Results by location

In addition to overall Houghton County results for each of the 26 survey statements, results are also tabulated for each of 14 townships, 2 cities, and 5 villages within the county (fig. 1). If the number of surveys returned from each jurisdiction is compared with the number of occupied housing units, according to 1990 census figures, the percentage of households responding to the survey ranges from a low of 8 percent in the Village of South Range to a high of 24 percent in Hancock Township.

Nineteen statements show significant differences in responses by residence (see facing page). “Significant” is defined for the purposes of this analysis as showing a difference of 10 percentage points or more agreement (agree strongly + agree somewhat) among the locations or 40 “total points” (see p. 3).

Only locations with at least 50 responses are used in calculating significance; with fewer responses, each “vote” represents more than 2 percent of the total and tends to distort the percentages. Eight locations are excluded by this criterion: Duncan, Elm River, Hancock, Laird, Quincy, and Schoolcraft Townships, Copper City, and the Village of South Range. However, the three rural southern Houghton County townships of Duncan, Elm River, and Laird (D-E-L), with a total of 75 responses, are grouped together for this analysis as well as reported separately to each township and in Volume 2 of this report (Appendix E).

Each of the 19 statements with differences by residence is listed below, from greatest to smallest range of total points, followed by the locations whose residents agreed most and least strongly with the statement:

- **Property owners should have absolute and final say about what happens on their property.** (Strongest agreement: Adams and D-E-L Townships and Village of Calumet; least agreement: City of Houghton and Stanton Township)

- **Private property rights are more important than public interest when a development is proposed.** (Strongest agreement: Adams and D-E-L Townships; least agreement: City of Houghton and Stanton Township)

- **More recreational opportunities are needed in my township/city/village.** (Strongest agreement: Village of Calumet and Adams and Calumet Townships; least agreement: Stanton and Torch Lake Townships)

- **Lack of jobs, especially for young people, is a problem in our area.** (Strongest agreement: Villages of Laurium and Calumet and Adams and Calumet Townships; least agreement: Stanton and Torch Lake Townships)

- **Similar commercial development along U.S. 41 between Hancock and Calumet would benefit the area.** (Strongest agreement: Calumet and Adams Townships and Village of Lake Linden; least agreement: Stanton Township and City of Houghton)

- **I feel that I have a voice in shaping the future of my community/township/city.** (Strongest agreement: Village of Lake Linden and D-E-L Townships; least agreement: Stanton Township)

- **New development would be acceptable to more people if it blended better with the historical buildings in the area.** (Strongest agreement: Village of Calumet; least agreement: Franklin, Torch Lake, and Adams Townships and City of Hancock)
• Some roads should be designated as “scenic” and should retain their natural character. (Strongest agreement: Village of Laurium; least agreement: D-E-L Townships)

• Tax incentives, such as tax abatements, should be used to attract new businesses. (Strongest agreement: Villages of Lake Linden and Laurium; least agreement: Stanton, Chassell, and Portage Townships)

• Public access to waterfront areas is becoming too limited. (Strongest agreement: Osceola and Calumet Townships; least agreement: Chassell Township)

• The design and appearance of new buildings and signs are important to the community. (Strongest agreement: Villages of Lake Linden and Calumet and City of Houghton; least agreement: Chassell Township)

• Some open space and undeveloped land should be protected from future development. (Strongest agreement: Village of Calumet and City of Houghton; least agreement: Torch Lake Township)

• Property is becoming unaffordable for local residents. (Strongest agreement: Calumet and Osceola Townships; least agreement: Stanton and Chassell Townships)

• “Big city” shopping and entertainment benefit the area. (Strongest agreement: D-E-L Townships; least agreement: Stanton and Franklin Townships)

• Developers should be allowed to develop with little or no restriction because it helps the local economy. (Strongest agreement: Chassell and D-E-L Townships; least agreement: City of Houghton and Village of Laurium)

• We need to balance private property rights and public interest. (Strongest agreement: City of Houghton and Village of Laurium; least agreement: Village of Lake Linden and Chassell and D-E-L Townships)

• Change brought by economic development should be balanced with actions to preserve community character. (Strongest agreement: Villages of Laurium and Calumet and City of Houghton; least agreement: Chassell Township)

• The benefits of recent commercial development along M-26 and Sharon Avenue outweigh any disadvantages. (Strongest agreement: Adams Township; least agreement: City of Houghton)

• Improvement of existing properties, especially those of historical significance, should be encouraged as an alternative to developing more land. (Strongest agreement: Village of Calumet and Stanton Township; least agreement: Chassell Township)

Complete results by location are included in Volume 2 (Appendices E and F).