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1.1 Introduction

According to the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) State Long-Range Transportation Plan 2005-2030, non-motorized transportation is one key element to an integrated transportation system and MDOT is working to best incorporate non-motorized initiatives in future projects. To meet this objective, MDOT has coordinated a state-wide initiative partnering with local regional planning agencies to develop regional investment strategies for non-motorized travel that state and local officials can use when planning for future road construction or re-construction projects. In 2007 the MDOT provided funding to the three planning regions of the Upper Peninsula: the EUP Regional Planning and Development Commission (EUPRPDC), the Central UP Planning & Development Region (CUPPAD) and the Western UP Planning & Development Region (WUPPDR) to collaborate on the Superior Region Non-motorized Transportation Plan & Investment Strategy (Strategy).

The Strategy covers the 15 counties of Michigan’s Upper Peninsula including: Baraga, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw and Ontonagon in the Western Upper Peninsula; Alger, Delta, Dickinson, Marquette, Menominee and Schoolcraft in the Central Upper Peninsula and Chippewa, Luce and Mackinaw in the Eastern Upper Peninsula. The purpose of the Strategy is to identify non-motorized gaps and serve as a guidance tool that State and local agencies and groups can use to incorporate non-motorized facilities into their future planning and construction. The Strategy supports the goals and objectives of the people of Michigan’s Upper Peninsula but also coordinates with the neighboring regions in the northern Lower Peninsula and neighboring northern Wisconsin communities.

The Strategy is a living document that represents the current non-motorized transportation needs in the Superior Region and will need to be updated periodically as sections of roads and trails are built, other potential trail connections are established or the needs of the community change. Complimenting other statewide non-motorized efforts, the Strategy incorporates findings from Connecting Michigan-A Statewide Trailways Vision and Action Plan prepared by the DNR in collaboration with MDOT and Michigan Trails at the Crossroads: A Vision for Connecting Michigan developed by the Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance which addresses key issues of funding for trail acquisition, development and maintenance; tourism marketing and promotion; trail design and standards; connections and state interdepartmental cooperation.
1.2 Study Area

The study area includes the entire Upper Peninsula of Michigan with consideration for non-motorized connections into the State of Wisconsin, Lower Michigan and Canada. (See Map 1-1: MI Department of Transportation Superior Region and Upper Peninsula Planning Regions.) Most of the study region is rural containing one-third of the land area of Michigan (16,452 square miles) but just three percent of the population (308,319 persons as of 2008 Census Bureau estimates). The peninsula’s largest cities are Marquette, Escanaba, Sault Ste Marie, Menominee, Houghton, and Iron Mountain. It is bounded on the north by Lake Superior, on the east by St. Mary's River, on the south by Lake Michigan and Lake Huron, and on the west by Wisconsin. It has about 1,700 miles of continuous shoreline with the Great Lakes, about 4,300 inland lakes, the largest of which is Lake Gogebic, and 12,000 miles of streams. About one third of the peninsula is government owned recreational forest land, including the Ottawa National Forest and Hiawatha National Forest. The economy has been based on logging, mining and tourism.

By working within each of the planning regions, non-motorized connections have been reviewed by local partners and governments providing the best insight into local conditions and challenges. For the Strategy, the Upper Peninsula was reviewed by planning region as follows:

- **Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission (EUPRPDC)** covering the counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinaw;
- **Central UP Planning & Development Region (CUPPAD)** encompassing the counties of Alger, Delta, Dickinson, Marquette, Menominee and Schoolcraft;
- **Western Upper Peninsula Planning & Development Region (WUPPDR)** including the counties of Baraga, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw and Ontonagon

1.3 Facility Types

Non-motorized travel is fast becoming a choice for many people across the country as they are faced with high fuel prices and other environmental issues affecting the planet. Non-motorized facilities can be grouped in two general types: On-Road or Off-Road. According to the MDOT these two groups can be broken down into more specific types and/or uses:

- **On-road Bicycle facilities** can be marked and designated, or marked and undesignated, or simply unmarked. On-road facilities can be as simple as a wider then normal travel lane, or a wide paved shoulder. Narrow, striped lanes, specifically dedicated to bicycle use, are becoming more common on the roadway. However, the provision of dedicated left-turn lanes for bicyclists is still rare.
- **Sidewalks** are the most common pedestrian facility. They might be adjacent to the roadway, or separated from the travel lanes by green space, parking, or a utility and furniture zone. Most sidewalks are included as part of the street right-of-way.
- **Shared-use off-road paths** frequently follow green space, abandoned rail beds, or might be adjacent to natural features like rivers. Due to their separation from vehicular traffic, they provide a popular alternative means of travel for many types of users. Typical
users of hard surface paths include bicyclists, pedestrians, rollerbladers and wheelchairs. While typical users of unpaved/natural paths are mountain bikers, hikers and equestrians. In the Upper Peninsula, these same paths allow for cross country skiing and snowmobiling in the winter months when there is sufficient snow cover.

- **Side paths** are another type of shared-use off-road facility but are only appropriate in areas with minimal conflicts from driveway access and intersections. These off-road paths are typically designed for two-way traffic and are seldom part of the road infrastructure but often are built in proximity to major road networks.

### 1.4 Process and Community Participation

The planning process was started in each of the three planning regions with the development of Road and Trail Bicycling Guides beginning in 2005. These map guides were created to provide bicyclists knowledge of the road and trail conditions available in the Upper Peninsula. The Superior Region East, Superior Region Central and Superior Region West were just three of the many regions that created these guides across the State of Michigan. The maps indicate where wide shoulders are (4-foot or wider paved) and general traffic volumes of paved roads, trails and parks, state and federal lands, as well as places of interest. Map insets show the various communities within our region and where points of interests are located. There is also resource information on state parks and trails, tourism agencies, as well as biking and safety considerations. Using the map as a starting point, the next step in creating this Strategy was to evaluate routes and connectivity, followed by the identification of goals, objectives and implementation plans and methods.

As a first step in the planning process, each region developed a Biking and Trail Survey which asked a variety of questions pertaining to the biking and trail interests appropriate to their region. The EUPRP&DC distributed paper copies of the survey at 2008 Home/Spring Shows, to local groups, as well as to bike groups who were touring through the area. A web page was designed and developed for the project. The survey was made available on-line for downloading or to be completed on-line at the website [www.eup-planning.org](http://www.eup-planning.org). News releases were sent to local newspapers throughout the region to provide more information on the project and survey. In the Central region, a community survey was made available on the website [www.cuppad.org](http://www.cuppad.org) for downloading and also distributed at public meetings to identify public focus and needs. WUPPDR focused on existing needs by surveying the local communities to identify established facilities and recognized gaps in the region.

All three regions then researched and created a database of potentially interested agencies, units of government, individuals, and groups throughout the region. The database of stakeholders includes local officials from village, city, township, county, state and federal government, businesses and groups, as well as individuals. A Trail Summit was held in each region during September of 2008 where the stakeholders were invited to learn more about trail development, different options for non-motorized transportation facilities, projects other
groups are pursuing in neighboring areas, and the MDOT funding programs that are available to assist with trail development.

Staff then met with local communities and groups, recreation committees, government officials, road commissions, state and federal departments within the region to gather information on goals, objectives, desires, and wants. Research of recreation plans and transportation plans was incorporated into the planning process. After the initial “information gathering” local maps were generated showing existing facilities and proposed future trail initiatives.

Several workshops were set up across the regions with invitations sent out to stakeholders. These workshops were announced in the local media asking for public input. At the workshops the attendees were asked to review the maps and give input on route corridors and non-motorized facility needs. They were instructed to look at connections with major facilities, connections to recreation areas, and connections between population centers. The recommendations and ideas gathered from the workshops have been incorporated into this plan.

The Strategy lends support and justification for funding requests by local units of government, collaborative partnerships and transportation agencies. In nearly all sources of funding from state and federal programs to foundations and philanthropic organizations, trail projects that are part of a regional trail network and in an adopted regional plan are looked upon in a favorable light. Municipalities and trail advocates should utilize this plan to seek funding support and other assistance in their trail development and improvement efforts. This Strategy will also serve as a guide on where to locate information and resources needed to build non-motorized facilities and help answer questions on implementation, funding and maintenance so that our regional non-motorized system is equitable and sustainable.

1.5 Organization of the Strategy

The following chapters of the Strategy are designed to first provide overviews and analysis in each of the regions, followed by collaborative goals and actions, design considerations, and funding and resources for the entire Superior Region as follows:

Chapter 2: Eastern Upper Peninsula
Chapter 3: Central Upper Peninsula
Chapter 4: Western Upper Peninsula
Chapter 5: Goals and Actions
Chapter 6: Design Considerations
Chapter 7: Funding and Resources
CHAPTER 2 EASTERN UPPER PENINSULA PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT REGION

EASTERN UPPER PENINSULA REGION - CHAPTER CONTENTS:

2.1 Introduction
2.2 Major Population and Employment Centers
   Map 2-1: Eastern Region Population Centers and Major Employers
2.3 Major Attractions
2.4 Stakeholder Engagements
2.5 Existing Facilities
   Map 2-2: Eastern Region Non-motorized Assets and Attractions
2.6 Gap Analysis
   Map 2-3 Eastern Region Non-motorized Issues and Opportunities
   Map 2-4 Eastern Region Non-motorized Local Connections

2.1 Introduction

The Eastern U.P. Region is comprised of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac Counties, located at the east end of Michigan’s Upper Peninsula. The Region is surrounded by the three Great Lakes Michigan, Huron and Superior, as well as the St. Mary’s River system. Included in the region are 129 islands, the larger ones located to the east and to the south. Sugar, Neebish, Drummond, Mackinac and Bois Blanc Islands have ferry service and year-round residents.

The total area of the Region is approximately 3,508 square miles, and includes 1,715 inland bodies of water, encompassing 55,442 acres. The Region contains 1,805 miles of rivers and streams and includes a vast amount of Great Lakes shoreline covering more than 722 linear miles.

Approximately 80% of the land surface is forested, 6% under agricultural use, and approximately 10% is occupied. Almost one-half (47%) of the land in the region is under public ownership, with 30% owned by the State, 16% by the Federal, and the balance by local government. The entire region is almost entirely low plain, slightly less than 800 feet in elevation, with one small section in the northwest which rises to 1,200 feet.

The counties in the region have similar geographic, social, and cultural traits as well as many transportation, trade and community linkages. The region has been summer resident and tourist-oriented for many years. A substantial number of families come and reside in the region for two to three and one-half months during the late spring, summer and early fall. A large number of residents have retired to the area but leave during the winter for areas with warmer climates. A large number of tourists visit this area in all seasons, attracted by the woods, waters, and wildlife that offer a great variety of recreational activities and tourist
attractions. The location at the eastern end of the Upper Peninsula, sandwiched between Michigan’s Lower Peninsula and Ontario and its natural beauty, make the EUP an ideal tourist mecca.

Mackinac Island provides a unique opportunity for biking in the area, having adopted a non-motorized transportation policy long ago, with an exception for emergency vehicles and snowmobile use in the winter. The City of Sault Ste. Marie developed a side-path along the heavily traveled I-75 Business Spur and continues to expand on their trail system throughout the city. The Zellar Trail, a mile long, non-motorized path from the downtown area south to the proposed future civic center, built in 2009, has fulfilled a transportation goal\(^1\) established 30 years ago for the Newberry area. In recent years, grass roots trail groups are emerging along the Lake Huron and Lake Superior shoreline areas creating multi-jurisdictional partnerships to further develop and connect the trail systems in the region.

\(^1\) EUP Regional Transportation Concerns, Regional Transportation Systems Plan 1978; EUP RP&DC
Chippewa County

Population: 38,543

Population Centers:
- City of Sault Ste. Marie (14,287)
- Kincheloe (5,922)

County Seat: Sault Ste. Marie

MDOT Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Routes:</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-129</td>
<td>Bay Mills Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-134</td>
<td>Bruce Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-28</td>
<td>Chippewa Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dafter Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DeTour Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DeTour Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drummond Island Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hulbert Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinross Charter Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County Served by: Newberry Transportation Service Center

Non-Motorized Organizations

- Superior Shores Trail Group
- North Huron Scenic Pathway Committee
- Chippewa County Building a Healthier Community Coalition
- Safe Routes to School Committee
- M-123 Heritage Route Committee
- M-134 Heritage Route Committee
- Hiawatha Shore-to-Shore

Main Industries:
- Education/Health/Social Services; Arts/Entertainment/Recreation/ Accommodations/Food Services; Government; Retail

Largest Employers:
- State of Michigan (MDOT, MDNR, FIA, MDEQ, MSP); Sault Tribe of Chippewa Indians; Bay Mills Indian Community; War Memorial Hospital; MI Department of Corrections; Lake Superior State University; Sault Area Public Schools
### Luce County

**Population:** 7,024  
**Population Centers:**  
- Village of Newberry (2,686)  
**County Seat:** Village of Newberry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-123</td>
<td>Columbus Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-28</td>
<td>Lakefield Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-77</td>
<td>McMillan Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Served by:</strong> Newberry Transportation Service Center</td>
<td>Village of Newberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Motorized Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Pentland Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-123 Heritage Route Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Industries:**  
- Education/Health/Social Services; Arts/Entertainment/Recreation/Accommodations/Food Services; Government; Manufacturing

**Largest Employers:**  
- State of Michigan (MDOT, MDNR, FIA, MDEQ, MSP); Michigan Department of Corrections; Helen Newberry Joy Hospital; Luce County; Village of Newberry; Tahquamenon Area School District; Louisiana-Pacific Corporation; LMAS District Health Department
## Mackinac County

**Population:** 11,943

**Population Centers:**
- City of St. Ignace (2,678)

**County Seat:** City of St. Ignace

### MDOT Facilities

**Principle Routes:**
- US-2
- M-134
- M-129
- M-123
- M-77

**County Served by:** Newberry Transportation Service Center

### Municipalities

- Bois Blanc Township
- Brevort Township
- Clark Township
- Garfield Township
- Hendricks Township
- Hudson Township
- Mackinac Island, City of
- Marquette Township
- Moran Township
- Newton Township
- Portage Township
- St. Ignace, City of
- St. Ignace Township

### Non-Motorized Organizations

- North Huron Scenic Pathway Committee
- M-134 Heritage Route Committee
- Les Cheneaux Bike Path Committee
- Hiawatha Shore-to-Shore

### Main Industries:
- Education/Health/Social Services
- Arts/Entertainment/Recreation/Accommodations/Food Services
- Construction
- Retail

### Largest Employers:
- Mackinac Straits Hospital
- State of Michigan (MDOT, MDNR, FIA, MDEQ, MSP)
- Mackinac Carriage Tours
- Shepler’s Mackinac Ferry
- Arnold Transit Co.
- Chippewa Hotel
- Mackinac Bridge Authority
2.2 Major Population and Employment Centers

There are numerous small communities scattered across the Eastern U.P. region. Many of these communities grew along the shoreline, on the larger islands, and along the rail line in the early 1800’s. Many of the smaller communities are similar in nature and typically have a school, post office and retail businesses. Most rely heavily on tourism as their economic base.

Four communities have emerged in the region as the larger population and employment centers and are described below. (See Map 2-1: Eastern Region Population Centers & Main Employers.)


Sault Ste. Marie, the most populated city in the area, is located on the northern border in Chippewa County, on the shores of the St. Mary’s River. It lies on the northern most point along the US I-75 Highway approximately 50 miles north of the Mackinac Bridge. The International Bridge connects this border city to its sister city of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada.

The City of Sault Ste. Marie is a beautiful city with a great and storied history. It is America’s third oldest city west of the Alleghenies, founded in 1668. The city is proud of the historic treasures, such as the Museum Ship Valley Camp, Fort Brady, and several historic churches.

The City of Sault Ste. Marie is serviced by bus within the city limits by Dial-A-Ride through Chippewa, Luce, Mackinac Community Action Agency (CLM CAA) and Eastern Upper Peninsula Transportation Authority (EUPTA) which provides multiple daily rides to Kincheloe and a weekday round trip to DeTour Village alternating routes to include Cedarville some days and Stalwart/Goetzville on the opposite days. EUPTA also provides a route to Rudyard, Trout Lake, and Eckerman Corners taking County Road H-40 stopping at Brimley 3 times a week from September through May. The Sault Tribe also provides bus shuttles from some area hotels to the Kewadin Casino.

The main transportation artery into Sault Ste. Marie is I-75, providing connection to areas downstate and Canada to the north. State Highway M-129 travels south out of the City to the town of Cedarville, making several community connections along the way. County Road H-63 Mackinac Trail connects the City of Sault Ste. Marie south to the City of St. Ignace and smaller communities in-between.

Many businesses and offices are located in the downtown region of Sault Ste. Marie with commercial establishments all along the main transportation corridor of Ashmun Street and along the I-75 Business spur. Major employers in the area include War Memorial Hospital, Lake Superior State University, and the Sault Tribe of Chippewa Indians.
Map 2-1
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The City of Sault Ste. Marie has long been active in planning for non-motorized transportation opportunities. There is a long range trail plan included in the Master Plan and Recreation Plan. In addition to the overall recreation plan, the City has site specific plans for the Ashmun Bay area and the islands by Rotary Park, as well as a Waterfront Walkway plan completing a link from the east side of the city to the west side and eventually connecting to the Soo/Strongs trail. The City has active sub-committees and is working in conjunction with EUPRP&DC, the Chippewa Co. Health Department, Sault Tribe and Chippewa Co. MSU Extension in planning, implementing and promoting these plans to make Sault Ste Marie more pedestrian friendly. The City also has designated several on-road route corridors throughout the city as well as the off-road bike path that provides connections throughout the whole city.

**St. Ignace (2008 Population Estimate: 2,335)**

Located just north of the Mackinac Bridge, St Ignace is the first community reached after crossing the Straits of Mackinac and the second largest community in the region. This area has been historically renowned for its location as the connecting passage between Lake Michigan and Lake Huron affording the early European explorers and Native Americans shelter, protection, and resources for survival. It was incorporated as a City in 1883. Today, the natural features and resources of the region attract new residents and visitors from across the Midwest.

The main transportation artery used by travelers is I-75, providing convenient access to the population centers in southern Michigan. The Mackinac Bridge, opened in 1957, created the landmark gateway for tourists visiting the region and the Upper Peninsula. Other major highways include US-2 heading west out of town and Hwy M-123 which makes a northwest connection to Hwy M-28. County primary Mackinac Trail (H-63) makes connections to M-134 and travels north all the way to Sault Ste. Marie.

Major employers in the area include the Sault Tribe of Chippewa Indians Kewadin Casino, Mackinac Straits Hospital, three Ferry Services to Mackinac Island and the public school. Tourist related business such as hotels, restaurants and shops are numerous, many of which are only open seasonally May through November and are located along the I-75 Business Spur/State Street.

**Newberry (2008 Population Estimate: 1,517)**

It was in 1892 the former site of the Grant lumber mill became known as Newberry, the county seat for Luce County, Michigan. Named after John S. Newberry, it was a tract of land on which to build a railroad and a railroad 75 miles long from Newberry east to St. Ignace was built. Lumbering was the economic base until supplies dwindled.

While logging and forestry are still important to the region, now the major employers in the County include the Helen Newberry Joy Hospital and other health care, Michigan Department of Corrections and other State Departments of DNR and DOT, Tahquamenon Area Schools as well as many establishments in finance, and retail trade and truck transportation.
The major transportation artery is M-123 which loops from M-28 at Newberry corner to M-28 at Eckerman corner. This segment of M-123 has been designated a Scenic Heritage Route. Highway M-28 runs east/west just 3 miles south of the center of the Village, where the area has grown with retail establishments to assist the driver-by. Highway M-117 connects M-28 with the community of Engadine and US-2.

The EUP Transportation Authority provides a Dial-A-Ride daily bus service within a 5 mile radius of the Village.

**Kinross/Kincheloe (2008 Population Estimate (including prison population): 8,797)**

The Kinross/Kincheloe community is located approximately 20 miles south of Sault Ste. Marie and 35 miles north of St. Ignace. Kinross, located along Mackinac Trail, started as a busy little lumbering town and was a railroad center for shipping wood and wood products. The Kinross Auxiliary airfield was established in 1941 and was transformed into the Kincheloe Air Force Base (KAFB). The Kincheloe community grew along Hwy M-80 (Tone Road) with the air force base until it was closed in 1977 and converted, in part, into five state correctional facilities.

The transportation network includes two connections to Interstate-75 which travels north/south at M-80 and Gaines Highway. State Hwy. M-80 is the east/west connector from Mackinac Trail (CR H-63) and I-75 east to State Hwy. M-129. Mackinac Trail, Gaines Highway, Thompson, Tilson, Strongs and Bound Roads are considered primary connectors with numerous county, local and federal forest roads that make up the rest of the transportation network both paved and gravel.

Major employers in the area include the five State Correctional Facilities, Chippewa County International Airport, light industrial businesses as well as numerous commercial establishment consisting of lodging, grocery, restaurants, personal and professional services to name a few. Future development plans include a cellulosic ethanol refinery that will become part of the economic base as well as create spin-off business opportunities. Agriculture is important to the township mostly involving dairy farming and growing of hay for local, regional and out-of-state feed purposes.

The Chippewa County International Airport is located in Kincheloe and provides freight and passenger service. The new 20,400 square foot passenger terminal opened in September 2002. The airport has multiple runways with a 7,200 x 200’ concrete runway which can handle larger aircraft as well as smaller passenger service planes.

EUPTA provides bus service to the area with multiple daily routes to Sault Ste. Marie which is used mainly by State Corrections commuting employees.
2.3 Major Attractions

The Eastern Upper Peninsula was one of the first regions east of the Mississippi to be settled by the white man and the capitol of the Chippewa Indian nation. The waters and lands in this area supplied the people with their food and way of life. This wild and rugged forest land with an abundance of lakes, rivers and streams, rich in history and scenic beauty, make the Peninsula a natural attraction in itself.

The landscape of the Eastern U.P. results from the effects of glacier movement and diminishing size of the Great Lakes as they have matured since the ice age. The geological rock formations found throughout the area, are similar, yet uniquely different in various regions of the Upper Peninsula. From Arch Rock, on Mackinac Island, to Castle Rock in St. Ignace, to the cliffs of Marblehead on the east side of Drummond Island, to the sandy shores of Whitefish Point in the north, the area provides many beautiful, natural, and scenic geological treasures. In one of the peninsula's more spectacular natural attractions, the Tahquamenon Falls, has the soft sandstone which has been eroded from under the harder dolomite layer above it, creating the environment needed for the water to cascade over the rocks in some dazzling displays of color.

The Eastern U.P. is part of the Great Lakes Circle Tour on the three Great Lakes of Michigan, Huron and Superior. The Great Lakes Circle Tour is a designated, scenic road system connecting all of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River. The Circle Tour, established by the Great Lakes Commission in cooperation with its eight member states and the province of Ontario, promotes travel and tourism along the shores of "North America's Fresh Coast."

Construction of the man-made Mackinac Bridge and Soo Locks at the time provided much needed jobs for the area and continues to be major employers in the operation of the facilities today in addition to being major tourist attractions to the area. The Great Lake freighters can be viewed from many areas of the eastern U.P., but none as close as one can get at the Soo Locks.

The region is well known to tourists not only for its location in the Great Lakes area and famous scenic attractions but because it offers a great variety of outdoor recreation activities, e.g. hunting, fishing, boating, swimming, wildlife observation, biking and camping, etc. Numerous state, federal, and local parks, trails, water access and campgrounds are scattered across the region providing ample opportunities for enjoying nature.

Other attractions that draw tourists to the area include golf courses, gaming facilities, art and cultural facilities and many festival and community activities held throughout the year.
2.4 Stakeholders/Engagements

The Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission created and implemented the EUP Non-Motorized Travel and Trail Survey to gather public input and information in preparation for the development of this investment strategy.

The purpose of the survey was to collect data and public opinions on non-motorized transportation issues and trail development within the region. It was designed to ask a broad array of questions in order to gather information about non-motorized travelers and trail users about their age, gender, skill level, reasons for riding/trail use, preferences, etc. The survey was not intended to be a rigorous mathematical or scientific study but instead and aid to suggest general trends and an overall profile of the cycling community/trail users, as well as key issues for future planning.

The survey was completed by 23 men and 30 women; 57% between the ages of 41-62, and 32% between the age of 21-40 with 11% of respondents over the age of 62 and no respondents under the age of 21. More than 80% were residents of the area, 6% seasonal residents and 11% just visiting. Most survey respondents classified themselves as moderately experienced bikers and ride for exercise and/or recreation, 3 times a week, for one or up to 10 miles. When asked what facilities we need more of the majority of respondents picked multi-purpose off-road trails with wider paved shoulders as the top second choice. The survey also showed that over 90% of the respondents felt trails were important to the community and that the government should invest more money into the non-motorized system. Ninety-five percent of respondents supported the concept of multi-purpose use – snowmobiling in winter and biking in summer. For complete survey results see Appendix A.

On September 10, 2008, the EUP Regional Planning & Development Commission held a Regional Non-motorized Transportation Trail Summit at Lake Superior State University in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. Subsequently seven county specific public input sessions were held at the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackinac County</td>
<td>April 6, 2009</td>
<td>St. Ignace Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinac County</td>
<td>April 7, 2009</td>
<td>Clark Twp. Hall, Cedarville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa/Luce County</td>
<td>April 8, 2009</td>
<td>Whitefish Twp. Hall, Paradise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa County</td>
<td>April 9, 2009</td>
<td>Avery Square, Sault Ste. Marie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackinac/Luce County</td>
<td>April 14, 2009</td>
<td>Curtis Community Building, Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luce County</td>
<td>April 15, 2009</td>
<td>McMillan Twp. Hall, Newberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa County</td>
<td>April 16, 2009</td>
<td>DeTour Senior Center, DeTour Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trail organizations in the eastern U.P. are driving forces to promote, plan, fundraise, and develop non-motorized transportation facilities in collaboration with governmental entities. Following is a list of the trail organizations in the region:

1. **Superior Shores Trail Group** – an informal trail advocate group including representation from Bay Mills Indian Community, Bay Mills Township, Brimley State Park, Hiawatha Forest Service, Superior Township, MDOT, EUPRP&DC and local citizens.

2. **North Huron Scenic Pathway Committee** – and informal group with representatives from Chippewa County, Mackinac County, City of St. Ignace, St. Ignace Township, Clark Township, DeTour Township, DeTour Village, and Drummond Island Township with additional representation from MDOT, MDNR, EUP RP&DC, Mackinac Co. MSU Extension.

3. **Chippewa County Building a Healthier Community Coalition** - representatives from Chippewa County Health Department, Chippewa Co. MSU Extension, Sault Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Bay Mills Indian Community, Superior Shores Trail Group, and Sault Ste. Marie DDA working together on the Sault ste. Marie Area Recreation Trail (SMART) Initiative

4. **Safe Routes to School Committee** – an informal group of stakeholders with representation from the schools, Chippewa Co. Health Department, EUP RP&DC, Chippewa Co. MSU Extension and parents interested in creating safer routes to area schools.


6. **Hiawatha Shore-to-Shore** - The Hiawatha Shore-to-Shore Chapter (HSS) of the North Country Trail Association (NCTA) is a group of hikers of various skill and interest levels that volunteer their time and efforts to promote, maintain, improve, and explore the North Country National Scenic Trail (NCNST). Based in the Eastern Upper Peninsula of Michigan with 122 miles of the NCNST.

### 2.5 Existing Facilities

**Transportation Network**

Roadways provide the most extensive network of transportation facilities second to none. They provide virtual door-to-door access to all destinations and in many cases link to
drive-through service facilities. All roads are open to bicycles in the region with the exception of Interstate-75.

While all roads are open to bicycle travel, not all roads are particularly suitable or “compatible” for bicycling. Basic factors that determine bicycle compatibility of a roadway include pavement (shoulders and/or vehicle lanes) width, traffic speed and traffic volume.

The most important factor of these variables is pavement width. Bicycle compatibility of a roadway necessitates that there be adequate width for both motor vehicle and bicycle traffic to travel in the same direction without changing lanes to pass. In most cases, a roadway’s failure to be compatible with bicycling is because there is insufficient space for the bicycle to occupy without requiring a motorist to cross into the oncoming lane in order to safely pass the bicyclist. This is especially unsafe for both bicyclists and motorists in a no-passing zone such as on a hill or around a curve.

Traffic volumes in the Eastern U.P. Region are considerably lower than the volumes of traffic in the lower half of the Lower Peninsula. On the heaviest traveled roads in this area, daily traffic volumes fall within the range of 2,500 to 10,000 or a Medium annual average daily traffic (AADT). The majority of the roads in this area have an AADT less than 2,500 which is considered Light. The only road in our region that falls within the Heavy category of traffic volumes greater than 10,000 is the main I-75 Business Spur/Ashmun Street within the City of Sault Ste. Marie in Chippewa Co. Traffic volumes in the eastern U.P. fluctuate each season with the highest peak in the summer months due to the increase in summer residents and tourist travel. Compared to areas in Lower Michigan, the traffic volume is still considerably less even on the busiest road in the region.

According to the EUP Non-Motorized Travel and Trail Survey, the majority of cyclists rides on the highway or county roads and prefers a paved surface. Large bicycling tour groups that travel through the area also use the road network to reach destinations. The roadway network in the project area consists of numerous State trunk-lines, county primary, secondary and two tracks as well as residential streets in the numerous communities within the region. (See Map 2-2: Eastern Region Non-motorized Assets and Attractions.)

**State Highways**

Major state trunk lines include:

**US-2** - traversing east to west across the south western border of the region. This major highway has two 12-foot curb lanes with 10-foot shoulders 9-foot which are paved shoulders. There are a number of passing lanes along the route. It is one of the regions higher traffic volume roads with AADT ranging from 6,280 down to 3,200 as one travels further west in the rural areas and increasing in volume near urban areas. The commercial AADT count is roughly 22 percent of the total volume. US-2 makes the connection from I-75 with several communities including St. Ignace, Brevort, Epoufette, Naubinway, Gould City and Gulliver. This road is part
of the Lake Michigan Circle Tour. Although there is a high volume of commercial traffic and a high rate of speed along this road, because it has the wider paved shoulders and is a direct connection west it is a route that is currently used by bicyclists. Improvements in 2009 include a 6 mile section from Brevort Lake to Martin Lake Road, deck replacement of the Cut River Bridge with scenic enhancement and erosion control measures. More improvements are scheduled along this road in 2010 along a 2.7 mile stretch west of Engadine, in 2011 along a 5 mile stretch between Naubinway and Highway M-117, in 2013 along an 8 mile stretch from Borgstrom Road to west of Hiawatha Trail.

**Highway M-134** travels across the south east side of the Upper Peninsula connecting I-75 at the west end to the very eastern tip of the peninsula (DeTour Village) and ferrying across the St. Mary’s River to the eastern most point in the region, Drummond Island. It is part of the Lake Huron Circle Tour. As with most of the state highways in the region it consists of 2-12 lanes with 3-ft-wide paved shoulder and an additional 5-ft. wider crushed stone/gravel shoulder from I-75 to Cedarville. The lane width narrows to 11 feet from Cedarville to DeTour Village with the same 8’ partially paved shoulder. On Drummond Island, M-134 loses 4 feet of shoulder with 3-foot paved and 1-foot gravel. Traffic volume on this road is heavier from I-75 to the Cedarville region. Traffic volume declines as one continues east to DeTour Village. The speed at which the traffic flows along this highway is a safety factor for non-motorized travel.

Although the ferry to Drummond Island runs on an hourly schedule, it is typical to find drivers rushing to “catch” the boat along this stretch. This road is currently used by bicyclists as a major route to the east end of the region and has been designated by local units of governments along the route as part of the North Huron Scenic Pathway trail initiative. As a result of this designation MDOT has incorporated future plans for increasing the paved shoulder width from 3 foot to 5 foot with 2 foot rumble strips from the I-75 exit to Hessel. This improvement could be started as early as 2011 if the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds are available. There is also a local grass roots initiative to obtain a Recreational Heritage Route designation for M-134. The Heritage Route Committee made up of representatives from 2-counties, 6-townships, 1-village and EUP Regional Planning have currently been developing a Corridor Management Plan for submission to MDOT. Once designated as such a route the benefits include identifying, preserving and enhancing our scenic, historic, and recreational resources, promotion of our resources, providing the opportunity for growth management, and preservation and education of the uniqueness of our area for future generations. More information on the Heritage Route Designation Program can be found on MDOT’s web site at [http://www.mi.gov/mdot](http://www.mi.gov/mdot).

**Highway M-129** connects M-134 from the south (Cedarville) to the north end (Sault Ste. Marie) with the village of Pickford in the middle. It is a 2-lane highway consisting of 11 and some 12-foot lane widths with 8-foot shoulders, 3-foot of which are paved. Highway M-129 carries a higher volume of traffic than most others in the region increasing in volume as one travels north into the more urban area of Sault Ste. Marie with a high AADT of 5,106 and a low of 2,263 around the Cedarville area. About three percent of the traffic volume is commercial.
There are some bicyclists and pedestrians that do use this road as part of their route, but the speed, traffic volume and surface condition at the time of this writing, would suggest a safer route would be to utilize the county roads that run parallel on either the west or east side. Future plans for maintenance on this highway include a 7.25 mile segment from M-80 to 10 Mile for crush and shape work in 2009, and the Charlotte Bridge replacement in 2010. MDOT is also working with the City of Sault Ste. Marie in securing funds for reconstruction project along the segment from 10th Avenue to Easterday Avenue in 2010 and a streetscape project from Easterday Ave to Sheridan Dr. in 2011.

**Highway M-48** which connects M-129 to the communities of Goetzville, Stalwart and Pickford to the east provides a lesser-traveled option from the route of M-129 and M-134 if traveling east. Along this section each of the 2-lane road has a lane width of 11-foot with a 6-foot shoulder, 3-foot of which is paved. The AADT varies along this route with ranges from a high of 755 near M-129 to a low of 374 nearer M-134. MDOT improvements along this section include guardrail replacement in 2009. M-48 also connects from M-129 to the community of Rudyard to the west. The shoulders are 8-foot wide in this segment with 3-foot paved. The AADT along this section is 605.

**Highway M-80** makes the connection from M-129 west to the community of Kincheloe and to the I-75 interchange and ends at Mackinac Trail. Traffic volume increases along this road concurrent with shift changes in the existing prison system located in Kincheloe. The AADT along M-80 is 3,033 with approximately 4 percent commercial traffic. The lanes are 11-foot wide with an 8-foot shoulder, 3-foot of which is paved.

**Highway M-28** travels west from Highway M-129 across the region. It carries a heavier amount of traffic closer to the communities of Sault Ste. Marie and Brimley, then traffic wanes slightly until one reaches the outskirts of Newberry. This highway consists of segments of 11 and 12-foot wide lanes with 3-foot paved shoulders and an additional 5-foot of crushed stone/or gravel. Nearer the intersection of M-123/Newberry the 8 foot shoulders are completely paved. Highway M-28 has seen improvement in recent years with more improvements scheduled in 2009 from M-117 to the Luce/Schoolcraft county line. ARRA funds have also made it possible for projects such as the addition of rumble strips from M-123 at Eckerman to Newberry in 2009 and pavement resurfacing near Raco in 2014.

**Highway M-221** spurs off north of M-28 to connect to Brimley. M-221 consists of 2 11-foot lanes with 3-foot paved shoulder and 5-foot gravel shoulder. The AADT is 1,468 along this segment.

**Highway M-123** is a south-northwest connection from I-75 just north of St. Ignace. It consist of 2 11-foot lanes with an 8-foot shoulder of which 5-foot are paved from I-75 to the Mackinac County line. As one travels north along M-123 the M-28 connection will be made. The paved shoulder is reduced to 3-foot from the County line to M-28. Continuing
north on M-123 one enters the segment designated as the Tahquamenon Scenic Heritage Route. This loop of road which begins and ends at M-28 received the Heritage Route designation in 2007. It makes the connection from Eckerman to Paradise to Newberry. Tahquamenon Falls, one of the biggest tourist destinations in the State, is located along this route. The AADT along this route averages about 1,000 along this road with higher levels nearer the communities of St. Ignace, Newberry and Paradise. Traffic volume increases tremendously along this road with the start of the summer tourism season. This road is a primary route used by bicyclers traveling through the area, however, the increased tourist traffic volume, rate of speed, shoulder width, and curves along the route make it more dangerous for bicyclers. The Tahquamenon Scenic Heritage committee made up of representatives from 2-counties, 4-townships and 1-village as well as state and private representation. Bike paths and safety improvements are recommended improvements along this route in the 2007 M-123 Scenic Heritage Route Corridor Management Plan. The abundance of State-owned land provides the opportunity to develop a trail system around this route. However, wetlands and other natural areas complicate and increase costs for such development. It is a hope that future compromises can be made with road shoulder widening and/or off road paths created where allowable to get the most benefit of a trail system with the least amount of environmental impact on the land. The Whitefish Township Recreation Plan includes an off-road multi-purpose path proposal along M-123 south and west through the community of Paradise. An area of concern that was raised at the community input session along this route was the bridge across the Tahquamenon River as there is no shoulder space for bicyclers or snowmobilers.

**Highway M-117** runs north/south and ties together M-28 with US-2 and connects to the community of Engadine. This segment of highway consists of 11-foot lanes with 8-foot shoulders, 3-foot of which are paved. The AADT along this road is 1,760 with 16 percent commercial traffic. MDOT crews will be giving this segment a double chip seal in 2009.

**County Roads**

Major county roads or county primaries also provide connections within the region. County primary roads typically are paved and have a small grass or gravel shoulder. Some of the main county primary roads in the region include:

**Mackinac Trail (H-63)** which heads north out of St. Ignace making connections to M-134, M-123, Rudyard, Kinross, and Dafter, M-28 and W. Six Mile into Sault Ste. Marie. This
route was designated by some local units of government as a preferred bicycle route years ago. Sections of Mackinac Trail between Rudyard and Kinross and M-28 to Sault Ste. Marie have a 4-ft wide paved shoulders and it is the intention of the Chippewa County Road Commission to fill in the gaps. Mackinac Trail is on the slate for road work in 2010 from M-28 to 12 Mile including milling/paving with shoulders. The Mackinac County Road Commission also has this on the schedule for 2011 from I-75 to Garden Hill.

**Gogomain Road**, along with **North and South Caribou Lake Roads** provides a connection to DeTour Village, Goetzville, Raber and Pickford. The speed limit on the Gogomain as it heads east out of Pickford is 55. This low volume road has a small grassy shoulder, which creates a hazard around curves and hilly areas for non-motorized travelers. Expanded paved shoulders at a steep hill and sharp curve near the Raber Township boat launch/park would increase the safety for pedestrian and non-motorized travelers in this area. The Gogomain/Raber Road connects to M-48 at the east end. North and South Caribou Lake Roads connect from M-48 and travel on either side of the largest lake in the County. There are some hills and curves along both of these roads with a built-up of residential area around the lake. North Caribou Lake Road is on the work slate for 2010 from M-48 to DeTour Village.

**Pennington Rd.** to **Riverside Drive** provides an alternative route to M-129 from Pickford to Sault Ste. Marie. Riverside Drive is on the County Road Commission’s construction schedule for 2011 from 4 Mile to 9 Mile and again in 2013 for resurfacing. Stimulus funds may provide additional money for the paving of the shoulders along this segment. Portions of Riverside Drive contain hills and curves that need wider paved shoulders for bicycling safety.

**H-40** travels west from Rudyard across the region connecting the communities of Trout Lake, Rexton, Garnet, to Engadine and across to US-2. The Chippewa County Road Commission will be working on Main Street in Rudyard in 2011, from M-48 to Albert Street. The Mackinac County Road Commission is scheduled to resurface this road in 2010 from Hurd Road in Rexton west to Black River Road.

**W. 6 Mile Rd.,** located just south of Sault Ste. Marie, travels west and has been improved with 4-ft wide paved shoulders to the community of Brimley. This road is a preferred bicycle route due to the paved wide shoulders, despite the fairly high volume of traffic and some trouble spots along the road, including the overpass across I-75 and the railroad trestle which allows little room for both bicycle and vehicle.

**Lakeshore Drive,** continues through Brimley from W. 6 Mile Rd. and also has wider
shoulders through the Bay Mills Indian Community. Once past the Iroquois Point Lighthouse there are no paved shoulders and the speed limit increases. As a shoreline connector with area tourist attractions, this road has a fair amount of truck and trailer traffic which increases with the tourist season. Speed limits vary throughout sections of the township with slower requirements in the residential/business areas. At this time, this road is the primary route being used by bicyclers traveling west. It is also part of the Lake Superior Circle Tour.

Curley Lewis Highway continues where Lakeshore Drive ends and is also a part of the Lake Superior Circle Tour. This road travels the Lake Superior shoreline until it makes the connection to the Tahquamenon Scenic Heritage Route (M-123). Similar to Lakeshore Drive, this road is the route currently used by most bicyclists traveling along Lake Superior shoreline. The traffic volume is less than M-28, but there is little to no shoulder and it does carry a lot of tourist type traffic such as trucks pulling campers or motorhomes as well as passenger cars. Hills, curves and speed along this route contribute to the safety factor for bicyclists.

Whitefish Point Road spurs north off of M-123 at the community of Paradise and connects to Whitefish Point home of the Great Lakes Historical Shipwreck Museum and Whitefish Point Bird Observatory. Already designated a bicycle route this county road has 4-foot paved shoulders along its’ entire length. Even with the wider paved shoulders some residents do not feel safe with the volume and speed of traffic and sharing the road with ORV’s and inquired at the community input session as to whether there are ways to make this route safer. There currently are areas along the road in which ATV users have created off-road paths. Some of these off-road paths follow the utility corridor. The Whitefish Point area with is a major tourist destination and gets a lot of traffic to and from the Village of Paradise.

Ranger Rd. and Salt Point Rd. connect M-28 to the Curley Lewis Highway and the northern lake shore route. These roads do not have paved shoulders. The forests along these routes make for very scenic, peaceful ride through tunnels of tree cover.

Brevort Lake Road and Worth Road are county roads that make connections from M-123 to US-2 in Mackinac County. Brevort Lake Road starts at M-123 just south of the community of Moran and curves around Brevort Lake turning south to connect to US-2 and the Sand Dunes Trail network. Worth Road, just north of Moran, makes a straight west connection to US-2, just a few miles west of the Cut River Bridge.
Borgstrom Road travels north from US-2 connecting to H-40 and turning into County Road 393 where it intersects with M-28 in Luce County. Mackinac County Road Commission lists this road for construction in 2012. This road runs through a majority of state forest and wetlands, providing ample opportunity for wildlife viewing.

Manistique Lakes Road makes the connection from US-2 to M-28 and connects the communities of Curtis, Helmer and McMillan.

H-42 Curtis Road provides the connection west from Manistique Lakes Road to neighboring Schoolcraft County and Highway M-77. While South Curtis Road travels in a parallel direction a few miles to the south.

South Gould City Road spurs south off of US-2 to make a connection to the community of Gould City and further south to the shore of Lake Michigan. Corinne Road branches west off Gould City Road, just one mile south of US-2 and makes a sharp turn north to connect to US-2 just across from S. Manistique Lakes Road. North Gould Lake Road, a gravel surfaced road, travels north from US-2 to make a connection to Sandtown Road, just east of Curtis.

County Road 407 takes one into northern Luce County and to the shores of Lake Superior. Branching off of M-123 at Four Mile Corner, a paved CR 407 connects to the Muskallonoge Lake State Park where the surface changes to hard packed gravel and turns west to follow the shoreline and connect to the community of Grand Marais. This wild, beautiful area through mostly state land is one of our regions most scenic and natural resource.

In addition to the State highways and paved county roads, numerous gravel roads and two-tracks crisscross through the region traveling through, private, as well as state and federal forest lands. Residential roads within communities are typically paved and may or may not have curbs and sidewalks.

Trail Network
A high majority (88%) of respondents of the EUP Non-Motorized Travel and Trail Survey indicated they ride for exercise or recreation, with 54% classifying themselves as moderately experienced bikers. The data suggests more cyclists ride to enjoy healthy recreational and exercise aspects of cycling rather than as commuting to work or school. The number one reason most people do not commute on bikes is they feel there is no safe bike route and the second reason was too much traffic/driver behavior. When asked what should there be more of, 60% responded they would like to see more on-road bicycle routes and more than 50% would like to see wider paved shoulders on the highways and county roads. Off-road multi-use trails also ranked third highest on what people thought we should have more of.

The best place to bike on a non-motorized paved trail system in the region is on Mackinac Island where motorized transportation has been banned. Sault Ste. Marie offers a
paved multi-use side path along the Business Spur which has been expanded to connect to local ballfields, park and the University area.

Abandoned railroad corridors are most often very attractive and ideal for use as bike trails or multi-use recreational facilities. Once developed, they are almost universally very popular with bicyclists, inline skaters (on paved surfaces only) and many passive recreational activities. Despite some public misconception with regard to having such a facility be developed near homes or businesses, experience has shown, that in all parts of the country recreational rail-trail facilities most often prove to be beneficial to nearby property values. Just as easy access to roadways, highways, sidewalks, transit, parks and schools increases the value of property; a rail trail facility provides a safe and attractive recreational facility for local residents to use. Numerous business successes (ice cream, delis, etc.) throughout the country owe a dramatic increase in sales to rail trail user patronage.

The MDNR began acquiring railroad lines in the Upper Peninsula for trail use more than 30 years ago. These early acquisitions helped expand the snowmobile trail system. Trail improvements have been limited, most of the rail trails, could be improved to trailway standards and thus accommodate a wider range of uses. The DNR welcomes local proposals to explore developing U.P. trailways to their full potential. The DNR is also investigating opportunities for major rail-trail acquisitions, which someday could span the U.P. from east to west and north to south.

1. **Soo-Strongs Rail Corridor** – Traveling west from Sault Ste. Marie to M-123, this 32 mile, unimproved rail-grade is under MDNR Forest Management Divisions control. It is considered a motorized trail at this time, but the potential exists to re-designate it as a multi-purpose trail and non-motorized users are welcome to use it at this time. The sandy-gravel track surface is adequate for hiking but very poor for biking. Upgrading this rail grade with crushed limestone to make it more suitable for biking has long been a desire of the biking enthusiasts in Chippewa County. According to the document **Proposed Development: Sault Ste. Marie-Brimley Bikeway** submitted to MDNR in December 1977, by EUP Regional Planning and Development Commission, a request was made for upgrading a 10 mile segment of the trail from the City of Sault Ste. Marie to Brimley with crushed limestone, citing numerous benefits, as well as displaying multi-jurisdictional community support. This bikeway corridor was also a goal cited in a 1977 plan by
EUPRP&DC, Eastern U.P. Regional Transportation Concerns. Today, there is still a strong desire by local citizens and governments to link these communities through this route. Although expensive to build, it is the most feasible option at this time for an off-road bike path in the Eastern U.P. region, as the base already exists. The DNR SSM Forest Management Unit has no current or future plans to re-designate or improve this trail, but is open to the consideration of such a change. The City of Sault Ste. Marie is currently purchasing land to make a connection from a downtown waterfront park to this rail trail. Citizens and the Bay Mills Indian Community, in the Brimley area have formed the Superior Shores Trail Group to pursue trail opportunities along the lakeshore route from Brimley State Park to the Point Iroquois Lighthouse. Community input sessions held around the region revealed that off-road bike trails were most often asked about from tourists requesting information about the region.

2. **St. Ignace/Trout Lake Rail Corridor** - This abandoned rail-grade spans 26 miles and is owned by MDNR. Traveling north out of St. Ignace this abandoned railroad grade is now considered a motorized trail used by snowmobile and off-road vehicle users. Similar to the Soo-Strong's trail, the surface of the trail is not suitable for biking, and rough for hiking. The City of St. Ignace has a designated bike route which can easily be connected to this trail.

Improving a portion of the trail from St. Ignace to Moran with a surface suitable for multi-purpose uses would give visitors and citizens in that area 11 miles to use for exercise, recreation and commuting between the two communities.

In addition to abandoned railroad corridors, trail opportunities separated from traffic exist on public lands in all three counties of Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac. The majority of these trails are typically hiking trails on natural surface, through the state and federal forest lands not suitable for biking. (See Appendix B for a full list.) Some trails typically used for cross country skiing in the winter months are suitable for mountain biking, and are described below.

3. **Algonquin Pathway** – This 9.3 mile, natural surface trail includes a two (2) mile lighted loop along a gently rolling terrain with benches along the way for seating. Additional loops through the forested area of birch, spruce and pine are located along a more flat terrain. The trailhead, located on the west end of Sault Ste. Marie includes a large parking lot with a vault toilet. Activities include cross country skiing and snowshoeing in
the winter, hiking or mountain biking the rest of the year. No motorized use is allowed on this trail. It is under DNR ownership.

4. **Lynn Trail – Sault Seal Recreation Area** – Located at the Sault Seal Recreation Area (formerly known as, Minneapolis Woods Recreation Area) of Sault Ste. Marie, this trail, composed of a combination of a crushed limestone and natural surface trail winds through the woods and up and down the ridge. It is used for walking/hiking, jogging, cross-country running, mountain biking and cross country skiing. The City of Sault Ste. Marie owns this trail.

5. **Pine Bowl Pathway** – Located in Kinross Township this 7.7 mile long, fairly flat trail winds through the pines and hardwoods. Trails are groomed in winter for cross country skiing. A large parking lot and vault toilet accommodates both cross country trail users and snowmobile and off-road vehicle users at the shared trailhead. These trails are under DNR ownership.

6. **Rudyard School Farm Trail** – This trail system consists of six loops ranging from one half mile to four and one half miles in length. Groomed and maintained by the Rudyard Lions Club this trail is used for cross country skiing in winter and hiking in other seasons. Two track roads winding through hardwoods allow for mountain biking. The trails are marked well with large parking area and map at trailhead. Property is owned by Rudyard Area Schools and is located at the corner of W. Postma Road and S. Tilson Road in Kinross Township.

7. **Sault Ste. Marie Bike Path** –
This is a 1 ¼ mile paved multi-purpose side-path in Sault Ste. Marie lies along the west side of the I-75 Business Spur from M-129 intersection to the Three Mile Road interchange, with benches along route. An additional 3 ¼ mile side-path also extends from the Business Spur along Davitt Street north to 12th Avenue, west to Meridian Street and north to Easterday Avenue making connections with the Malcolm Ball Fields Complex and Lake Superior State University. Sidewalks and an on-road connection along Easterday Avenue to Portage-Meridian Street complete the connection. The trail route continues along Portage and to the southern City limits.
8. **Waboose** – This 1.5 mile winter ski trail, along Ranger Road in Superior Township, offers a quiet remote setting and a chance to see small wildlife species scamper through the snow. (Waboose is an Ojibwe word meaning “rabbit”.) The terrain is flat to gently rolling. With no more than a couple of easy to moderate climbing and descending challenges, this is a leisurely ski experience that skiers of all levels can enjoy. Without snow, a seasonal two track road provides a graveled surface for mountain biking through the Hiawatha Federal Forest.

9. **Canada Lake Pathway** – This 14 mile pathway located in Luce County, features hiking, skiing, and camping and is owned by the DNR. Situated within two miles of the Village of Newberry, this is a well maintained cross country ski trail that is suitable for snowshoeing and hiking. During spring, delicate white wildflowers blanket the forest surrounding this double-track maze. The hard-packed trail is a fast, rolling ride that crosses an inviting ORV single-track and rambles through dense forest with trees sprouting huge, gnarled growths like crouching gargoyles.

![Zellar Trail – May, 2009](image)

10. **Zellar Trail** – This one mile fitness trail, named for the man who has donated access across his land, parallels M-123 from behind the Newby Dental Clinic to the Luce County recreational land and the LMAS Health Department in Newberry. This newly built trail is made of a special gravel mix to produce a hardened surface without paving. This multi-purpose trail provides the opportunity for non-motorized uses such as hiking, jogging, biking, with wheelchair and stroller accessibility through the meadowland and hardwoods away from traffic. It meets the community health goals identified by a community coalition and was funded in part through a grant from Building Healthy Communities program applied for by the LMAS District Health Department. It also fulfills a goal set 32 years ago in a 1977 plan by EUPRP&DC, *Eastern U.P. Regional Transportation Concerns.* Luce County has taken ownership of the trail and plans for using the trail as part of an annual Fun Run fund raiser have been made. This trail connects the downtown area with an area to the south where a new Civic Center is being planned for.

11. **Mackinac Island Perimeter Road** - Highway M-185 is the State road that travels the perimeter of Mackinac Island. This road is a 16-foot paved two lane which only carries, bicycle, pedestrian, equestrian and horse-drawn vehicles, with the exception of
emergency vehicles. The whole Island is supported with a road and trail network system of paved, gravel and natural surfaces providing ample opportunity for hiking and biking.

12. **Peter’s Creek Ski Trail** – This is 2.2 miles along a two-track grassy road that is suitable for mountain biking. This DNR owned trail is used for cross country skiing in the winter. It is located between the communities of Engadine and Garnet along H-40 and is close by the Black River State Forest Campground.

13. **Bodi Lake Pathway** – Located within the Bodi Lake State Forest Campground this 1.25 miles of trail through rolling pine/oak uplands provides the opportunity for hiking or mountain biking. This rustic campground has 20 sites for tent and small trailer use along Bodi Lake in northern Luce County. The North Country Trail passes within a mile and a half and several adjacent small lakes provide ample opportunity for fishing, boating and wildlife viewing. The area is home to several notable bird species such as the gray jay, boreal chickadee, Connecticut warbler, palm warbler, rusty blackbird, black-throated green warbler, osprey, loons, other waterfowl, as well as river otter, moose, fern, and wild orchids. Crisp Point Lighthouse, located on the Lake Superior shoreline, is a must see if one is in this area.

14. **Marsh Lake Pathway** – Marsh Lake Trail starts at Big Knob State Forest Campground is about one and half miles in length an easy hike or mountain bike trail.

**Proposed Trail Initiatives**

Across the eastern U.P. citizens are expressing a desire for more walking/biking trails. Units of government in the region who have surveyed their community see trail development as one of their resident’s top requests. Responding to this need, the following trail initiatives are happening around the region. (See Map 2-3: Eastern Region Non-Motorized Issues and Opportunities and Map 2-4: Local Connections at the end of this section.)

1. **Ashmun Bay Park Trail** – This plan, developed in 2004 includes a non-motorized pathway/trail system in and along the Ashmun Bay area. The trail would meander through the property and take one west along the shore with boardwalk and viewing platforms onto the Bay. The trail would extend west toward Sherman Park then connect to the Sault/Strongs Rail Corridor.

2. **North Huron Scenic Pathway** – The North Huron Scenic Pathway group proposes to establish a connective multi-purpose trail system from St. Ignace to Drummond Island. Currently seven governing entities, including two counties are collaborating on this effort. Organized in 2007, the participating local units of government committed funds for development of a conceptual routing plan which was prepared by engineering firm Rowe, Inc. in 2008. The routing plan displays preferred and alternative route alignments on top of aerial photos and includes cost estimates for the entire 75 miles. Plans by
MDOT for widening shoulders along Highway M-134 from Mackinac Trail to Hessel will provide a safer on-road connection. A road diet along the I-75 Business Spur in the City of St. Ignace and into St. Ignace Township was recently considered. The road diet would have reduced the current 4-lanes to 3-2-directional traffic lanes with a middle left hand turn lane and bike lanes on the outside. A public meeting was held where concerns and issues were discussed. One of the major disincentives for the City was having maintenance funds taken away, because of the reduced car lanes, leaving the City responsible for maintaining the bike lanes. Other factors included the location of the Straits Area Hospital and the potential for conflicts on the emergency vehicle routes. It is possible to change the lane striping temporarily to see how this change would actually affect the community without losing funds, but at the time of this writing there is no plan to change anything.

3. **Rudyard Twp. Park Pathway** – The Township is currently working on Phase II of this pathway. A short section was built in 2007. The Township plans to circle the perimeter of the park and eventually pave the path to allow for non-motorized uses. At the time of the writing of this plan, the Rudyard Township Recreation Committee is currently in the process of updating their Recreation Plan. The Committee is researching connecting this proposed trail with the Rudyard Area School.

4. **SSM City Bike Trails** – Listed in the City’s Master Recreation Plan a combination of sidewalk, on-road and side-paths are planned for making bicycling/pedestrian connections throughout the city. Included in these plans is a non-motorized pathway along the south side of the Power Canal from Portage/Meridian Street to Johnston Street. Once created, it will provide a pleasing path along the waterway and provide an off-road route from the downtown area to Lake Superior State University and the Ashmun Bay Park area. In the spring of 2009, the City of Sault Ste. Marie created green space for community gardens along the south side of the canal between Kimball Street and Bingham Street. The proposed pathway adjacent to the community gardens will become a tremendous asset to the City and will promote a sense of community to the citizens of Sault Ste. Marie.

5. **Superior Shores Trail** – A grass roots effort has been started by residents of the Brimley area and the Bay Mills Indian Community with visions of an off-road multi-purpose trail
from the Brimley State Park to the Pt. Iroquois Lighthouse. The Superior Shores Trail group grew out of Bay Mills Indian Community Tribal Health Department’s goal for developing healthy recreational opportunities for community members. Meeting on a monthly basis this group includes representation from local units of government including Chippewa county, Bay Mills, Superior and Chippewa Townships, Bay Mills Indian Tribe, US Hiawatha Forest Service, MDNR, MDOT, Chippewa County Road Commission, EUP Regional Planning and local individuals and groups interested in hiking and biking opportunities. Ideally an off-road paved path is preferred, but a more realistic combination of on-road and off-road connections are starting to emerge as the group continues their planning.

6. **Whitefish Twp. Multi-purpose Trail** – Included in the Recreation Plan for Whitefish Township is an off-road paved route which would follow the west side of M-123 from Birch Hill to intersection of Whitefish Point Road, then North side of M-123 approximately one half mile to State land.

### 2.6 Gap Analysis

Similar transportation and economic issues face each of the three counties within the eastern U.P. region. Following are some of the regional issues that emerged from the input gathering stage of this plan:

- There is a limited amount of financial resources for state and local agencies.
- There is no written policy for including non-motorized transportation planning when planning the transportation construction/maintenance goals.
- Each county relies on tourism dollars to help sustain the communities.
- There is an abundance of state and federal trail opportunities, mainly hiking, ATV/ORV, and snowmobiling, in the region but not a lot of opportunities for biking.
- There is a need in each County for establishing a formalized non-motorized advocate group, possibly a regional group, that could raise money, apply for grants, develop plans, maintain and promote the system similar to the EUP Snowmobile Association or Hiawatha Shore-to-Shore Group.
- There is a lack of trail data and gaps in data that is available. There is no central place that showcases the information.

Community input sessions held around the region provided the opportunity for the public, stakeholders, local governments and organizations to comment on non-motorized transportation issues, wants and needs specific to their community. Following are some issues that arose from these input sessions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Possible Solution</th>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of, or gaps in, paved shoulders on preferred bicycle corridors: M-134 – Mackinac Trail to Hessel, Cedarville to DeTour Village, Drummond Island Ferry to Four Corners, Drummond Island M-129- I-75 Business Spur/Ashmun St. to 3 Mile Rd, 3 Mile Rd to Pickford, Pickford to Cedarville M-28 – Highway I-75 Interchange to western Luce Co. border M-123 – Eckerman Corners/M-28 to Village of Newberry Lakeshore Drive – W. 6 Mile to Ranger Road Curley Lewis Hwy. – Ranger Road to M-123 Riverside Drive – 3 Mile Rd. to 20 Mile Rd. Gogomain Road – Pickford to Raber Road. Raber Road – Gogomain Road to M-48 N &amp; S Caribou Lake Roads – M-48 to Village of DeTour Manistique Lakes Rd. – Highway M-28 to US-2 H-40 – Rudyard to Engadine Mackinac Trail – St. Ignace to M-134, M-134 to Rudyard, Kinross to 9 Mile Rd.</td>
<td>Consider and assess the need for non-motorized transportation accommodation early in the project development/definition/scoping process. Incorporate needed accommodations into project definition and scope Look for additional funding for non-motorized facilities and construct the accommodations as part of the road work project. Create a combination of paved/hard packed wider shoulders and off-road side paths.</td>
<td>MDOT Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Two dangerous crossing areas along W. 6 Mile Rd: I-75 Overpass Railroad crossing</td>
<td>Create an off-road side path around trouble spots. Widen for pedestrian/bicycle crossing with barrier between traffic and pedestrians.</td>
<td>Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Possible Solution</td>
<td>Responsible Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Heavy recreation traffic (truck/trailers) and lack of shoulders in areas of higher speed zones make Lakeshore Drive less safe for non-motorized uses.</td>
<td>Create a combination of on-road trail and off-road side paths. Re-stripe lanes with more markings for non-motorized use. Add bike route signage, and/or flashing warning high pedestrian use signs.</td>
<td>Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lack of shoulders on Tahquamenon Rivermouth Bridge.</td>
<td>Add –on to current structure Replace bridge with wider bridge deck.</td>
<td>MDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Heavy/fast traffic along Whitefish Point Road leave pedestrian/bicyclers feeling unsafe.</td>
<td>Create a combination of on-road trail and off-road side paths. (ATV/ORV side paths currently along parts of road and utility corridor.) Add bike route signage, and/or flashing warning high pedestrian use signs.</td>
<td>Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sharp curve and steep hill make it dangerous for pedestrian/bicyclers on Raber Road from Township Boat Launch/Community Park to M-48.</td>
<td>Create a combination of wider shoulders and/or off-road side paths.</td>
<td>Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Make a connection from Zellar Trail to Hamilton Lake nature area in Pentland Township.</td>
<td>Create a combination of wider shoulders and/or off-road side paths along CR 428.</td>
<td>Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Possible Solution</td>
<td>Responsible Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. One road through Village of Curtis with bridge over Portage Creek. Concerns arise for emergency services if bridge was ever destroyed. Current bridge has a very narrow pedestrian lane. A lot of pedestrian/ATV/ORV users during summer mixing with motorized traffic.</td>
<td>Create new road that runs parallel to Main Street. Create a combination of wider shoulders, sidewalks and/or off-road side paths along route.</td>
<td>Local Road Commissions Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A pedestrian connection across Highway I-75 is needed between Bridgeview Park/Father Marquette Memorial Park and Strait State Park in City of St. Ignace. Non-motorized users currently use a very heavily traveled US-2/I-75 Business Spur to tour these tourist attractions.</td>
<td>Tunnel under or build non-motorized user overpass across Highway I-75 on north side of Mackinac Bridge.</td>
<td>MDOT Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Areas in the City of St. Ignace’s proposed bicycle route are lacking a paved or hard-packed surface.</td>
<td>Identify and plan future paving of gravelled surfaces along route. Add bike route signage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Areas along 4-Mile Block in Cedarville need improvement for non-motorized use. A steep hill on Meridian Street and wider shoulders are needed along route to make it safer for pedestrian/bicyclers.</td>
<td>Widen and pave shoulders along Meridian/Kromiller Rd./4 Mile Block Add bike route signage.</td>
<td>Local Road Commission Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A desire for an off-road connection between the communities of Cedarville and Hessel was expressed at community input session.</td>
<td>Consider options identified in conceptual routing plan for North Huron Scenic Pathway. Formalize trail group for non-profit status and start fund raising. Continue to work with MDOT and other stakeholders along route.</td>
<td>MDOT Local Unit of Government Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Possible Solution</td>
<td>Responsible Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gaps in connections for non-motorized travelers have been identified within the City of Sault Ste. Marie and Soo Township areas and include: Easterday Ave from Ryan Street to Portage Ave. East side of I-75 Business Spur from Newton St. to 7th Ave.; 8th Avenue to Marquette Ave.; just south of Marquette Ave to 3 Mile Road. 3 Mile Rd. to Radar Road. M-129 from 3 Mile Road to Ashmun Street. W. 12th to I-75 Tunnel eventually connecting to Business Spur Side Path (exact routing to be determined).</td>
<td>Consider and assess the need for non-motorized transportation accommodation early in road project development/definition/scoping process.&lt;br&gt;Include needed accommodations into road project definition and scope.&lt;br&gt;Look for additional funding for non-motorized facilities and construct the accommodations as part of the road work project.&lt;br&gt;Seek property easements or acquire property as needed to make connections.&lt;br&gt;Establish a trail committee/group who’s responsibilities and focus would include seeking and analyzing potential routes and making recommendations to the City.</td>
<td>MDOT, MDNR&lt;br&gt;Local Unit of Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Currently, a trail that starts at Ashmun Bay Park is a soft natural surface combined with wood chips that make it very difficult to bike on. Widening and improving the surface to a hard packed or paved facility would create an asset to benefit old and young alike. This trail is currently used by ORV users and as a snowmobile trail route. The City of Sault Ste. Marie is in the process of acquiring the property and has specific plans for the Ashmun Bay area with viewing areas overlooking the Bay. This trail is the connecting link to the Soo-Strongs Rail Corridor.</td>
<td>Improve current trail with hard-packed or paved surface from Ashmun Bay to Soo/Strongs Rail Corridor.&lt;br&gt;Designate trail as a shared-use path and mark as such with appropriate signage.&lt;br&gt;Establish a maintenance plan.</td>
<td>Local Unit of Government&lt;br&gt;Trail User Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Issue

15. The Soo-Strongs Rail Corridor is currently designated as a motorized trail. The gravel/ballast surface is very difficult to bike on although it is open to non-motorized users. Desire was expressed at community input session for surface improvement of approximately 11 miles from the City of Sault Ste. Marie to Brimley.

16. The St. Ignace/Trout Lake Rail Corridor is currently designated as a motorized trail. The gravel/ballast surface is very difficult to bike on although it is open to non-motorized users. An 11 mile segment of the trail from the City of St. Ignace to Moran could be re-designated as a multi-purpose shared use trail and improved for a nice off-road trail.

17. EUPTA and Dial-A-Ride busses do not have capability for carrying bikes. Passengers traveling from smaller communities into the Sault Ste. Marie area could use a bike to get around the city.

18. Not enough parking facilities for bicycles.

## Possible Solution

Re-designate trail to a multi-purpose shared pathway. Mark trail with appropriate signage.

Improve current trail with hard-packed or paved surface from Ashmun Bay to Brimley State Park.

Re-designate trail to a multi-purpose shared pathway. Mark trail with appropriate signage.

Improve current trail with hard-packed or paved surface from St. Ignace to Moran.

Apply for funding to mount bike racks on busses.

Identify areas in community where having a bike rack would be beneficial.

Seek funding sources for bike parking facilities.

## Responsible Entity

MDOT, MDNR Local Units of Government Trail User Groups

MDOT, MDNR Local Units of Government Trail User Groups

EUPTA, CLM CAA

Local Units of Government Trail User Groups

---

### Project Prioritization

The vision has been created, goals and objectives have been determined, the potential connections have been defined and preferred corridors mapped. The next step is to identify the most important non-motorized connections that will have the most impact on the region and will have the best potential for implementation.

With the overall objective of connectivity, each trail identified in the plan is an important piece to the overall non-motorized system. By prioritizing the connections identified
in this plan, specific goals can be set to best achieve this objective. A 100 point prioritization matrix was used to determine the initial ranking of all trails. (See Appendix C – Trail Prioritization Criteria Table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Trail Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M-134/ North Huron Scenic Pathway</td>
<td>Mackinac Trail</td>
<td>Hessel</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Ashmun Bay Trail</td>
<td>Ashmun Bay Park</td>
<td>Soo/Strong's Trail</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Easterday Ave.</td>
<td>Ryan Street</td>
<td>Portage Ave.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>East Side of I-75 Business Spur</td>
<td>8th Ave.</td>
<td>Marquette Ave.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>East Side of I-75 Business Spur</td>
<td>Just south of Marquette Ave.</td>
<td>3 Mile Rd.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Riverside Drive</td>
<td>3 Mile Road</td>
<td>9 Mile Road</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M-134/ North Huron Scenic Pathway</td>
<td>Cedarville</td>
<td>DeTour Ferry Dock</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mackinac Trail/North Huron Scenic Pathway</td>
<td>St. Ignace</td>
<td>M-134</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sault-Strong's Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie</td>
<td>Brimley</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>St. Ignace/Trout Lake Rail Corridor</td>
<td>St. Ignace</td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M-123</td>
<td>M-28/Eckerman</td>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M-123</td>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>Village of Newberry</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 Mile Block Corridor</td>
<td>M-134/Meridian</td>
<td>M-134/4 Mile Block</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie Canal Path</td>
<td>Kimball Street</td>
<td>Portage Street</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Curley Lewis Highway</td>
<td>Ranger Road</td>
<td>M-123</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mackinac Trail</td>
<td>M-80 Interchange</td>
<td>9 Mile Road</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>East Side of I-75 Business Spur</td>
<td>3 Mile Rd.</td>
<td>Radar Rd.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M-134/North Huron Scenic Pathway</td>
<td>Drummond Island Ferry</td>
<td>Four Corners</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Les Cheneaux Trail</td>
<td>Hessel</td>
<td>Cedarville</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tunnel Connection</td>
<td>I-75 Tunnel</td>
<td>Davitt St./I-75 Business Spur</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Caribou Lake Road</td>
<td>M-48</td>
<td>DeTour Village Limits</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Lakeshore Drive/Superior Shores Trail</td>
<td>W. 6 Mile/Brimley State Park</td>
<td>Ranger Road</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Voyageurs Trail</td>
<td>US-2/Boulevard Dr.</td>
<td>US-2/Gros Cap Rd.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>East Side of I-75 Business Spur</td>
<td>Newton St.</td>
<td>7th Ave.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>H-40 Road</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
<td>Rexton</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sault-Strong's Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Brimley</td>
<td>Raco</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Trail Name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sault Strongs Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Raco</td>
<td>Strongs</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Whitefish Point Road</td>
<td>M-123</td>
<td>Whitefish Point</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M-129</td>
<td>Cedarville</td>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gogomain Road</td>
<td>Pennington Road</td>
<td>S. Raber Road</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>South Caribou Lake Road</td>
<td>M-48</td>
<td>DeTour Village Limits</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H-40 Road</td>
<td>Rexton</td>
<td>Engadine</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M-117 Road</td>
<td>US-2</td>
<td>M-28</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Tunnel Connection</td>
<td>W. 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I-75 Tunnel</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riverside Drive</td>
<td>9 Mile Road</td>
<td>Pennington Road</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mackinac Trail</td>
<td>M-134</td>
<td>Rudyard</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>St. Ignace/Trout Lake Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Moran</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>H-40 Road</td>
<td>Rudyard</td>
<td>Trout Lake</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Raber Road</td>
<td>Gogomain Road</td>
<td>M-48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSM plans to develop a walking path along the water canal to Ashmun Bay, which will have a park and multi-use trail, essentially connecting Downtown SSM to the Algonquin Pathway and Sault-Strongs Rail Corridor. The Sault-Strongs Rail Corridor could connect to Brimley and the Superior Shores connection.

The Superior Shores Trail Group hopes to establish a connection from the Brimley State Park to the Pt. Iroquois Lighthouse through both on-road and off-road multi-use paths via Lakeshore Drive. This could lead to a potential connection to M-123 via the Curley Lewis Highway.

A connection from St. Ignace to Trout Lake via the St. Ignace/Trout Lake Rail Corridor. This could create a connection with the North Huron Scenic Pathway from St. Ignace to Drummond Island.
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3.1 Introduction

The Central Upper Peninsula Planning and Development (CUPPAD) Region consists of six counties in the central Upper Peninsula: Alger, Delta, Dickinson, Marquette, Menominee, and Schoolcraft. The central Upper Peninsula encompasses 14,465 square miles with the largest area (5049 square miles) and the lowest population per square mile (1.9 persons) being Alger County. Marquette County is the most populous county.

The Central Upper Peninsula is primarily rural with large tracts of national and state forests. A limited amount of agriculture exists, with livestock being predominant with some wheat, barley, corn, and rye being raised as grain crops. A new crop being experimented with in Alger County which may have both industrial and tourism potential is the row cropping of hybrid willow.

The Central Upper Peninsula provides a veritable textbook of geological features ranging from glacial impacts, such as marshes and lakes, to evidence of long past volcanic activity which left major mineral deposits and steep rocky terrain. The topography of the central Upper Peninsula varies widely with areas in proximity to Lake Michigan being, for the most part, relatively flat but as one travels away from Lake Michigan the terrain becomes more hilly. The area in western Alger and Schoolcraft counties has large areas of wetland. The areas north and west of Marquette are characterized by steeper rocky terrain extending southward into western Dickinson County. Eastern Dickinson and western Menominee counties are characterized by rolling terrain, as the topography flattens in eastern Menominee and Delta Counties.
3.2 Major Population and Employment Centers

Similar to the Upper Peninsula as a whole, the CUPPAD region is a vast area of land with concentrated areas of population. These areas include: Escanaba-Gladstone, Marquette-Negaunee-Ishpeming, Norway-Iron Mountain-Kingsford, Manistique, Menominee-Marinette, and Munising. (See Map 3-1: Central Region Population Centers and Major Employers.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Centers</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escanaba-Gladstone</td>
<td>17,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette-Negaunee-Ishpeming</td>
<td>31,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway-Iron Mountain-Kingsford</td>
<td>15,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manistique</td>
<td>3,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee-Marinette</td>
<td>19,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munising</td>
<td>2,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from U.S. Census Bureau

Major employment centers in the CUPPAD region by county are as follows:


- Dickinson: Grede Foundries, Inc. in Kingsford and the Verso Paper in Quinnesec, MJ Electric and CCI in Iron Mountain. Among non-manufacturing employers, the three largest employers, Dickinson County Hospital, Veterans Administration Hospital and Systems Control.

- Marquette: Northern Michigan University, Marquette General Hospital

- Menominee: Chip-In Island Resort & Casino, Lloyd Flanders, Anchor Coupling, LE Jones, Menominee Area Schools, Angeli’s Supermarket, Menominee County, and Menominee City.

- Schoolcraft: Schoolcraft Memorial Hospital, Schoolcraft County Medical Center, Manistique Papers, Kewadin Casino, Schoolcraft County Courthouse, Carmeuse (Quarry – Gulliver)
The following is an overview of each county:

### Alger County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: 9,862</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Centers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Munising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Seat: Munising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MDOT Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Routes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- US-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Munising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village of Chatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AuTrain Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Island Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munising Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onota Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock River Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Motorized Organizations

Anna River Peddlers

#### Main Industries:

Manufacturing, tourism, service industries and governmental sector

#### Largest Employers:

- Kimberly Clark Paper
- Timber Products
- Munising Public Schools
- Christmas Kewadin Casino
## Delta County

### Population:
- Population: 38,520

### Population Centers:
- Escanaba
- Gladstone

### County Seat:
- Escanaba

### MDOT Facilities

#### Principle Routes:
- US-41
- US-2
- M-35
- M-69
- M-183

#### County Served by:
- Escanaba Transportation Service Center

### Municipalities

- City of Escanaba
- City of Gladstone
- Village of Garden
- Baldwin Township
- Bark River Township
- Bay De Noc Township
- Brampton Township
- Cornell Township
- Ensign Township
- Escanaba Township
- Fairbanks Township
- Ford River Township
- Garden Township
- Maple Ridge Township
- Masonville Township
- Nahma Township
- Wells Township

### Non-Motorized Organizations

- No formal non-motorized organizations exist; however, there are two informal bicycle groups and a runners group that informally meet and are active in non-motorized projects in Delta County.

### Main Industries:
- Manufacturing, tourism, service industries and governmental sector

### Largest Employers:
- New Page Paper
- OSF St Francis Hospital
### Dickinson County

**Population**: 27,472

**Population Centers**:
- Iron Mountain
- Kingsford
- Norway

**County Seat**: Iron Mountain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Served by</strong>: Crystal Falls Transportation Service Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Motorized Organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County Bike Path Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Industries</strong></td>
<td>Manufacturing, tourism, service industries and governmental sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Largest Employers</strong></td>
<td>Dickinson County Health Care, Verso Paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Marquette County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: 64,634</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Centers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marquette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negaunee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ishpeming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Seat: Marquette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>City of Marquette</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US-41</td>
<td>Village of Negaunee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-28</td>
<td>City of Ishpeming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-35</td>
<td>Champion Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-94</td>
<td>Chocolay Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-95</td>
<td>Ely Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-553</td>
<td>Ewing Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forsyth Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humboldt Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ishpeming Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquette Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigamme Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negaunee Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Served by: Ishpeming Transportation Service Center</td>
<td><strong>Marquette County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Motorized Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Municipalities, continued:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron ore Heritage Trail Recreation Authority</td>
<td>Republic Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noquemanon Trail Network</td>
<td>Richmond Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipalities, continued:</strong></td>
<td>Sands Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skandia Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tilden Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wells Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Branch Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Industries:</strong></td>
<td>Manufacturing, tourism, education service industries and governmental sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Largest Employers:</strong></td>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marquette General Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan State Prisons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Menominee County

**Population**: 25,326  
**Population Centers**:  
- Menominee  
- Stephenson  
**County Seat**: Menominee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- US-2  
- US-41  
- M-35  
- M-69  |  
- City of Menominee  
- City of Stephenson  
- Village of Carney  
- Village of Daggett  
- Village of Powers  
- Cedarville Township  
- Daggett Township  
- Faithorn Township  
- Gourley Township  
- Harris Township  
- Holmes Township  
- Ingallston Township  
- Lake Township  
- Mellen Township  
- Menominee Township  
- Meyer Township  
- Nadeau Township  
- Spalding Township  
- Stephenson Township |
| **County Served by**: Escanaba Transportation Service Center | |

| Non-Motorized Organizations |  |
|----------------------------|  |
| **Spokes and Folks Bike Club** | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Industries:</th>
<th>Manufacturing, tourism, service industries and governmental sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Largest Employers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Lloyd Flanders  
- Anchor Coupling  
- Angeli’s Market  |
### Schoolcraft County

**Population:** 8,903

**Population Centers:**
- Manistique

**County Seat:** Manistique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes:</strong></td>
<td>City of Manistique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-2</td>
<td>Doyle Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-28</td>
<td>Germfask Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-77</td>
<td>Hiawatha Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-94</td>
<td>Inwood Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-149</td>
<td>Manistique Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**County Served by:** Escanaba Transportation Service Center

**Non-Motorized Organizations:**
No formal non-motorized transportation organizations exist; however, there are a number of interested private citizens

**Main Industries:** Manufacturing, tourism, service industries and governmental sector

**Largest Employers:**
- Manistique Papers
- Kewadin Casino
- Schoolcraft Memorial Hospital
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- **Marquette - Negaunee - Ishpeming**
  - Population: 31,852
  - Northern Michigan University
  - Marquette General Hospital

- **Escanaba - Gladstone**
  - Population: 17,281
  - New Page Corporation

- **Marquette - Negaunee - Ishpeming Schools**
  - OSF St. Francis Hospital
  - Veterans Administration Hospital

- **Norway - Iron Mountain - Kingsford**
  - Population: 15,881
  - Grede Foundries, Inc.
  - Verso Paper
  - MJ Electric

- **Menominee - Marinette**
  - Population: 19,083
  - Chip-In Island Resort & Casino
  - Lloyd Flanders
  - Anchor Coupling
  - LE Jones
  - Menominee Area Schools
  - Menominee County
  - Menominee City

- **Munising**
  - Population: 2,311
  - Neenah Paper
  - Alger County Prison
  - Timber Products
  - Kewadin Casino
  - Hiawatha Telephone Company
  - Munising Memorial Hospital
  - Tendercare Health Center
  - Munising Public Schools
  - Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore & Hiawatha National Forest

- **Manistique**
  - Population: 3,085
  - Schoolcraft Memorial Hospital
  - Schoolcraft County Medical Center
  - Manistique Papers
  - Kewadin Casino
  - Schoolcraft County Courthouse
  - Carmeuse (Quarry - Gulliver)

- **Menominee - Marinette**
  - Population: 19,083
  - Chip-In Island Resort & Casino
  - Lloyd Flanders
  - Anchor Coupling
  - LE Jones
  - Menominee Area Schools
  - Menominee County
  - Menominee City
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  - Menominee City

- **Munising**
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  - Neenah Paper
  - Alger County Prison
  - Timber Products
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  - Munising Memorial Hospital
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- **Manistique**
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  - Manistique Papers
  - Kewadin Casino
  - Schoolcraft County Courthouse
  - Carmeuse (Quarry - Gulliver)
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  - Schoolcraft County Courthouse
  - Carmeuse (Quarry - Gulliver)
3.3 Major Attractions

The central region boasts beautiful beaches, lush forests, and quaint towns rich in historic culture. The northern border of the central region spans from Marquette to Grand Marais along the Lake Superior shoreline, which includes tourist destinations such as the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Grand Island and Presque Isle Park. The southern border stretches along the Lake Michigan shore from east of Manistique to Menominee, including the Big Spring “Kitchi-ti-kipi”, Bays de Noc and the UP Hidden Coast Recreation Heritage Route (M-35 between Gladstone and Menominee).

Among the major attractions in the Central Region are:

Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Alger County
Pictured Rocks derives its name from the 15 miles of colorful sandstone cliffs northeast of Munising. The cliffs are up to 200 feet above lake level. They have been naturally sculptured into shallow caves, arches, formations that resemble castle turrets, and human profiles, among others.

Grand Island, Alger County
Grand Island is located in Lake Superior, about one-half mile from the mainland community of Munising, Michigan. Munising is about 43 miles from Marquette and 55 miles from Manistique. The island’s scenic natural beauty and interesting history make it an attractive place for camping and other outdoor activities

Seney National Wildlife Refuge, Alger County
The Seney National Wildlife Refuge is located on M-77, 5 miles south of Seney. The refuge includes 70 miles of back country hiking and biking trails with over 50 miles on gravel roads. Within the refuge, you are able to view abundant wildlife in its many fields, pools, streams and marshes

Fayette State Park, Delta County
Fayette State Park is located between Escanaba and Manistique off of US-2. Located on Lake Michigan, the Park offers approximately 5 miles of hiking trails. The trails, which are groomed in the winter for cross-country skiing, wind through beech and maple hardwoods.

Al Quaal Recreation Area, Marquette County
The Al Quaal Recreation Area is a 4k cross-country ski trail, located in Ishpeming. Al Quaal features hiking, mountain biking, trail running, and cross-country ski trails, as well as a picnic area, playground, tennis courts, and fishing in Teal Lake. There are 20K of groomed cross-country ski trails, ranging in difficulty from beginner to advanced. The Red trail, which starts at the ski lodge, is an intermediate level trail providing a roller coaster type ride. The Blue trail,
which starts near the tow rope building, is a beginner’s level trail, providing a mellow ride along scenic Teal Lake. The North Teal Lake trail, which is being developed, will offer intermediate to expert level biking along the rugged North shore of Teal Lake.

**Presque Isle Park, Marquette County**

Presque Isle Park is a small peninsula jutting out into Lake Superior in Marquette. It offers a 6 to 7 mile loop for hikers, bikers, and skiers.

**Little Presque Isle/Harlow Lake Pathway, Marquette County**

Little Presque Isle features 430 acres of natural area, just 7 miles northwest of Marquette. Eighteen miles of hiking trails, over four miles of Lake Superior beach, breathtaking scenery, and wildlife make Little Presque Isle a popular place for outdoor enthusiasts.

**Sugarloaf Mountain Area**

Sugarloaf Mountain is located 5 miles north of Marquette on County Road 550. With three observation decks waiting at the top of the mountain, hikers have their choice of a poorly maintained difficult trail and an easy trail with several sets of stairs for the .5 mile climb.

**Hiawatha National Forest, Delta, Alger, Marquette, and Schoolcraft Counties**

The Hiawatha National Forest features shoreline on both Lake Superior and Lake Michigan and has numerous trails, campgrounds, lighthouses, the Picture Rocks National Lakeshore and numerous lakes and streams within its boundaries.

These and more of the attractions to the central region can be found on Map 3-2: Central Region Non-motorized Assets and Attractions.

### 3.4 Stakeholder Engagements

On September 11, 2008 the CUPPAD Regional Commission held a Regional Non-motorized Transportation Trails Summit at Bay College in Escanaba, Michigan. Subsequently six county specific public input sessions were held at the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alger County</td>
<td>September 9, 2009</td>
<td>Munising City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta County</td>
<td>September 2, 2009</td>
<td>Escanaba City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson County</td>
<td>August 18, 2009</td>
<td>Dickinson County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette County</td>
<td>September 8, 2009</td>
<td>Marquette Michigan Works Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menominee County</td>
<td>September 1, 2009</td>
<td>Menominee City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolcraft County</td>
<td>September 3, 2009</td>
<td>Schoolcraft County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- **Legend**
  - Paved - Light AADT
  - Paved - Medium AADT
  - Paved - Heavy AADT
  - No AADT Ratings
  - 4' or greater paved shoulder or bike lane
  - UP Hidden Coast Recreation Heritage Route (Menominee - Gwinn)
  - North Country National Scenic Trail
  - Haywire Grade Trail
  - Bruno's Run Trail
  - Valley Spur Trail
  - Bay de Noc to Grand Island Trail
  - Fox River Trail
  - Noquemanon Trail

- **Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) Volume**
  - Light - Under 2,500
  - Medium - 2,500 to 10,000
  - Heavy - Above 10,000

- **Roadway Ratings**
  - Paved - Heavy AADT
  - Paved - Light AADT
  - Paved - Medium AADT
  - No AADT Ratings
  - 4' or greater paved shoulder or bike lane

- **Other Features**
  - Township Boundary
  - County Boundary
  - City Boundary
  - Village Boundary
  - CDP Boundary

- **Notable Locations**
  - Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore
  - Presque Isle Park
  - Kitchi-ti-kipi
  - "Big Springs"
  - Grand Island
  - Grand Marais
  - Presque Isle Park
  - Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore

- **Mapping Details**
  - Township Boundaries
  - County Boundaries
  - City Boundaries
  - Village Boundaries
  - CDP Boundaries

- **Scale**
  - 1:200,000

- **Data Source**
  - Michigan Department of Natural Resources
  - Michigan Department of Transportation

- **Additional Information**
  - Map 3-2: Central Region Non-Motorized Assets and Attractions
  - Legend for roadways and attractions
  - Average annual daily traffic (AADT) volume categories
  - Visual representation of major trails and routes

- **Geographic Coverage**
  - Central Region of Michigan
  - Lake Superior and Lake Michigan
  - Includes Menominee, Marquette, Escanaba, and surrounding areas

- **Additional Details**
  - Key features and attractions highlighted
  - Transportation and recreation infrastructure
  - Integration of natural and developed areas

- **Technical Specifications**
  - Map scale: 1:200,000
  - Data accuracy: Varies by source
  - Composite map for non-motorized assets and attractions

- **Contact Information**
  - For more details: Michigan Department of Natural Resources
  - 517-284-6268
  - natureresources.michigan.gov
The Central Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission created and implemented the Non-Motorized Travel and Trail Survey to gather public input and information in preparation for the development of a Regional Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and Investment Strategy for Alger, Delta, Dickinson, Marquette and Menominee Counties.

The report represents the major findings and results of the survey. The purpose of the survey was to collect data and public opinions on non-motorized transportation issues and trail development within the region.

The survey was distributed by mailing and offered on-line during the months of April, 2008 through August, 2008. For complete survey results see Appendix D.

3.5 Existing Facilities

ALGER COUNTY

North Country National Scenic Trail
The North Country Scenic Trail is managed by the National Park System. This hiking trail stretches from New York to North Dakota across seven states and 4,600 miles. The North Country Trail Hikers Chapter of the North Country Trail Association maintains a portion of the trail that extends through north-central Marquette County. The Grand Marais Chapter maintains 150 miles of the trail along the Lake Superior shoreline through the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

Bay de Noc to Grand Island Trail
The Bay de Noc to Grand Island Trail is a 40 mile strictly non-motorized trail with two trail heads on County Road 509 northeast of Rapid River and one trail head at Ackerman Lake, ten miles southwest of Munising on M-94. The trail parallels the Whitefish River following along the approximate location of an ancient Chippewa Indian portage route used to carry canoes and supplies between Lake Superior and Lake Michigan. The trail is used mainly for hiking and horseback riding.

Valley Spur Trail
Within the Hiawatha National Forest, the Valley Spur Trail is 27 miles of trail loops suitable for cross-country skiing in the winter months and mountain biking and hiking in the summer, spring and fall. The Valley Spur Trail system is operated by the Friends of Valley Spur, a non-profit volunteer organization, through a special use permit with the Hiawatha National Forest held by the Noquemanon Trail Network (NTN).
Fox River Pathway Trail
The Fox River Pathway Trail is 27.5 miles within the Kingston Lake State Forest Campground and the Fox River State Forest Campground. The trail is suitable for hiking and biking.

Tyoga Historical Pathway
The Tyoga Historical Pathway is a 1.4 mile loop through a historical village around a lumber mill and general store built in 1906 by the Tyoga Lumber Company. The trail is suitable for hiking and biking with interpretive signage. The pathway begins off of Risku Road, north of M-28 in Deeront, and ends at the Laughing Whitefish River’s mouth on Lake Superior.

Bruno’s Run
The Bruno’s Run Trail is a 9 mile multi use trail located about 11 miles south of M-28 in Munising. It winds its way over gently rolling country past small lakes, over foothills, along overlooks, and through valleys. The trail may be reached from the north or the south via Forest Highway 13. The trail may be accessed from both Wide Waters and Pete’s Lake campgrounds as well as from Forest Highway 13 at Moccasin Lake and Forest Road 2173 at Grassy Lake.

Grand Marais Trail System
300+ miles of mountain biking trails through the forest, along the shoreline of Lake Superior and on roads near the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore. The Grand Marais Trail system includes 7 mapped trails.

Red Buck Trail
The Red Buck Trail is a 2-mile multi-use trail through the ferns and pines. The trail begins at the southern end of the Council Lake Campground in Wetmore and meets the Bruno’s Run Trail near Fish Lake. There are three rustic campsites along the trail.

DELTA COUNTY

M-35 Hidden Coast Heritage Recreation Route, Delta County Portion
The M-35 Hidden Coast Heritage Recreation Trail is a multi modal recreation trail that extends from Gladstone to Menominee. The trail begins in Gladstone providing street access to Van Cleeve Park, fishing and camping facilities through Escanaba, connecting to the Ford River boat launch and extending to the Menominee County line south of OB Fuller Park.

City of Escanaba Bike Path
The City of Escanaba Bike Path is a 4.54-mile network of bicycle paths within the city. The path travels the perimeter of Ludington Park, around the municipal dock and then along 1st Avenue North. The path also runs along Lincoln Road from Lake Shore Drive to the north city limit on Danforth Road. There is also a loop that circles the west side of Escanaba, westward on Old State Road to South 30th, then to 5th Avenue South and back to South Lincoln Road.
**Escanaba Cross Country Ski Pathway**

The Escanaba Cross Country Ski Pathway is a 4.6 mile trail, divided into 3 loops varying from .75 miles to 2.2 miles. Closed in 2004, the trail is not maintained, but still sees some cross-country skiing traffic occasionally.

**Days River Natural Trail**

The Days River Natural Trail is a 9-mile trail 3 miles northwest of Gladstone via US-2 and the Days River Road. Nature enthusiasts can bike, hike and cross-country ski along a clearwater stream through a forest of pine trees.

**Maywood History Trail**

The Maywood History Trail is a hard-packed .6-mile trail that winds through towering 200-year old hemlocks and pines along the shore of Lake Michigan. The fully-accessible trail features twelve interpretive panels describing the rich history of the surrounding area.

**Nahma Marsh Trail**

The Nahma Marsh Trail is an easy, wheelchair-accessible trail near the Sturgeon River on Hiawatha National Forest land. A boardwalk and hard-surfaced path lead a third of a mile from the parking area alongside the dammed marsh. The trailhead is off CR three miles south of U.S. 2 at Nahma Junction.

**Peninsula Point Lighthouse Interpretive Trail**

The Peninsula Point Lighthouse Interpretive Trail is a one-mile, non-wheelchair-accessible trail that extends south from the light tower near the shore and across a cedar swamp via a boardwalk to a parking area for RVs, a mile from the park. The 40-foot light tower is all that remains of the cream brick Peninsula Point Lighthouse, built in 1865.

**Rapid River Ski Trail**

The Rapid River Ski Trail is located 7 miles off of US-2 on US-41. Nineteen miles of loops through pine and maple forests offer something for everyone: easy loops of 1.2 and 2.7 miles (with a 20-foot variation from high to low), advanced loops of 6.4 and 10 miles that take good advantage of glacial hills, a 6.8 mile intermediate loop, and ski skating loops of 4.7 miles (intermediate) and 7.4 miles (advanced).

**Bay de Noc to Grand Island Trail**

The trail from Bay de Noc to Grand Island is 40 miles of pleasant, varied trails. Horses, hikers, backpackers, and mushers alike make use of the trail, which parallels the Whitefish River. The shortest distance from Lake Michigan to Lake Superior is this corridor, which goes north from the head of Little Bay de Noc by Rapid River to Au Train Bay on Lake Superior. The southern trailhead is on CR 509, 1 1/2 miles north of U.S. 2 and 2 miles east of Rapid River.
DICKINSON COUNTY

Merriman East Pathway
The Merriman East Pathway is a 9.5-mile trail 13 miles northeast of Iron Mountain. The trail is groomed for cross-country skiing, but people also enjoy biking and hiking.

Felch Grade Trail
The Felch Grade Trail is a 45-mile long trail that parallels M-69 for two-thirds of its length. The trail is ideal for walking, horseback riding, snowmobiles, mountain biking.

Fumee Lake Trail
Located in Breitung Township, the Fumee Lake Natural Area is 1,808 acres in size. Abundant scenery and varied terrain make these 11+ miles of trails perfect for hiking and biking in the summer and cross-country skiing in the winter. With the recent acquisition of 716 acres of property to the north and west of the lake, the trail system has been expanded and now consists of four loops. The trails encircling Big and Little Fumee Lakes are relatively flat and suitable for beginning bikers. The South Ridge Trail is more difficult, involving a gradual climb of 227 feet above Fumee Lake’s elevation of 1,078 feet.

Gene’s Pond Pathway
Gene’s Pond Pathway is a 2.3-mile trail with a trailhead at Gene’s Pond Campground. This rolling terrain is ideal for hiking and mountain biking.

MARQUETTE COUNTY

Anderson Lake Pathway
The Anderson Lake Pathway is a 6-mile trail, with 4 loops varying from 2 miles to 4.3 miles long. People enjoy viewing wildlife, hiking and biking along these loops.

Black River Pathway
The Black River Pathway can be found near Ishpeming on Country Road 581 in the Escanaba River State Forest. The Pathway consists of 2.5 miles of marked, slightly hilly trails.

Blueberry Ridge Pathway
The Blueberry Ridge Pathway consists of 7 loops (12 miles) of groomed and marked ski, hike, bike trails found 6 miles south of Marquette. Novice or advanced skiers can enjoy 1.7 miles lighted for night skiing.

Craig Lake Main Trail
The Craig Lake Main Trail offers 8 miles of some of the most rugged hiking trails in Michigan.
Harlow Lake Pathway
The Harlow Lake Pathway features 5.6 miles of hiking and biking with 2 loops at 3.3 miles and 5.6 miles long.

Kawbawgam Cross-Country Ski Trail
The Kawbawgam Cross-Country Ski Trail is 5.4 miles of trail with two loops, 1.5 miles and 3.9 miles long. The Pocket Park is located on Kawbawgam Road, just south of M-28 East, approximately 5 miles east of the US-41/M-28 intersection.

Kivela Road Trail
The Kivela Road Trail is a 4.25 km free trail at Kivela Road Park. Ski trails are groomed Monday, Wednesday and Friday. The trails are not lighted. Three loops for beginners, intermediate and advanced.

Longyear Ski Trail
The Longyear Ski Trail is located on Forestville Road. This trail is best left to experts and is not groomed.

Mead-Wetmore Pond Nature Trail
12 miles, 3 loops
Access to the Mead-Wetmore Pond Nature Trail can be found on the west side of County Road 550. Some trails are interpretive, linking with trails of the Presque Isle Tract as well as the North County Trail.

Negaunee Township Ski Trail
The Negaunee Township Ski Trail is 5.4 miles with 3 loops, each under 3 miles long.

Noquemanon Trail Network
The Noquemanon Trail Network claims 155K of trails just 5 minutes outside of Marquette, including the Lower Noquemanon, Saux Head, Cedar Hurst, Big Bay, Blueberry, Al Quaal, South Marquette and Valley Spur Trails.

The Lower Noquemanon Trail is a 25K point to point trail system featuring intermediate to difficult trails. Predominantly uphill while heading east, it includes three different trail heads:

1. **County Road 510.** From U.S. 41- 2 miles west of Wal-Mart, turn north on County Road 502 (Midway Drive). After 1/4 mile turn north onto County Road 510 towards Big Bay. Trailhead marker is 6 miles down on the east side of the roadway.
2. **Forestville Road.** Follow Wright Street north off of US 41 for approximately one mile to Forestville Road. Turn left. Follow Forestville road for 3 miles. Watch for railroad tracks to the right. Turn right and cross tracks. Immediately turn left for trailhead, restroom and parking.

The **Saux Head Trail** is located off of County Road 510. This intermediate trail features a two-way 12K route starting at the parking area, which is located a half mile off Saux Head Lake Road.

The **Blueberry Trail** is a DNR-managed trail. Groomed regularly, this 21K trail features 7 loops, from 2.5 (easy-rated) trails to a 4.8 advanced trail. Located approximately 5 miles south of Marquette, with signage available on all trails.

The **South Marquette Trails** are all single-track trails, rated intermediate to difficult. The trails were rated in 2005 in Bike Magazine in the Top Ten Biking Trails in the country.

**North Country Trail**

The North Country Trail consists of 4,600 miles stretched across seven states. It passes through Michigan’s Upper Peninsula near Ironwood before entering the Ottawa National Forest and the Porcupine Mountains Wilderness State Park. The longest hiking path in the U.S., this trail is managed by the National Park Service.

**Range Mountain Bike Trails**

The Range Mountain Bike Trails have about 35 miles of marked, mapped trails open for biking.

**Suicide Bowl Trails**

30 kilometers of cross-country ski trails and those in the Suicide Bowl are rated as among the best in the midwest. Bring your skis, come early or stay after the tournaments and enjoy some great skiing! The SUNTRAC (Suicide Bowl-Hill Street) trail system provides the bulk of the trails at this time, offering trails with all levels of difficulty, from beginner to expert. Hill Streets Lookout Loop, a beginner’s level trail, offers a couple of scenic overlooks, which give some breathtaking views of Lake Angeline. Sandi’s Trail provides some serious ups and downs for the expert level biker, along with a panoramic view of some of the local mining operations. The Suicide Bowl Trails will also offer some very challenging situations to the serious mountain biker.

**Van Riper Main Trail**

Van Riper State Park is located 35 miles west of Marquette on US-41. It’s Main Trail is .5 miles in length and is primarily used for cross-country skiing and hiking.
MENOMINEE COUNTY

M-35 Hidden Coast Heritage Recreation Route, Menominee County Portion

The M-35 Hidden Coast Heritage Recreation Trail is a multi-modal recreation trail that extends from Gladstone to Menominee. The Menominee Portion of the M-35 Hidden Coast Heritage Recreation, extends from the Delta County border south of O.B. Fuller Park to the Michigan-Wisconsin border in Menominee, MI. Features along the route include Fox Park which allows camping, picnicking, and swimming; the Cedar River Marina, a full service marina; J.W. Wells State Park, which has hiking, camping, and swimming facilities; Kleinke Park which allows camping, fishing and swimming; Bailey Park/West Shore Fishing museum which emphasizes fishing history but also allows swimming; and the Menominee City Park System.

SCHOOLCRAFT COUNTY

Haywire Grade Trail

The Haywire Trail begins on M-94 south of Shingleton and ends at the Water Intake Plant in Manistique, traveling on 33 miles of dirt, gravel, sand and original ballast. The main trailheads at either end of the trail provide parking areas for trail users.

3.6 Gap Analysis

For the gap analysis, the Superior Region – Central Road and Trail Bicycling Guide was used to determine where gaps existed between population centers (where riders would be coming from) and employment centers and attractions (where riders would be going to). When looking at the map, there are numerous “green” roads, which indicates that they have low traffic volumes (below 2,500 vehicles per day). These “green” roads are ideal for bicycle traffic as it is safer with less vehicular traffic. The “green” network in the central region was driven to assess any safety issues for non-motorized traffic. (See Map 3-3: Central Region Non-motorized Opportunities.)

Routes along State and Federal highways were identified as being of major concern to the Michigan Department of Transportation. These routes are prioritized on a point scale shown on the table below using the following Criteria. (See Appendix C for more detail.)

1. Population within one mile of the route.
2. Connection between residential land commercial districts.
3. Connection to tourist attractions
4. If the proposed trail exists in Community Plans
5. If the trail connects to Existing Trails
6. Government participation and support
7. If a maintenance agreement is in Place
8. If the route has previously applied for funding from a state or federal agency
9. If the route is affiliated with an existing trail group  
10. If the route is already in public ownership or a public easement is in place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Route</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-35 Heritage Route</td>
<td>1 Mile North of Menominee County Line</td>
<td>Menominee</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette-Negaunee-Ishpeming Area</td>
<td>Kwbawgam Road (Chocolay Twp)</td>
<td>Ishpeming</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-35 Gladstone-Escanaba</td>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>County Road 426</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munising Bay Bike Path near M-28 through downtown Munising</td>
<td>Munising Tourist Park</td>
<td>Lakeshore/North Country Trail</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-95 US-41- Iron Mountain</td>
<td>US 41/M28</td>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-94 US-41 east to M-28</td>
<td>US 41</td>
<td>M-28 near Munising</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-41 Rapid River to M-28 east</td>
<td>City of Rapid River</td>
<td>Intersection of 94 East</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-35 South Escanaba</td>
<td>Lakeshore Drive</td>
<td>9th Ave</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-41 Powers to Menominee</td>
<td>Powers</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-28 between Munising and Christmas</td>
<td>Munising</td>
<td>Christmas</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-35 Gwinn to US-41</td>
<td>Middle Escanaba River Bridge</td>
<td>US 41/28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-77 US-2 to Grand Marais</td>
<td>Intersection US 2 &amp; 77</td>
<td>Grand Marais</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-94 Shingleton to Manistique</td>
<td>Shingleton</td>
<td>Manistique</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-28 from Mackinac County Line to Wetmore</td>
<td>Mackinac/Schoolcraft County Line</td>
<td>Wetmore</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following list of “gaps” in the non-motorized system of the central region is meant to initiate projects that make our system better. These gaps were identified by various public input methods including public input meetings and surveys and may not be part of the state or federal highway system:

- Each individual population center contains adequate amounts of “green” roads. Regardless, continued effort should be made to add safe facilities for non-motorized travelers such as wide shoulders, or bike lanes.
- In an area such as the Upper Peninsula where the cities are spread far apart, the need for a cyclist to transport his bicycle from each area is great. Bicycle racks on transport buses would be beneficial for a non-motorized traveler to get from one city to the next.
• Escanaba-Gladstone is a large population center in Delta County. Many individuals live in one city, but are employed in the other. Currently, the bike route between the two cities is 8.4 miles long, and bypasses the Escanaba River Bridge. This route would be ideal only for the avid cyclist. There is potential for a bike path along US-2, 41, M-35, which would cut the route to 4 miles, but the Escanaba River Bridge is still an issue. The bridge currently has no room for non-motorized traffic. Additionally, there are railroad overpass structures which constrict the roadway north of the Escanaba River Bridge and south of Danforth Road in Escanaba. The current route is not only over twice the distance, it ceases to be a designated bikeway at a point roughly 2 ½ miles west of Highway M-35 on county road 426. The shoulders on the current route are less than four feet and for the most part are not paved. MDOT has tentative plans to replace the bridge in 2017. US 41/2 between Wells and Gladstone on east (Lake) side the paved shoulder is less than 4 ft between highway mat and guardrail.

• County Road 426 East has intermittent shoulders between US 2/41 and the City of Escanaba.

• The M-35 Hidden Coast Heritage Recreation Route (M-35) has paved shoulders between Escanaba and approximately one mile north of the Menominee Line. From the point approximately one mile north of the Menominee County Line to the city of Menominee, are no paved shoulders and sections exist where the shoulders are less than 4 feet wide. The M-35 UP Hidden Coast Recreation Heritage Route Corridor Management Plan includes a non-motorized plan. In addition to its use as a recreation trail, it is also used by bikers and long distance hikers as part of a route around Lake Michigan.

• M-35 has no shoulders on the Gladstone hill approximately one mile west of the intersection with US 2/41.

• M-35 north of Middle West Escanaba River Bridge does not have paved and existing shoulders are less than 4 ft wide where any type of shoulder exists at all from Middle West Escanaba River Bridge to US 41/M28 intersection. This is a scenic area through hilly terrain but is currently unsafe for bicyclists due to the terrain which may make it difficult to see a biker and the lack of a place for the biker to avoid conflicts with motorized vehicles.

• A bike path on the easterly side of M-35 from Lakeshore Drive northerly to approximately 9th Avenue would increase the safety for bikers that currently find it necessary to cross multiple lanes of traffic from the east to the west side of the Highway.

• Norway-Iron Mountain-Kingsford is a large population/employment center in Dickinson County. Currently each individual area includes non-motorized travel within their networks. Continued effort to connect these cities to each other, and the rest of the county, would be a great advantage to the county.

• The Marquette-Negaunee-Ishpeming area in Marquette County has made great strides in non-motorized travel with the Iron Ore Heritage Trail from Republic to Kawbawgam Road in Chocolay Township. Connecting to Iron Mountain and Escanaba would create a large network for the entire region. There are several popular bike routes in the area that local bicycling organizations have requested trails to form a network. Among these
are the route through KI Sawyer where no shoulders exist along M-94 to West Branch road and along unpaved trails to Gordon; a connection of the bike trails at Harlow Lake north of Marquette to the Marquette Mountain area south of Marquette; and a bypass route along US 41 connecting to the Heritage Trail near the Soo Line Bridge. One noted gap within the City of Marquette is the hazardous McClellan Road intersection with US 41.

- Powers to Menominee is a route that is the alternate for persons traveling the great circle around Lake Michigan as well as other long distance riders traveling Highway 41. Between Wallace and Powers, there are primarily gravel shoulders of varying widths and which sometimes slope towards the drainage ditch making it unsafe to ride on the gravel shoulder of the road.

- M-77 from Highway 2 to Grand Marais allows access to both the Seney Wildlife Refuge and the popular tourist attraction of Grand Marais. The route from US 2 to Seney has gravel shoulders of sufficient width to allow bicycles and should be paved. M-77 from Seney to Grand Marais has no shoulders of sufficient width to allow a bicyclist to get off the road to avoid motorized vehicles.

- M-28 East from Seney to Mackinac County line has unpaved, soft shoulders which are either in need of gravel or have not been graveled. M-28 from M 77 to Wetmore has wide but unpaved shoulders. This is a flat area bordering the Seney Wildlife area and appears to receive a good deal of tourist travel. The shoulders should be paved for bicycle safety.

- M-28 west of Munising between Munising and Christmas. The hill has less than 4 ft between street mat and guardrail. Shoulders of various widths located on one side of road or other but not necessarily on both sides do not allow access from one side to other without crossing traffic lane on a blind curve. Paved shoulders should be installed.

- M-95 from US 41/28 to Iron Mountain has no paved shoulders. Gravel shoulders in some places to wide (more than 4 ft) gravel shoulders in others. This is a transportation route from communities on US 41 to Iron Mountain and should have paved shoulders installed for safety.

- M-94 from US 41 to M-28 in Alger County line has unpaved shoulders. Shoulders adjacent to guardrails between M67 and M-28 are in excess of 4 ft. This route runs through state and national forest lands and crosses the Bay du Noc/Grand Island trail and several forest trails as well as accesses to the Au Train Lake Campground and lakes. Paved Shoulders should be installed to facilitate bicycles.

- M-94 from Wetmore to Manistique is a relatively level route with connection to various lakes, campgrounds and trails. M-94 Wetmore to Shingleton gravel shoulders in excess of 4 ft. M-94 Shingleton to Manistique has gravel shoulders of varying widths ranging from approximately 3 feet to in excess of 4 feet but has steep slopes in places, vegetation to road mat. This route connects Munising to Manistique and should have paved shoulders installed to accommodate bicycles.
• US 41 north of Rapid River intersection with US41/US2 has no paved shoulders. Gravel shoulders appear to be in excess of 4 feet but are difficult to determine due to vegetation in some locations. Gravel shoulders continue until intersection of M-94 east. This route crosses the Rapid River Ski Trail and Hunters Trail and is relatively flat between the city of Rapid River and the intersection with M-94 east. Paved shoulders to accommodate bicyclists would enhance safety and possibly increase non-motorized use of the route.

• Munising has a bike path designed generally following the Lake Superior Shoreline from west to east crossing the Anna River. This project has been slowed due to lack of funds.

• Wheel chairs were identified as a form of non-motorized transportation which is in need of a paved route from the Munising Frond lighthouse to Bayshore Park.

• M-28 in Munising changes abruptly from 2 lane to 4 lanes with the sudden elimination of a designated bicycle shoulder.

• Several County roads, notably the Rock River Road, the Forest Lake Road, H-13 and H-15 were identified as needing shoulders.
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4.1 Introduction

The Western Upper Peninsula Region is composed of the six rural counties of Baraga, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw and Ontonagon covering 9,540 square miles. A regional population of 80,767 (2008 population estimate) is concentrated in historic towns and dispersed among rural areas and former mining locations. Because of its rural nature, bicycle travel in the Western U.P. can be limited due to topography and isolated populations but is becoming more popular as economic conditions encourage alternative means of travel. Bicycling is also seeing a boon because of healthy living initiatives and as access to facilities is improving. Non-motorized trails and facilities are an important part of a diversified economy as well as the area’s future, facilitating tourism and serving populations looking to move to the region.

4.2 Major Population and Employment Centers

The population centers of the Western Region are also the employment centers for the region (See Map 4-1: Western Region Population Centers and Major Employers). The following is an overview of each county.
## Baraga County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle Routes:</td>
<td>Baraga County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-41</td>
<td>Village of Baraga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-141</td>
<td>Village of L’Anse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-28</td>
<td>Baraga Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Served by: Ishpeming Transportation Service Center</td>
<td>L’Anse Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Organizations</td>
<td>Arvon Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No existing groups identified</td>
<td>Covington Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spurr Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Industries: Manufacturing, service industries and governmental sector

Largest Employers:
- Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (Village of Baraga)
- Baraga Maximum Security Correctional Facility (Village of Baraga)
- Pettibone Corporation (Village of Baraga)
- Terex (Village of Baraga)
- Certainteed (Village of L’Anse)
- Baraga County Memorial Hospital (Village of L’Anse)
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## Gogebic County

![Map of Gogebic County](image)

**Population:** 16,043

**Population Centers:**
- City of Ironwood (5,368)
- City of Wakefield (1,846)
- City of Bessemer (1,846)

**County Seat:** City of Bessemer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes:</strong></td>
<td>Gogebic County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US-2</td>
<td>City of Ironwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-64</td>
<td>City of Bessemer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- M-28</td>
<td>City of Wakefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Served by: Crystal Falls Transportation Service Center</td>
<td>Ironwood Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erwin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wakefield Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bessemer Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marenisco Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watersmeet Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Motorized Organizations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Next Generation – Strengthening our Niche”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilderness Lakes Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Main Industries: | Diverse industries, forest products, and tourism |
| Largest Employers: | Lac Vieux Desert Tribal Enterprises (Watersmeet) |
| | Grand View Health System (Ironwood) |
| | Gogebic Nursing Facility (Wakefield) |
| | Jacquart Fabric Products (Ironwood) |
| | WalMart (Ironwood) |
| | Gogebic Community College (Ironwood) |
| | Gogebic Community Mental Health (Wakefield) |
## Houghton County

| Population: | 35,174 |
| Population Centers: |  |
| • City of Houghton (6,878) |  |
| • City of Hancock (4,158) |  |
| • Village of Laurium (2,003) |  |
| • Village of Lake Linden (1,049) |  |
| • Village of Calumet (800) |  |
| County Seat: City of Houghton |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principle Routes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-41</td>
<td>City of Houghton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-26</td>
<td>Village of Lake Linden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-203</td>
<td>Village of Calumet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Copper Country Trail</td>
<td>Calumet Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Scenic Byway / Michigan State Heritage Route</td>
<td>Schoolcraft Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hancock Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quincy Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adams Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chassell Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laird Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village Laurium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village of South Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osceola Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torch Lake Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stanton Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portage Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elm River Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duncan Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Served by: Ishpeming Transportation Service Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Motorized Organizations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keweenaw Trail Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keweenaw Trekkers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Industries:</th>
<th>Education, government, service and tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest Employers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University (Houghton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Health System (Hancock)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirus Keweenaw (Laurium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton County Medical Care (Hancock)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Iron County

Population: 12,001

Population Centers:
- City of Iron River (3,003)
- City of Crystal Falls (1,594)
- City of Caspian (882)
- City of Gaastra (300)

County Seat: City of Crystal Falls

MDOT Facilities

Principle Routes:
- US-141
- US-2
- M-73
- M-189
- M-69
- Iron County Heritage Trail: Michigan State Heritage Route

Iron County
City of Iron River
City of Caspian
City of Gaastra
City of Alpha
City of Crystal Falls
Stambaugh Township
Iron River Township
Bates Township
Hematite Township
Mastodon Township
Crystal Falls Township
Mansfield Township

Municipalities

County Serve by: Crystal Falls Transportation Service Center

Non-Motorized Organizations

Iron County Heritage Route Bicycle Committee

Main Industries: Manufacturing, services and government

Largest Employers:
- Iron County Medical Care Facility (Crystal Falls)
- NorthStar Health System (Iron River)
- Oldenburg Group (Iron River)
## Keweenaw County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: 2,202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Centers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ahmeek (145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mohawk (unincorporated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Seat: Eagle River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MDOT Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle Routes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• US-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Copper Country Trail National Scenic Byway / Michigan State Heritage Route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Municipalities

- Keweenaw County
- Grant Township
- Eagle Harbor Township
- Houghton Township
- Sherman Township
- Allouez Township

### Non-Motorized Organizations

- Copper Harbor Trails Club
- Keweenaw Trail Alliance

### Main Industries: Tourism and Wood products

### Largest Employers:

- Keweenaw County Road Commission
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources
- Keweenaw County
# Ontonagon County

**Population:** 6,819

**Population Centers:**
- Village of Ontonagon (1,509)
- White Pine (unincorporated)
- Greenland (unincorporated)

**County Seat:** Village of Ontonagon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDOT Facilities</th>
<th>Municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle Routes:</strong></td>
<td>Ontonagon County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-64</td>
<td>Bohemia Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• US-45</td>
<td>Ontonagon Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-38</td>
<td>Greenland Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M-26</td>
<td>Rockland Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M107</td>
<td>Stannard Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• M26</td>
<td>Carp Lake Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Served by:</strong> Ishpeming Transportation Service Center</td>
<td>Bergland Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Motorized Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Matchwood Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No existing groups identified</td>
<td>McMillan Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haight Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Industries:** Educational, healthcare services and tourism

**Largest Employers:**
- Smurfit-Stone Container (Ontonagon)
- Aspirus Ontonagon Hospital (Ontonagon)
- Gogebic-Ontonagon Intermediate School District
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Population: 1,049
Michigan Technological University

Population: 1,882
Certainteed
Iron County Medical Care Facility

Population: 882
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community
Baraga Maximum Security Correctional Facility
Petibone Corporation

Population: 1,049
Aspirus Keweenaw

Population: 882
Northstar Health System

Population: 4,158
Portage Health System

Population: 1,509
SmartFit-Store Container
Aspirus Ontonagon Hospital
Gogebic-Ontonagon Intermediate School District

Population: 1,846
Gogebic Community Mental Health

Population: 1,846
Gogebic Community College

Population: 3,003
Michigan DNR

Population: 1,594
Aspirus Ontonagon Hospital

Population: 3,003
Oldenburg Group

Population: 1,472
Lac Vieux Desert Tribal Enterprises

Population: 1,184
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community
Baraga Maximum Security Correctional Facility

Population: 800
Keewenaw County Road Commission

Population: 2,003
Aspirus Keweenaw

Population: 1,484
Michigan DNR

Population: 1,484
Gogebic Nursing Facility
Gogebic Community Mental Health

Population: 5,368
Northstar Health System
Jacquat Fabric Products
Walmart
Gogebic Community College

Population: 1,594
Michigan DNR

Population: 882
Certainteed
Baraga County Memorial Hospital

Population: 1,684
Keewenaw Bay Indian Community
Baraga Maximum Security Correctional Facility
Petibone Corporation

Population: 882
Keweenaw Bay Indian Community
Baraga Maximum Security Correctional Facility
Petibone Corporation

Population: 1,458
Portage Health System
Houghton County Medical Care

Population: 5,878
Michigan Technological University
4.3 Major Attractions

A number of major attractions draw visitors to the Western Region including:

Educational institutions:

- Michigan Technological University (Houghton)
- Finlandia University (Hancock)
- Gogebic Community College - Mt. Zion Ski Hill & Tubing Park (Ironwood)

State and National Parks:

- Keweenaw National Historic Park (Hancock and Calumet)
- Isle Royale National Park (Keweenaw County)
- Fort Wilkins State Park (Copper Harbor)
- McLain State Park (between Hancock and Calumet)
- Porcupine Mountains Wilderness State Park (Silver City)
- Bewabic State Park (Crystal Falls)
- Baraga State Park (Baraga)
- Twin Lakes State Park (Twin Lakes)
- Craig Lake State Park (Baraga County)
- Lake Gogebic State Park (Gogebic County)
- Ottawa National Forest (Ontonagon, Gogebic, Iron Counties)
- Sylvania Wilderness (Watersmeet)

National Scenic Byway/State Heritage Routes:

- Copper Country Trail (US41 from Houghton to Copper Harbor)
- Black River Road (Ottawa National Forest in Gogebic County)
- Iron County Heritage Trail (between Crystal Falls and Iron River)

Lake Superior and the Great Lakes Circle Tour

Ski resorts:

- Mt. Bohemia (Lac LaBelle)
- Mont Ripley (Hancock)
- Porcupine Mountains (Silver City)
- Indianhead Mountain (Wakefield)
- Big Powderhorn (Bessemer)
- Ski Brule (Iron River)
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Snowmobile and ATV trail systems:

Throughout region (All six counties)

Significant cross country ski, mountain bike and hiking trail systems:

ABR (Ironwood)
Michigan Tech Trails (Houghton)
Churning Rapids/Maasto Hiihto (Hancock)
Swedetown Trails (Calumet)
Copper Harbor Trails (Copper Harbor)
Agonikak Trail (Watersmeet)
North County Trail (Baraga, Ontonagon and Gogebic Counties)
Wolverine Nordic Ski Trails (Ironwood)

Other numerous county and local parks; heritage sites, the activities of fishing and hunting; water-based recreation; winter activities; fall color season and related events are also draws to the area.

4.4 Stakeholder Engagements

Currently the Western U.P. has varying levels of government-led and other organized efforts working on connectivity of trails and bicycle/non-motorized facilities. On the West end of Gogebic County connections are being forged by the “Next Generation - Strengthening Our Niche” group led by UW Extension from adjacent Iron County, Wisconsin. The Friends of the Miners Memorial Heritage Park is also working to establish non-motorized trails in the “caves” are of Ironwood. In the Watersmeet Area, the Wilderness Lakes Trails are working on a bicycle route looping around the Sylvania Wilderness and connecting thru Wisconsin (www.wildlakes.org). Iron County efforts have been directed by the Iron County Heritage Route Bicycle Committee building on previous Apple Blossom Trail developments. In Keweenaw and Houghton Counties, trail development efforts have been shared and represented by numerous entities including local government, Copper Harbor Trails Club, Keweenaw Trekkers, and the new Keweenaw Trails Alliance (www.keweenawtrails.com) among other more focused efforts. However, the only entity representing the coordination of these efforts on a region-wide scale is the Western U.P. Planning & Development Region. The Western U.P. Planning & Development Region can help identify projects and link groups that have the potential to coordinate efforts.

To gather input from stakeholders for this plan, a number of public input opportunities were provided during the planning process. On September 8, 2008, WUPPDR held a Western U.P. Non-Motorized Summit titled “Making the Connection” at the UPPCO Conference Room in
Houghton, Michigan. Subsequently six county specific public input sessions were held at the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baraga County</td>
<td>May 27, 2009</td>
<td>Baraga County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogebic County</td>
<td>May 26, 2009</td>
<td>Gogebic County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton County</td>
<td>June 2, 2009</td>
<td>Houghton County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>May 28, 2009</td>
<td>Iron County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keweenaw County</td>
<td>June 4, 2009</td>
<td>Keweenaw County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontonagon County</td>
<td>June 3, 2009</td>
<td>Ontonagon County Courthouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Existing Facilities

**Highway Connections**

The first step in improving the connections within the Western U.P. is analyzing the existing facilities within the 6 county region. The largest and most vital transportation infrastructure for the region is the highway network. The Western Upper Peninsula is served by a number of major state trunklines (See Map 4-2: Western Region Non-Motorized Assets and Attractions).
**US41** – Connecting to Marquette County on the east and terminating in Copper Harbor in Keweenaw County to the north, US41 is a major route for commerce and recreation to the Keweenaw Peninsula. As a major highway the route is well maintained and includes wide shoulders along much of its length. From the Portage Lift Bridge north the corridor is a designated National Byway, the ‘Copper Country Trail’ and it also passes through the two units of the Keweenaw National Historic Park. The highway traverses a number of the western region communities including L’Anse and Baraga, Chassell, Houghton, Hancock, Calumet, Laurium, Mohawk and Copper Harbor. The AADT of the route varies greatly with a high of 26,600 as it crosses the Portage Lake Lift Bridge and a low of 900 east of Copper Harbor near the northern terminus of US41. The route has 4-8’ shoulders along much of the route except for north of Delaware along the ‘covered drive’ where no paved shoulder exists.
**US2** – A major east west corridor connecting to Wisconsin, US2 enters Gogebic County at the City of Ironwood and stretches across the southern portion of the Western Region. The route heads south towards Wisconsin in Iron County at the City of Crystal Falls. US2 connects a number of communities including: Ironwood, Bessemer, Wakefield, Watersmeet, Iron River and Crystal Falls. The route provides access to the Ottawa National Forest that covers much of the Western U.P. AADT for the route ranges from a high of 11,400 in the City of Ironwood to a low of 660 west of Watersmeet. A paved shoulder is available along much of the route and in the communities of Bessemer, Ironwood and Crystal Falls, 4 lanes of traffic are supplemented with sidewalks in some areas. In Iron River, a trial 4 to 3 lane (with bike lanes) conversion is gaining support and will likely be maintained. The 4 to 3 lane conversion was also tried in Bessemer but was rejected by the local community after 1 year.

**US45** – Connecting Ontonagon to Rockland, Bruce Crossing, Watersmeet then to Wisconsin, US45 provides an important link for the Western U.P. Wide 8’ shoulders accommodate non-motorized for approximately 1 mile north of Watersmeet, otherwise 3’ shoulders are present along the remainder of the route. AADT ranges from 880 at the Village of Ontonagon to 2,500 near Wisconsin’s border. A contract has been awarded by MDOT to provide 8’ paved shoulders from the Wisconsin border to North Moon Lake Road and from Duck Lake Road to the US2 intersection with a scheduled completion date of July 2, 2010.

**US141** – Splitting from M28 near Covington, US141 connects Covington to Amasa, Crystal Falls to Wisconsin. US141 is a primary route for visitors from the Green Bay-Appleton region of
Wisconsin. No extended paved shoulders are present. The AADT of the route varies from 1,000 to 7,700 in Crystal Falls.

**M28** – This route splits from US41 half way across Baraga County and traverses southern Baraga County, Houghton County, Ontonagon County until in ends in Gogebic County at Wakefield. M28 connects a number of small communities including Kenton, Bruce Crossing and Bergland. Most of the route has 3’ shoulders but near the communities of Covington, Bruce Crossing, Ewen and Bergland, 8’ shoulders provide a buffer for non-motorized traffic. AADT along the route range from a high of 3,400 in Wakefield to 1,300 between Bruce Crossing and Bergland. An off-highway pathway was constructed to connect Ewen to the nearby school but remains as a gravel surface due to budget constraints.

**M26** - Originating from US45 just east of Rockland and heading north all the way to Copper Harbor, M26 is a major south-north corridor for the region. Mass City, Twin Lakes, Painesdale, Trimountain, South Range, Houghton, Ripley, Dollar Bay, Mason, Hubbell, Lake Linden, Laurium, Calumet, Mohawk, Eagle River and Eagle Harbor are among the communities served by M-26. M-26 is joined with US41 from Calumet to Phoenix. Shoulder width varies from 2’ to 8’ from South Range to Houghton, and portions of the route from Dollar Bay to Laurium. The Superior Region has long range plans to provide wide shoulders along M26 from the Portage Lift Bridge to Calumet. AADT varies greatly along the route from 26,600 (shared route with US41) at the Portage Lake Lift Bridge to 850 north of Eagle River in Keweenaw County.
M64 – This route connects Ontonagon to Silver City, White Pine and Bergland, and then follows the west edge of Lake Gogebic connecting to Marenisco, then to Wisconsin. The route is lightly traveled with AADTs ranging from 600 near Marenisco to 2,100 outside Ontonagon. Shoulders are 3’ or less.

M38 – Connecting Baraga to Nisula to Greenland to Ontonagon, M38 provides a vital east west connection. AADT ranges from 680 near Nisula to 3,000 west of Baraga. Sections of M38 are served by a 4’ shoulder which diminishes down to 2’ near Forest Highway 16. In the Village of Baraga, a sidewalk provides for non-motorized travel.

M203 – From Hancock to Calumet, this route provides access to McLain State Park and is a popular recreational and scenic drive. A bicycle shoulder of 3-4’ provides safety for non-motorized users along the route. A short section near McLain Park provides only 2’ shoulders. M203 is a very popular route for commuters as well as recreational bicycle riders. AADT along the route ranges from 4,600 in Hancock to 440 near Calumet.
**M73** – Splits from US2 west of Iron River passing through the southeast corner of the Ottawa Forest and connects into Wisconsin across the Brule River. The AADT is 690 for the route and shoulders have 3’ paved.

**M189** – This route heads south from Iron River into Wisconsin. The road provides access to the Ski Brule resort. AADT is 1,100 and shoulders have 3’ paved.

**M69** – Connects Crystal Falls to M95 in Dickinson County. The AADT for the route is 1,800 and shoulders have 3’ paved.

The Superior Region MDOT has been working hard to provide shoulders along the state trunklines as needed and as resources permit. Beyond the state trunklines, non-motorized travel is spread amongst county and local roads, paved pathways, multi-use trails, and combinations of these facilities. These roads and facilities are primarily lightly traveled, provide loop connections for recreational cyclists, connect to destinations (parks, etc.) or provide alternatives to highway routes.

**Facilities by County**

In order to determine gaps and needs within the region, it is important to inventory the existing non-motorized travel routes within each County. Because communities in the Western U.P. tend to be clustered with long distances between each cluster, it is important to recognize that most travel will be within the clusters. It should also be noted that new opportunities may become available as additional rail routes are abandoned. A focus of this bicycle plan is not only providing connections within communities but also connecting clusters of communities and their respective community and recreational assets. A priority for the Western U.P. is to identify improvements that encourage more bicycle commuting accessible to the core.
communities. Because each of the six counties is unique in their setting and their connectivity, each County has been reviewed individually to identify specific non-motorized needs.

Baraga County

In Baraga County, the communities of Baraga and L’Anse are the population centers for the area. The County has a highway shoulder connection for non-motorized travel between the communities and adjacent Counties, but very limited non-motorized facilities extending to other nearby communities. Sections of Pequaming Road heading north from L’Anse have a narrow 3-4’ paved shoulders as well as sections of the Skanee Road. Sidewalks are available in the communities of L’Anse and Baraga and short walking/nature trails are available at the Baraga State Park and Sand Point. The North Country Hiking Trail also passes through the County.

Gogebic County

The main non-motorized transportation corridors in Gogebic County are the state trunkline shoulders. Beyond the trunklines, rural roads and sidewalks within communities provide for non-motorized travel. A short bike path is available in the City of Ironwood along Alfred Wright Blvd. stretching from downtown to Lime Street. Wide shoulders are installed on Lake Road from US2 to Jackson Street. The City of Ironwood is lacking pedestrian facilities along US2. Off road loop trails are available at the Powers Trail System near Little
Girls Point and at the Wolverine Ski Trails in Ironwood. An unpaved multi-use trail stretches from Marenisco east into Iron County and a paved recreational pathway circles Sunday Lake in Wakefield. The Porcupine Wilderness State Park has a small section extending into Gogebic County with hiking trails available beginning at Presque Isle Campground. The North Country Trail also enters Gogebic County in the north and efforts are underway to extend it through the County. The Agonikak Trail stretches 11 miles from Watersmeet south to Wisconsin.

There are exciting planning efforts underway in the Ironwood-Bessemer-Wakefield area to connect those communities via a paved pathway following old US 2 or following old rail grades. Plans are also in the works to provide looped non-motorized trails at the “Miner’s Memorial Heritage Park” within the City of Ironwood. In the Watersmeet area, an effort is underway called the Wilderness Lakes Trails to develop a recreation loop using primarily existing roads and trails circling the Sylvania Wilderness and into Wisconsin, part paved and part unpaved.

**Houghton County**

In Houghton County, a combination of highway shoulders, bicycle lanes, paved pathways and trails provide for non-motorized travel. The Cities of Houghton and Hancock are the economic and educational centers of the area with Michigan Technological University in Houghton and Finlandia University in Hancock. Portage Health and the Quincy Unit of the Keweenaw National Historic Park are also located in Hancock. In northern Houghton County, the Villages of Calumet and Laurium are the community focal points, home to the Calumet Unit of the Keweenaw National Historic Park, Aspirus Keweenaw Hospital and the Swedetown Trails.
Paved pathways are located along the waterfront in the City of Houghton from Kestner Park to Nara Park and from Sharon Avenue to the Portage School and in Hancock stretching from the Portage Lift Bridge to north of Ingot Street and along Campus Drive near Portage Health. One gap in the system is a safe connection between the Portage Lift Bridge and the Hancock paved trail. Multi-use trails (unpaved) following old rail beds stretch south from Houghton, 41 miles towards Ontonagon (Bill Nichols Trail), from Houghton to Chassell 8.64 miles, Hancock to Calumet 14 miles (Jack Stevens Trail), and the Portage Bridge to Lake Linden. The stretch of trail from Houghton to Chassell is State Forest Land and not currently managed as an official trail. There is a second rail grade from the Portage Bridge to Lake Linden that has potential as a paved route and is supported by the communities along the route.

Paved 4’ shoulders are provided for non-motorized along a portion of the Houghton Canal, along the Bootjack Road and along Sharon Avenue in the City of Houghton, contributing to the on-road non-motorized system. The state trunklines provide main connections and have wide shoulders from Houghton to Chassell, Dollar Bay to Lake Linden, Lake Linden to Calumet and along M203 connecting to McLain State Park. MDOT has plans to eventually add paved shoulders from Dollar Bay to the Portage Lift Bridge.

Numerous off road looped trail systems are available in Houghton County including: Michigan Tech/Nara Trails, Maasto Hiihto/Churning Rapids, Swedetown Trails, Chassell Trails and numerous other small recreational and nature trails. The main trail systems are all accessible from rail grades.

**Iron County**

Iron County has two main population centers, including the communities of Iron River, Caspian and Gaastra on the west and Crystal Falls in the east. Connecting the two communities
are paved shoulders along US2 and a multi-use off road trail. This portion of US2 is a designated State Heritage Route, the Iron County Heritage Route. Between Iron River and Caspian is the Apple Blossom Trail which provides family friendly recreation along a paved pathway. A plan has been developed to extend the Apple Blossom Trail eastward through Caspian and connecting to Pentoga Park, then to Bewabic State Park and to Crystal Falls. MDOT has funding to install a portion of the planned pathway from the Iron County Medical Care Facility into Crystal Falls in 2011.

Other non-motorized facilities include off road hiking trails at Bewabic State Park, Glidden Lake, Lake Ottawa, Brule Lake, Pentoga Park and the Wolf Track Nature Trail.

**Keweenaw County**

As the most sparsely populated County in the Region, Keweenaw County is known for its natural and recreational amenities. The non-motorized infrastructure for on road travel is limited to 2-4‘shoulders along US41 from the southern border to Delaware. An unpaved trail of crushed limestone provides access from Fort Wilkins State Park to Copper Harbor. The Keweenaw Road Commission has added 2’ shoulders to the Eagle Harbor Cutoff Road to improve safety along that route.

An extensive looped non-motorized trails system connects Copper Harbor to the Keweenaw Mountain Lodge, Fort Wilkins State Park and conservancy lands. In Eagle Harbor there is a looped ski trail and also a point to point trail to Mt. Lookout (Mt. Baldy). There is also a hiking trail at Hunter’s Point on the west end of Copper Harbor. Other trails provide for nature walks within established nature sanctuaries. Sidewalks in the communities of Mohawk and Ahmeek provide for in town connections. A long range goal is to connect Copper Harbor to Eagle Harbor via a non-motorized trail following the spine of the peninsula.
Ontonagon County

Ontonagon County has a number of small communities including the Village of Ontonagon, Silver City, White Pine, Rockland, Bergland, Bruce Crossing and Mass City. The Village of Ontonagon is the County seat and the most populated community in the County. The communities are all isolated from each other by mileage. Existing non-motorized facilities include a paved pathway crossing the Ontonagon River in Ontonagon and an unpaved pathway connecting Ewen to the school on the west end of Ewen, and sections of 8’ shoulder within communities along M28. A combination of sidewalk and sections of 2-3’ shoulders along Lakeshore Drive provide access to the Ontonagon Township Park. New 8’ shoulders are being installed along M64 from the Village of Ontonagon to Silver City and 107th Engineer Memorial Highway (formerly M107) has 6’ shoulders from Silver City to the Porcupine Mountains State Park.

Off road trails include looped hiking and biking trails at the Porcupine Mountains State Park and the North Country Hiking Trail that traverses Ontonagon County. There is an effort underway to connect the multi-use trail in Gogebic County from Marenisco up to Bergland.

4.6 Gap Analysis

The priorities identified within the Western Region are the same in each of the six counties:

- A need for safety improvements along high traffic corridors
- Family friendly access within and between communities
- Filling in gaps to complete non-motorized connections
- Improved signage

Maintenance of existing facilities and expansion of non-motorized (unpaved) trail opportunities were also identified as a need in all Counties. Based on the surveys and stakeholder input meetings, the following table lists the projects that have been identified to address non-motorized transportation priorities within the Western Region. These projects
address gaps in the non-motorized inventory or trail initiatives already in motion (See Map 4-3: Western Region Non-motorized Opportunities). A 100 point prioritization matrix was used to provide a ranking for the projects within the Western Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fill in bike lane gaps along Sharon Ave to complete connection from M26 to Michigan Tech.</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extend Apple Blossom Trail to Pentoga Park to link Iron County Heritage Trail sites and provide safe access to Pentoga parallel to Co. Rd. 424.</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Install 8’ shoulders from Lift Bridge to Dollar Bay to improve bicycle access along this narrow, high traffic area.</td>
<td>Hancock to Dollar Bay</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resurface Brockway Mountain Drive to provide safer travel for bicyclists along the deteriorating destination roadway.</td>
<td>Keweenaw County</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide Portage Lift Bridge access to/from Hancock Trail to greatly improve non-motorized connection between Hancock and Houghton.</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agonikak Trail surface improvements that contribute to Wilderness Lakes Trails Plan</td>
<td>Watersmeet to WI Border</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Complete Border Lakes Trail improvements that contribute to Wilderness Lakes Trails Plan</td>
<td>Watersmeet</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Connect MDOT Trail to Bewabic State Park to further Heritage Trail connections.</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Surface second rail grade from Portage Lift Bridge to Lake Linden to provide family friendly corridor and connection to Hancock Trail.</td>
<td>Hancock to Lake Linden</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trail improvements/delineation of Chassell Grade to provide safe use.</td>
<td>Houghton to Chassell</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Construct spur trail to LVD Casino that contributes to Wilderness Lakes Trails Plan.</td>
<td>Watersmeet</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Improve access between Michigan Tech and waterfront by constructing pathway to mitigate elevation change.</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Connect Bewabic State Park to Pentoga Park to further Heritage Trail connections.</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Improve signage on M26 and US41 to make motorists aware of potential for cyclists along narrow highway.</td>
<td>Keweenaw County</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Pathway along old US2 from Wakefield to Ironwood</strong> to provide off-highway non-motorized route for the communities.</td>
<td>Between Wakefield and Ironwood</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Extend shoulders along Lake Road to Airport</strong> to provide safer access for bicyclists along this high traffic corridor.</td>
<td>Ironwood</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Designate off highway route Watersmeet to Wakefield</strong> using existing roads as feasible to provide off-highway routes.</td>
<td>Watersmeet to Wakefield</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Off highway pathway Delaware to Copper Harbor</strong> to provide alternative for bicyclists along this winding, narrow roadway.</td>
<td>Keweenaw County</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Paved pathway Ft. Wilkins to Hunter’s Point around Lake Fanny Hooe</strong> to improve connections and opportunities between parks and town.</td>
<td>Copper Harbor</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Sidewalks or pathway along US2 in Ironwood</strong> to provide pedestrian access along this high traffic corridor.</td>
<td>Ironwood</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Improve shoulders on M26</strong> to provide safer travels along this narrow, winding stretch of highway.</td>
<td>Keweenaw County</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>Widen shoulders from White Pine to Silver City on M64</strong> to complete shoulder connections to White Pine from M107 intersection.</td>
<td>Ontonagon County</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><strong>Construct shoreline pathway from State Park to Marina</strong> to improve connections between community and recreation sites.</td>
<td>Village of Baraga</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Construct pathway from Marina to Sand Point</strong> to improve recreational opportunities and connections to community.</td>
<td>Village of Baraga</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>Construct trail connection to Chassell via old RR grade</strong> to connect to Chassell-Houghton Trail.</td>
<td>Baraga to Chassell</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td><strong>Pave shoulder on County Road 424</strong> to provide safe travel along this narrow route.</td>
<td>Iron County</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>Widen paved shoulders along M28 to 8’ where needed</strong> to complete connections.</td>
<td>Baraga - Gogebic County</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>Fill in shoulders along roads from Skanee to Pequaming</strong> to provide route to northern Baraga County.</td>
<td>Between Skanee &amp; Pequaming</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Construct shoulders along Black River Road</strong> to provide safe non-motorized route to Black River Harbor.</td>
<td>Gogebic County</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>Research L’Anse –Baraga off highway pathway</strong> to provide family friendly connection between the two communities.</td>
<td>Between L’Anse &amp; Baraga</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CHAPTER 5 SUPERIOR REGION IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

## 5.1 Goals and Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To inventory and promote our trailway assets.</td>
<td>To create and maintain regional trailway database</td>
<td>✓ Establish a database of contacts throughout the region.</td>
<td>✓ Regional Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Establish a regional trailway task force committee.</td>
<td>✓ Regional Trailway Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Define necessary attributes beneficial for the trail community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Adopt a protocol for updating including roles and responsibilities for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participating agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Provide convenient access for updating and means for ensuring up-to-date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accurate information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To produce promotional material – maps, brochures, web page</td>
<td>✓ Develop regional/localized maps</td>
<td>✓ Regional Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Develop informational brochures</td>
<td>✓ Regional Trailway Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Create and design web page/web site</td>
<td>✓ Local Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Chambers of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make connections from trailway to trailway and/or trailway to destination: using on-road links to fill in the gaps.</td>
<td>Raise awareness of state and local transportation officials on how non-motorized on-road connections can be used to complete connections between trails.</td>
<td>✓ Identify on-road connections to trails and develop a presentation to showcase these examples.</td>
<td>✓ Trail Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Deliver the presentation to targeted audiences, i.e. county road commissions, funding agencies, local elected officials, at conferences and meetings.</td>
<td>✓ Trail Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Local Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase non-motorized transportation networks (and on-road connections) so that</td>
<td>Establish an annual event to raise awareness of needed on-road trailway links, educate attendees, promote networking and collaboration for success</td>
<td>✓ Establish event planning committee of</td>
<td>✓ Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Community Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Trail Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 5 Superior Region Implementation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>municipalities, transportation planners, and public officials regularly incorporate non-motorized transportation into their planning, programming and development.</td>
<td>bicyclists and pedestrian trail users, with representatives from government, advocacy groups, property &amp; business owners, handicapped individuals, etc.</td>
<td>✓ Adopt resolutions  ✓ Work with County Road Commissions, Department of Public Works (DPW), and Planning Departments to identify already scheduled road improvement projects, both in the private and public sectors, which may be modified to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities. This should include improvements for pedestrians and bicycles whenever feasible.  ✓ Look for opportunities to re-stripe existing roadways (during resurfacing) to include bike lanes.  ✓ Update this Plan as facilities are built. It is estimated that updates will be needed every three to five years in order to show achievements and to adjust for future improvement goals.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government  ✓ Road Commissions  ✓ Street/ Engineering/DPW  ✓ Regional Commissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and promote regional corridors that will connect communities and points of interest within the region and outside the region.</td>
<td>✓ Establish an education and safety task force to monitor and promote education initiatives throughout the Region.  ✓ Involve local law enforcement in promotion and safety education.  ✓ Encourage colleges and universities in the region to develop a “Guide to Bicycling” publication for distribution each year to new students.  ✓ Promote and support the development of a pedestrian and</td>
<td>✓ Local Government  ✓ Local Law Enforcement  ✓ Area College/ University  ✓ MDOT/Secretary of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Proposed Actions</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bicycle component of the driver’s education training program and manual in order to help educate new drivers on pedestrian and bicycle awareness. ✓ Strictly enforce speed limits in high pedestrian activity areas, including school zones.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government ✓ Trail Groups ✓ Health Departments ✓ MSU Extension Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and implement best practices for improving pedestrian and bicycle safety.</td>
<td>✓ Apply for community grants for pedestrian and bicycle education, safety and injury prevention. A continued effort to apply for community funding will ensure the longevity and effectiveness of proposed safety education programs.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government ✓ Trail Groups ✓ Health Departments ✓ MSU Extension Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build community support</td>
<td>Provide public outreach and education during all phases of trail project</td>
<td>✓ Prepare a quarterly newsletter with updates regarding bicycle and pedestrian improvements, education and funding initiatives.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government ✓ Trail Groups ✓ MSU Extension Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote citizen involvement</td>
<td>Establish a program to encourage the involvement of volunteers in various bicycle and pedestrian activities, including promotional events (such as Walk-A-Child-to-School Day, Bike to Work Day, etc). ✓ Create an easy-to-use system for the public to report sidewalk, bikeway, trail hazards and maintenance needs.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government ✓ Health Departments ✓ MSU Extension Offices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase pedestrian/bicycling/trailways usage.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of what trails are available</td>
<td>✓ Partner with adjacent counties to sign and promote a regional system of on-road rural bicycle routes. ✓ Incorporate bicycle touring opportunities in state, regional and national tourism promotional materials. ✓ Provide bike racks on buses</td>
<td>✓ Local Road Commissions ✓ Local Government ✓ Transit Authorities ✓ Chambers of Commerce ✓ Trail Owners ✓ Trail Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 5 Superior Region Implementation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Proposed Actions</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase year-round usage</td>
<td>✓ Partner with nonprofit organizations and cycling clubs to develop and promote bicycle touring events. ✓ Maintain trails, parking facilities for use in winter – trail grooming, plowing, etc. ✓ Connect key tourist sites in the region with bicycle and trail facilities to attract residents and tourists.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government ✓ Trail Groups ✓ Trail Owners ✓ Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing facilities for multi-purpose trailways</td>
<td>✓ Create trail committees to develop fund raising and long-range maintenance plans. ✓ Partner with trail owners to identify, plan and coordinate improvements ✓ Identify grant, fund-raising opportunities</td>
<td>✓ Federal/State/Local Government ✓ Private Trail Owners ✓ Trail Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and increase the number and diversity of partners who incorporate trails into their programs, so trails are affirmed as important community assets.</td>
<td>✓ Work with realtors and economic development partners to promote pedestrian and bicycle-friendly facilities and activities.</td>
<td>✓ Local Government ✓ Trail Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Recommendations for Implementation

The following suggestions will assist in furthering implementation efforts of an interconnected trail system within the Upper Peninsula:

✓ Local governing documents, such as master plans, parks and recreation plans, and land use and transportation plans should be amended to include content consistent with this plan.

✓ Communities should encourage local developers to incorporate non-motorized connections into their site design. Try to ensure that these smaller trail systems are linked with the larger regional system, or at least have the potential to connect.
Connectivity within the development, as well as with adjacent land uses, should be recommended.

✓ Collaboration is vital to the success of a regional trail system. Every effort should be made to cooperate and coordinate non-motorized goals, not only with neighboring communities, but also with the regional commissions, the local road commission, MDOT, MDNR USFS and other interested stakeholders.

✓ This trail plan should be reviewed and updated as goals are met and future plans made. The trail database should be updated on a regular basis and made available to all trail planning bodies.

✓ Gaining grant funding for local trails should be a priority. Lack of funding is often the largest barrier impeding trail development. Trail planners should be actively seeking grant funding from programs listed in this document but also continue to search for alternative sources.

✓ Trail design and maintenance should be top considerations as systems are being developed. If a trail is designed and constructed correctly from the beginning it will help ensure longevity and less maintenance in the long run. Maintenance plans should be developed and are often required for grant funding.

✓ Consider forming a regional Trail Association or formalizing your local trail group. Committed associations are geared toward providing the best possible experience to trail users. They typically perform a number of activities including trail promotion, public events, trail maintenance, clean-up projects, and attendance at public meetings and lobbying for trail improvements. Most trail associations select a small trail system or a particular segment to support. Citizens are encouraged to join and create trail associations as the regional system develops.

✓ Consider compromising solutions for the sake of safety to non-motorized travelers. Biker’s are currently using the road network as is and large cycling groups make trips through the region annually. Ideally, it would be safer to be off the road. Only if compromises can be made between motorized users and non-motorized users, federal, State (departments of State) and local agencies will any progress be made.

✓ Look for opportunities to incorporate non-motorized facilities within road projects scheduled along the preferred corridors. Apply for additional funding for non-motorized facilities. Coordination with road projects will make trail development more efficient.

5.3 Cost Estimates

A number of important decisions are required to implement a trail system. A major consideration that will influence these decisions is cost. Cost will factor into decisions from the beginning to the end of a project, ranging from material types and construction to the funding sources targeted.
The cost of bicycle and pedestrian facilities varies greatly depending on the current cost of materials, rights-of-way needs, and topographic site features. Comprehensive cost information, as well as important considerations in choosing and installing facilities can be found on-line. In addition, the BikeCost tool located at http://www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost/index.cfm provides regularly-updated cost estimates for most types of bicycle facilities.

The following information was taken from the “Trails for the 21st Century” published by Rails-To-Trails Conservancy, 2001:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paved Shoulder Per Mile</th>
<th>Existing Road Sections for Bike Paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 feet each side</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike Lanes Per Mile</th>
<th>$281,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 feet each side w/curb &amp; gutter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wide Curb Lane Per Mile</th>
<th>$50,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 feet each side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface Material</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile</th>
<th>Longevity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood Chips</td>
<td>$65 - $85K</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granular Stone</td>
<td>$60 – 100K</td>
<td>7-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resin Stabilized</td>
<td>Varies based on application</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>$200-300K</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>$300-500K</td>
<td>20+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td>$1.5 – 2 Million</td>
<td>7-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycled Material</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Trail Maintenance

Trail maintenance is an indispensable aspect of trail planning. A clean, safe trail will promote further use by residents. The implementation of a good maintenance strategy not only helps sustain a safer trail environment, but can also instill a sense of community pride in local citizens.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical Yearly Maintenance Costs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For One-Mile Paved Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage and storm channel maintenance</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeping/blowing debris off trail</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup and removal of trash</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed control and vegetation management</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing of grass shoulder</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor repair to trail furniture/safety features</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance supplies for work crews</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment fuel and repairs</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost Per Mile</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While almost every trail planning body will agree that trail maintenance is a very important concern, an agreement on whose responsible for that maintenance is not always easy. Many grant programs require a detailed trail maintenance plan be in place for agencies to be eligible for funding. Governmental units are encouraged to make written agreements with each other to maintain different trail segments. Often times, townships will not have sufficient staff or the proper equipment to perform trail maintenance activities, in which case they may need to contract with a city or county department. See Appendix B for a sample maintenance agreement.

Adopt-A-Trail

The Adopt-a-Trail program is an excellent way to help maintain a trail. This program works on a volunteer basis, with common participants being neighborhood organizations, businesses, service clubs, churches or even families. Usually a formal agreement is reached between trail owner and the volunteer organization. This program is comparable to the Adopt-a-Highway program. Volunteers usually perform enhancement projects such as fundraising and landscaping.
CHAPTER 6 DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

These design considerations are intended to serve as an aid to engineers, designers, planners, and others in accommodating bicycle traffic in different riding environments, and to encourage predictable bicycling behavior. The design guidance is not meant to act as design standards, but rather as a list of acceptable bicycle facilities and the situations in which they are acceptable.

Use the following criteria to determine if a bicycle facility will be effective and desirable. The network will include whether the facility is an existing or proposed bicycle facility.

- **Accessibility**—Residential areas and high priority destinations (schools, shopping areas, business centers, parks, etc.) should all have reasonable safe access by bicycle.
- **Directness**—Studies have shown most bicyclists will not use even the best bicycle facility if it greatly increases the travel distance or trip time over that provided by less-desirable alternatives.
- **Continuity**—the network should have few missing links.
- **Route Attractiveness**—Low perceived threat to personal safety and high visual aesthetics.
- **Low Conflict**—Few conflicts between bicyclists and motor vehicles.
- **Cost**—Costs should be reasonable to implement.
- **Ease of Implementation**—Room to place facility; does not unduly impact traffic operations.

6.1 Designing for the Rider

**Advanced riders**—experienced riders who can operate under most traffic conditions, they comprise the majority of current users of collector and arterial streets and are served by the following:

- Direct access to destinations usually via the existing street and roadway system.
- The opportunity to operate at maximum speed with minimum delays.
- Sufficient operating space on the roadway or shoulder to reduce the need for either the bicyclist or the motor vehicle operator to change position when passing.

Types of facilities on which to focus—arterial and collector roadway improvements including bicycle lanes and wide curb lanes.

**Basic riders**—these are casual or new adult and teenage riders who are less confident of their ability to operate in traffic without special provisions for bicycles. Some will develop greater skills and progress to the advanced level, but there will always be many millions of basic bicyclists. They prefer:
• Comfortable and safe access to destinations, preferably by a direct route; either low-speed, low-traffic-volume streets, or designated bicycle facilities.
• Well-defined separation of bicycles and motor vehicles on arterial and collector streets (bike lanes and shoulders), or on separate paths.

Types of facilities on which to focus—bicycle trails, collector bicycle lanes, and residential street routes to specified attractions or sidepaths, and sidewalks where no other option is available.

Child riders—pre-teen riders whose roadway use is initially monitored by parents. Eventually they are accorded independent access to the system. They and their parents prefer the following:
• Access to key destinations surrounding residential areas, including schools, recreation facilities, convenience shopping, or other residential areas.
• Residential streets with low motor vehicle speed limits and volumes.
• Well-defined separation of bicycles and motor vehicles on arterial and collector streets—or on separate bicycle paths.

Types of facilities on which to focus—bicycle trails, residential street routes to specified attractions, and sidepaths where no other option is available.

6.2 Bicycle Compatibility Levels

Using the following system the streets can then be rated Levels A-F designating the streets for compatibility between motorists and non-motorists, where:
• Levels A - C = Recommended street for all levels of bicyclists (except maybe children).
• Level D = Recommended for moderately experienced bicycle riders.
• Level E = Recommended for only experienced bicycle riders.
• Level F = Not recommended for any level of bicycle rider.
• NA = Roadways and interstate that, by law, prohibit bicycles.

Selected bicycle riders will bicycle all preliminarily rated streets. The riders review the routes to either concur on the preliminary rating or change the rating based upon the following criteria. With the maps provided, the bicyclists ride each route and determine if the preliminary rating is accurate or should be upgraded or downgraded.

Factors for riders to consider when rating:

Curb lane condition
• If good condition, leave at same level.
• If poor condition, lower one level.
• If condition makes it difficult to ride, lower two levels.
Turning traffic and driveways

- If there is very little turning traffic, leave at same level.
- If there is significant turning traffic, lower one level.
- “Rumble strips” at intersections need to be set back a sufficient distance to allow a bicycle to make a left turn without crossing the cut in “rumble strip”.

Curb Lane Width

- If 15 feet or greater, raise one level (includes parking lane).
- If 13 to 15 feet, leave at same level. Less than 13 feet, lower one level (feels like riding in same lane as traffic).

6.3 Types of Bicycle Facilities

**Bike Lanes** are feasible when:

- A portion of the roadway has been designated by striping, signing, and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists.
- The minimum width for a bike lane is 5 feet, at least 4 feet of which should lay to the left of the gutter pan seam. Comments from bicycle riders indicate that motor vehicle “rumble strips,” meant to alert motor vehicle drives increase the difficulty for bicycles and measurements should be outward from the “rumble strip” channels.
- Possible on collectors and two-lane arterials if street is at least 44 feet wide with no continuous turn lane. With continuous turn lane, the street must be at least 52 feet in width.
- Field studies confirm bike lanes have a strong channelizing effect on motor vehicles and bicycles.
- Bike lane stripes can increase bicyclists’ confidence that motorists will not stray into their path of travel if they remain in the bike lane. Likewise, with more certainty as to where bicyclists will be, passing motorists are less apt to swerve towards opposing traffic in making certain they will not hit bicyclists.
- Motor vehicle traffic moves at speeds that are not perceived as being excessive or too close to the rider.
- Storm drains and catch basin grates are of a grid or pattern with no long gaps parallel the direction of travel to avoid capturing bicycle tires.
- Catch basins and storm drains are level with the surrounding pavement mat.

**Wide curb lanes** on collectors and arterials.

- Right-most through traffic lanes that measure at least 14 feet (measured from the lane stripe to the edge of the gutter pan). When traffic exceeds 10,000 Average Daily Traffic, 15-foot lanes are desirable.
- On two-lane collectors, very possible if parking lane is utilized infrequently.

Advantages:

- Accommodate shared bicycle/motor vehicle use without reducing roadway capacity for motor vehicle traffic.
- Minimize both the real and perceived conflicts between bicycles and motor vehicles.
• Increase the roadway capacity by the number of bicyclists capable of being accommodated.

**Sidepath links**
• Where no other alternatives exist and continuity of the network requires a sidepath.
• On roadways where speed limits exceed 45 mph.

**On-street signed destination routes** located on collector or some residential streets.
• Update current route network to be more destination-based.
• Improve separate routes that have widecurb lanes. Shoulder bikeways (on rural section roadways)
• Smooth paved roadway shoulders provide a suitable area for bicycling, with few conflicts with faster-moving motor vehicle traffic.
• Roadway shoulders for bikeways under ideal circumstances should be 6 feet wide or greater. A minimum 4-foot shoulder may be used if there are physical width limitations.

**Sharrows** as an option—when not enough room for a bike lane

The shared lane pavement marking is typically used where a bike lane is desired but cannot be implemented due to insufficient roadway width or other constraint. Use of the shared lane marking would be applicable in the following situations:

• In a wide lane (12 feet or greater) on a two-lane roadway.
• In the right lane of a four- to six-lane arterial.
• On a signed bike route where lane widths narrow (12 feet or less), or where traffic volumes and speeds are relatively high, possibly in conjunction with “Share the Road” signs.
• For route continuity between sections of roadway where a more desirable facility can’t be implemented.
• Within a shared bus/bicycle lane.

The pavement marking warns the motorist of the presence of bicycles, while helping the bicyclist determine which part of the road they may use to be most visible to drivers, and to help avoid conflicts with parked cars. It can also serve to identify a link in a bicycle route network and assist in way-finding. Periodic use of the “Share the Road” sign is recommended to accompany the shared lane marking. If “Share the Road” signs are used, they may be located immediately adjacent to the pavement marking and may include a downward arrow (45 degrees down and left) pointing directly at the symbol, making it clear what the symbol means.

6.4 **Design Considerations**

*Which bicycle facilities should we use?*
Wide curb lane versus bicycle lanes—which are better?

Excerpt from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) 1999 Study

“The overall conclusion of this research is that both BL (bike lanes) and WCL (wide curb lane) facilities can and should be used to improve riding conditions, and this should be viewed as a positive finding for the bicycling community. The identified differences in operations and conflicts were related to the specific destination patterns of bicyclists riding through the intersection areas studied. Given the stated preferences of bicyclists for BLs in prior surveys (e.g., Rodale Press, 1992) along with increased comfort level on BLs found in developing the Bicycle Compatibility Index (Harkey et al., 1998), use of this facility is recommended where there is adequate width, in that BLs are more likely to increase the amount of bicycling than WCLs. Increased bicycling is important because in the United States there are but a few communities that have a significant share of trips made by this mode. Overall, we have not yet reached the critical mass necessary to make motorists and pedestrians aware of the regular presence of the bicycle. When this critical level of bicycling is reached, gains in a “share the road” mentality will come much more quickly than at present. Certainly not all the problems will disappear, but the ability to develop and implement solutions will be greatly enhanced.”

What are some strategies for adding some of these bicycle facilities?

Gaining Space on our Streets

Following are strategies for gaining extra space that can be redistributed for bicycle use in the roadway as wide outside lanes, striped shoulders, or bike lanes.

- On multilane roadways, travel lanes can be narrowed to 10 or 11 feet.
- On streets with raised medians, the median could be narrowed, providing more pavement width.
- Road diets can be employed, if appropriate, to eliminate one or two travel lanes or possibly the continuous left turn lane.
- If parking supply exceeds demand, parking can be consolidated and limited to one side of the street, or eliminated altogether if it is truly unnecessary.

Bicycle Routes

Generally, bicycle routes should be along collector streets that have good connectivity and somewhat slower speeds and volumes than arterial roadways. In some cases, arterial roads may be used as linkages, and in those cases sidepaths may be a better option for four-lane arterial roadways having outside lanes that are too narrow for comfortable and safe riding.
The criteria for safe bicycle routes includes the following:
- Paved collector streets with good connectivity.
- Restricted or unused parking areas.
- Two-lane roadways without center turn lanes.
- Controlled intersections across arterial or other collectors (stop signs or signals).

Bicycle Parking

More than 1.5 million bicycles are reported stolen every year in the United States, and fear of bicycle theft is recognized as a significant deterrent to bicycle use. The availability of safe and convenient parking is as critical to bicyclists as it is for motorists, and yet it is frequently overlooked in the design and operation of shops, offices, schools, and other buildings. However, providing good-quality bicycle parking that is going to be used and useful is not quite as easy as leaving a “fence” or “grid” style rack out by the back fence of the shopping plaza or school yard and expecting cyclists to find and use it. Indeed, many agencies are now adopting quite specific bicycle parking design, location, and installation requirements. When installing bicycle parking facilities, the below recommendations should be followed.

1. **Planning**
   Bicycle parking needs to be . . .
   - Visible
   - Accessible
   - Easy to use
   - Convenient
   - Plentiful

Racks need to support the whole bike (not just one wheel) and enable the user to lock the frame and wheels of the bike with a cable or U-shaped lock. Parking should preferably be covered, well-lit, and in plain view without being in the way of pedestrians or motor vehicles.

2. **Finding a good location**
   - Racks are installed within the right-of-way, usually on a wide sidewalk with 5 more feet of clear sidewalk space remaining.
   - Racks are placed to avoid conflicts with pedestrians. They are usually installed near the curb and away from building entrances and crosswalks.
   - Racks can be installed in bus stops or loading zones only if they do not interfere with boarding or loading patterns and there are no alternative sites.
   - Bike racks should be installed in concrete, as they cannot be securely anchored in asphalt.
   - Racks should be 4 feet from fire hydrants, curb ramps, building entrances, etc.
Bicycle racks that are sited poorly will not be well-used. Racks that are too close to the wall, or which don’t have enough room between them, will end up sitting empty while nearby railings, trees, and light poles continue to be used by bicyclists.

3. **Choosing the type of rack**
The Inverted U type bike rack is the preferred bicycle parking rack, although other racks may be proposed provided that they meet certain performance requirements. Racks should:
- Support the frame of the bicycle, and not just one wheel.
- Allow the frame and one wheel to be locked to the rack when both wheels are left on the bike.
- Allow the frame and both wheels to be locked to the rack if the front wheel is removed.
- Allow the use of either a cable or U-shaped lock.
- Be securely anchored.
- Be usable by bikes with no kickstand.
- Be usable by bikes with water bottle cages.
- Be usable by a wide variety of sizes and types of bicycles.

**Parking Rack Recommendations**

The rack area should be located along a major building approach line and clearly visible from the approach. The rack area should be no more than a 30-second walk (120 feet) from the entrance it serves and should preferably be within 50 feet. A rack area should be as close as or closer than the nearest car parking space. A rack area should be clearly visible from the entrance it serves.

The following racks are recommended because one rack element supports two bikes and it supports the bicycle upright by its frame in two places.

4. **Short-term bicycle parking**
Short-term bicycle parking is usually defined as being two hours or less, such as might be necessary outside a store, or for visitors to an office building or government service center.

Racks should be within 50 feet of the main entrance to the building, or entrances that are frequently used by cyclists. Other critical factors for short-term parking are that it be:
- Well-distributed (i.e., it’s likely better to have four or five racks spread out along one city block rather than a group of four or five racks mid-block).
- Visible to the cyclist.
- In areas of high pedestrian activity to discourage would-be thieves.

5. **Long-term parking**
Long-term parking usually suggests that the bicyclist is leaving the bike all day, or overnight, or for an even longer duration. Obviously, the level of security and protection from the elements needs to be greater, but the immediate convenience of the parking facility may not be
as important. Long-term parking options include:
- Lockers—individual lockers for one or two bicycles.
- Racks in an enclosed, lockable room.
- Racks in an area that is monitored by security cameras or guards (within 100 feet).
- Racks or lockers in an area always visible to employees.

6. **Covered bicycle parking**
Wherever possible, bicycle parking should be covered to protect the bicycle from rain, snow, and other elements. Covered parking areas should have at least 6 or 7 feet of clearance, but not so high as to allow rain and snow to easily blow under the roof.

7. **Signs and markings**
Provide bicycle parking identification signs where possible.

8. **Amount of parking**
An increasing number of communities are adopting bicycle parking ordinances that specify a minimum level of bicycle parking for different building types and land uses. While these usually relate to new developments, the level of provision required can be used as a guide to retrofit communities also.
7.1 Funding Sources

**Federal Funding Sources**

The **Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991** (Public Law 102-240; ISTEA, pronounced *Ice-Tea*) is the United States federal law that posed a major change to transportation planning and policy. It was the first U.S. federal legislation on the subject in the post-Interstate Highway System era and presented an overall inter-modal approach to highway and transit funding. It had collaborative planning requirements, giving significant additional powers to metropolitan planning organizations. Signed into law on December 18, 1991, it expired in 1997. It was preceded by the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987 and followed by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and most recently in 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). More information on these laws can be viewed at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/factsheets.htm.

These federal authorization statutes established funding eligibility for non-motorized facilities in virtually every federal road, bridge and safety funding program. They also require:

- Consideration for non-motorized travel in designing road construction/reconstruction projects
- States must include a non-motorized plan element in their long range transportation plans
- States must set aside 10% of their Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding for allocation for the Transportation Enhancement Activity Program.

**Surface Transportation Program**

STP is used by state and local jurisdictions for road and transit projects. Local projects are eligible for funding from the annual allocation of STP Funds to the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Road projects must be located on roads functionally classified as a rural major collector or higher. Ten percent of the STP fund is set aside for the Transportation Enhancement fund and ten percent is set aside for the Safety program. The remaining funds are used statewide or distributed to the MPO for use in the urbanized areas (STPU), rural areas (STPR), and small cities in rural areas with a population of 5,000 to 50,000 (STPC).

**Transportation Enhancement Funds**

Enhancement funding is awarded to local road agencies through a competitive process managed by MDOT. From fiscal year 1998-2004 TEA-21 apportioned approximately $173 million for enhancement improvements. The State of Michigan received approximately $27 million in fiscal year 2005 to be spent on Enhancement projects. Estimates of apportionments...
for 2006-2009 have not been determined. A rolling application period allows agencies to submit projects at any time and awards are made up to three times per year. This funding also requires a minimum twenty percent match with over-matching given additional consideration.

The Enhancement Program funds projects in 12 activities under four major categories that enhance the road system in ways other than motorized vehicle capacity or safety improvements. Three of the activities are specifically associated with the category of non-motorized transportation:

- Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles
- Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrian and bicyclists
- Preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including their conversion and use for pedestrian or bicycle trails)
- Streetscape and landscape improvements

Other categories that can be funded through this program include improving aesthetics, historic preservation, and water quality and wildlife.

The MDOT Transportation Enhancement Program has given $85.5 million in grants to non-motorized trail projects. Almost 33% of all non-motorized applications submitted were funded.

**Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation**

A federal program to replace and rehabilitate deficient highway bridges and to seismically retrofit bridges located on any public road. Pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities are eligible. If a highway bridge deck is replaced or rehabilitated, and bicycles are permitted at each end, then the bridge project must include safe bicycle accommodations (within a reasonable cost).

**Highway Safety Improvement Program**

This is a program to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on public roads. Eligible activities include improvements for pedestrian or bicyclist safety, construction and/or signage at crossings and in school zones, identification of and correction of hazardous locations, and safety improvements on publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian pathways or trails.

**Land and Water Conservation Fund**

The National Park Service operates the Land and Water Conservation Funds, which administers federal funding to state and local governments for acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Grant applications are available through the MDNR and require a 50% local funding match. To be eligible, this grant requires an approved community recreation plan filed prior to application deadline date. For more information please contact the Michigan DNR, Grants Program at (517) 373-9125 or visit [www.michigan.gov/dnr](http://www.michigan.gov/dnr).
Safe Routes to School
The most recent federal transportation legislation passed in August 2005, (Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act a Legacy for Users -SAFETEA-LU) made Safe Routes to School funding available. Michigan is expected to receive approximately 19 million dollars during fiscal years 2006 - 2009. The process for awarding these funds has not been determined at this time. Funding is for 100% of the cost and there is no local match required. More information on Safe Routes to school funding can be found at www.SR2S.org. Residents and communities should consult this process in bringing an improvement forward.

Recreational Trails Fund
This program is comprised of federal gas taxes that MDOT receives from the Federal Highway Administration and passes on to the DNR for administration and distribution. These funds are for the maintenance and development of recreational trails and related facilities. Eligible categories are trail maintenance and rehabilitation, trailside or trailhead facilities, construction and maintenance equipment, trail construction, trail assessments, and trail safety and environmental protection education. Annual appropriation by the Michigan Legislature varies, Fiscal Year 2005 Appropriation was $1,800,000 – approximately $1,500,000 available for grants.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
This program is to reduce traffic congestion and enhance air quality. These funds can be used for either the construction of bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways, or non-construction projects such as maps, brochures, and public service announcements related to safe bicycle use. Funds are available to counties designated as non-attainment areas for air quality, based on federal standards.

National Scenic Byways Program (NSBP)
This is a discretionary program; all projects are selected by the US Secretary of Transportation. Eight specific activities for roads designated as National Scenic Byways, All-American Roads, State scenic byways, or Indian tribe scenic byways. Eligible activities include construction along a scenic byway of a facility for pedestrians and bicyclists and improvements to a scenic byway that will enhance access to an area for the purpose of recreation.

State Funding Sources
Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund
Since 1976, the MNRTF has been providing financial assistance to local governments and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to purchase land (or rights in land) for public recreation or protection because of its environmental importance or its scenic beauty. Amounts ranging from $15,000 to $500,000 are available.

Any person, organization, or unit of government can submit a land acquisition proposal; however, development proposals are only accepted from state and local governments. State and local units of governments applying for these grants must include a minimum local match.
of 25% of the total project cost. A DNR approved community recreation plan must be on file prior to application deadline to be eligible. For more information contact the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Grants Program at (517) 373-9125 or visit www.michigan.gov/dnr.

Recreation Improvement Fund
This program is for the operation, maintenance, and development of recreation trails, restoration of lands damaged by off-road vehicles, and inland lake cleanup. These funds are utilized by the DNR for projects related to the state trail system.

ORV and Snowmobile Trail Funds
These programs provide grants for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of the state’s motorized off-road trail system.

Community Development Block Grants
The primary objective of the CDBG program is to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment and expanded economic opportunities for people of low and moderate income. CDBG funds can also be used as local match funds for federal and state grants such as enhancement grants. All activities carried out under the CDBG program must meet one of the three national objectives:

- Benefiting low to moderate income persons
- Aids in the elimination or prevention of slum or blight
- Addressing an urgent community need.

Michigan Cool Cities Initiative
The Michigan Cool Cities Initiative is designed to revitalize cities and attract workers and jobs. This initiative is focused around creating places with a mix of residential and commercial uses, mixed income housing, and a pedestrian-friendly environment. Local governments, non-profit organizations and quasi-governmental entities are all welcome to apply. In addition, that community must either be a Core Community, Michigan Main Street Program community, MEDC Blue Prints Program community and/or one of the 267 “invited” cities identified by the Governor and set letters in September, 2003. For more information please visit www.coolcities.com.

Economic Development Fund
Category A – Economic Development Road projects. The goal is to promote increased economic potential and improve the quality of life through support of job creation and retention in Michigan. Eligible projects are those that address transportation need (condition, safety, or accessibility) that is critical to an economic development project. Must create or retain permanent jobs.

Category D – Secondary All-Season Roads. This program purpose is to provide funding for transportation projections which: complement the existing state trunkline system with
improvements on connecting local routes that have high commercial traffic and minimize disruptions that result from seasonal load restrictions. Construction projects only.

Category F – City in Rural Counties. The goal of this program is to provide continuity within Michigan’s system of all season roads. Must be a federal aid road.

Local Funding Sources

Michigan Transportation Fund (Act 51)
Revenues from the Michigan Transportation fund are generated from state gas and value taxes. The funding is divided among the Michigan Department of Transportation, road commissions, cities and villages. Each Act 51 agency is required by law to spend at a minimum 1% of their Act 51 dollars on non-motorized improvements. A recent change in State legislation eliminated the ability to use this money for paving gravel roads and maintenance such as street sweeping in an effort to increase the number of improvements constructed. This funding may be used to provide the match for federal funds.

Millage
A millage is a tax on property owners based on the value of their home. Millages are use specific and approved by vote of the residents.

Special Assessment
A special assessment is a special kind of tax on a subset of a community. Special assessments are placed on those adjacent land owners who will receive the greatest benefit from a project to be funded using a special assessment.

General Funds
A community or road agency’s general fund dollars have no restriction placed on them preventing them from being used for non-motorized improvements. The improvements do, however, need to be approved by a community’s governing body such as a board of commissioners or City Council.

Foundations and Organized Trails Groups have the ability to raise capital and generate local support for trail acquisition and development projects. Private foundations serve the interests of the foundation, defined by a family or corporation. Community foundations work to improve, within their geographic area, the quality of life for residents.

Private
Private funds such as those from private developments or private donations are eligible to be spent on non-motorized improvements.
Businesses

Local businesses are frequent partners in the promotion of trail projects in their area. Public-spirited companies understand that the popularity of recreational trails improves the quality of life in their community – an important aspect of economic growth. They can provide meeting rooms, provide small grants, donate copying or printing services on company equipment, or free or reduced-fee use of the company’s special services.

Friends Groups and Other Organizations

The long-term success of many trail projects has been due to “friends” groups and advocacy organizations that support a project from inception to implementation. In addition to local fund raising, friends groups can also provide a number of services including physical labor as through “Adopt-a-Trail” maintenance or construction activities, fundraising, user education, promotion, and actual surveillance of the facility. Civic groups and school groups can also play an important role in support of projects through advocacy, promotion, and hosting events. These organizations are often the best source for identifying local priorities.

Trail license fees, like those for fishing and hunting, can be considered. People (trail users) don’t mind paying a fee to support their sport. In Lower Michigan, the Kal-Haven Trailway collects user fees via an annual pass. Surveyed users were okay with the fee as long as the trails were well maintained.

Pay Boxes on Trails, each trail gets its own dollars but there is the maintenance of the boxes and lightly used trails may not collect enough funds. There is also a potential for vandalism of the boxes.

Bicycle Licenses, a small uniform license fee for bicycles was suggested at several meetings by bicyclists. These license fees would be small, perhaps in the $1 to $2 range but would be used to assist in developing and maintaining trails and routes throughout the Upper Peninsula.

Other Funding Sources

Building Healthy Communities Grant Program

At The Home Depot, they understand the impact of hard work and sweat equity. They believe in the power of hands-on service- of rolling up our sleeves and getting dirty while working beside your neighbors to improve your community.

More importantly, they understand that volunteering to improve the physical health of your neighborhood by planting trees, developing green spaces and updating school facilities and community centers creates a healthier, more stable community where families can thrive. Home Depot recognizes that committed and motivated neighbors accomplish an enormous amount of important in work in communities across the country. That’s why they support these efforts by lending a hand or a hammer... or a shovel... or flats of perennials.
Grants, up to $2,500, are now available to registered 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations, public schools or tax-exempt public service agencies in the U.S. who are using the power of volunteers to improve the physical health of their community. Grants are made in the form of The Home Depot gift cards for the purchase or tools or materials. Only grants submitted through the online application process will be considered for funding. Grants are highly competitive and there are three grant cycles planned for 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Opens</th>
<th>Closes</th>
<th>Notifications Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Cycle</td>
<td>April 15, 2009</td>
<td>June 15, 2009</td>
<td>July 15, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The internet is a valuable resource for searching for other grant opportunities that may be available.

**Applying for Funding**

The Rails-To-Trails Conservancy is an excellent resource for any agency thinking about trail development. Here are some tips they offer for fund raising and grant writing:

- **Develop a fund raising plan for your projects:** Begin with your estimated project cost and set funding goals from key sources. This is a valuable resource because foundations often require you to show percentages of funding anticipated from each source.

- **Identify key components of your project that can be tailored to specific funding sources:** Without compromising your project, try to develop a list of mini-projects tailored to the interest of a number of different funding sources.

- **Complete all planning elements prior to submitting funding requests:** Seeking funding prematurely is not advisable as you often only get one chance to make a positive impression on a potential funder.

- **Start by writing a two-page summary letter:** This help to succinctly define your project and your request for support. Many funding sources provide guidelines for the initial “inquiry” letter. Make sure you follow their guidelines.

- **Create a credible team prior to seeking funding:** Funders are interested in not only quality of your project, but the quality of your organization or team as well.

- **Establish strong partnerships and demonstrate coordination:** At a minimum, all project partners should provide “lead” funding, both cash and in-kind services where feasible. If you do not have “lead” funding, attach support letters from individuals, local businesses, civic groups and others to your request.
• **Submit proposals:** Once the research is completed, partners in place, backed by a solid plan, submit proposals to your target list of funders. Make sure to follow any and all guidelines set forth by potential funders.

• **Complete all follow-up documentation; thank and recognize donors:** Make sure you send thank-you letters recognizing receipt of donations and complete any required follow-up documentation or reporting.

### 7.2 Trail Resources

**Agency Policies and Contacts**

Throughout the development of this plan there were a number of governmental bodies, non-profit organizations and citizen advocates involved in the process. These agencies will have a substantial influence on the development of a regional trail system in the Upper Peninsula.

**Michigan Department of Transportation**

MDOT provides considerable support for trail development in the state. The Transportation Service Centers have actively pursued the development of non-motorized facilities on MDOT properties, such as providing wide shoulders on state roads and trails in the right-of-way and technical assistance to local units of government and trail groups. Contact information for the MDOT Superior Region offices:

- **MDOT Superior Region Office**
  1818 Third Avenue North
  Escanaba, MI 49829
  Phone: 906-786-1800
  Fax: 906-789-9775
  Toll Free: 888-414-MDOT (6368)

- **MDOT Crystal Falls TSC**
  120 Tobin-Alpha Road
  Crystal Falls, MI 49920
  Phone: 906-875-6644
  Fax: 906-875-6264
  Toll Free: 866-584-8100

- **MDOT Escanaba TSC**
  1818 Third Avenue North
  Escanaba, MI 49829
  Phone: 906-786-1800
  Fax: 906-789-9775
  Toll Free: 888-414-MDOT (6368)

- **MDOT Ishpeming TSC**
  100 S. Westwood Drive
  Ishpeming, MI 49849
  Phone: 906-485-4270
  Fax: 906-485-4878
  Toll Free: 888-920-MDOT (6368)

- **MDOT Newberry TSC**
  14113 M-28
  Newberry, MI 49868
  Phone: 906-293-5168
  Fax: 906-293-3331
  Toll Free: 866-740-6368
Many of the trails within the Upper Peninsula are State facilities. Contact information for trails on Michigan DNR land in the Upper Peninsula:

- Baraga Operations Service Center
  427 US-41 North
  Baraga, MI 49908
  Phone: 906-353-6651

- Newberry Operations Service Center
  5100 State Highway M-123
  Newberry, MI 49868
  Phone: 906-293-5131.

- Marquette Operations Service Center
  1900 US-41 South
  Marquette, MI 49855
  Phone: 906-228-6561

- Baraga Forest Management Unit
  427 US-41 North
  Baraga, MI 49908
  Phone: 906-353-6651

- Crystal Falls Forest Management Unit
  1420 US-2 West
  Crystal Falls, MI 49920
  Phone: 906-875-6622

- Escanaba Forest Management Unit
  6833 Hwy 2, 41 & 35
  Gladstone, MI 49837
  Phone: 906-786-2354

- Gwinn Forest Management Unit
  410 West M-35
  Gwinn, MI 49841
  Phone: 906-346-9201

- Newberry Forest Management Unit
  Box 428
  Newberry, MI 49868
  Phone: 906-263-3293

- Sault Ste. Marie Forest Management Unit
  2001 Ashmun Street
  Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
  Phone: 906-635-5281 ext 56167

- Shingleton Forest Management Unit
  M-28 West
  P.O. Box 67
  Shingleton, MI 49884
  Phone: 906-452-6227

- Tahquamenon Falls State Park
  Park Headquarters
  41382 W M 123
  Paradise, MI 49768
  Phone: 906-492-3415
  Toll-free: 800-447-2757

US Forest Service
A large amount of land in the Upper Peninsula is owned by the US Forest Service. Contact information for the US Forest Service:
Hiawatha National Forest:

- Hiawatha National Forest Service  
  2727 N. Lincoln Road  
  Escanaba, MI 49829  
  Phone: 906-786-4062

- Sault Ste. Marie Ranger District  
  4000 I-75 Business Spur  
  Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783  
  Phone: 906-635-5311

Ottawa National Forest:

- Ottawa National Forest Service  
  E6248 US-2  
  Ironwood, MI 49938  
  Phone: 906-932-1330

- Bessemer Ranger District  
  E6248 US-2  
  Ironwood, MI 49938  
  Phone: 906-932-1330

- Iron River Ranger District  
  990 Lalley Road  
  Iron River, MI 49935  
  Phone: 906-265-5139

- St. Ignace Ranger District  
  1900 US-2  
  St. Ignace, MI 49781  
  Phone: 906-643-7900

- Kenton Ranger District  
  4810 E. M-28  
  Kenton, MI 49967  
  Phone: 906-852-3500

- Ontonagon Ranger District  
  1209 Rockland Road  
  Ontonagon, MI 49953  
  Phone: 906-884-2085

- Watersmeet Ranger District  
  E24036 Old US-2 East  
  Watersmeet, MI 49969  
  Phone: 906-358-4551

Local Road Commissions

Each county road commission is responsible for maintaining the county roads and streets. There is no written policy or procedure for addressing non-motorized facilities. Typically, a request is made by the local unit of government to the Road Commission regarding designating an on-road bicycle route along a county road. The Road Commission will work with the local of unit government to determine if conditions along that road are favorable for such a designation. If it is acceptable the unit of government can pass a resolution to submit to the Road Commission, who then takes that into consideration when construction or maintenance is due and can apply for additional funds for non-motorized transportation facilities. Contact information for the Upper Peninsula Road Commissions:
• Alger County Road Commission
  E9264 M-28
  Munising, MI 49862
  Phone: 906-387-2042

• Baraga County Road Commission
  US-41 South, P.O. Box 217
  L’Anse, MI 49946
  Phone: 906-524-7270

• Chippewa County Road Commission
  3949 S. Mackinac Trail
  Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
  Phone: 906-635-5295

• Delta County Road Commission
  3000 32nd Avenue North
  Escanaba, MI 49829
  Phone: 906-786-3200

• Dickinson County Road Commission
  1107 S. Milwaukee Avenue
  Iron Mountain, MI 49801
  Phone: 906-774-1588

• Gogebic County Road Commission
  Courthouse Annex
  Bessemer, MI 49911
  Phone: 906-667-0233

• Houghton County Road Commission
  20140 Gagnon Circle, M-26
  Hancock, MI 49930
  Phone: 906-482-3600

• Iron County Road Commission
  800 W. Franklin Street
  Iron River, MI 49935
  Phone: 906-265-6686

• Keweenaw County Road Commission
  1916 Fourth Street
  Mohawk, MI 49950
  Phone: 906-337-1610

• Luce County Road Commission
  423 W. McMillan Avenue
  P.O. Box 401
  Newberry, MI 49868
  Phone: 906-293-5741

• Mackinac County Road Commission
  706 N. State Street
  St. Ignace, MI 49781
  Phone: 906-643-7333

• Marquette County Road Commission
  1610 N. Second Street
  Ishpeming, MI 49849
  Phone: 906-486-4491

• Menominee County Road Commission
  W5416 Belgiumtown Road
  Stephenson, MI 49887
  Phone: 906-863-5100

• Ontonagon County Road Commission
  415 Spar Street
  Ontonagon, MI 49953
  Phone: 906-884-2332

• Schoolcraft County Road Commission
  P.O. Box 160
  Manistique, MI 49854
  Phone: 906-341-5634
Local Health Departments
Health departments in the region are actively involved in many areas of trail development, with a mission to improve the health and well-being of the communities by collaborating resources which offer opportunities for building a healthy mind, body, and spirit through physical activity, healthy food, and environmental options. Contact information for the Upper Peninsula Health Departments:

- Chippewa County Health Department
  508 Ashmun Street
  Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
  Phone: 906-635-3578

- Dickinson-Iron District Health Dept.
  601 Washington Avenue
  Iron River, MI 49935
  Phone: 906-265-9913

- Luce, Mackinac, Alger, Schoolcraft (LMAS) Health Department
  14150 Hamilton Lake Road
  Newberry, MI 49868
  Phone: 906-293-5107
  Toll Free: 800 562-4832

- Bay Mills Community Health
  12124 W. Lakeshore Dr.
  Brimley, MI 49715
  Phone: 906-248-8340

- Marquette County Health Department
  184 US-41 Highway East
  Negaunee, MI 49866
  Phone: 906-475-9977

- Public Health Delta and Menominee Counties
  2920 College Avenue
  Escanaba, MI 49829
  Phone: 906-786-4111

- Sault Tribe Community Health
  2864 Ashmun
  Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
  Phone: 906-635-8844

- Western Upper Peninsula District Health Department
  540 Depot
  Hancock, MI 49930
  Phone: 906-482-7382

EUP Regional Planning & Development Commission
Our agency works with Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac County as well as the local township and municipality governments and is involved in many planning activities from transportation to economic development. Our agency has developed a non-motorized trail GIS database in the development of this plan. We offer technical assistance, planning and grant writing services and act a liaison with State and federal governments. Contact information is EUP Regional Planning, P.O. Box 520, 125 Arlington Street, Suite 18, Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783; (906) 635-1581.

CUPPAD Regional Commission
Our agency works with Alger, Delta, Dickinson, Marquette, Menominee, and Schoolcraft County as well as the local township and municipality governments and is involved in many planning activities from transportation to economic development. Our agency has developed a non-motorized trail GIS database in the development of this plan. We offer technical
assistance, planning and grant writing services and act a liaison with State and federal governments. Contact information is CUPPAD Regional Commission, 2415 14th Avenue South, Escanaba, MI 49829; (906) 786-9234.

**WUPPDR Regional Commission**

Our agency works with Baraga, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, and Ontonagon County as well as the local township and municipality governments and is involved in many planning activities from transportation to economic development. Our agency has developed a non-motorized trail GIS database in the development of this plan. We offer technical assistance, planning and grant writing services and act a liaison with State and federal governments. Contact information is WUPPDR Regional Commission, P.O. Box 365, Houghton, MI 49931; (906) 482-7205.

**Utility Corridors**

Gas line and electric utility ROW’s sometimes present favorable options for separate recreational trails. Typically however, these corridors exist through easements associated with numerous different property owners and varying agreement nuances. Occasionally, a utility ROW will be owned fee simple. In this case, if the corridor represents a location that is desirable from a bicycle transportation perspective – such as linking a major business, industrial or commercial center with residential center – then it may be desirable to pursue negotiations with the utility company for the purpose of establishing a recreational/bicycle trail facility in that corridor.

Trail development could be a “win-win” for the trail users and utility company in a utility corridor as maintenance of the corridor can be shared. Many snowmobile and ORV trails do currently follow utility corridors in the region. Although there are no policies in place, any plans for trails along the utility corridors should include representation from the utility companies involved to ensure a safe route.

**UP-wide Utility Corridor Contacts:**

- **American Transmission Company**
  P.O. Box 47
  Waukesha, WI 53187-0047
  Phone: 262-506-6700
  Toll Free: 866-899-3204

**Eastern Region Utility Corridor Contacts:**

- **Cloverland Electric Cooperative**
  2916 W. M-28
  Dafter, MI 49724
  Toll Free: 800-562-4953

- **Edison Sault Electric**
  725 East Portage Avenue
  Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783
  Phone: 906-632-2221
  Toll Free: 800-562-4960
Central Region Utility Corridor Contacts:

- DTE Energy
  One Energy Plaza
  Detroit, MI 48226
  Phone: 800-477-4747

- WE Energies
  231 W. Michigan St.
  Milwaukee, WI 53203
  Phone: 414-221-2345
  Toll Free: 800-714-7777

Western Region Utility Corridor Contacts:

- Northern Natural Gas Company
  1111 South 103rd Street
  Omaha, NE 68124
  Phone: 402-398-7664
  Toll Free: 866-810-5268

- Upper Peninsula Power Company
  PO BOX 19076
  Green Bay, WI 54307-9076
  Phone: 800-562-7680
Resource Materials

**American Associate of State Highway and Transportation Officials (http://www.transportation.org/)**
The American Associate of State Highway and Transportation Officials is the voice for transportation and catalyst for organizational and technical excellence. Their mission advocates transportation-related policies and provides technical services to support states in their efforts to efficiently and safely move people and goods. They have developed a standard manual on designing bicycle facilities which is available on their website.

**Smart Growth(http://www.smartgrowth.org)**
In communities across the nation, there is a growing concern that current development patterns -- dominated by what some call "sprawl" -- are no longer in the long-term interest of our cities, existing suburbs, small towns, rural communities, or wilderness areas. Though supportive of growth, communities are questioning the economic costs of abandoning infrastructure in the city, only to rebuild it further out. Smart growth also means ensuring connectivity between pedestrian, bike, transit and road facilities.

**Safe Routes to School (http://www.saferoutesmichigan.org)**
An international movement to make it safe, convenient and fun for children to bicycle and walk to school. When routes are safe, walking or biking to and from school is an easy way to get the regular physical activity children need for good health. Each participating school forms a local team consisting of school administrators, teachers, parents, student leaders, law enforcement officers and other community members who are interested in children’s health and safety. Schools in the EUP region currently participating:

**Context Sensitive Solutions (http://www.michigan.gov/mdot)**
In 2003, Governor Granholm issued an Executive Directive that requires MDOT to incorporate Context Sensitive Solutions into transportation projects whenever possible. Under CSS, MDOT solicits dialogue with local governments, road commissions, industry groups, land use advocates and state agencies early in a project’s planning phase. This dialogue helps to ensure that bridges, interchanges, bike paths and other transportation projects “fit” into their communities. The CSS approach results in projects that respect a community’s scenic, aesthetic, historic, economic and environmental character.
Connecting Michigan: A Statewide Trailways Vision and Action Plan
(http://www.michigantrails.org/connectingmichigan/)
Connecting Michigan is a proactive and broad-based initiative to identify and address the critical issues that are impeding Michigan’s progress on developing a statewide interconnected system of trailways and greenways. The Michigan Trails and Greenways Alliance (MTGA) has led this effort. They are a non-profit organization that fosters and facilitates the creation of an interconnected statewide system of trails and greenways for recreation, health, transportation, economic development and environmental/cultural preservation purposes.

Michigan Trails at the Crossroads: A Vision for Connecting Michigan
On July 18, 2006, Governor Jennifer Granholm announced the state will work with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Trust fund to link Michigan’s trail system by building new trails and upgrading existing trails throughout the state. This initiative, to achieve an interconnected statewide system of trails, will take the coordination of many state agencies and local trail partners. Michigan Trails at the Crossroads outlines some of the partnerships and funding mechanisms that can help create a vibrant statewide trail system.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center
(http://www.bicyclinginfo.org/)
The Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC) is a national clearinghouse for information about health and safety, engineering, advocacy, education, enforcement, access, and mobility for pedestrians (including transit users) and bicyclists. The PBIC serves anyone interested in pedestrian and bicycle issues, including planners, engineers, private citizens, advocates, educators, police enforcement, and the health community.

Rails to Trails Conservancy (http://www.railstotrails.org/)
Rails-to-Trails Conservancy is a nonprofit organization working with communities to preserve unused rail corridors by transforming them into trails, enhancing the health of America’s environment, economy, neighborhoods and people. The mission of Rails-to-Trails Conservancy (RTC) is to create a nationwide network of trails from former rail lines and connecting corridors to build healthier places for healthier people.

Superior Region Non-Motorized Investment Strategy
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Introduction

The Eastern Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission created and implemented the *EUP Non-Motorized Travel and Trail Survey* to gather public input and information in preparation for the development of a *Regional Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and Investment Strategy for Chippewa, Luce and Mackinac Counties*.

This report represents the major findings and results of the survey. The purpose of the survey is to collect data and public opinions on non-motorized transportation issues and trail development within the region.

The survey was distributed at the Sault Ste. Marie Spring Show and Mackinac County Home Show as well as sent out to local trail user groups, community officials, bikers and offered on-line during the months of April, 2008 through August, 2008.

A total of 53 surveys were returned. The survey was designed to ask a broad array of questions in order to gather information about non-motorized travelers and trail users about their age, gender, skill level, reasons for riding/trail use, preferences, etc. The responses were analyzed and are graphically represented in this document with descriptive analysis. The survey is not intended to be a rigorous mathematical or scientific study but instead to suggest general trends and an overall profile of the cycling community/trail users, as well as key issues for future planning.
Summary

Twenty-three men and 30 women completed the survey, 57% between the ages of 41-62, 32% between the ages of 21-40 and 11% over the age of 62. The majority of respondents were year round local residents, 11% were just visiting and 6% were seasonal residents. The majority of respondents were interested in both biking and hiking trails.

A little over half the people classified themselves as moderately experienced bikers, with the other half evenly split between beginners and experienced. More men claimed to be experienced or moderately experienced, where as the majority of women classified themselves as moderately experienced or beginner.

When questioned why they ride, the majority answered for exercise and recreation. Commuting and running errands did not rank very high for reasons to ride the bike. Respondents showed that those riding for commuting or errands ride fewer miles a week than those riding for exercise or recreation. For those who chose exercise cyclists typically ride long distances, up to 3 times per week. The majority of those who are riding for recreation ride up to 10 miles or more, once or twice a week, which possibly suggests weekend trips.

When asked reasons why they did not use their bike for commuting, having no safe bike route was the most important reason with driver behavior/too much traffic ranking second most important.

The majority of cyclists use the city/county roads or highway roads with equestrian trails and ORV trails used least. When asked they’re opinion on what we should have more of, 60% responded on-road bicycle routes with 50% wanting more wider paved shoulders on the road system. Multi-use trails ranked high as a primary choice also. When asked what cycling facilities were most needed the top answer was off-road bike lanes with on-road lanes/designated routes w/signage tied for second choice.

Focusing more on trails, the number one reason respondents choose to use a trail was for exercising/fitness and to enjoy nature followed by reducing stress. Almost all the respondents said they do not know about the trail opportunities. The majority of respondents do not want to travel great distances to get to a trail. Restrooms were the most desired amenity at a trailhead, with drinking water also rating highly. Parking and restrooms were rated as the most needed amenities.

Respondents were asked their opinion on where tax dollars could be used to invest in the trail system with developing new greenway trails, including paving wider shoulders in road improvement projects and pursuing the multi-purpose trail concept as the top three choices.

Over 90% of respondents agreed that trails are important to the community and that the county/local unit of government should invest more money into non-motorized facilities.
The majority of those who answered responded favorably to contributing a fee for development and maintenance of trails. Ninety-five percent supported the concept for multi-purpose trail of snowmobiling in winter and biking in summer.
Questions 1-5 of the survey asked about the respondents themselves and their interest. Those interested in only biking were asked to complete questions 6-15, trail users could skip to question 16 and finish. The survey was completed by 23 men and 30 women (Figure 1).

Figure 1 – What is your gender?

The age breakdown of respondents shows that 57% were between the age of 41-62 and 32% between the age of 21-40 with 11% of respondents over the age of 62 and no respondents under the age of 21.

Figure 2 - What is your age?

Those who responded were asked what their residency status was. Eighty-three percent were year-round residents, 6% were seasonal residents and 11% were just visitors to the area. Of the year-round residents the majority of respondents were from Sault Ste. Marie (22). Responses also came from Newberry (3), Brimley (1), Bay Mills Township (1), Superior Township (2), Cedarville (2), Dafter Township (1), DeTour Village (1), Drummond Island (3), Kinross (1), Moran Township (1), Soo Township (2), Sugar Island (1), St. Ignace City (2) & Township (1), Paradise (1) and Whitefish Township (1).

Figure 3 - Do you live in the Eastern U.P.?
The respondents were asked what their interests were and given three options, biking, hiking or both. The majority of people (77%) was interested in both cycling and trails.

**Figure 4 - What interests you?**

The people were given three choices to classify their riding level and ability; experienced, moderate or beginner. Fifty-one of the 53 respondents that answered this question classified themselves on their biking ability as follows:

**Figure 5 - How would you classify yourself as a biker?**

Overall 24% classified themselves as experienced bikers. Forty-three percent of males classified themselves as experienced while only 7% of women did.

**Figure 6 - Male: How would you classify yourself as a biker?**

**Figure 7 - Female: How would you classify yourself as a biker?**
People were asked the question, Why do you ride a bicycle? Four broad options were given to choose from: recreation, exercise, errands/shopping and commuting (work/school) with the option to check more than one category. Exercise received the highest positive response at 88% followed by recreation at 86%, errands/shopping at 47% and commuting at 32% (Figure 8). Two of the four categories rated very high and people responded positively to three of the four categories. Commuting received the most negative responses with 20 people or 59%. The data suggests more cyclists ride to enjoy the healthy recreational and exercise aspects of cycling rather than as commuting to work or school.

![Figure 8 - Why do you bike?](image)

People were asked how many miles a week (Figure 9) and how many times a week (Figure 10) they ride their bikes. They were given the same four categories to choose from: commuting, exercise, recreation, errands/shopping and, again, they could choose multiple categories. The relationships between activity and riding distance suggest that various functions of cycling have different catchment areas. Those who ride in order to commute are riding fewer total miles per week (23% are riding 1-5 miles per week). Cyclists who ride long distances for errands are clearly in the minority (only 6% are riding over 25 miles per week). This most likely reflects a preference for completing errands within local neighborhoods, with cyclists riding shorter distances to pick up items like groceries and other sundries. For the other three activities—commuting, exercise, and recreation—riders typically ride 1-5 or 5-10 miles 3 times per week. A small number of respondents in each of these three categories ride over 25 miles per week. Exercise cyclists claim the greatest percentage of long distance riding (14% are riding more that 25 miles per week), surpassing the commuters (9% are riding more than 25 miles per week). Overall, most respondents are willing to travel long distances for exercise.
The results indicate that the majority of people who ride for exercise and recreation, generally ride one to three times per week. Most recreation users (60%) cycle one or two times per week, which suggests that these riders might be focusing on weekend trips.
Question 8 asked people if they do not use their bikes to commute to work/school, what keeps them from doing so. The choices they were given were distance, poor roadway surface conditions, no place to park or store bike, too much traffic/driver behaviour, no shower/change facility, no safe bike route, it is a longer commute, or to write in another reason (Figure 11). Results show that the most important reason most people do not bike to work/school is there is no safe bike route, with too much traffic/driver behavior coming in second. Other reasons include being retired, working at home or having to use the car for work or dropping kids off.

Survey question #9 asks if anyone is a member of a bike club or advocacy organization and 84% responded that they were not, while 16% are. Respondents were asked if they used the Superior Region-East Road and Trail Bicycling Guide to plan their routes. The majority do not use this map to plan the routes. This map has only recently been published which may be the reason it is not used. People were asked if they thought the Guide was useful and 60% considered it useful, 20% considered it not very useful and another 20% considered it very useful. Bikers were asked what type of surface they preferred to ride on. The most favorable was asphalt/concrete with 65%, with a hard packed surface coming in second at 41%. A natural surface was not as favorable only receiving 14% as a preferred surface.
Question #13 asked respondents to rank up to 5 the most frequently and least used types of trails. Figure 12 depicts that city/county paved roads and state highway shoulders are the most frequently used with equestrian and off-road motorcycle trails being least used.

In question 14 we ask the respondents opinion on what they think we should have more of. Almost 60% would like to see more on-road bicycle routes and more than 50% would like to see more wider-paved shoulders on state highways and county roads.
Respondents were asked which cycling facilities are needed in question 15 (Figure 14). Off-road bike lanes ranked at the top of the list with on-road bike lanes and designated routes with signage as second and third choices.
Focusing more on trail users, question 16 begins by asking “why” people use trails. The choices were: enjoy nature; reduce stress; exercise/fitness; explore new areas; challenge of the trail; to get away from the city; not crowded; located close to home; no hassles from authorities; to commute to work and they could also write in other reasons. Exercise/Fitness was the top choice of 71% of respondents while enjoying nature came in second. Other reasons included group activity with friends, and safer than walking on road.

![Figure 15 - Why do you use trails?](image-url)
Following that, question 17 asks respondents if they do not use the trails what prevents them from doing so. The choices were: don’t have time, don’t know about the trail opportunities, or not interested in trails as well as a write-in other option. Figure 16 shows that the majority of respondents do not know about the trail opportunities in the area. Other reasons include - there are no existing trails to use in this area.

Respondents were asked how far they would travel to get to a greenway or trail in question 18. Forty-one percent said they would travel less than 5 miles, while only 8% said they would travel more than 50 miles.

Question 19 asks what support facilities/amenities they use when visiting a trail (Figure 18). Restrooms received the highest response at 87%. Drinking water was also a high use at 81%. Camping and vending were the least used.
The respondents were then asked what greenway/trail support amenities they thought were most needed (Figure 19).

Survey respondents thought restrooms and parking/staging areas were the most needed amenities and vending was the least needed.
Respondents were asked their opinion on where tax dollars (State and local) could be used to invest in the trails system for the EUP. Several choices were given as well as a write-in option. Figure 20 shows the following response to question 21.

**Figure 20 - Where could State and local government use funds to invest in the trail system in the EUP?**

Developing new trails and including wider shoulders in road improvement planning were top choices. Pursuing the Multi-Purpose Trail concept of snowmobiling in winter/biking in summer was also one of the top choices.

Questions 22-27 asks a series of questions whether the respondents agree, are neutral, or disagree.
Question 28 asked respondents if they would be interested in attending a meeting to discuss more about trails in their community and asked for contact information. Sixty-three percent agreed to attend a meeting. In Question 29 we asked if the respondents community held annual biking events and were asked to list them. We also asked respondents if there was a local entity or organization in their community that is involved in trail planning, development and maintenance, to which 75% responded that yes there was.

Respondents were asked if they would be willing to contribute a fee for development or maintenance of trails within their community. Seventy-seven percent responded favorably to contributing a fee. Of those that answered yes, they were then asked how much they would be willing to contribute. The respondents that answered ranged from $5 - $100 for the months of April – September and from $10-$400 for the months of October – March.

The final question that was asked was whether the respondents support the Multi-Purpose Use concept of snowmobiling in winter and biking in summer. Ninety-five percent supported this concept.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIL NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>SURFACE TYPE</th>
<th>FOR MORE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHIPPEWA COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey-Lagerstrom Preserve</td>
<td>Sugar Island</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Walking Trail</td>
<td>Tres Lake</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detour Botanical Garden Trail</td>
<td>DeTour Village</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/Wood chips</td>
<td><a href="http://www.detourvillage.org">www.detourvillage.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond Island Heritage Trail</td>
<td>Drummond Island</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drummondislandchamber.com">www.drummondislandchamber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiny-Palms Preserve</td>
<td>Whitefish Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy, logging mads</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinross Heritage Park Trail</td>
<td>Kinross</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kinross.net/heritage.htm">www.kinross.net/heritage.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNearney Lake</td>
<td>North of Sts. Ignace</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/skiing">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/skiing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monocle Lake Interpretive Trail</td>
<td>Bay Mills Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/point_iroquois_light/index.php">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/point_iroquois_light/index.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country Trail</td>
<td>Chippewa County</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/hiking">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/hiking</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise Pathway</td>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bowl Pathway</td>
<td>Knicheloe</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Iroquois Boardwalk</td>
<td>Bay Mills Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Boardwalk/ sidewalk</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/point_iroquois_light/index.php">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/point_iroquois_light/index.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy Trail</td>
<td>Drummond Island</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.drummondislandchamber.com">www.drummondislandchamber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round Island Point Preserve</td>
<td>Bay Mills Township</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudyard School PAHM Walkway</td>
<td>Kinross Township</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Two-track, Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudyard Twp. Park Trail</td>
<td>Rudyard</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Crushed stone</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sault-sainte-marie.mi.us/">http://www.sault-sainte-marie.mi.us/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Lake Trail</td>
<td>Superior Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/camping/detourvillage/index.php">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/camping/detourvillage/index.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahquamenon/Emerson Trail</td>
<td>Whitefish Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion Point Preserve</td>
<td>Whitefish Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waboose</td>
<td>Northwest of Raco</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-track, Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/developed_campgrounds/">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/developed_campgrounds/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Lake Loop</td>
<td>South of Sts. Ignace</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/developed_campgrounds/">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/lighthouses/developed_campgrounds/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Nature Preserve</td>
<td>Drummond Island</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luce County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind Sucker Pathway</td>
<td>Northern Luce County</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodl Lake Pathway</td>
<td>Northern Luce County</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaqua Lake Pathway</td>
<td>South of Newberry</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Lake Trail</td>
<td>Pentland Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskalongue Hiking Trail</td>
<td>Northern Luce County</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahquamenon Logging Museum Trail</td>
<td>McMillan Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boardwalk/Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahquamenon Nature Trail</td>
<td>Tahquamenon Falls State Park</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahquamenon River Trail</td>
<td>Tahquamenon Falls State Park</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahquamenon/Clark Lake Loop</td>
<td>Tahquamenon Falls State Park</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahquamenon/Giant Pines Trail</td>
<td>Tahquamenon Falls State Park</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zellar Trail</td>
<td>Newberry/Pentland Twp.</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Crushed stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mackinac County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Portage Pathway</td>
<td>Garfield Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birge Nature Preserve</td>
<td>Clark Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Boardwalk/Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carp River Fisherman's Hide</td>
<td>North of St. Ignace</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carp River Trail</td>
<td>Mackinac County</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/skiing">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/skiing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC Camp Round Lake Interpretive Site</td>
<td>Garfield Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/skiing">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hawatha/recreation/skiing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow Lake Trail</td>
<td>Garfield Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandnr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Area Cross Country Ski Trail</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PRIMARY TRAIL INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAIL NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>SURFACE TYPE</th>
<th>FOR MORE INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUT RIVER BRIDGE</td>
<td>Garfield Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural/Boardwalk Stairway</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER MARQUETTE PARK INTERTPRETIVE TRAIL</td>
<td>St. Ignace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk/Crushed stone</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORSESHOE BAY HIKING TRAIL</td>
<td>North of St. Ignace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1 mile</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/hiking/">http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/hiking/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKINAC ISLAND TRAILS</td>
<td>Mackinac Island</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paved/Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mackinacisland.org/">http://www.mackinacisland.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARQUETTE ISLAND PRESERVES</td>
<td>Clark Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.landtrust.org">www.landtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSH LAKE PATHWAY</td>
<td>Garfield Township</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.5 miles</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH COUNTRY TRAIL</td>
<td>Mackinac County</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/hiking/">http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/hiking/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEEK-A-BOO SKI TRAIL</td>
<td>Cedarville</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>2.16 miles</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETE'S CREEK SKI TRAIL</td>
<td>Garfield Township</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>2.2 miles</td>
<td>Two-track, Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDGE INTERPRETIVE</td>
<td>Brevoort Lake</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.5 mile</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAND DUNES</td>
<td>West of St. Ignace</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/skiing">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/skiing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. IGNACE HURON BOARDWALK</td>
<td>St. Ignace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boardwalk</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stignace.com/">www.stignace.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. IGNACE/TROUT LAKE RAIL GRADE</td>
<td>St. Ignace to Trout Lake</td>
<td>Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballast, Sand</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigantrail.org">www.michigantrail.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. MARTINS CROSS COUNTRY SKI TRAIL</td>
<td>West of Hessel</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
<td>3 miles</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/skiing">www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/hiawatha/recreation/skiing</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAITS MAIN TRAIL</td>
<td>St. Ignace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.0 mile</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITCHBACK RIDGE</td>
<td>Little Brevort Lake SF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.25 mile</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td><a href="http://www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails">www.michigandr.com/parksandtrails</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKING CRITERIA</td>
<td>SCALE</td>
<td>POINTS</td>
<td>SCORE (0-100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Within 1 Mile of Proposed Trail</td>
<td>Over 5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects Residential and Commercial Districts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Trail Connects to Tourist Attractions (Heritage Routes, Natural Areas, State Parks, Snowmobile and-or ORV Trail Heads, Historic Downtowns, Etc.)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Plans Completed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Trail Exists is Community Plan(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects To Existing Trails</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonmotorized</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-use</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Participation / Support</td>
<td>Multi-jurisdiction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other State or Federal Agencies (including Tribes)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Jurisdiction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Agreement in Place</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously Applied For Funding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated With Existing Trail Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Public Easement in Place</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisition Required</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE = 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central U.P. - Survey Analysis

Appendix D

Introduction

The Central Upper Peninsula Regional Planning and Development Commission created and implemented the Non-Motorized Travel and Trail Survey to gather public input and information in preparation for the development of a Regional Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and Investment Strategy for Alger, Delta, Dickinson, Marquette and Menominee Counties.

This report represents the major findings and results of the survey. The purpose of the survey is to collect data and public opinions on non-motorized transportation issues and trail development within the region.

The survey was distributed by mailing and offered on-line during the months of April, 2008 through August, 2008.

A total of 17 surveys were returned. The survey was designed to ask a broad array of questions in order to gather information about non-motorized travelers and trail users about their age, gender, skill level, reasons for riding/trail use, preferences, etc. The responses were analyzed and are graphically represented in this document with descriptive analysis. The survey is not intended to be a rigorous mathematical or scientific study but instead to suggest general trends and an overall profile of the cycling community/trail users, as well as key issues for future planning.

Summary

Nine men and eight women completed the survey, 70% of whom were between the ages of 21 and 40, 18% between the ages of 41 and 62 and 12% were over the age of 62. The majority of respondents (94%) were year round local residents, 6% were seasonal residents. The majority of respondents (88%) were interested in both biking and hiking trails.

With regard to the level of experience of the bikers, slightly more than three-fourths of the respondents, (76%), classified themselves as experienced or moderately experienced bikers, with the remainder evenly split between beginners and non-bikers.

When questioned why they ride, the majority answered for exercise and recreation. Commuting by bicycle was identified by approximately 30% of the respondents, while 18% stated that they used their bicycles to run errands.

When asked reasons why they did not use their bike for commuting, the most important reason was driver behavior/too much traffic ranking with having no place to store the bike and poor roadway surface conditions ranked as close second and third reasons. Membership in bicycle related organizations showed that 59% of the respondents were members of some type of bicycle organization.
Fifteen persons responded to the question of do you use the Superior Region Central Road and Trail Bicycling Guide to Plan Your Route; only one person responded that they used the guide. Eleven persons said they did not use the guide and three persons said they were unfamiliar with the guide. The majority of persons stated that the Guide was useful or very useful with only 19% feeling the guides were not useful.

The majority of cyclists preferred to ride on concrete or asphalt with a hard packed surface coming in as a distant second preference. When asked their opinion on the most needed bicycle facilities in the area, the most common response was designated bike routes with signs. On road bike lanes and off – road bike lanes (paths) were the second and third most common response.

Asked for their opinion on where state and local government could invest funds in the non-motorized trail system the most common response was trail improvement planning followed by developing trails and corridors for biking. Using funds to acquire railroad right-of-ways and other land for public use trails also scored as high priorities. All respondents felt that non-motorized transportation was important to the community. Of the respondents that answered the question, 87% felt that their community did not have a good non-motorized system in place.

Asked if they would like a non-motorized path along or near their property, 71% of the respondents indicated that they would like a non-motorized path. All respondents indicated that they felt that county and local government should invest more money into non-motorized facilities.

Tabulated Survey Results

The following tables show the responses to the questions in the survey. The actual question or topic is shown below the table. Explanations or commentary is shown above the table.

Questions 1-5 of the survey asked about the respondents themselves and their interest. There were 17 respondents, 9 men and 8 women.
The age breakdown of respondents shows that 70% were between the age of 21-40 and 18% between the age of 41 and 62 with 12% of respondents over the age of 62 and no respondents under the age of 21.

Local residents made up 94% of the respondents with the remaining 6% being seasonal.
The respondents represented five general areas from the six county area.

Biking and hiking were the most popular non-motorized activities identified by respondents.
The majority of the respondents were moderately experienced cyclists.

The primary reasons for biking were recreation and exercise.
Driver behavior combined with too much traffic was the most common reason respondents did not commute by bicycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not commuting</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I work too far from home</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roadway surface conditions are poor</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No place to park/store bike</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Too much traffic/driver behavior</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No Shower/change facility at work</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No safe bike route</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is a longer commute</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other reasons for not commuting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work at home</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids schedules</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WOULD YOU USE THE SUPERIOR REGION CENTRAL ROAD AND TRAIL BICYCLING GUIDE TO PLAN YOUR ROUTE?
The majority of bicycle riders responding preferred riding on a paved surface.

The three most needed facilities identified by the respondents were bike routes with signs, on-road bike lanes, and off-road bike lanes (paths).
All respondents felt that non-motorized transportation was important to the community. (no table shown-100% in agreement).

The question regarding the proximity of a bicycle trail next to or along their property is of interest due to the natural tendency of some people to not want the potential impacts of a facility.

All respondents felt that the local or county government should invest more money in non-motorized facilities. (No chart-100% in agreement).
The following annual bicycling events were identified by respondents in the Central Upper Peninsula region.

- Tour de Dickinson
- Lake Antoine Fun Ride
- Silent Ride
- Bike Parade
- Century Ride – Gladstone

Significant interest was shown in continuing to meet to work toward improved non-motorized transportation.

Would you be interested in attending a meeting to discuss more about non-motorized transportation in your community?
1. What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. What is your age? ☐ Under 21 ☐ 21 – 40 ☐ 41 – 62 ☐ 63 or Older

3. Do you live in the Central U.P.? ☐ Year-round ☐ Seasonally ☐ Just Visiting

4. If year-round or seasonal resident, what city/township/village do you live in? __________

5. What non-motorized activities interest you? (check all that apply)

☐ Biking ☐ Hiking/Walking ☐ Other __________

6. How would you classify yourself as a biker?

☐ Experienced ☐ Moderate ☐ Beginner ☐ I Don’t Bike

7. Do you ride your bike for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>No. of miles per day(circle):</th>
<th>Days per week(circle):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Exercise</td>
<td>1-5 5-10 11-15 16-25 25+</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Recreation</td>
<td>1-5 5-10 11-15 16-25 25+</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Commuting</td>
<td>1-5 5-10 11-15 16-25 25+</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Errands</td>
<td>1-5 5-10 11-15 16-25 25+</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other________</td>
<td>1-5 5-10 11-15 16-25 25+</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Not Applicable

8. If you do not use your bike to commute to work or school, what keeps you from doing so? Please rank importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Least Important</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work too far from home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway surface conditions poor</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No place to park/store bike</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much traffic/driver behavior</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No shower/change facility at work</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No safe bike route</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a longer commute</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are you a member of a bike club or advocacy organization?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you use the Superior Region – Central, Road and Trail Bicycling Guide to plan your routes?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How useful would you rate the Superior Region- Central, Road and Trail Bicycling Guide?</td>
<td>Not Very Useful</td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What type of surface to do you prefer to ride on?</td>
<td>Asphalt/Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Packed Surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In your opinion, which cycling facilities are needed most in this area? (check all that apply)</td>
<td>Designated Routes w/Signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-Road Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-Road Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bike Parking Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In your opinion, where could the State or local unit of Government use funds to invest in the non-motorized trail system in the Central U. P.?</td>
<td>Developing new trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving existing trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving existing facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include 4-foot paved shoulders in road improvement planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquiring land for public use of trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acquiring abandoned railroad corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving railroad corridors for biking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintaining existing trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pursue Multi-Purpose Trail Concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(snowmobiling winter/biking summer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In your opinion, do you think a non-motorized transportation system (i.e., bike/walking routes, bike lanes, etc.) is important in a community?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. In your opinion, does your community have a good non-motorized transportation system?
   □ Yes  □ No

17. Would you like a non-motorized path along or near your property?
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Neutral

18. Do you feel your county/local government should invest more money in non-motorized facilities? (bike lanes, bike parking, signage, etc.)
   □ Yes  □ No  □ Don’t care

19. Does your community have annual bicycling events? Please list.

20. Would you be interested in attending a meeting to discuss more about non-motorized transportation in your community?
   □ Yes  □ No

Contact Information: ____________________________________________
(Optional)

Please fold and staple with the back page out and mail back to CUPPAD. THANK YOU.
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