congestion in urban counties
• Category D: road improvement in rural counties to create an all-season road network
• Category E: construction or reconstruction of roads essential to the development of commercial forests
• Category F: road and street improvements in cities in rural counties

Other
Federal funding for state highways is supported mainly through motor fuel taxes. Construction and repair costs associated with state trunkline systems are generated from these taxes. The authorization of the SAFETEA Act in 2005 will provide Michigan with increased funding than received previously under TEA-21. Under the concept of “multi-modal,” transportation planning is supposed to bring about cooperation among the different transportation modes that interconnect at shared hubs, or multi-modals. The state of Michigan is attempting to utilize flexible funding to support multi-modal infrastructure.

Ten percent of each state’s Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding is set aside for transportation enhancement activities. Enhancement activities are meant to be such things as landscaping, bicycle paths, historic preservation, stormwater runoff mitigation and other quality-of-life type projects. A formal process of application has been established by the Michigan Department of Transportation to afford local and state jurisdictions an opportunity to obtain this funding.

9.8 Traffic Volume
Nationwide, the rate of growth in travel remains well above the rate of growth in roadway capacity. Two car households have been increasing dramatically, from 10 million in 1960 to 40.5 million in 2000. 18 million households in 2000 had three or more vehicles. This trend leads to increased congestion and travel times, according to the Federal Highway Administration.

According to the MDOT’s Long Range Plan, highway travel in Michigan is increasing at a much higher rate than the state population. In 1940, travel logged on Michigan roads totaled 14.6 billion miles. Vehicle travel on Michigan’s major highways increased by 27 percent from 1990 to 2004 - jumping from 81.1 billion vehicle miles traveled in 1990 to 103.3 billion vehicle miles traveled in 2004. At the same time, total lane miles in the state increased by only four percent. Seventy-seven percent of the $321 billion worth of commodities delivered annually to and from sites in Michigan is transported on the state’s highways.
9.9 Access Management
Location is a critical factor when it comes to the success of a commercial venture. If development is not sufficiently monitored it may disrupt the movement of traffic and heighten congestion and safety issues. Significant commercial development has occurred along the US-2/US-141/M-95 corridor to take advantage of high traffic volumes. Continued development along US-2/US-141 and M-95 will further increase traffic volumes and introduce additional conflict points which could erode traffic operations and increase potential for traffic crashes.

Communities along the US-2/US-141/M-95 corridor have incorporated an Access Management Action Plan into the Zoning Ordinances adopted for each municipality. Among those recommendations were the creation of an overlay zone along these highways within Dickinson County and the adoption of uniform access management standards by all the jurisdictions along the US-2/US-141/M-95 corridor which are based on the Michigan Department of Transportation access management standards and the Michigan Access Management Guidebook.

The Access Management Plan is intended to promote safe and efficient travel on state highways within Dickinson County; improve safety and reduce the potential for crashes; minimize disruptive and potentially hazardous traffic conflicts; ensure safe access by emergency vehicles; protect the substantial public investment in the highway and street system by preserving capacity and avoiding the need for unnecessary and costly reconstruction which disrupts business and traffic flow; separate traffic conflict areas by reducing the number of driveways; provide safe spacing standards between driveways, and between driveways and intersections; provide for shared access between abutting properties; ensure reasonable access to properties, although not always by the most direct access; and to coordinate access decisions with the Michigan Department of Transportation, the Dickinson County Road Commission, and adjoining jurisdictions, as applicable.

9.10 Public Transportation
Transportation for elderly and handicapped person is provided by the Dickinson-Iron Community Services Agency on a demand-response basis. There is no public system that provides general public transportation within Dickinson County. Private taxi companies are available. Specialized medical transport services are also available in Dickinson County.

9.11 Intercity Transportation
There is currently no intercity bus service operating in Dickinson County.
9.12 Rail Service
There is no passenger rail service within the Norway Area. A Canadian National line runs through the industrial park in the Township and throughout the City.

9.13 Air Transportation
Ford Airport is located in Kingsford. It serves the greater Dickinson County Area; including the cities of Iron Mountain, Kingsford and Norway in Michigan and the bordering communities of Aurora, Florence and Niagara, WI. Its service area also includes portions of Iron and Menominee counties in Michigan and portions of Florence and Marinette counties in Wisconsin. Ford Airport is the primary air cargo center for the Upper Peninsula and also offers both scheduled and charter air service.

Facilities at the airport include a passenger terminal building, hangar facilities (county and private), a maintenance building that also houses a crash/rescue vehicle, a sand storage building, a 6,500 foot primary runway, and a 3,800 foot secondary runway. Northwest Airlink operated by Mesaba Airlines became the new commercial provider for Ford Airport in June 2008.

9.14 Non-Motorized Transportation
Non-motorized transportation facilities have become a priority for both the City and the Township. Alternate modes of transportation are encouraged and made safer by constructing bike lanes, paths and trails. As discussed in detail in Chapter 8, both the City and the Township have plans to expand and enhance non-motorized transportation options. Grant opportunities are being pursued to fund trail enhancement.

In 2000, the City began a program of sidewalk replacement cost sharing with residents. The City currently shares the cost of replacement 50/50 with the residents. The City’s budget anticipates a continuation of sidewalk replacement and construction.

9.15 Safe Routes to School
Michigan’s Safe Routes to School program is managed by the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), with training, logistical, administrative, and technical support from the Governor’s Council on Physical Fitness, Health and Sports/Michigan Fitness Foundation.

The purposes of Safe Routes to School programs are:
- To enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school;
- To make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative, thereby encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age;
• To facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption and air pollution in the vicinity of elementary schools.

A federal Safe Routes to School program was authorized as part of the surface transportation bill signed into law in August 2005. As a result, every state now has dedicated dollars to help with infrastructure improvements (e.g. new sidewalks and traffic calming projects) and non-infrastructure activities to encourage and enable students to walk and bicycle to school.

The City has begun the process to carry out the Safe Routes to School program. The final step to implement Safe Routes to School in a community is to develop a SR2S Action Plan. The SR2S team will review findings from the walking audit and information collected through student and parent surveys to develop recommendations to encourage and enable students to walk to school on safe routes. The Action Plan will address education, encouragement, enforcement and/or engineering needs. Grant funding is available through the program.

9.16 Ride Share
Michigan’s Statewide Carpool Parking Lot Program was initiated during the energy crisis of the early 1970s. At that time, rising transportation costs caused by fuel scarcity prompted many motorists to begin carpooling on a larger scale than ever before. Lacking adequate and convenient parking facilities, commuters parked along roadsides and on private property. Potential safety problems associated with roadside parking provided the impetus for the development of the Statewide Carpool Parking Lot Program: an effort to provide safe and convenient parking facilities for Michigan carpoolers.

Residents of the Norway Area often travel long distances to work or for educational purposes. The Norway Area does not currently have a “Park and Ride” lot and could benefit from a lot being designated. An area to be considered would be near the mine cap.

9.17 Issues and Opportunities
• While certain roads in the Norway Area are in good condition, a significant proportion of the roads are in need of repair. Funding through the state for road improvements is becoming increasingly limited due to the state’s budget crisis.

• The City and the Township have adopted the US-2/US-141/M-95 Access Management Action Plan. Following the standards recommended in the plan will help to improve access, traffic flow and safety.
• Dickinson County does not currently have a county-wide transit system. Transportation is available for the elderly and disabled; however, the increasing aging population may require a future expansion of services.

• Michigan’s population is aging; older residents and residents with disabilities will increasingly depend on transit services. There may be a need to expand or enhance transit services available to seniors and residents with disabilities.

• The natural setting of the Norway Area provides an opportunity to expand non-motorized transportation facilities. Grant opportunities are being pursued to fund trail enhancement.

• The City, in partnership with the school system, local law enforcement and the local road authority, can continue to increase the number of children able to safely walk and bike to school by pursuing the Safe Routes to School program. Grant funding is available.

• City and Township officials could contact MDOT to determine the feasibility of designating a location in the Norway Area as a Park and Ride lot, providing a safe area for residents to park and ride with other commuters.
Chapter 10.0 Goals and Strategies

10.1 Introduction
Throughout the preceding chapters of this plan, detailed information has been presented defining the historical trends and current situation in the Norway Area. This background information has helped the Joint Planning Commission to gain an understanding of the forces which have shaped the growth and development of the Norway Area to this point.

In order for a community to have a sound plan for growth and development, it is essential that goals be set. These goals are broad statements which reflect desired future conditions and are based on the background information, assumptions, alternatives and policy variables presented earlier. More specific strategies are then developed, defining actions that can be taken to implement the goals.

The final stage of the planning process, implementation, begins once the goals and strategies have been defined. The first step in implementation is the adoption of this plan by the Joint Planning Commission and the City Council of Norway and the Norway Township Board following a public hearing and consideration of any public comments received.

Plan implementation continues through adherence to the goals and strategies set forth in this plan. It should be emphasized, however, that these goals and strategies are only a guide and provide long-term vision; ideas and projects mentioned are adjustable per a community’s needs. While the Joint Planning Commission has developed these goals and strategies based on the best information available, the needs of the community at a point in time, changing needs and desires within the community, or changes in the local population or economy may mean that these goals and strategies will need to be re-evaluated. This plan must remain flexible enough to respond to changing needs and conditions, while still providing a strong guiding mechanism for future development. The Joint Planning Commission, City Council and Township Board, together with other groups, organizations and individuals, can use this plan as a dynamic decision making tool, and should assure that the plan is referred to frequently and updated periodically.

To assist in understanding the nature of the goals and strategies presented on the following pages, the following definitions are presented:

**Goal:**
A broad statement of a desired future condition, the generalized end toward which all efforts are directed. Goals are often stated in terms of fulfilling broad public needs, or alleviating major problems. Goals are generally difficult to measure and are idealistic.
Strategy:
A statement that sets forth specific means of functions related to goal attainment. A strategy can be a task, step or action that supports achieve the stated goal.

10.2 Population

Discussion:
The City has experienced gradually decreasing populations since 1960. That trend has reversed in the last decade. The City of Norway has experienced a small population growth from 2,910 persons in 1990 to 2,959 persons in 2000. During the same time period, Norway Township has experienced a sizeable population growth. In 1990 the Township’s population was 1,325 and the population increased 23.7% to 1,639. The median age in the City of Norway and Norway Township was 38.6 years, significantly higher than the State. The percentage of the population in the Norway area that is age 60 and older is higher than both the county and the state. The percentage of the population that is under the age of 19, otherwise known as the school age population is about the same as the county and the state. However, the group ages 20-24 is at a significantly lower level for the Norway area and Dickinson County when compared to the State of Michigan. As the community ages, demand for senior housing, entertainment and health care will need to increase to meet the needs of an older population.

Observing the aging trends of the Norway area presents the need to find new ways to attract younger families and individuals to the area to support an aging community. Attracting businesses which provide jobs for young people will encourage a younger demographic to settle and remain in the Norway area.

Goals:
- Maintain the existing population and manage future growth.

10.3 Economic Base

Discussion:
The majority of commercial and industrial enterprises in Dickinson County are located along the US-2 corridor, from Norway westward into Breitung Township and Iron Mountain. For the most part, the area’s employment, shopping and services are also located within this general area. Local unemployment rates are generally lower in Dickinson County than those rates elsewhere in the Upper Peninsula. The lower unemployment rate is a direct reflection of economic diversity in the area.

Dickinson County boasts a varied economy, with several large employers in the manufacturing and service sectors. The local economy also contains a large and diverse array of small and mid-sized firms. The Norway-Vulcan Industrial
Park in the Township offers direct access to US-2 and offers municipal water and has parcels available for development.

**Goals:**
- Maintain the existing economic base and continue to improve the Norway Area by attracting diversified businesses.
- Maintenance and strengthening of the tourist industry.
- Continue to enhance the physical appearance of the community.

**Strategies:**
- Encourage industrial diversification and market the Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park in an attempt to fill the available parcels.
- Look to extend municipal wastewater services to the industrial park to attract businesses through the pursuit of Economic Development Administration and Rural Development grants.
- Encourage existing businesses to stay in the Norway Area and assist in expansion efforts when possible.
- Encourage new companies to locate in the Norway Area.
- Encourage the direct connection of fiber optic lines throughout the area to attract high-tech business and industry.
- Encourage coordination between economic development groups in the Norway Area and support initiatives that are consistent with the goals of the Norway Area.
- Ensure that the Norway Area’s infrastructure is up to date and efficient with the capacity to meet economic expansion demand.
- Encourage the reuse of existing commercial and retail sites when possible.
- Encourage the promotion of local historic sites, outdoor activities and the area’s natural features to bring tourism business into the Norway Area.
- Encourage technology based employers to locate in the Norway Area to further expand the economic base.
- Continue to utilize the Michigan State Housing and Development Authority’s Downtown Façade program to improve downtown buildings.
• The City and the Township should coordinate with the Downtown Development Authority, the Chamber of Commerce and the Economic Development Corporation to attract new businesses to the Norway Area.

10.4 Natural Features

**Discussion:**
Natural features are one of the primary determinants of land use. In the case of the Norway Area, the presence of both iron ore and pine forests were critical to the early development of the region. The area has many small lakes, hilly terrain and lots of open space. The Norway Area also has areas well suited for agricultural development.

**Goal:**
- Enhance the natural environment while providing for compatible development.
- Improve the physical appearance of the community.
- Focus commercial development in targeted locations in the Norway Area.

**Strategies:**
- Encourage growth in area that are identified and zoned as suitable to support development and does not jeopardize the Area’s natural features.
- Encourage review of setback requirements, lot sizes and other factors when considering rezonings to protect existing natural features.
- Continue to participate and coordinate with organizations and agencies who share common concerns and interests with the Norway Area’s natural features.
- Actively work to ensure that regulations governing septic tanks and household wells are enforced to protect water sources.
- Establish a Wellhead Protection Overlay district in the Zoning Ordinance and continue to follow standards established in the Wellhead Protection Program to protect the quality of the groundwater supply.
- Encourage land use that minimizes impacts to the environment.
- Continue to protect sensitive areas.
- Enforce zoning regulations that require buffering between conflicting land uses.
• Establish overlay zones, such as commercial corridors and planned unit development overlays as identified on the Future Land Use map.

10.5 Land Use

Discussion:
In the north half of the City, large tracts of unplatted land are dotted with several farms and low density residential development. The southeastern quadrant consists of a small urban center where the City’s population is concentrated and stores, institutions and industrial enterprises are found. Residential development within the City is concentrated in an area extending north just beyond the Wisconsin Central Railroad to the southern corporate limit east of Stephenson Street to the eastern extremities close to the US-2 corridor. New commercial development has been locating along the US-2 corridor west of the City.

In recent years, the Township has seen moderate growth in residential development. Most residences in the Township are single family homes and the most compact development occurs in and around Vulcan. Recent development has been occurring along WPA Road, County Road 573, County Road 577 and along Lower Pine Creek Road. There is also a new subdivision located below Norway Mountain, along Ski View Drive. There is very little commercial development in the Township, limited to several businesses along US-2 in Vulcan. The Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park is located in the Township, along US-2, with parcels available for development.

Goals:
• Establish land use patterns in the Norway Area that provide for development in areas where adequate facilities exist or can be extended, maintain the overall character of the community and ensure the health, safety and welfare of Area residents.

Strategies:
• Maintain a diversified land use pattern throughout the Norway Area.

• Continue to encourage high density land use from the City limits south and lower density land use from the City limits to the northern end of the Township.

• Continue to be consistent with the enforcement of the zoning ordinances and additional code enforcement.

• Review and revise the existing zoning ordinances and consider combining them into one joint zoning ordinance covering the City and the Township.
• Provide for a variety of residential districts, commercial districts and industrial districts for development purposes.

• Recognize that commercial retail opportunities may follow additional residential development. Continue to promote excellent residential development opportunities in the area.

10.6 Community Facilities and Services

Discussion:
In an attempt to avoid duplication of services, to save money and to provide services efficiently and at a high level, the City and Township share several services. The City and the Township have joint ventures in fire protection, ambulance services, water and wastewater, electric services, education and recreation. The Norway Area is unique in that the City owns and operates the power generating facility, a high speed internet/cable TV system and a golf course in addition to water and wastewater systems. Most major facilities for these services are located within the Township. Utility services are provided to concentrated areas of population within the Township. A joint planning commission was established in 2007 for the purpose of land use planning. Upon completion of the Norway Area Master Plan, a joint zoning ordinance is planned.

Goals:
• Provide, maintain and continuously improve the efficiency and quality of community facilities and services in a cost-effective manner.

Strategies:
• Continue to encourage the joint activities of the Utilities Authority.

• Engage in public and private partnerships to support the expansion of broadband service to underserved areas.

• Where feasible encourage utility expansion in the Norway Area.

• Encourage the coordination of municipal processes to ensure efficiency and cost effectiveness.

• Pursue GIS mapping for utilities when necessary.

• Pursue state and federal grant and loan programs to provide and improve facilities and services.
10.7 Housing

Discussion:
About 70 percent of the housing units in the City and about 40 percent in the Township were built before 1960. About 85 percent of the housing units in the Norway Area consist of single family housing. There has been a decrease in household size and an increase in the number of non-family households. Over one fifth of the housing stock in the City is renter occupied. New homes are being built on larger lots in the Norway Area.

Goals:
- Develop a housing stock offering a range of cost, type and location to meet the needs, preferences and financial capabilities of the local population.
- Preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods to offer residents a quality neighborhood environment.

Strategies:
- Consider developing a rental registration program.
- Participate in the MSHDA housing rehabilitation program which provides funding for home repairs, rehabilitation and home ownership.
- Promote neighborhood enhancement programs such as tree plantings, neighborhood clean-ups, neighborhood gardens and sidewalk improvements.
- Continue to enforce those ordinances designed to protect public health and safety, as well as control blight and structural deterioration.
- Promote citizen interaction that encourages healthy neighborhoods and community pride.
- Encourage neighborhood beautification programs.

10.8 Recreation

Discussion:
Natural features throughout the Norway Area provide a variety of year-round active and passive recreational opportunities for residents and visitors. Both the City and the Township have developed several priorities for recreational development. Other public and private facilities provide recreational opportunities for all ages.

Goals:
• Maintain and improve recreational opportunities for residents and visitors of all ages.

**Strategies:**

• Improve barrier free access at public parks and recreation facilities.

• Support efforts to establish a County-wide bike route and coordinate with the Dickinson County Bike Path Committee when possible.

• Encourage public participation in recreation planning.

• Coordinate area recreation facilities and programs to avoid duplication.

• Pursue MDNR Trust Fund grants, MDOT Transportation grants as well as additional grants to provide for recreation funding.

• Coordinate the Norway Area’s recreation facilities and programs by forming a Joint Recreation Authority.

10.9 Transportation

**Discussion:**

Transportation patterns have emerged in response to development and physical constraints of the landscape. The Norway Area is served by two state trunkline highways, US-2 and US-8. Concentrated commercial development is located along these two routes. These routes pose safety concerns due to the increasing traffic volume and the large number of existing access points.

**Goals:**

• Provide a safe, well maintained and efficient multi-modal transportation network.

**Strategies:**

• Pursue implementation of safety improvements at various intersections throughout the City.

• Update zoning ordinance regulations to require that private roads in the Norway Area be built to Dickinson County Road Commission specs.

• Promote the concept of shared access or service drives at the site plan review level to decrease the number of curb cuts along heavily traveled roadways.

• Continue to follow the US-2/US-141/M-95 Access Management Action Plan to improve safety, access and traffic flow.
• Expand and connect bike paths throughout the Norway Area.

• Complete a city-wide sidewalk assessment and develop a prioritized list of needed improvements based on available resources and safety concerns.

• Consider implementing a Safe Routes to School program to enable more students to safely walk and bike to school.

• Develop a coordinated road improvements plan to address future projects in the City and the Township.

• Work with MDOT to establish a Park and Ride lot in the Norway Area, perhaps near the mine cap.
Chapter 11.0 Future Land Use and Zoning Plan

11.1 Introduction
The previous chapters of the Master Plan provide an overview of the existing conditions in the Norway Area. A future land use plan is representative of the “preferred future” of how the community would like to grow and includes recommendations on how development will be carried out. It is based on analyses of environmental opportunities and constraints, existing trends and conditions and projected future land use needs. Future land use planning establishes the desired amounts and locations of residential, commercial, and industrial development; public facilities; open space; environmental conservation and recreational areas; and changes or improvements to the local traffic circulation systems. This Chapter also presents the Zoning Plan, which along with the rest of the relevant parts of this Future Land Use Plan, is intended to guide the implementation of and future changes to the City and Township’s Zoning Ordinances.

The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEA) requires in Sec. 203 (1) that zoning be based on a plan. Similarly, Sec. 7 (2) of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) sets forth the purposes for which a master plan must be created. In order for a master plan to serve as the basis for zoning, it should promote the purposes in the MZEA and MPEA. The zoning plan identifies the zoning districts and their purposes, as well as the basic standards proposed for each district. Current zoning districts utilized in the City and Township zoning ordinances and any potential modifications to the districts will also be discussed in this chapter. Proposed consolidated zoning districts for the Norway Area are also included.

Map 11-1, Future Land Use, reflects the assumption that land use patterns in the Norway Area will continue to be heavily influenced by transportation corridors, particularly along US-2. Other major considerations which helped shape the future land use map are a desire to establish appropriate uses and to develop a consistent land use patterns throughout the Norway Area.

11.2 Current Zoning Districts
The City is currently divided into ten zoning districts and the Township is divided into nine districts. The intent and general purpose will be depicted for each district. A review of the schedule of regulations will also be included for both the City and the Township. As mentioned in previous chapters, the City and the Township are considering the consolidation of the two zoning ordinances into one comprehensive ordinance covering the Norway Area. A review of the current districts is pertinent to the discussion of any consolidation efforts.
City of Norway Zoning Districts and Schedule of Regulations

R-1: Residential One District
Intent: The R-1 Residential One District is established and maintained for medium- to high-density residential and related uses, typically in older residential neighborhoods with small lots. These areas are served by municipal water and wastewater services.

R-2: Residential Two District
Intent: The R-2 Residential Two District is established and maintained for medium-density residential and related uses in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended.

RR: Rural Residential District
Intent: The RR Rural Residential District is established and maintained to provide a low-density residential environment in accessible outlying areas of the City. Uses in this district will normally not be served by municipal water and wastewater services.

RP: Resource Production District
 Intent: The RP Resource Production District is established and maintained for low intensity use of those areas which, because of their location, physical characteristics and current use are suitable for agricultural, forestry and recreational uses. Uses in this district will normally not be served by municipal water and wastewater services.

B-1: Essential Business District
Intent: The B-1 Essential Business District is established and maintained for business uses within the Central Business District, in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, and where small lots, zero lot line development and minimal or no side setbacks are common.

B-2: Central Business District
Intent: The B-2 Central Business District is established and maintained for business uses within the Central Business District, in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, and where small lots, zero lot line development and minimal or no side setbacks are common.

B-3: General Business District
Intent: The B-3 General Business District is established and maintained for diverse business uses outside the Central Business District, in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended. This district provides for business development at a low density.
**I-1: Industrial One District**  
**Intent:** The I-1 Industrial One District is established and maintained for wholesale, warehousing, manufacturing and assembly uses within completely enclosed buildings in areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended. Uses in the I-2 District generally do not produce noise, odors, light, smoke or other impacts which extend beyond the boundary of the district.

**I-2: Industrial Two District**  
**Intent:** The I-2 Industrial Two District is established and maintained for manufacturing and other industrial uses, including those which may involve outdoor storage of materials or equipment in areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended. Uses in the I-2 District may produce noise, odors, light, smoke or other impacts which extend beyond the boundary of the district.

**P: Park District**  
**Intent:** The P Park District is to establish and maintain open space in conjunction with recreational opportunities. Provisions are made to allow for certain types of commercial or nonprofit use within the area.

### City of Norway  
**Height, Bulk and Placement Regulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (Square Feet or Acreage)</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Width (Feet)</th>
<th>Minimum Setback (Feet)</th>
<th>Maximum Height (Feet)</th>
<th>Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>Rear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>6,000 square feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>15,000 square feet</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>6,000 square feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>6,000 square feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>10,000 square feet</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>50/30 feet</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>20,000 square feet</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
<td>50/30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
<td>50/30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes to the Table:**

A. Lot width shall be measured at front setback line and shall not include any encumbrances, such as easements or other such restrictions.

B. Cornices, eaves, and gutters, may project two feet into the required yard. Attached or unattached decks and porches shall comply with required front, side and rear setbacks.
C. The setback shall be measured from the road right-of-way, except where a parcel abuts a water body. In that case the setback shall be measured from the ordinary high water mark.

D. If more than 50% of the structures in the same block on the same side of the street are at different front setback line, then other structures may be built at the average setback line of the majority of structures in the block.

E. In the B-1 and B-2 Districts the side yards may be eliminated if the side walls are of fireproof construction and are wholly without opening and the zoning of the adjacent property is business.

F. Where parking is in the front, the front setback shall be a minimum of 50 feet; where the parking is in the rear or side yard, the front setback shall be a minimum of 30 feet.

G. The maximum height of an accessory building in the R-1 or R-2 District shall be 14 feet.

H. The maximum lot coverage will be 100% in the situation where side yards have been eliminated.

Norway Township Zoning Districts and Schedule of Regulations

**R-1: Residential-1 District**

Intent: To establish and preserve quiet single-family home neighborhoods in which each structure is located on an individual lot or premises adequate in size and shape to provide for safe water supply and disposal facilities, to minimize hazards of spreading fires, and to require setback from the public thoroughfare to facilitate safe exit from an entrance to the premise. The district shall be free from other uses except those which are both compatible with and convenient to the residents of such a district.

**R-2: Residential-2 District**

Intent: To establish and preserve neighborhoods for single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings, and mobile homes in an appropriate, safe, sanitary, and attractive environment.

**RR: Rural Residential District**

Intent: To establish and maintain an alternative residential environment in accessible rural areas free from other uses except those which are both compatible with and convenient to the residents of such a district.

**AP: Agriculture Production District**

Intent: To insure that land areas which are uniquely suited for agricultural production are retained for that use, unimpeded by the establishment of incompatible uses of land which would hinder agricultural practices and irretrievably deplete essential agricultural lands and productivity.

**TP: Timber Production District**

Intent: To maintain for timber production purposes those lands which because of their soil, drainage, and other characteristics, are especially productive timber lands.
**RP: Resource Product District**
Intent: To maintain certain lands because of their geologic formations, soils, and other characteristics for resource production.

**PL: Public Land District**
Intent: To establish and preserve areas for certain public purposes.

**TD: Town District**
Intent: To establish and preserve a town district for single-family homes and for retail commercial uses that are compatible with a small town setting and serve the residents and tourists. This district is designed for small unincorporated town areas where a mix of residential and retail commercial is in accord with established patterns of use and the needs of nearby residents.

**I: Industrial District**
Intent: To establish and preserve areas for industrial and related uses of such a nature that they do not create serious problems of compatibility with other kinds of land uses, and to make provision for certain kinds of commercial uses which are most appropriately located as neighbors of industrial uses.

### Norway Township

**Height, Bulk and Placement Regulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule of Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Footnotes to the Table:*

- **A)** Detached garage not exceeding 14 feet in height may be located not less than seven feet from a side lot line.
- **B)** 15,000 square feet where lot is served by public water and/or water supply.
- **C)** Lot width shall be measured at front setback line.
- **D)** A detached single family dwelling may be located on a one-acre minimum lot size.
- **E)** As set forth in Section 319, Subsection Q, minimum front setback for lots within the Highway Overlay Zone is 50 feet from the roadway right-of-way.
- **F)** Minimum lot width within the Highway Overlay Zone is 300 feet as set forth in Section 319, Subsection Q, refer to Section 319 for exceptions to the minimum lot width.
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#### 11.3 Potential Consolidated Zoning Districts

**Norway Area Height, Bulk and Placement Regulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Size (Square Feet or Acreage)</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Width (Feet)\textsuperscript{A, L}</th>
<th>Minimum Setback (Feet)\textsuperscript{B, C}</th>
<th>Maximum Height (Feet)</th>
<th>Maximum Lot Coverage Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>6,000 square feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>30 feet \textsuperscript{G}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>20,000 square feet\textsuperscript{i}</td>
<td>100 feet\textsuperscript{j}</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>30 feet \textsuperscript{G}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>20,000 square feet\textsuperscript{i}</td>
<td>100 feet\textsuperscript{j}</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>35 feet</td>
<td>30 feet \textsuperscript{G}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>2.5 acres</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{k}</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>6,000 square feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>10 feet \textsuperscript{D}</td>
<td>8 feet \textsuperscript{E}</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>6,000 square feet</td>
<td>50 feet</td>
<td>10 feet \textsuperscript{D}</td>
<td>8 feet \textsuperscript{E}</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>10,000 square feet</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>50/30 feet \textsuperscript{F}</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>20,000 square feet</td>
<td>150 feet</td>
<td>50/30 feet \textsuperscript{F}</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>5 acres\textsuperscript{k}</td>
<td>300 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes to the Table:**

A. Lot width shall be measured at front setback line and shall not include any encumbrances, such as easements or other such restrictions.
B. Cornices, eaves, and gutters, may project two feet into the required yard. Attached or unattached decks and porches shall comply with required front, side and rear setbacks.
C. The setback shall be measured from the road right-of-way, except where a parcel abuts a water body. In that case the setback shall be measured from the ordinary high water mark.
D. If more than 50% of the structures in the same block on the same side of the street are at different front setback line, then other structures may be built at the average setback line of the majority of structures in the block.
E. In the B-1 and B-2 Districts the side yards may be eliminated if the side walls are of fireproof construction and are wholly without opening and the zoning of the adjacent property is business.
F. Where parking is in the front, the front setback shall be a minimum of 50 feet; where the parking is in the rear or side yard, the front setback shall be a minimum of 30 feet.
G. The maximum height of an accessory building in the R-1 or R-2 District shall be 14 feet.
H. The maximum lot coverage will be 100% in the situation where side yards have been eliminated.
I. 15,000 feet where lot is served by public water and/or water supply.
J. Detached garage not exceeding 14 feet in height may be located not less than seven feet from a single lot line.
K. A detached single family dwelling may be located on a one-acre minimum lot size. As set forth in the Access Management Section, Subsection Q, minimum front setback for lots within the Highway Overlay Zone is 50’ from the roadway right-of-way.
L. Minimum lot width within the Highway Overlay Zone is 300 feet as set forth in the Access Management Section, Subsection Q, refer to Access Management Section for exceptions.
R-1 Residential One District
A. **Intent:** The R-1 Residential One District is established and maintained for medium- to high-density residential and related uses, typically in older residential neighborhoods with small lots. These areas are served by municipal water and wastewater services.

B. **Permitted Principal Uses:**
   - Adult foster care small group home
   - Day care facility, family
   - Elementary or secondary school
   - Library and other public building
   - Religious institution
   - Single-family dwelling

C. **Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:**
   - Adult foster care large group home
   - Bed and breakfast establishment
   - Day care facility, group
   - Funeral home
   - Home occupation
   - Kennel
   - Multiple-family dwelling
   - Parks and recreational facilities for day use
   - Planned unit development (PUD)
   - Two-family dwelling
   - Wind turbine
   - Wireless communication facility, concealed or stealth antennas only

D. **Accessory Uses Permitted:** Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as a garage, shed for yard tools, playhouse, facilities for household pets, boathouse, swimming pools, woodshed, or sauna are permitted. Boathouses and other shoreline uses may be regulated or prohibited by other agencies, including but not limited to, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality.

R-2 Residential Two District
A. **Intent:** The R-2 Residential Two District is established and maintained for medium-density residential and related uses in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended.

B. **Permitted Principal Uses:**
   - Adult foster care family home
   - Adult foster care small group home
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• Day care facility, family
• Elementary or secondary school
• Foster family home
• Home occupation in a single family residence for instruction in crafts or fine arts
• Libraries and other public building
• Religious institution
• Single-family dwelling

C. Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:
• Adult foster care large group home
• Bed and breakfast establishment
• Day care facility, group
• Foster family group home
• Funeral home
• Home occupation
• Kennel
• Multiple-family dwelling
• Nursing home, assisted living facility or similar use
• Parks and recreational facility for day use
• Planned unit development (PUD)
• Two family dwelling
• Wind turbine
• Wireless communication facility, concealed or stealth antennas only

D. Accessory Uses Permitted: Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as a garage, shed for yard tools, playhouse, facilities for household pets, boathouse, swimming pools, woodshed, or sauna are permitted. Boathouses and other shoreline uses may be regulated or prohibited by other agencies, including but not limited to, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality.

R-3-Residential Three District
A. To establish and preserve neighborhoods for single family dwellings, two-family dwellings, multiple family dwellings and mobile homes in an appropriate, safe, sanitary and attractive environment.

B. Permitted Principal Uses:
• Adult foster care family home
• Adult foster care small group home
• Churches
• Detached single-family dwelling
• Foster family home
• Family day care home
• Home occupation in a single family residence for instruction in craft or fine arts
• Multiple-family dwellings
• Mobile homes on individual lots
• Mobile home parks
• Two-family dwelling

C. Conditional Uses:
• Adult foster care large group home
• Foster family group home
• Group day care home
• Home occupations
• Planned unit development (PUD)

D. Accessory Uses Permitted: Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as a garage, shed for yard tools, playhouse, pens, boathouses, swimming pools, woodshed, or sauna are permitted. Boathouses and other shoreline uses may be regulated or prohibited by other agencies, including but not limited to, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality. Accessory structures clearly incidental to the agricultural activity permitted on the site, to include roadside sales, are also permitted.

**RR-Rural Residential District**

A. Intent: The RR Rural Residential District is established and maintained to provide a low-density residential environment in accessible rural areas. Uses in this district will normally not be served by municipal water and wastewater services.

B. Permitted Principal Uses:
• Adult foster care small group home
• Adult foster care family home
• Agriculture production
• Cemetery
• Day care facility, family
• Foster family home
• Home occupation in a single family residence for instruction in craft or fine arts
• Keeping of livestock and poultry, on parcels at least five acres in size, and not to exceed one animal unit for the first five acres plus one animal unit per acre over five.
• Mobile homes on individual lots
• Mobile home parks
• Religious institution
• Single-family dwelling
• The growing and harvesting of timber

C. **Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:**
• Adult foster care large group home
• Bed and breakfast establishment
• Campground, RV park, stables and other similar recreational uses
• Day care facility, group
• Foster family group home
• Greenhouse or nursery, implement sales and service, etc.
• Gravel pit, sand and topsoil excavation
• Home occupation
• Kennel
• Kennel, commercial
• Planned unit developments (PUD)
• Private club and lodge hall
• Two-family dwelling
• Wind turbine
• Wireless communication facility, concealed or stealth antennas only
• Veterinary services, when located and designed so as not to reasonably interfere with, degrade or decrease the enjoyment of existing uses of nearby land

D. **Accessory Uses Permitted:** Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as a garage, shed for yard tools, playhouse, pens, boathouses, swimming pools, woodshed, or sauna are permitted. Boathouses and other shoreline uses may be regulated or prohibited by other agencies, including but not limited to, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality. Accessory structures clearly incidental to the agricultural activity permitted on the site, to include roadside sales, are also permitted.

**RP-Resource Production District**
A. **Intent:** The RP Resource Production District is established and maintained for low intensity use of those areas which, because of their location, physical characteristics and current use are suitable for agricultural, forestry and recreational uses. Uses in this district will normally not be served by municipal water and wastewater services.

B. **Permitted Principal Uses:**
• Farm, livestock
• Farm, poultry
• Growing and harvesting of timber
• Home occupation in a single family residence for instruction in craft or fine arts
• Single family dwelling
• Timber production

C. **Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:**
• Adult foster care small group home
• Asphalt plant
• Campground or RV park
• Day care facility, family
• Greenhouse or nursery, implement sales and service, etc.
• Home occupation
• Kennel
• Kennel, commercial
• Light manufacturing
• Mining operations, gravel pits, quarries, sand pits and top soil excavation
• Planned unit development (PUD)
• Sales or service establishments which are related to agricultural, forestry and recreational uses, including but not limited to small-scale wood products
• Wind turbine
• Wireless communication facility

D. **Accessory Uses Permitted:** Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as a private garage, shed for yard tools, playhouse, pens, boathouses, swimming pools, woodshed, or sauna are permitted. Boathouses and other shoreline uses may be regulated or prohibited by other agencies, including but not limited to, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality. Accessory structures clearly incidental to the agricultural activity permitted on the site, to include roadside sales, are also permitted.

**B-1-Essential Business District**

A. **Intent:** The B-1 Essential Business District is established and maintained for business uses within the Central Business District, in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, and where small lots, zero lot line development and minimal or no side setbacks are common.

B. **Permitted Principal Uses:**
• Business, professional or trade school
• Dwelling unit in the upper floors of commercial establishment provided that such dwelling unit have a separate entrance.
• Financial institution
• Laundromat
• Medical offices, including clinic
• Off-street parking lot
• Outdoor retail sale of merchandise when associated with a permitted use in this district.
• Personal service establishments, such as barber or beauty shops, health and fitness facilities, etc.
• Professional office building
• Religious institution
• Restaurant and tavern not having drive-through service
• Retail store
• Service business, such as photo studio, shoe repair, etc.
• Theater, concert hall, art gallery, museum, or similar place of assembly

C. Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:
• Automobile repair establishment
• Bowling alley, indoor archery range, indoor skating rink, or similar form of indoor recreation
• Day care facility, group
• Funeral home
• Outdoor retail sale of merchandise when associated with a permitted use in this district
• Publicly-owned building, publicly-owned or regulated utility buildings and facility
• Sales and showroom for new and/or used motor vehicles, recreational vehicles, boats, etc.

D. Accessory Uses Permitted: Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as any structural or mechanical building or use customarily incidental to the permitted principal use, and signs subject to the regulations established in Article X Signs are permitted.

**B-2-Central Business District**

A. Intent: The B-2 Central Business District is established and maintained for business uses within the Central Business District, in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, and where small lots, zero lot line development and minimal or no side setbacks are common.

B. Permitted Principal Uses:
• Business, professional or trade school
• Dwelling unit in the upper floors of commercial establishment, provided that such dwelling unit have a separate entrance and separate off-street parking in addition to the entrance and parking required for the commercial use
• Financial institution
• Laundromat
• Medical offices, including clinic
• Off-street parking lot
• Outdoor retail sale of merchandise when associated with a permitted use in this district
• Personal service establishments, such as barber or beauty shops, health and fitness facilities, etc.
• Professional office building
• Publicly owned building, publicly owned or regulated utility buildings and facility
• Religious institution
• Restaurant and tavern not having drive-through service
• Retail store
• Service business, such as photo studio, shoe repair, etc.
• Theater, concert hall, art gallery, museum, or similar place of assembly

C. Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:
• Automobile repair establishment.
• Bowling alley, indoor archery range, indoor skating rink, or similar form of indoor recreation.
• Restaurant with drive-through
• Sales and showroom for new and/or used motor vehicles, recreational vehicles, boats, etc.

D. Accessory Uses Permitted: Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as any structural or mechanical building or use customarily incidental to the permitted principal use, and signs subject to the regulations established in Article X Signs are permitted.

B-3-General Business District
A Intent: The B-3 General Business District is established and maintained for diverse business uses outside the Central Business District, in those areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended. This district provides for business development at a low density.
B. Permitted Principal Uses:
- Automobile repair establishment
- Business, professional or trade school
- Financial institution
- Greenhouses, florists, and plant material sale
- Laundromat
- Long term care facilities, such as hospital, convalescent or nursing home
- Medical office, including clinic
- Off-street parking lot
- Outdoor retail sale of merchandise when associated with a permitted use in this district
- Personal service establishment, such as barber or beauty shop, health and fitness facility
- Plumber, decorator, electricians, etc. showroom and office
- Private club, fraternal organization and lodge hall
- Professional office building
- Religious institution
- Restaurant and tavern not having drive-through service
- Retail store
- Sales of mobile homes, campers, recreational vehicles, boats, and monuments
- Service business, such as photo studio, shoe repair, etc.
- Theater, concert hall, art gallery, museum, or similar place of assembly

C. Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:
- Accessory use(s) incidental and subordinate to a principal use permitted under this Ordinance
- Amusement park and similar outdoor recreational facility
- Bottling works and food packaging
- Bowling alley, indoor archery range, indoor skating rink, or similar forms of indoor recreation
- Car wash
- Convenience mart on lots of 10,000 square feet or greater
- Dwelling unit in the upper floors of commercial establishment, provided that such dwelling unit have a separate entrance and separate off-street parking in addition to the entrance and parking required for the commercial use
- Funeral home
- Gasoline service station on lots of 10,000 square feet or greater
- Gravel pit
- Hotel and motel
• Publicly-owned building, publicly-owned or regulated utility buildings and facility
• Planned unit development
• Restaurant with drive-through
• Sales and showrooms for new and/or used motor vehicles, recreational vehicles, boats, etc. repair establishment
• Shopping center/mini mall
• Veterinary hospital or animal clinic, provided that all activities are conducted within a completely enclosed building
• Wholesale and warehousing, locker plant, mini-storage warehouse

D. Accessory Uses Permitted: Structural or mechanical building normally associated with permitted uses and signs subject to the regulations established in Article X Signs are permitted.

I-Industrial District
A. Intent: The I, Industrial District is established and maintained for industrial uses and to make provision for certain kinds of commercial uses which are most appropriately located as neighbors of industrial uses, in areas which are served by municipal water and sewer, or where such service could be easily extended. Uses in the I-1 District generally do not produce noise, odors, light, smoke or other impacts which extend beyond the boundary of the district.

B. Permitted Principal Uses:
• Automobile repair garage
• Automobile parts and tire sales
• Automobile sales and rental
• Bottling works and food packaging
• Building materials sales and storage
• Commercial printing and publishing
• Construction and farm equipment sales
• Contractors yards and shops
• Drop forging, punching and plating operation
• Forest industries
• Freight handling facility
• Jobbing and machine shop
• Laundry and cleaning/dyeing plants
• Lumber and coal yards, and storage of similar materials
• Manufacturing and assembly
• Public utility building
• Research and development establishment
• Retail warehouse outlet
• Warehouse, self storage
• Wholesale and warehousing

C. Conditional Uses Authorized by Permit:
• Extractive processing
• Food processing establishment
• Gravel or rock crusher
• Junk yards, including baling and disposal of scrap materials or salvage yards
• Painting, varnishing and undercoating shop
• Planned unit development
• Recycling collection center
• Reduction, conversion, and disposal of waste goods and materials
• Sexually oriented business
• Slaughterhouse
• Storage of flammable liquids
• Trade and technical school
• Truck stop
• Truck terminal
• Utility substation
• Wireless communication facility
• Wind turbine

D. Accessory Uses Permitted: Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as any structural or mechanical building or use customarily incidental to the permitted principal use, and signs subject to the regulations established in Article X Signs are permitted.

**PL-Public Land District**
A. Intent: To establish and preserve areas for certain public purposes. Provisions are made to allow for certain types of commercial or nonprofit use within the area.

B. Permitted Principal Uses:
• Community agriculture/flower garden
• Governmental or proprietary function conducted by any governmental agency or publicly-owned corporation which is authorized to conduct such function, except such uses as constitute a nuisance in the place where conducted. Including, but not limited to, schools, parks, and utility buildings, facilities, or equipment
• Recreational uses: community playgrounds, picnic areas, passive park, swimming beach, non-motorized trails.
C. **Conditional uses Authorized by Permit:**
   - Cultural/ conference facility
   - Museum
   - Nature center
   - Recreational uses: archery range (outdoor), campground, cross-country ski-trail, fields (soccer, hockey, baseball, football), fishing pier, ice rink, indoor recreation (handball, badminton, tennis, archery, golf, bowling, ice skating), mini-golf, track (ORV, bicycle, BMX, motor cross, go-carts, snowmobile, car, midget racing)
   - Temporary outdoor activity

D. **Accessory Uses Permitted:** Accessory uses and structures normally associated with permitted uses, such as any structural or mechanical building or use customarily incidental to the permitted principal use, and signs subject to the regulations established in Article X Signs are permitted.

**AP-Agriculture Production District**

A. **Intent:** To insure that land areas which are uniquely suited for agricultural production are retained for that use, unimpeded by the establishment of incompatible uses of land which would hinder agricultural practices and irretrievably deplete essential agricultural lands and productivity.

B. **Permitted Principal Uses:**
   - Agricultural production including the raising or growing of forages and sod crops; grains and feed crops; dairy and dairy products; livestock, including breeding and grazing; fruits; plants, trees, shrubs, and nursery stock; vegetables; and other similar agricultural uses except feedlots, poultry farms, and fur farms
   - Single and two-family dwelling and mobile homes.
   - Roadside stands for the sale of a farm product
   - Rendering, slaughtering, and dressing only of animals raised on the premises
   - Uses or structures customarily incidental to the operation of a farm and permitted dwellings
   - Home occupation in a single family residence for instruction in craft or fine arts
   - Adult foster care family home
   - Adult foster care small group home
   - Foster family home
   - Family day care home
C. **Conditional Uses:**
- Feedlots, poultry farms, fur farms, gravel or sand pits, provided that no such operations shall be established within one-quarter mile of any existing residence not on the premises.
- Home occupations.
- Sale and service of farm machinery; storage and sale of seed, feed, fertilizer, and other products essential to agricultural production; facilities used for the centralized bulk collection, storage, and distribution of agricultural products to wholesale and retail markets; and facilities used to provide veterinarian services for livestock, on lots fronting on and with principal driveway access to a paved street at least 20 feet in width, and so located and designed so as not to interfere with, degrade, or decrease the existing uses of nearby land.
- Adult foster care large group home.
- Foster family group home.
- Group day care home.

**TP-Timber Production District**

A. **Intent:** To maintain for timber production purposes those lands which because of their soil, drainage, and other characteristics, are especially productive timber lands.

B. **Permitted Principal Uses:**
- The growing and harvesting of timber
- Detached single family dwelling
- Home occupation in a single family residence for instruction in craft or fine arts

C. **Conditional Uses:**
- Home occupations

**Overlay Zoning Districts**

A. The overlay districts are intended to apply in combination with the underlying base district to impose regulations and standards that address special geographic areas or land use issues.

B. In the event of conflict between overlay district regulations and the regulations of the underlying (base) district, the overlay district regulations govern. In all other cases, both the overlay district and base district regulations apply.
C. Overlay districts are established in accordance with the Zoning Map Amendment procedures, Amendments to Text of Ordinance or District Map.

D. The following overlay districts are included in this Ordinance:

- WP-O Wellhead Protection Overlay
- HC-O Highway Commercial Overlay

**WP-O-Wellhead Protection Overlay**
A. **Intent**: The intent of the Wellhead Protection Overlay District is to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of persons served by the Norway Area Public Water Supply System by protecting groundwater that serves as drinking water, thus providing a safe potable water supply now and for future generations.

**HC-O-Highway Commercial Overlay**
A. **Intent**: The intent of the Commercial Overlay District is to preserve existing commercial areas along the US-2 corridor.

### 11.4 Sensitive Areas

The designated Wellhead Protection areas should be protected in order to maintain safe groundwater for residents. A wellhead protection program (WHPP) was completed for the City of Norway in 2004. The WHPP was developed to aid the City in providing the best and most manageable program to protect the quality of the Type I potable groundwater supply. A Wellhead Protection Overlay Zone could be established in the Zoning Ordinance with the intent to safeguard the health, safety, and welfare of persons served by the Norway Area Public Water Supply System by protecting groundwater that serves as drinking water, thus providing a safe potable water supply now and for future generations.

North of the railroad tracks in the City is another sensitive area. The land is soft and murky, basically swamp-like. The land has also been mined underneath in the past. Development of these areas should be limited, if developed at all.

The Norway Myr is a 23 acre conservation park developed in 2007 through a US Department of Agriculture Wetland Mitigation Program. The top priority for this park is to develop a parking lot and outdoor educational area for the residents and school groups for field trips. An additional trail extension is required to connect the parking lot with the 23 acre Myr.
11.5 Commercial Development
As discussed in Chapter 5-Land Use, the majority of commercial development in the City is concentrated along US-2 from Belgiumtown Road eastward to Section Street. The greatest amount of commercial development along US-2 has occurred to the west of the City limits. Besides the business advantages of locating along the high traffic volume corridor, the availability of large land parcels that meet access and parking requirements increases the desirability to locate here. There has been a small amount of commercial development in the Township along the US-2 corridor, limited to the area between Loretto and Vulcan. There are no local stores within the Township.

The central business district in the City is located on Main Street and extends east to Norway Street and west to Iron Street. Attracting businesses to locate in the downtown area in the City is a necessity. There are several buildings available for commercial use.

Commercial development within the Norway Area is likely to continue to occur along established commercial corridors, such as US-2, moving west toward Breitung Township and Iron Mountain as well as in downtown Norway. As development along the highway continues, consulting the adopted Access Management standards will be essential to provide for safe development and access, as well as adequate parking.

The Norway Area plans on establishing a Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) as a conditional use in compatible districts. PUDs are a flexible zoning technique that allows a land developer much more creativity in how land is used without sacrificing public concerns for compatibility with adjacent units of land and often with greater protection of significant environmental features. PUD is a special type of floating overlay district which generally does not appear on the municipal zoning map until a designation is requested. This is applied at the time a project is approved and may include provisions to encourage clustering of buildings, designation of common open space, and incorporation of a variety of building types and mixed land uses. A PUD is planned and built as a unit thus fixing the type and location of uses and buildings over the entire project.

11.6 Industrial Development
Industrial development in the Norway Area is expected to occur in areas currently zoned as industrial. The 180-acre Norway-Vulcan Industrial Park fronts US-2 in Norway Township. City water, three phase power and natural gas are available. Internet is available through private services. Municipal wastewater services do not extend to the site. There are parcels available for development in the park. The extension of sewer services to the industrial park could increase the potential for new businesses to locate in the Norway Area.

The City also has available land that is zoned industrial, including, land south along the Canadian National Railroad. Most of the City’s industrial land use is
found along and north of 9th Avenue, west of Norway Street. Businesses currently located in the area could possibly be expanded. Within the industrial district in the City, storm water improvements are needed and several of the roads need to be paved. Currently the route in and out of the industrial district along Railroad Avenue is being repaired to provide easier access.

11.7 Residential Development

Residential development within the City is concentrated in an area extending north just beyond the Wisconsin Central Railroad to the southern corporate limit east of Stephenson Street to the eastern extremities close to the US-2 corridor.

The City has land existing for new residential development out near the Oak Crest Golf Course. There is plenty of space available for larger lots and bigger homes. Expansion of sewer and water services may be necessary should substantial development occur.

Businesses in the downtown area could consider rehabilitating the upper levels of their buildings for apartments. Downtown living is becoming increasingly popular and may help generate business for the downtown as well.

There is potential for new residential development to occur in the Township along the west side of the Menominee River. The land is currently zoned industrial. A buffer zone would need to be added to serve as a barrier between prospective homes and any industrial uses.

New residential development is also likely to occur in the Township along County Road 573 and Lower Pine Creek Road. There is also potential development near Hanbury Lake.

11.8 Recreational Development

The City and the Township could consider forming a Joint Recreation Authority for the purchase, development and management of recreational facilities in the Norway Area. Like the Joint Planning Commission, the Joint Recreation Authority would be made up of members from the City and the Township.

The future recreational development in Norway Area will likely focus on the development and upgrade of parks and facilities that are currently owned by the City and the Township. The City has an updated recreation plan with a capital improvement schedule to follow. The Township’s plan is in need of an update. The Norway Area would like to improve miscellaneous parks to create larger recreational complexes centrally located in both the City and the Township.

Trail development is a priority in the Norway Area. The City would like to pursue a trail extension to connect the parking lot with the Norway Myr. The
City owns and operates a municipal golf course near its Marion Park. Plans have been developed to extend a walking trail from the park and golf course to the Piers Gorge Park located on the Menominee River. The Piers Gorge is a class 4 rapid and is the only such rapids in the Midwest. The trail would also provide a single trail connection from Piers Gorge into the City and to the Norway Myr. There are also miscellaneous trail extensions discussed in the non-motorized trail plan that would create a complete loop around the City and connecting with the Dickinson County Bike Path Plan. Michigan Department of Natural Resources Trust Fund grants and Michigan Department of Transportation Enhancement funding could be pursued for these projects.

11.9 Transportation and Utilities

Roads throughout the Norway Area are in need of upgrades. Both the City and the Township intend to continue with the PASER road rating process to assess the quality of roads in the community. Road improvement projects should be prioritized utilizing the PASER scale. When road improvement projects are possible, sidewalks in the City could be upgraded concurrently.

Water and sewer infrastructure and services are fundamental to the Norway Area’s ability to accommodate future growth and development. Growth can be managed somewhat through the strategic placement of such services. Municipal water and sewer could be extended out toward the golf course in the future, which may encourage residential development. Water and sewer could also be extended out in the Township toward the Industrial Park, toward Hamilton Lakes as well as along County Road 577. Water and sewer extensions are dependent on development and extensions should be made in a way to promote the orderly development of the Norway Area.

11.10 Alternative Energy

With increasing energy costs, there has been a growing interest in utilizing alternative energy resources. Regulations regarding alternative energy sources will continue to be reviewed by the City and the Township and incorporated into the zoning ordinance as appropriate.

The City has recently incorporated regulations regarding wind energy systems (WES) into their zoning ordinance. Should the City and Township pursue a joint zoning ordinance in the future, the regulations should be reviewed to ensure they fulfill the needs of both communities.

Solar energy systems hold great promise for the future energy needs of the Norway Area because they use a renewable energy resource; they require less capital, land, water and other resources needed for central-station generation of electricity; and because they do not pollute the community’s water and air; and the successful use of solar energy systems for such purposes as supplying space heating, water heating or the production of electricity is dependent upon sufficient access to direct sunlight. Regulations could be adopted promoting
the use of solar energy systems and protecting access to sunlight for solar
energy systems when in compliance with minimum lot requirements and
setbacks.

**11.11 Conclusion**
The City of Norway and Norway Township have been working cooperatively over
many years. The City and Township already share a common heritage,
cultural resources, natural resources, recreation opportunities, a school
system, ambulance service and some of the same infrastructure. The joint
plan can define a community-wide sense of place and character.

Planning is intended to guide the forces of change in ways that encourage
desirable outcomes while striking an appropriate balance with development
and preservation. Priorities will likely require periodic review and further study
as unforeseen circumstances bring about new challenges. The Planning
Commission will be responsible for the review of this plan every five years.
Patience, resolve and flexibility are necessary to achieve the goals set forth in
this plan. The Master Plan is one of the tools that the Norway Area can utilize
to encourage better land use decisions.
Norway Area Citizen Survey

The City of Norway and Norway Township are currently working on a Joint Master Plan for land use planning. Citizen input is an integral part of the Plan. Please complete the following questionnaire. Your responses are anonymous and will be reported in group form only. Please return your completed survey to City Hall or the Norway Township Hall. The survey may also be completed online at http://survey.uplogon.com/norway

Please circle one of the answers below.

1. I am a resident of:
   a. City of Norway
   b. Norway Township

2. How long have you lived and/or owned property in the Norway Area?
   a. Less than one year
   b. Between 1 and 5 years
   c. Between 5 and 10 years
   d. Between 10 and 20 years
   e. More than 20 years

3. Do you live in the Norway Area year round?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. What strategy would you prefer for growth management in the Norway Area?
   a. Growth encouraged
   b. Growth takes its own course
   c. Planned and limited growth
   d. Goal of no growth

1. Please check the box that comes closest to your opinion for each of the following questions:

   a. Overall how would you describe the quality of life in the Norway Area?
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   b. How would you rate the overall quality of your neighborhood?
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   c. How do you rate the Norway Area as a place to raise children?
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   d. How do you rate the Norway Area as a place to live?
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   e. How do you rate the Norway Area as a place to retire?
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know

2. Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to the Norway Area as a whole:

   a. Sense of community
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   b. Overall appearance of the Norway Area
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   c. Quality of the K-12 schools in the Norway Area
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   d. Opportunities to attend cultural activities
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   e. Opportunities for leisure-time activities
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   f. Shopping opportunities
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
   g. Recreation opportunities
      □ Excellent  □ Good  □ Fair  □ Poor  □ Don't know
h. Job opportunities
☐ Excellent    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor    ☐ Don’t know
i. Access to affordable housing
☐ Excellent    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor    ☐ Don’t know
j. Economic development
☐ Excellent    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor    ☐ Don’t know
k. Cable television
☐ Excellent    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor    ☐ Don’t know
l. Internet
☐ Excellent    ☐ Good    ☐ Fair    ☐ Poor    ☐ Don’t know

3. To what degree are the following problems in the Norway Area:
a. Loitering youth
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
b. Drugs
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
c. Taxes
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
d. Growth
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
e. Crime
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
f. Graffiti
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
g. Traffic
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
h. Run down homes and buildings
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know
i. Parking
☐ Not a problem    ☐ Minor problem    ☐ Important problem    ☐ Major problem    ☐ Extreme problem    ☐ Don’t know

4. Please rate the speed of growth in the following sections of the Norway Area over the past 5 years:
a. Population growth
☐ Much too slow    ☐ Somewhat too slow    ☐ Right amount    ☐ Somewhat too fast    ☐ Much too fast    ☐ Don’t know
b. Business/retail growth
☐ Much too slow    ☐ Somewhat too slow    ☐ Right amount    ☐ Somewhat too fast    ☐ Much too fast    ☐ Don’t know
c. Job growth
☐ Much too slow    ☐ Somewhat too slow    ☐ Right amount    ☐ Somewhat too fast    ☐ Much too fast    ☐ Don’t know

5. In the past 12 months about how many times, if ever, have you or any other household members done the following things?
a. Used public libraries or their services in the Norway Area?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
b. Used the recreation facilities in the Norway Area?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
c. Participated in a recreation program or activity?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
d. Visited a Norway Area park?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
e. Attended a City Commission, Township Board or other public meeting?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
f. Used the internet for anything?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
g. Used the internet to obtain information about the Norway Area?
☐ 0 or 1    ☐ Twice    ☐ 3 to 12 times    ☐ 13 to 25 times    ☐ 25+ times    ☐ Don’t know
h. Read a community newsletter?

- 0 or 1
- Twice
- 3 to 12 times
- 13 to 25 times
- 25+ times
- Don't know

6. Overall, how would you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Norway/Norway Township?

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

7. How do you rate the quality of each of the following Norway Area services?

a. Police department

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

b. Fire services

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

c. Ambulance services

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

d. Garbage collection

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

e. Recycling

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

f. Electric services

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

g. Water services

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

h. Recreation facilities

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

i. Recreation programs and classes

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

j. Park maintenance

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

k. Parks in general

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

l. Street maintenance

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

m. Cleanliness of streets

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

n. Sidewalk maintenance

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

o. Snow removal

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

p. Street lighting

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

q. Enforcement of traffic laws

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

r. Services to seniors

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

s. Water quality

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

t. Planning and zoning

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

u. Storm drainage

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

v. Services to youth

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

8. What was your impression of Norway Area employees in your most recent contact?

a. Knowledge

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

Appendix A-Page 3
b. Responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

c. Courtesy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. Overall impression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Please rate the following statements by checking the box that most closely represents your opinion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I receive good value for the City or Township taxes that I pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I am pleased with the overall direction that the Norway Area is taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I am well informed on major issues in the Norway Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The Norway Area welcomes citizen involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What do you feel will be the single most important issue facing the Norway Area over the next several years?

2. Please use the following space for comments, suggestions and solutions you would like the Norway Area to consider.
Norway Area Citizen Survey Results

1. **I am a resident of:**
   - 225 respondents
   - 78.2 percent live in the City
   - 21.8 percent live in the Township

2. **How long have you lived and/or owned property in the Norway Area?**
   - 218 respondents
   - 1.4 percent=Less than one year
   - 5.5 percent=Between 1 and 5 years
   - 7.0 percent=Between 5 and 10 years
   - 15.0 percent=Between 10 and 20 years
   - 71.1 percent=More than 20 years

3. **Do you live in the Norway Area year-round?**
   - 221 respondents
   - 99.5 percent=Yes
   - 0.5 percent=No

4. **What strategy would you prefer for growth management in the Norway Area?**
   - 215 respondents
   - 57.4 percent=Growth encouraged
   - 15.8 percent=Growth takes its own course
   - 25.1 percent=Planned and limited growth
   - 1.7 percent=Goal of no growth

1. **Please check the box that comes closest to your opinion for the following questions:**

   1a. Overall how would u describe the quality of life in the Norway Area?
   - 225 respondents
   - 25.2 percent=Excellent
   - 58.0 percent=Good
   - 13.3 percent=Fair
   - 3.5 percent=Poor
   - 0 percent=Don’t Know

   1b. How would you rate the overall quality of your neighborhood?
   - 225 respondents
   - 27.1 percent=Excellent
   - 50.2 percent=Good
1c. How do you rate the Norway Area as a place to raise children?
   - 225 respondents
   - 15.7 percent=Fair
   - 7.0 percent=Poor
   - 0 percent=Don’t Know

1d. How do you rate the Norway Area as a place to live?
   - 225 respondents
   - 36.6 percent=Excellent
   - 48.3 percent=Good
   - 8.6 percent=Fair
   - 2.2 percent=Poor
   - 4.3 percent=Don’t Know

1e. How do you rate the Norway Area as a place to retire?
   - 225 respondents
   - 27.4 percent=Excellent
   - 42.5 percent=Good
   - 19.0 percent=Fair
   - 8.0 percent=Poor
   - 3.1 percent=Don’t Know

2. Please rate each of the following characteristics as they relate to the Norway Area as a whole:

2a. Sense of community
   - 221 respondents
   - 16.7 percent=Excellent
   - 53.4 percent=Good
   - 25.3 percent=Fair
   - 4.1 percent=Poor
   - 0.5 percent=Don’t Know

2b. Overall appearance of the Norway Area
   - 221 respondents
   - 12.2 percent=Excellent
   - 61.1 percent=Good
   - 23.1 percent=Fair
   - 3.6 percent=Poor
2c. Quality of the K-12 Schools in the Norway Area
- 221 respondents
- 31.7 percent=Excellent
- 47.5 percent=Good
- 7.7 percent=Fair
- 2.3 percent=Poor
- 10.8 percent=Don’t Know

2d. Opportunities to attend cultural activities
- 221 respondents
- 6.7 percent=Excellent
- 36.0 percent=Good
- 30.7 percent=Fair
- 17.3 percent=Poor
- 9.3 percent=Don’t Know

2e. Opportunities for leisure-time activities
- 221 respondents
- 16.0 percent=Excellent
- 40.0 percent=Good
- 32.0 percent=Fair
- 6.7 percent=Poor
- 5.3 percent=Don’t Know

2f. Shopping opportunities
- 222 respondents
- 0 percent=Excellent
- 10.7 percent=Good
- 37.3 percent=Fair
- 52.0 percent=Poor
- 0 percent=Don’t Know

2g. Recreation opportunities
- 220 respondents
- 15.1 percent=Excellent
- 43.6 percent=Good
- 33.1 percent=Fair
- 3.6 percent=Poor
- 4.6 percent=Don’t Know

2h. Job opportunities
- 222 respondents
- 5.3 percent=Excellent
2i. Access to affordable housing
   • 220 respondents
   • 4.0 percent=Excellent
   • 48.2 percent=Good
   • 34.7 percent=Fair
   • 9.3 percent=Poor
   • 3.8 percent=Don’t Know

2j. Economic development
   • 218 respondents
   • 0 percent=Excellent
   • 18.7 percent=Good
   • 45.3 percent=Fair
   • 25.3 percent=Poor
   • 10.7 percent=Don’t Know

2k. Cable television
   • 217 respondents
   • 13.2 percent=Excellent
   • 54.9 percent=Good
   • 17.4 percent=Fair
   • 6.5 percent=Poor
   • 8.0 percent=Don’t Know

2l. Internet
   • 218 respondents
   • 13.2 percent=Excellent
   • 32.0 percent=Good
   • 17.3 percent=Fair
   • 2.7 percent=Poor
   • 34.8 percent=Don’t Know

3. **To what degree are the following problems in the Norway Area?**
3a. Loitering youth
   • 221 respondents
   • 32.2 percent=Not a problem
   • 35.7 percent=Minor problem
   • 17.2 percent=Important problem
   • 3.4 percent=Major problem
Norway Area Master Plan
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• 0 percent=Extreme problem
• 11.5 percent=Don’t know

3b. Drugs
• 218 respondents
• 4.1 percent=Not a problem
• 27.4 percent=Minor problem
• 41.1 percent=Important problem
• 11.0 percent=Major problem
• 12.3 percent=Extreme problem
• 4.1 percent=Don’t know

3c. Taxes
• 221 respondents
• 16.0 percent=Not a problem
• 23.0 percent=Minor problem
• 32.1 percent=Important problem
• 11.9 percent=Major problem
• 15.2 percent=Extreme problem
• 1.8 percent=Don’t know

3d. Growth
• 221 respondents
• 18.1 percent=Not a problem
• 24.9 percent=Minor problem
• 31.7 percent=Important problem
• 14.0 percent=Major problem
• 2.3 percent=Extreme problem
• 8.0 percent=Don’t know

3e. Crime
• 222 respondents
• 19.2 percent=Not a problem
• 49.5 percent=Minor problem
• 29.2 percent=Important problem
• 0.1 percent=Major problem
• 0.1 percent=Extreme problem
• 0.9 percent=Don’t know

3f. Graffiti
• 222 respondents
• 40.6 percent=Not a problem
• 43.6 percent=Minor problem
• 4.0 percent=Important problem
• 1.0 percent=Major problem
• 1.0 percent=Extreme problem
• 9.8 percent=Don’t know

3g. Traffic
• 219 respondents
• 44.6 percent=Not a problem
• 44.6 percent=Minor problem
• 6.8 percent=Important problem
• 4.0 percent=Major problem
• 0 percent=Extreme problem
• 0 percent=Don’t know

3h. Run down homes and buildings
• 222 respondents
• 10.9 percent=Not a problem
• 47.5 percent=Minor problem
• 21.8 percent=Important problem
• 6.9 percent=Major problem
• 11.9 percent=Extreme problem
• 1.0 percent=Don’t know

3i. Parking
• 221 respondents
• 44.1 percent=Not a problem
• 36.3 percent=Minor problem
• 13.7 percent=Important problem
• 2.0 percent=Major problem
• 2.9 percent=Extreme problem
• 1.0 percent=Don’t know

4. Please rate the speed of growth in the following sections of the Norway Area over the past 5 years:
4a. Population growth
• 224 respondents
• 17.7 Percent=Much too slow
• 20.7 Percent=Somewhat too slow
• 33.9 Percent=Right amount
• 8.0 Percent=Somewhat too fast
• 0 Percent=Much too fast
• 19.7 Percent=Don’t know

4b. Business/retail growth
• 224 respondents
58.7 Percent=Much too slow
33.3 Percent=Somewhat too slow
6.7 Percent=Right amount
0 Percent=Somewhat too fast
0 Percent=Much too fast
1.3 Percent=Don’t know

4c. Job growth
- 224 respondents
- 69.3 Percent=Much too slow
- 21.3 Percent=Somewhat too slow
- 2.7 Percent=Right amount
- 0 Percent=Somewhat too fast
- 0 Percent=Much too fast
- 6.7 Percent=Don’t know

5. In the past 12 months about how many times, if ever, have you or any other household members done the following things?

5a. Used public libraries or their services in the Norway Area?
- 220 respondents
- 39.5 Percent=0 or 1
- 9.5 Percent=Twice
- 25.0 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 11.8 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 11.8 Percent=25+ times
- 2.4 Percent=Don’t know

5b. Used the recreation facilities in the Norway Area?
- 216 respondents
- 25.9 Percent=0 or 1
- 5.6 Percent=Twice
- 4.1 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 29.2 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 32.4 Percent=25+ times
- 2.8 Percent=Don’t know

5c. Participated in a recreation program or activity?
- 214 respondents
- 53.3 Percent=0 or 1
- 5.1 Percent=Twice
- 14.6 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 5.1 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 14.0 Percent=25+ times
- 7.9 Percent=Don’t know
5d. Visited a Norway Area park?
- 211 respondents
- 15.6 Percent=0 or 1
- 15.2 Percent=Twice
- 37.0 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 13.3 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 16.1 Percent=25+ times
- 2.8 Percent=Don’t know

5e. Attended a City Commission, Township Board or other public meeting?
- 192 respondents
- 80.6 Percent=0 or 1
- 3.5 Percent=Twice
- 0.7 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 5.9 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 3.2 Percent=25+ times
- 6.1 Percent=Don’t know

5f. Used the internet for anything?
- 220 respondents
- 37.2 Percent=0 or 1
- 0 Percent=Twice
- 5.5 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 1.4 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 46.4 Percent=25+ times
- 9.5 Percent=Don’t know

5g. Used the internet to obtain information about the Norway Area?
- 218 respondents
- 53.7 Percent=0 or 1
- 9.6 Percent=Twice
- 17.0 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 8.7 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 7.8 Percent=25+ times
- 3.2 Percent=Don’t know

5h. Read a community newsletter?
- 217 respondents
- 17.7 Percent=0 or 1
- 14.3 Percent=Twice
- 47.0 Percent=3 to 12 times
- 3.7 Percent=13 to 25 times
- 14.7 Percent=25+ times
- 2.6 Percent=Don’t know
6. **Overall, how would you rate the quality of services provided by the City of Norway/Norway Township?**
   - 208 respondents
   - 24.5 Percent=Excellent
   - 47.1 Percent=Good
   - 17.8 Percent=Fair
   - 5.8 Percent=Poor
   - 4.8 Percent=Don’t know

7. **How do you rate the quality of each of the following Norway Area services?**

   7a. Police department
   - 218 respondents
   - 28.0 percent=Excellent
   - 49.7 percent=Good
   - 14.0 percent=Fair
   - 4.5 percent=Poor
   - 3.8 percent=Don’t Know

   7b. Fire services
   - 218 respondents
   - 42.0 percent=Excellent
   - 43.3 percent=Good
   - 5.1 percent=Fair
   - 0 percent=Poor
   - 9.6 percent=Don’t Know

   7c. Ambulance services
   - 217 respondents
   - 39.5 percent=Excellent
   - 39.9 percent=Good
   - 7.3 percent=Fair
   - 1.3 percent=Poor
   - 12.1 percent=Don’t Know

   7d. Garbage collection
   - 216 respondents
   - 49.6 percent=Excellent
   - 40.9 percent=Good
   - 7.6 percent=Fair
   - 1.9 percent=Poor
   - 0.6 percent=Don’t Know

    7e. Recycling
216 respondents
12.7 percent=Excellent
41.6 percent=Good
19.3 percent=Fair
10.6 percent=Poor
15.9 percent=Don’t Know

7f. Electric services
218 respondents
38.2 percent=Excellent
45.2 percent=Good
13.4 percent=Fair
2.9 percent=Poor
0.3 percent=Don’t Know

7g. Water services
215 respondents
37.6 percent=Excellent
45.9 percent=Good
9.6 percent=Fair
3.2 percent=Poor
3.7 percent=Don’t Know

7h. Recreation facilities
218 respondents
27.4 percent=Excellent
45.2 percent=Good
22.2 percent=Fair
3.8 percent=Poor
1.4 percent=Don’t Know

7i. Recreation programs and classes
214 respondents
27.4 percent=Excellent
34.4 percent=Good
18.5 percent=Fair
7.0 percent=Poor
12.7 percent=Don’t Know

7j. Park maintenance
218 respondents
18.5 percent=Excellent
54.0 percent=Good
18.5 percent=Fair
7k. Parks in general
- 216 respondents
- 17.2 percent=Excellent
- 63.7 percent=Good
- 14.6 percent=Fair
- 1.9 percent=Poor
- 2.6 percent=Don’t Know

7l. Street maintenance
- 219 respondents
- 11.5 percent=Excellent
- 40.8 percent=Good
- 20.4 percent=Fair
- 26.8 percent=Poor
- 0.5 percent=Don’t Know

7m. Cleanliness of streets
- 222 respondents
- 14.8 percent=Excellent
- 59.0 percent=Good
- 20.7 percent=Fair
- 5.0 percent=Poor
- 0.5 percent=Don’t Know

7n. Sidewalk maintenance
- 223 respondents
- 5.0 percent=Excellent
- 29.7 percent=Good
- 32.4 percent=Fair
- 29.3 percent=Poor
- 3.6 percent=Don’t Know

7o. Snow removal
- 224 respondents
- 26.0 percent=Excellent
- 54.3 percent=Good
- 12.1 percent=Fair
- 7.2 percent=Poor
- 0.4 percent=Don’t Know

7p. Street lighting
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- 224 respondents
- 16.5 percent=Excellent
- 53.6 percent=Good
- 20.1 percent=Fair
- 9.4 percent=Poor
- 0.4 percent=Don’t Know

7q. Enforcement of traffic laws
- 224 respondents
- 10.3 percent=Excellent
- 53.6 percent=Good
- 18.3 percent=Fair
- 8.9 percent=Poor
- 8.9 percent=Don’t Know

7r. Services to seniors
- 220 respondents
- 12.7 percent=Excellent
- 45.9 percent=Good
- 3.7 percent=Fair
- 5.5 percent=Poor
- 18.1 percent=Don’t Know

7s. Water quality
- 224 respondents
- 35.7 percent=Excellent
- 42.4 percent=Good
- 8.5 percent=Fair
- 2.2 percent=Poor
- 11.2 percent=Don’t Know

7t. Planning and zoning
- 216 respondents
- 6.1 percent=Excellent
- 40.7 percent=Good
- 19.0 percent=Fair
- 6.5 percent=Poor
- 27.7 percent=Don’t Know

7u. Storm drainage
- 221 respondents
- 7.2 percent=Excellent
- 42.2 percent=Good
- 24.0 percent=Fair
• 9.0 percent=Poor
• 17.6 percent=Don’t Know

7v. Services to youth
• 213 respondents
• 4.7 percent=Excellent
• 24.9 percent=Good
• 27.7 percent=Fair
• 18.3 percent=Poor
• 24.4 percent=Don’t Know

8. **What was your impression of Norway Area employees in your most recent contact?**

8a. Knowledge
• 222 respondents
• 26.6 percent=Excellent
• 49.5 percent=Good
• 14.8 percent=Fair
• 5.0 percent=Poor
• 4.1 percent=Don’t Know

8b. Responsiveness
• 220 respondents
• 29.5 percent=Excellent
• 45.5 percent=Good
• 15.0 percent=Fair
• 6.4 percent=Poor
• 3.6 percent=Don’t Know

8c. Courtesy
• 222 respondents
• 36.0 percent=Excellent
• 46.8 percent=Good
• 12.6 percent=Fair
• 2.3 percent=Poor
• 2.3 percent=Don’t Know

8d. Overall impression
• 218 respondents
• 28.0 percent=Excellent
• 50.9 percent=Good
• 13.3 percent=Fair
• 4.6 percent=Poor
• 3.2 percent=Don’t Know
9. **Please rate the following statements:**

9a. I receive good value for the City or Township taxes that I pay.
   - 216 respondents
   - 6.5 percent=Strongly Agree
   - 42.1 percent=Agree
   - 19.9 percent=Neither Agree or Disagree
   - 16.2 percent=Disagree
   - 9.7 percent=Strongly Disagree
   - 5.6 percent=Don’t Know

9b. I am pleased with the overall direction that the Norway Area is taking.
   - 220 respondents
   - 5.9 percent=Strongly Agree
   - 45.1 percent=Agree
   - 25.0 percent=Neither Agree or Disagree
   - 13.6 percent=Disagree
   - 5.9 percent=Strongly Disagree
   - 4.5 percent=Don’t Know

9c. I am well informed on major issues in the Norway Area.
   - 219 respondents
   - 6.4 percent=Strongly Agree
   - 47.5 percent=Agree
   - 25.1 percent=Neither Agree or Disagree
   - 12.5 percent=Disagree
   - 1.2 percent=Strongly Disagree
   - 7.3 percent=Don’t Know

9d. The Norway Area welcomes citizen involvement.
   - 218 respondents
   - 10.1 percent=Strongly Agree
   - 42.7 percent=Agree
   - 26.1 percent=Neither Agree or Disagree
   - 5.5 percent=Disagree
   - 4.1 percent=Strongly Disagree
   - 11.5 percent=Don’t Know
Norway Area Survey Open Ended Survey Questions

1. What do you feel will be the single most important issue facing the Norway Area over the next several years?
   - Not incurring any more debt and paying of current debt
   - Streets fixed
   - Restoring life and shopping on Main Street
   - New businesses and help the ones that are left
   - Maintaining services w/o increasing taxes
   - Economy
   - Depression, people not being able to pay their bills
   - Not able to afford my bills
   - Making Norway a desirable place to live even if people are not employed in Norway—we have a lot to offer
   - Police force
   - Taxes
   - Jobs
   - Power plant
   - Street repair and sidewalk repair
   - New business
   - Budget
   - Improve sidewalks and continue to upgrade and resurface the streets
   - Bring in business
   - Conditions of roads
   - Maintaining/improving employment opportunities
   - Economic growth
   - Employment
   - Complete road repairs
   - Lack of good employment
   - Taxes
   - Bring in business for jobs
   - Road maintenance and jobs
   - Need well paying jobs, industry, innovation
   - Employment
   - Jobs
   - Industrial growth, increase tax base and jobs
   - Jobs and dealing with retirement age care facilities
   - Public transportation
   - Electric upgrades and maintenance
   - Our budget
   - Employment opportunities
   - High property taxes
   - Taking care of the people in this area now over those coming in
   - Economic development
• Drug abuse
• Growth
• Jobs
• Fix streets and sidewalks
• Streets
• Maintain budget and improve downtown
• Get more businesses downtown
• Township governance
• Power and water issues
• Jobs
• Roads and street replacements
• Jobs
• Street improvements
• Keeping costs down
• Economic growth
• Infrastructure updating
• Keeping costs down
• Too much money put in the City and not the Township
• Not enough police protection or patrol in the Township
• New businesses
• Population declines
• Employment
• Employment
• Side street repairs
• Reducing taxes and utility bills (less government)
• Encourage people to plant gardens and raise animals
• Jobs
• Being able to pay Norway’s increasing budget demands w/o raising taxes and cost of services
• Cost of sewer and water
• Jobs
• Replacing streets
• Street improvements
• New businesses
• Taxes
• Controlling speed on US-8 near the walking trail
• Hydro plant power production
• Power lines need to be rebuilt and upgraded
• Rising taxes and declining employment
• Business growth
• Streets
• More businesses
• Budget shortfalls and keeping the services affordable
• Jobs and taxes
• Water and sewer charges are outrageous
• Streets
• Creating jobs
• Continued community involvement in summer activities
• Taxes
• Fixing the streets
• Sidewalk upkeep
• Garbage in Norway Township left w/o weekly pickup
• No jobs
• No place to shop
• Job growth
• Tax base retention
• Cost containment on benefits
• Moral decline
• To upgrade streets and services
• Employment
• Cost of living
• Taxes
• Unemployment
• Population decrease due to lack of adequate employment opportunities
• More jobs for the people of Norway
• Money and grants
• Finish the roads, dam and electric projects that have been started
• Employment
• Economy and jobs
• Employment
• Money or lack of
• Very high property tax
• Spending too much money
• Taxes too high
• Slum landlords taking over the City
• Police budget
• Economic growth
• Roads
• Maintaining and promoting our downtown areas
• Current economic problems
• Downtown businesses
• Keeping current businesses open
• Job growth
• Encourage new retail and manufacturing
• Develop alternate sources of energy
• Budget items
• Keeping taxes down
• Street repairs
• Repairing streets
• Economic growth
• Employment opportunities
• Drawing new employment and keeping current employment
• Jobs
• Loss of young in the area
• Jobs
• Stores
• Job opportunities
• Growth/New businesses—there are no new businesses and no taxes to pay for the extra services we need
• Loss of jobs
• Tax revenues lost with businesses moving out of the area
• Do not get involved with the City on zoning
• Growth too much for our size of community and zoning out rural and farming areas for homes making it harder for people who want to be self-sustaining with small farms and gardens and animals (for what tax base)
• Street repair
• Compromise
• Employment
• Jobs and growth
• Jobs
• Lowering City bill and taxes
• Road improvements
• Water and sewer upgrades
• Losing the “small-hometown” feel to expansion
• Fix sidewalks instead of walking trails
• Jobs/economy
• Encouraging small businesses to locate here
• Reasonable housing prices
• Property taxes
• Blight—run down houses and unlicensed automobiles
• Norway is a small town and there is nothing wrong with that, biggest problem is trying to be something we’re not (a big city or putting us on the map)
• Keeping taxes at the level they are
• Putting jobs first for all ages
• Lower taxes
• More jobs
• Less police
• Downtown business
• Curb unnecessary spending
• Taxes and road repair
• Building up our youth
• Create jobs
• Lower taxes on senior citizens
• Getting and retaining new small industries
• Filling empty buildings on Main Street
• Keep our youth here with jobs
• Utility rates keep going up
• Taxes are too high
• Diligent use of financial resources
• Rising cost of all services and the property taxes
• Road and street maintenance
• Jobs
• Upkeep of houses/property
• Business development
• Plan to attract customers for Main Street businesses
• Jobs
• Businesses-clothing stores
• Getting the streets done
• Taxes and jobs
• Jobs
• Jobs
• Money, population drop, shopping
• Jobs
• Roads and streets
• Cost of living in Norway is highest in the areas, utilities and taxes continue to rise
• Need to draw more businesses
• Enhance viability of downtown
• Drugs and our youth-involving them in constructive activities
• Sidewalks
• Jobs
• Keeping up with technology as the city grows-many elderly do not like change
• Money management and debt
• Lack of business and employment
• Streets are horrible and falling apart
• Road repair
• Taxes and spending money-there is no end
• Council spending
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• Taxes, taxes and more taxes
• Jobs
• High tax rate
• Taxes
• Decreasing population coupled with working prospects equals less taxpayers to support Norway’s aggressive growth plans
• Jobs
• Business and job growth
• City work crews
• Growth
• Street maintenance-extremely unsafe
• Raising property taxes, city utilities
• Need to attract more businesses to keep our young people here
• Need to be more proactive in filling our empty buildings on Main Street-but it’s good to see our store fronts getting a makeover

2. Comments:
• Groom the ski trails-put a groomed trail at Oakcrest Golf Course
• Blacktop the bike trail behind Dairy Queen so it makes a loop
• Consider signage on roadways to designate bike path connectors
• Keep police force and fire
• Would like to see improvements in thinks like residents parking vehicles, RV’s, ATV’s, etc. on the parkways in front yards and over public sidewalks
• Keeping sidewalks clear for pedestrians-especially schoolchildren during winter
• Do more to support local businesses with growth, may lead to other upstarts
• Develop and utilize our natural beauty, including trail system
• Better curbside recycling program
• Establish a “utility bundle”
• Encourage commercial building by “phasing in” property taxes
• Street repairs
• I miss Main Street at Christmas (w/decorations)
• I appreciate you taking the time to survey and compile results, please publish or follow up w/letters
• We have no sidewalks, fire hydrants, water or sewer yet we pay big money for taxes. I feel that since we lack services that taxes pay for we should get a discount in our rate.
• Cable TV in the Township
• Our power bills are much too high for only having power
• No garbage pickup, no TV or internet available
• Enforce no parking laws
• Taxes continue to rise with no explanation or added benefit that we can see, yet housing costs have dropped
• In the Township we see very little service for our tax $$, what recourse do we have?
• Need to crackdown on parties being held, minors drinking
• Zoning and construction codes are way too broad and not well thought out
• We need to look at the big picture, do we want sprawling growth, homes, businesses or do we want what so many people come back here to live-b/c of the small town safeness, friendly area that we’ve had and were known for. It seems like our Twp representatives are more concerned about taxes and growth than what the Norway Area was all about
• Improve electric lines in the Township
• Offer cable TV and internet to Township residents
• More youth programs and services
• Free or much more affordable TB for all
• Many flags need to be replaced-the one by the spring
• Eliminate police and garbage departments
• Sell the golf course
• Roads
• Norway hill area needs street improvements as much as downtown
• To fix roads, streets, sewer, water thru Obama’s shovel ready projects
• Too much wasted time and money by city employees and summer help
• Cable TV realignment and cost not good, will definitely switch to satellite
• We are very much against the way the TV channels are being rearranged
• Construct a better tennis court
• Less sports on TV
• Keeping the fair going
• Speeding
• Parking on sidewalks
• Utility rates
• If rates and taxes keep going up people will move out or not move in
• Communicate! Communicate! Channel 7 a great vehicle
• For the amount in taxes I pay I am not getting my money’s worth by any stretch of the imagination
• Start taking better care of the golf course, members shouldn’t get to have houses out there
• Support our golf course
• Support our ski hill
• Support our trails and nature’s opportunities
• Attract tourism
• Design a brochure to advertise our area and tourism attractions
• Keep considering green alternatives
• Enhance, consolidate, complete curb side recycling
• Business doing software industry or assembly plant for solar/wind parts-wiring subassemblies
• I don’t like your plans for cable TV, taking too much away from basic cable leaving nothing to watch. Some people cannot afford extended cable
• Freeze property taxes
• Norway Township needs to fix sidewalks and roads, they also need garbage service at a reasonable rate and recycling
• TV, I’m considering a dish
• Cable TV on Warner Lane
• Welcome committee for new members of the community
• Occasional town meeting
• Continue building relationship w/Norway Township
• Consider partnerships with developers as appropriate
• Thank you for all your hard work
• Make affordable businesses on the main street-a resale store, a small department store so you don’t have to go to Iron Mnt.
• Fill the empty buildings on Main Street
• The new store fronts are looking good, continue with this
• Continued upgrade of Main Street-buildings, flower boxes/baskets, park at US-2/Main Street needs care, remove dead trees
• Faster pace of street renovation/repair
• Encourage growth, lower taxes
• No additional low income housing
• No additional half-way units
• Cable is getting to be too expensive
• I think you people in public offices are doing quite well-keep up the good work
• Don’t change the cable structure
• Put 3rd Ward on priority not counting on “Vision” especially for our streets
• Expanding to more TV programs
• Limited cultural experiences
• Need more living quarters for elderly
• Change back the channels that were in the basic cable package
• Norway Township should have the same cable bill as the City
• Charge too much for internet
• New management
• Why can’t you keep a middle cable plan for the same as it is now
• Cash lottery with City taking 40% of the profits
• My taxes
• Better supervision of recycling
• Get rid of abandoned cars in yards
• Create a skateboard park for kids
• Fix downtown sidewalks
• More businesses need to come in and help the unemployed
• People on corner lots should have 1/2 price on sidewalk repair
• The golf course is a major attraction for the city, council support is necessary until the clubhouse bonds are paid off
• Please address the weed situation on Main Street-need maintenance
• Consider purchasing more wreaths for the holiday season-more permanent white lighting on maples, etc.
• Noxious weed clean up on Main Street, including City Hall
• Good long term employment is a must for the Norway Area
• Cut down the dead trees on the boulevard
• Need more trails and connecting trails to other areas
• Improve roads
• Need business, industry and jobs
• Eliminate RV storage on boulevards and front yards (boats too)
• Drop garbage pick up charges when residents are out of town for extended periods
• Enforce speed limits on US-2 and jake braking
• We have a powerhouse that is costing more than it will ever be worth
• Definitely need an escalation in street and street infrastructure repairs
• Do more in winter on scraping roads and less salt
• Get more strict on loud autos
• The new TV/phone/internet package sounds excellent but the new basic package is terrible
• I would like to see improvements in the properties that are left vacant and run down
• I am proud to say that I live in Norway. I believe all departments are doing the best they can. Thank you to all of them!
• More stores (grocery) and another fast food restaurant
• We do not need more TV channels, this is a retirement community and the fee is high enough
• Norway is known as the City of Trails, when trying to take a walk one has to walk the streets b/c the sidewalks are in extremely bad condition and are not kept clean in the winter
• Please demolish old run down buildings
• Please remind trash collector to replace cover when empty
• Building on Hwy 8 as entering MI is an eye sore
• Enforce weekly garbage pickup
• Please control speeding coming in to Norway
• Aggressive pursuit of entrepreneurial and corporate expansion in heavy industry applications as well as infrastructure enhancements
• Pursue additional power generating capacity
• Availability of secondary education
• Consolidation of local government services
• Entertain partnerships w/other commercial entities to extract growth opportunities for the area
• Land value tax reform
• Hazardous waste collection and storage
• Combine S. Circle drive with City
• Why does the Twp pay more for cable and internet
• Sell the golf course and reap the taxes from the new owner and tear down old house, barns and garages
• Set a time table for completion of remodeling a home
• Stiff blight control, some years are out of hand
• Remove all box elder trees around Strawberry Lake, plant pine and spruce
• Taxes and television charges for seniors are high enough
• The golf course should offer a ½ year membership-10 time punch card, this would bring members back
• Create jobs and lower utility rates
• Don’t change the basic cable package
• More speeders need tickets, so do loud vehicle exhaust
• Make progress in getting people to clean up their yards
• No parking semi trucks in the City
• No semis and large trucks using City streets as thoroughfares
• Making recycling a bigger part of our society
• Repave east 7th Ave.
• You are doing a great job-continually improving, our neighboring communities could take a lesson from us
• Tax evaluations
• This past year I was blessed to see a very caring and responsible police department and I will be forever thankful for all your kindness
• Bring businesses
• Lower taxes
• More help for senior citizens
• Light Main Street
• US-2/Main Street is very dangerous
• City budget-employee costs are getting out of line
• Pay per view TV needs to be added
• Add PPV TV
• Sound and picture on Channel 7 is very poor sometimes during council meetings
• The extended cable has a lot of junk
• If you are a senior citizen the taxes are way too high
• Norway needs to be much more aggressive in building opportunities to invite industry—with incentives in the long term
• Need more youthful attractions and activities
• We need several new businesses so we don’t have to run to Iron Mnt. for many of our needs
• Update TV service
• I think overall the Norway Area is a very good place to live
• Leave the cable the way it is don’t need the junk channels, should be voted on by Norway citizens
• Get these kids that speed down Main Street
• Pave streets
• Create jobs, help bring in businesses
• Keep improving the alleys and roads
• Please go more quickly at getting the streets repaved
• Please start planting more trees thru the City
• It’s the beauty and appeal of a town to be tree-d
• Fill empty buildings on Main Street
• Replace Summit Road
• Hire more for City
• Hire more summer help for City, college students
• Kids are leaving area, lack of jobs
• The street department provides a great service
• The garbage at and around Strawberry Lake is terrible—non profit group to clean it up?
• The garbage from the Strawberry Lake apartments is overloaded and ends up in the woods
• Lower city spending
• Lower utility rates
• Keep streets clean regularly
• Poor senior citizen help, no tax relief
• Nothing for kids
• People will not volunteer or help if council keeps negative attitude-closed minded
• I love the band shell concerts
• The sledding hill is great as is the skating rink and warming shack, bike trails and ramps
• I wish the trail to Vulcan Lake would circle around back to town
• The parades are wonderful but the distance b/w floats is too large
• The Memorial Day ceremony is impressive
• The cemetery is well maintained
• Combine Norway/Norway Township as one governing body
• Either fix my cable or tell me it can’t be fixed so I can get a dish
• Norway is too expensive, for lack of services
• Would like to see programs to help senior and low income people with their City bills
• The City needs to be proactive in bringing in industry and more business
• Sell golf course
• Tree replacement program for boulevards
• Build skateboard park
• Bring business to downtown
• We are over policed, need a smaller department for this size community
• Get a better handle on spending
• People cannot afford high taxes in a town that doesn’t have much to offer (why not live in IM/Kingsford, closer to work and shopping)
• Waiting for the new phone/cable/internet package
• Promote cable TV-good plan in newsletter
• Concentrate on road repair
• Keeping taxes and utility costs down
• Eliminate debt, no frivolous spending
• More farmers market opportunities
• Possible incentives to bring business here
• Fix 3rd street road and move the mail boxes
• Thanks for asking, look forward to the feedback/report, it’s been a great community to live in
• Community service projects to keep young people busy during the summer-helping the elderly
• Lower taxes and utility bills
• We need a taxi or public bus company for senior citizens
• Extend cable and internet to more Township residents in outlying areas
• Improve rental properties both inside and out
• Designate an area for teens to gather, socialize, play music-preferably away from the downtown and residential districts
• Wages and benefits are very expensive
• Get rid of the TV in the City garage
• Not to increase walking trails, too expensive to maintain
• The retirement plans in city employee contracts will be unaffordable in the future, should start at 62 or 65
• In 10 years, taxes will double to pay retiree benefits
• Having a policy to encourage new businesses to come to Norway, offer a break (taxes/utilities) to help get it going
• Worry about the people more than the money
• Please tear down the old farmhouse no longer used-located on Highway 8 near the Piers, not a pretty site when entering Norway
• Better supervision for electric and DPW
• More citizens input
• Cheaper rents
• Citizens standing up for what they want
• Better rates, we are poor
• Cleaner sidewalks downtown on Main Street, very icy
• Do something to make use of the golf course more affordable
• Encourage Habitat for Humanity to purchase and remodel homes for sale in the community instead of building new
• More financial support and interest to the museum
• More people supporting the local businesses
• Recycling for Township
• Recycling cardboard, metal and wood
• Promoting Norway as a retirement community, 4 season (seniors pay the highest taxes and cost the least in services)
• Not excited about the new TV programming
• The walking trails are a welcome addition as well as the parks
• Better package for basic TV and golf course dues, especially for senior citizens
• The use of wind turbines to generate some of our power, along with solar power to generate power for our city buildings with an excess going on to the power grid
• Turn the rest area across from Northrest Furniture into an “information center” where people passing thru Norway can get information on places to eat, places to visit-Piers Gorge, Norway Mnt, parks, along w/a place where our local manufacturers or anyone can rent a spot on the wall to present an overview of their business—we need to sell ourselves as a community-use “Forward Financial” in Iron Mnt as an example (internet access, coffee, cookie, salad and sandwich, not big, just accessible)
# Norway Area – List of Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map 4-1</td>
<td>Bedrock Geology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 4-2</td>
<td>Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 4-3</td>
<td>Surface Topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 5-1</td>
<td>Orthophoto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 5-2</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 9-1</td>
<td>ACT-51 Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map 11-1</td>
<td>Future Land Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>