



Tuscola County Planning Commission

125 W. Lincoln St.

989.672.3700

Caro, MI 48723

email - tcplanning@tuscolacounty.org

Fax: 989.672.4011

February 7, 2013

Dear Neighbor,

Attached you will find the proposed amended pages for our 2008 General Development Plan. For the most part, the amendments consist of the correction of typos/references, and the updating of information using the 2010 Census data or recent statistical data. We did rewrite and clarify our goals and objectives. This can be found on pages 2-1 thru 2-3. We have also included a new cover insert and the revised table of contents along with the required certification.

We would appreciate your input on our proposed amendments.

A public hearing to present this material will be held in the County Commissioners Chambers, 125 W. Lincoln Street in Caro at 5:30pm on April 3, 2013.

1.1 Regional Setting

Tuscola County is located at the western edge of the “Thumb” area of Michigan’s Lower Peninsula. The County has a year 2010 population of 55,729 and covers an area of over 800 square miles. The surrounding counties are Bay and Saginaw to the west, Huron to the north, Sanilac to the east, and Genesee and Lapeer to the south. The County has a 20-mile stretch of shoreline along Saginaw Bay at its northwest border. **Map 1** shows the geographic location of the County.

The County contains 34 units of local government: one city, ten villages and 23 townships. The County has remained predominantly rural thus far, with extensive agriculture and small communities. Family farms predominantly characterize agriculture in the County. Due to its close proximity to the population centers of Bay City, Flint and Saginaw, and excellent access provided by I-75, M-15, M-24, M-46 and M-53, the County is expected to change in the future.

1.2 Authority to Plan

The Tuscola County Planning Commission has prepared this development plan under the authority of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008 as amended. Section 37 states:

- (1) The county board of commissioners may designate the county planning commission as the metropolitan county planning commission. A county planning commission so designated shall perform metropolitan and regional planning whenever necessary or desirable. The metropolitan county planning commission may engage in comprehensive planning including but not limited to the following:
 - (a) Preparation, as a guide for long-range development, of general physical plans with respect to the pattern and intensity of land use and the provision of public facilities, together with long-range fiscal plans for such development.
 - (b) Programming of capital improvements based on relative urgency, together with definitive financing plans for the improvements to be constructed in the earlier years of the program.
 100. Coordination of all related plans of local governmental agencies within the metropolitan area or region.
 - (d) Intergovernmental coordination of all related planning activities among the state and local governmental agencies within the metropolitan area or region.
- (2) In addition to the powers conferred by other provisions of this act, a metropolitan county planning commission may apply for, receive, and accept grants from any local, regional, state, or federal governmental agency and agree to and comply with the terms and conditions of such grants. A metropolitan county planning commission may do any and all things necessary or desirable to secure the financial aid or cooperation of a regional, state, or federal governmental agency in carrying out its functions, when approved by a 2/3 vote of the county board of commissioners.

The Tuscola County Planning Commission has amended this General Development Plan under the authority to plan requirements as set forth by the MICHIGAN ZONING ENABLING ACT, Act 110 of 2006 as amended, specifically article III, effective July 1, 2006.

1.3 Planning Approach

This plan is the culmination of the third phase of a planning program that began in 1996. The long-range planning program was initiated for the purpose of updating the first General Development Plan, adopted in 1974. The first phase of the 1996 program led to the adoption of a Vision and Policy Plan in January 1998. The second phase was the General Development Plan of 2002.

The Tuscola County General Development Plan of 2008 was developed using the principal that it should be based upon a “bottom-up” rather than “top-down” approach. In other words, the Plan would be based upon the following assumptions:

- a. The most effective planning and land use controls are accomplished at the local level;
- b. Build upon the strength of all local planning efforts to date in the County; and
- c. The County Plan is designed to strengthen local planning.

1.4 Plan Organization

The Plan is organized into five major sections.

- Section One provides introductory information, including the regional setting for Tuscola County, legal authority for the County to plan, and purpose of the Plan.
- Section Two provides county-wide planning goals and policies that form a basis for the Plan.
- Section Three provides recommendations for developing a Capital Improvements Program.
- Section Four provides a review of the current status of planning at all levels of government in and around Tuscola County and other considerations.
- Section Five provides the County Profile.

2.0 Planning Goals and Policies

2.1 Planning Determinants

Map 2 reveals planning determinants. Planning determinants are major “shapers” of the future land use pattern:

The preservation of prime farmland north of the Cass River.

- ♣ Tourism industry growth associated with new Saginaw Bay shoreline access, the Cass River, bordering state hunting lands, and resort residential areas surrounding inland lakes.
- ♣ County receipt of new population and residential growth from the south extending along the M-24 and M-15 corridors.
- ♣ Continued expansion of Caro as the County focal point of business growth, along with M-15 as a developing commercial corridor.
- ♣ Continued County reliance on employment and shopping opportunities found in Bay City, Saginaw, Birch Run, Frankenmuth, and Flint.
- ♣ Maintenance of a rural development pattern because of limited public sanitary sewer systems.
- ♣ Capitalizing on current County assets such as the Caro Municipal Airport and healthcare facilities.

2.2 Tuscola County Goals

A revised “*Tuscola County Goals and Policy Plan*” was completed in January 2008 and reviewed and amended in 2012. The following is a summary of that Plan:

General Goals and Policies

The Tuscola County General Development Plan will serve to establish a decision-making framework for the coordinated development of the County. To achieve a fiscally, socially and environmentally responsible land use pattern consistent with local and county objectives.

1. All land use and development shall be based on PA 110 of 2006 as revised, PA 33 of 2008, Michigan’s Planning Enabling Act of 2008 and Schindler’s Land Use Series Checklist.
 - A. Land Use policies shall ensure the continued health, safety and general welfare of the residents of Tuscola County
 - (1) through Master Plans and zoning,
 - (2) education and training seminars.
 - B. Land uses shall be grouped in a well balance pattern of land uses that
 - (1) are in proper relationship to each other,
 - (2) meet present and future community needs,
 - (3) provide efficient, economical and environmentally practical land use.
 - C. Redevelopment will be encouraged, consistent with other County goals supporting orderly planning and well-organized land use.

-
2. Positive elements of the Tuscola County general environment will be maintained and preserved, keeping Tuscola County a desirable place to live by,
 - A. Assisting local units of government to comply with PA 110 and PA 33 and other legal requirements.
 - B. Reviewing and addressing the local units Master Plans, zoning, and ordinance changes.
 - C. Suggestions and pointing out legal requirements.
 - D. Insuring that growth is managed not inhibited.
 - E. Assuring availability and adequacy of but not limited to:
 - (1) public safety.
 - (2) public utilities.
 - (3) streets, community facilities and other requirements.

Planning and Zoning Goal:

The County Planning Commission will promote consistent and coordinated decision-making on all land use issues by county and local units of governments that are consistent with Federal and State agencies and guidelines.

The County will take the lead in helping local communities to prepare plans and regulations.

The Tuscola County Planning Commission will...

1. Take a leadership role in providing local units government with the planning and zoning data and techniques they need to properly deal with development or land use issues.

Action:

- A. Assign members of the Tuscola Planning Commission to local units of government to assist coordination of their Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
 - (1) Each member introduces themselves to the local units assigned to them
 - (2) Each member gives the local units contact numbers for information or questions
 - (3) Each member attends meetings of local units of government on a bi-annual basis to maintain and open lines of communication
 - (4) Each members reports the results of their contact with their assigned units of government at the monthly meeting.
 - B. Review assignments on a yearly basis
2. Promote consistent and coordinated decision-making on all land use issues by all Federal, State, and County agencies; as well as all local units of government.
 3. Work with all local units of government to improve communication on land use and development matters of interest or concern to all County Residents and provide a recognized and respected forum for discussions on issues of common concern.

Action:

- A. The Commission will send out semi-annual, or as needed, newsletters
The newsletters will include information on new laws, zoning, educational updates, and other relevant information regarding planning and zoning.
- B. Commission members will visit municipalities for information purposes.
 - (1) Members will give new information to municipalities as needed
 - (2) Members will be available for questions.
The member will give answers that day or research the information and review the information with the municipalities in a timely manner.

-
- C. Encourage all local units of government to prepare or update land use plans and provide data, information or technical assistance for these master plans, where possible or when requested.
 - (1) Members will give handouts to the municipalities as needed for information gathering on preparing and updating land use plans.
 - (2) Members will send out reminder notices to municipalities for Master Plan updates.
 - D. Study the feasibility of implementing a geographic information system within the County capable of meeting the needs of County departments and local units of government.
 - (1) Members will research other adjacent County systems
 - (2) Gather data regarding GIS systems
 - E. Establish a strategic program that will identify specific organizations, processes and a structure responsible for implementing the various plan proposals contained within this document.
3. Update website for criteria documents for Master Plans and Zoning as changes in legislation occur.

As a result of County initiatives for enhanced training and education, improved communication and a sharing of information, up-to-date local Master Land Use Plans and Zoning Ordinances will be utilized throughout the County.

Implementation Strategies:

1. **Shape** the Tuscola County General Development Plan so that it is in part a traditional “county master plan,” but also a “Tuscola County Planning Guidebook,” providing tools, techniques, and references that both the County Planning Commission and local planning commissions can utilize on a routine basis in conducting everyday business.
2. **Prepare** an annual strategic plan for non-capital tasks, to be undertaken by the Planning Commission, including such items as (1) grant writing, (2) zoning ordinance or zoning technique updates, (3) county-wide/regional training programs, (4) other community “outreach” efforts.
3. **Utilize** community task forces for the study and planning that will be required to implement future plan proposals.

The State of Michigan recently passed new laws amending the existing planning laws for municipalities and townships in order to promote intergovernmental cooperation and joint planning among neighboring communities. Adopted on January 9, 2002, Public Act 263 of 2001 (which amends the Township Planning Act) and Public Act 265 of 2001 (which amends the Municipal Planning Act) created new guidelines for preparing and adopting a master plan. Highlights of the new laws are given below.

At the beginning of the Master Planning process, a community must send a notice to adjacent communities and to the County informing them that they are intending to prepare a Master Plan. Once the community has prepared a draft plan, that plan must be sent to all of the neighboring communities and county for review and comment. It is the duty of the County to decide whether the proposed Plan is consistent with Plans of adjacent communities and the County Plan. This period of review and comment by the communities and County will take no more than 95 days. After the review and comment period is over, the community preparing the Master Plan must hold a public hearing for adoption.

The new planning acts also give more responsibilities to the local governing body in the Master Planning process. The local governing body has the opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan and must approve its distribution to adjacent communities and the County. The intent is to ensure that the governing body is in general agreement with the plan before it is sent out for comment.

Another noteworthy change in the Master Planning process is that **ALL COMMUNITIES ARE TO REVIEW THEIR MASTER PLANS EVERY FIVE YEARS** to determine whether their plan should be continued, amended, or revised.

Step 4: Conduct Financial Analysis of Prioritized Projects Based Upon Community's Capability of funding.

Data collected in Step 3 is next compared to the results in step 1 to determine if funding capability exists.

3.3 Suggested Ingredients For a Program Plan

1. Inventory of Facilities.

There should be a comprehensive inventory of the facilities in the program area. Include only those facilities that meet the CIP definition of a capital improvement. At a minimum, this inventory should identify basic data on the location and size of all the facilities. Additional information should include:

- ♣ date of the original construction, or the latest major rehabilitation
- ♣ condition (see below)
- ♣ capacity
- ♣ an estimate of its value
- ♣ type of material from which facility is constructed

2. Evaluation of Condition.

An assessment of needs, based on the condition of the facility, should be prepared. Information that may be helpful includes:

- ♣ frequency of repair
- ♣ breaks in service/down time
- ♣ time since last major repair/rehabilitation or original construction
- ♣ reduction in capacity, percentage of capacity available for use
- ♣ increase in unit operating costs or repair costs

3. Indicate Standards Used in Assessing Need.

Often the assessment of need is based on technical standards. The standards may be established by national, regional, technical, professional, or trade associations. Some standards may result from formal evaluations by such associations (e.g., to achieve or retain accreditation). The standards may be simply recognized practice, such as "good engineering practice," or accepted industry standards.

4. Repair/Replacement Schedule.

The facilities listed in the inventory should be on a schedule for repair or replacement. How many facilities are beyond the repair/replacement period recommended in technical (or locally developed) standards? What are the procedures and major policies by which you determine priorities for the program plan? the CIP?

5. Need for New (or Substantially Expanded) Facilities.

For proposed new or substantially expanded facilities, indicate the location, size, and capacity of the facility. There should be an analysis of the current demand and projected change in the demand for the facilities. For proposed new or substantially expanded facilities, what alternatives are available? Some state-federal programs require an alternatives analysis.

Step 5: Review Capital Improvements to Ensure Projects are Consistent with Community Development Objectives

This step can be deflected to the governing Planning Commission.

Step 6: Conduct Public Information Meeting

It is important that projects be exposed to public scrutiny to gauge the level of support and to identify any errors made up to Step 6.

Step 7: Project Comparison

Information collected in Steps 3-6 is then used to compare projects. Often, an Evaluation Form is used. The survey projects are then assembled into a Schedule of Revenue Expenditure. All information is then assembled into a CIP report and submitted to the legislative body. In turn, the legislative body adopts a Capital Budget covering only the ensuing year.

3.4 Challenges

The following “lessons learned” should be considered when developing a CIP.

Process and implementation steps should be done on an annual basis.

Process and implementation steps normally take a 4-6 month period.

Developing a balance between meeting community’s needs and its ability to fund is difficult.

Usually needs exceed ability to fund.

Selecting an appropriate level of public participation. Key is, however, to include public review prior to formal submittal to the legislative body.

4.0 Planning: Status and Considerations

The following guiding principals are used in the formulation of the 2013Plan:

1. The Plan is a visual representation of the County’s expectations for future local development. Important characteristics of this Plan are:
 - (di) Maintain agricultural use north of Cass River
 - (dii) Encourage compact growth around existing communities
 - (diii) Protect environmental resources
 - (div) Allow new development based upon the carrying capacity of land
 - (dv) Promote economic development in proximity to urbanized areas
 - (dvi) Promote high-density residential development in emerging growth areas
 - (dvii) Capitalize on the strengths and assets of the County while seeking ways to overcome its’ limitations
- (3) The Plan provides a broad framework for land development within the County. It is expected that a finer grain of planning will occur within each local unit of government that respects the overall integrity of the County Plan.
- (4) The Plan is generalized in nature as a means to coordinate (not dictate) the planning activities between units of government, to respond to changing conditions and trends, and to guide development within communities that have not yet completed local planning programs.
4. The Plan is based upon the premise that it must accommodate all reasonable land uses, including those that may have regional impact. In that regard, general site recommendations for industrial land, senior housing campuses and manufactured housing have been made.
5. The Zoning Enabling Act, P.A. 110 of 2006, for cities, villages, townships and counties provides that zoning ordinances shall be made “in accordance with a plan.” Moreover, courts have set aside zoning regulations where the zoning regulations are not related to any lawful or adequate plan or where the plan has been destroyed through inconsistent use or development. (See for example, Troy Campus v. Troy, 132 Mich. App 441 (1984).) Thus, the Plan provides a legal foundation for land development code preparation.
6. Plan preparation encourages private investment by reducing risk associated with an uncoordinated development pattern. The County Plan has been prepared based upon the tenet of planned growth to insure compatibility between land uses.
7. Environmental issues do not respect political boundaries, thus, the County Plan is directed toward protecting and conserving important natural assets.
8. The Plan has been prepared to direct governmental actions by better defining areas in need of public investment for roads, economic development activities, etc.

4.1 Existing Land Use Assessment

The rational application of the planning process for the County is possible only when there is a basic understanding of existing conditions and relationships between land uses. The Existing Land serves as a basis for the future goals and recommendations of the County.

EXISTING LAND USE ACREAGE

TABLE 1

Land Use Category	Acres (approximate)	Percent
1. Agriculture	344,200	66.2
2. Residential	8,000	1.5
3. Commercial	600	0.1
4. Industrial	400	0.1
5. Open Pit/Extractive	3,700	0.7
6. Public/Semi-Public	1,200	0.2
7. Recreation	600	0.1
8. Vacant	159,900	30.8
9. Water Bodies	1,400	0.3
Totals	520,000	100.0

4.2. Plan Development

Tuscola County communities are actively involved in shaping their future through local planning.

4.2.1 Community Assessment Team (CAT)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is based on observations made by the Community Assessment Team (CAT) during its visit to Tuscola County in December 2005. The CAT process began with an application from members of the community to MSU Extension. The application described the community's situation and listed questions that community members wanted the CAT to address. The CAT advisory committee then reviewed the application. The CAT then sent a small delegation to meet with the application committee to clarify questions raised in the application and recruited team members with skills appropriate to the community's needs. The full CAT visit involved two days of input gathering from a variety of small and large meetings with residents and tours of the community. The team then analyzed, debated and categorized the information to produce a preliminary verbal report to the community. Finally, the team reflected on its preliminary recommendations and wrote the final report (this document). The community is invited to receive a follow-up visit

about six months after the issuance of this report. The full report is available and accessible at the following web site:<http://web1.msue.msu.edu/cdnr/tuscolacatreport.pdf>.

The major focus of Tuscola County's application and subsequent questions was ways to improve and enhance its economic development. In general, the team found that Tuscola County is doing an excellent job with traditional approaches to economic development and recommends that these activities continue. In addition to the current economic development tools and strategies, new methods for re-energizing the economic development base have emerged in recent years. Such new methods include but are not limited to entrepreneurship, intergovernmental cooperation and enhancing quality of life. Quality of life issues should not be overlooked—they are an important factor for rebuilding, sustaining and maintaining an economically viable and vibrant community. A more inclusive approach can help Tuscola County achieve its economic development goals while strengthening other, non-economic aspects of the community.

During the CAT visit, it was repeatedly affirmed that the major economic development arm for Tuscola County is the Tuscola County Economic Development Corporation(EDC). The CAT recommends that the Tuscola County Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors provide leadership for the overall guidance and direction for implementation and evaluation of the recommendations contained in this document. During the visit, it was evident as well that numerous public and private entities should be invited to partner with the Tuscola County Economic Development Corporation in its quest to implement and evaluate the recommendations contained in this strategic master plan. Potential partners include but are not limited to the Tuscola County Board of Commissioners, MSU Extension—Tuscola County, the Tuscola County Farm Bureau, the Human Development Commission, the Tuscola County Community Foundation, the Tuscola County Planning Commission, the Thumb Area Tourism Council, all local units of government (township, village and city), Tuscola 2011, Inc., Lead Tuscola, the Tuscola Technology Center, the Tuscola Intermediate School District and all school districts serving Tuscola County, the chambers of commerce, local economic development corporations, downtown development authorities, the Tuscola Area Airport Authority, the Michigan Small Business and Technology Development Center, Rural Partners of Michigan, the East Central Michigan Planning and Development Regional Commission, U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development, the Michigan Department of Agriculture, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, Travel Michigan, financial institutions, real estate professionals, Tuscola Trails, Davenport University, Baker College, other institutions of higher education serving Tuscola County, and community-based and faith-based organizations.

4.2.2 Local Master plans

In 2008, nineteen of the thirty-four jurisdictions (56%) had master plans. As of 2013, twenty-eight (82%) have completed their plans. Of all the master plans in the County, only two are old. Significantly, all of the City and Villages that have plans have new plans. Those available were, in great part, the basis for the county plan.

4.2.3 Community Profile

In addition, the characteristics and resources of the people themselves play an important part in the determination of a community's future. Those factors, found in Chapter 5, "County Profile", played a big part in the creating this plan.

4.2.4 Land Assessment

Future land use and development is determined in part by soil type and the general geography of the county. These impact the planning and zoning choices available to the townships and the county as a whole. The carrying capacity of the land is shown on Map 3, pg. 4-4.

The plan recommends six broad land use categories. Table 2 shows the approximate acreage for each land use category.

FUTURE LAND USE ACREAGE TUSCOLA COUNTY TABLE 2

Land Use Category	Acres	Percent
1. Agricultural	250,000	48.5
1-A. Prime Agricultural	140,000	26.9
1-B. Agricultural Estate	110,000	21.2
2. Residential	150,000	29.1
• Country Residential	110,000	21.2
• Rural Residential	20,000	3.8
2-C. Resort Residential	20,000	3.8
3. Urban Service Area	18,000	3.5
3-A. Tier I Urban Service Area	10,000	1.9
3-B Tier II Urban Service Area	8,000	1.6
Business Corridor	5,000	1.0
Industrial	2,000	0.4
6. Recreation and Conservation	90,000	17.5
Total	515,000	100.0

Map 4, (pg 4-6) Land Use Composite, shows the Land Use Map recommendations as prepared in each community's Master Plan. Because the land use maps were unique to each community, with different land use categories, the maps were generalized in order to fit into six broad land use categories that applied to the entire county. The six land use categories shown on the map are as follows:

- Agricultural/Rural Residential/Conservation
- Low-density Residential
- Low-Density Residential
- High-Density Residential
- Commercial/Office
- Industrial
- Public/Semi-public/Recreation

The Agricultural/Rural Residential/Conservation category includes all lands proposed for agricultural and related uses, very low density, single-family homes intermixed with agricultural uses, and other uses as open space and natural resource conservation.

The Low Density Residential category includes lands primarily designated for single-family or two-family homes in an urban or suburban setting.

The High Density Residential category includes lands proposed to be used for multiple-family uses such as condominiums and apartments.

5.2.9 Farmland

Tuscola County's most valued natural resource is its highly productive soil. Farming began in the early 1850's with 13 working farms and today has grown to include over 320,000 acres of land. The County is one of the top agricultural areas in the State, according to the Tuscola County Soil Survey. Wise utilization of this valuable resource, emphasizing proper management practices, will sustain this economic base for future years.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has classified a large portion of the County's arable land as prime farmland. This land is best suited for food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. Generally, prime farmland produces the highest yield with minimal inputs of energy and economic resources. Farming the land in these already viable areas result in the least amount of impact to the remainder of the Country.

The USDA Soil Survey indicates nearly two-thirds of County land is prime farmland. Officials at the USDA Farm Service Agency use the General Soils Map (**Map 8**, pg, 5-11) to display the general location of land most suitable for agriculture. Soil associations one through five are rated the best locations for prime farmland followed by six through eight as reasonable, depending on the locality. Nine is less preferred due to being well drained and ten is least preferred due to very poor drainage qualities.

It is important to note that the inclusion of poorly drained or very poorly drained lands into the prime category is done only where improvements like drains or flood controls are in place. Artificial improvements to these areas are in place across most of the County.

In 1983 the Soil Conservation Service determined 359,000 acres, 69% of the total land area, were being farmed. According to the 1992 Census of Commerce, 324,111 acres were being farmed in the County that accounts for about 62% of the total land area. It is important to note that the loss is not entirely a result of land converted to urban or industrial uses. The Farm Service Agency states that one reason for the decline was lower prices for commodities at the market. Therefore land that could be in production is currently not utilized.

However, the loss of prime farmland to other uses does place pressure on marginal lands. These lands are not as productive due to a greater susceptibility to erosion, drought, and/or difficulty in cultivation.

Public Act 116 offers tax incentives for farmers who agree not to sell their land for non-agricultural uses. This contractual agreement lasts for ten years. Numerous farmlands in the County operate under the PA 116 agreement as shown in **Table 5** (pg 5-22).

Table 6 (pg. 5-23) is an agricultural Snapshot of Tuscola County while an analysis of the contribution of agricultural land to government revenues is presented in **Table 7** (pg. 5-24).

PA 116 AGREEMENTS

TABLE 5

Farmland Development Rights Agreements Tuscola County as of 1/27/2012		
Township	Number of Agreements	Acres
Akron	400	26,147
Almer	189	13,203
Arbela	92	6,523
Columbia	338	19,884
Dayton	34	2,493
Denmark	261	17,591
Elkland	127	9,501
Ellington	77	6,121
Elmwood	211	13,775
Fairgrove	307	18,827
Fremont	13	996
Gilford	322	19,999
Indianfields	13	940
Juniata	121	9,714
Kingston	87	6,009
Koylton	34	2,697
Millington	46	3,951
Novesta	72	4,403
Tuscola	161	11,712
Vassar	9	649
Watertown	33	2,187
Wells	29	1,865
Wisner	140	8,376
Total Tuscola County	3,116	207,563
		9,024

Avg. acreage per Township

Source: Farmland * Open Space Preservation Environmental Stewardship Division
Michigan Department of Agriculture

AGRICULTURE IN TUSCOLA COUNTY

TABLE 6

Average size of farms: 260 acres

Average value of agricultural products sold per farm: \$72599

Average value of crops sold per acre for harvested cropland: \$269.63

The value of nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod as a percentage of the total market value of agricultural products sold: 0.89%

The value of livestock, poultry, and their products as a percentage of the total market value of agricultural products sold: 22.39%

Average total farm production expenses per farm: \$70204

Harvested cropland as a percentage of land in farms: 80.47%

Irrigated harvested cropland as a percentage of land in farms: 2.14%

Average market value of all machinery and equipment per farm: \$107161

The percentage of farms operated by a family or individual: 88.31%

Average age of principal farm operators: 53 years

Average number of cattle and calves per 100 acres of all land in farms: 5.41

Milk cows as a percentage of all cattle and calves: 26.31%

Corn for grain: 77,400 harvested acres

All wheat for grain: 29,600 harvested acres

Soybeans for beans: 72,700 harvested acres

Sugarbeets for sugar: 19,400 acres

Vegetables: 2230 harvested acres

Land in orchards: 197 acres

TABLE 7**2011 Contribution of Tuscola County to Government Revenues**

Taxable Value	Purpose	Millage	Estimated Property Tax Revenue
\$1,381,323,002	State Education Tax	6.0000	\$8,169,574.03
\$1,381,323,002	General Operating (S07)	3.9141	\$5,406,636.36
\$1,381,323,002	Bridge/Streets	0.4807	\$638,012.29
\$1,381,323,002	Senior Citizens	0.1989	\$274,745.14
\$1,381,323,002	Medical Care	0.2500	\$345,330.75
\$1,381,323,002	Road Patrol	0.8953	\$1,236,698.40
\$1,381,323,002	Primary Road Improvements	0.9657	\$1,333,943.60
\$1,381,323,002	Mosquito Abatement	0.6316	\$872,443.60
\$1,381,323,002	Recycling	0.1483	\$204,850.20
\$1,381,323,002	Medical Care Debt	1.0000	\$1,381,323.00
\$1,381,323,002	Total County extra voted millage	4.5780	\$11,750,091.57
\$58,698,140	Akron Twp	6.2218	\$365,208.09
\$55,492,923	Almer Twp	2.4551	\$136,240.68
\$67,456,142	Arbela Twp	2.3651	\$159,540.52
\$45,241,643	Columbia Twp	6.3957	\$289,351.98
\$47,018,829	Dayton Twp	2.2845	\$107,414.51
\$88,028,580	Denmark Twp	2.4516	\$215,828.47
\$85,698,646	Elkland Twp	1.6468	\$141,128.53
\$34,166,950	Ellington Twp	4.8109	\$164,373.78
\$37,803,026	Elmwood Twp	4.2679	\$161,339.53
\$50,034,366	Fairgrove Twp	3.6263	\$181,439.62
\$71,394,667	Fremont Twp	1.3761	\$98,246.20
\$39,290,729	Gilford Twp	4.8563	\$190,807.57
\$62,160,656	Indianfields Twp	2.3722	\$147,457.51
\$42,402,390	Juniata Twp	4.4588	\$189,063.78
\$32,442,120	Kingston Twp	3.4263	\$111,068.84
\$39,742,887	Koylton Twp	3.3158	\$131,779.46
\$103,463,428	Millington Twp	2.2256	\$230,268.21
\$31,414,294	Novesta Twp	2.3963	\$75,278.07
\$63,991,480	Tuscola Twp	1.5265	\$97,682.99
\$77,340,705	Vassar Twp	1.0000	\$77,340.71
\$47,177,175	Watertown Twp	1.1985	\$56,541.84
\$38,587,598	Wells Twp	3.2047	\$123,661.68
\$23,377,479	Wisner Twp	5.1592	\$120,609.09
\$91,661,539	City of Caro	16.1643	\$1,481,644.61
\$47,238,835	City of Vassar	17.0000	\$803,060.20

TABLE 7

2011 Contribution of Tuscola County to Government Revenues

Taxable Value	Purpose	Millage	Estimated Property Tax Revenue
\$20,643,884	O-G School	0.0000	\$78,057.82
\$15,971,717	Frankenmuth School	3.3200	\$76,712.61
\$16,664,631	Marlette School	0.0000	\$32,685.17
\$113,259,841	Akron-Fairgrove School	3.6000	\$650,345.84
\$266,349,298	Caro School	4.2000	\$2,730,116.32
\$156,632,093	Cass City School	3.6850	\$1,204,616.94
\$81,999,480	Kingston School	6.1500	\$827,175.28
\$132,425,400	Mayville School	5.1500	\$1,259,422.67
\$196,549,004	Millington School	3.7400	\$1,355,788.49
\$93,150,304	Reese School	4.7500	\$696,641.23
\$85,239,321	USA School	7.0000	\$758,183.79
\$202,438,029	Vassar School	2.5500	\$1,339,106.26
1,328,042,770	Tuscola ISD	4.2409	\$5,632,096.58
6,695,611	Village of Akron	12.8912	\$86,314.46
48,939,920	Village of Cass City	18.1387	\$887,706.53
8,472,239	Village of Fairgrove	12.0440	\$102,039.65
5,154,111	Village of Gagetown	21.6036	\$111,347.35
5,422,480	Village of Kingston	15.9153	\$85,300.40
\$16,059,087	Village of Mayville	12.7312	\$204,451.45
\$20,113,041	Village of Millington	14.0888	\$283,368.61
\$28,530,096	Village of Reese	11.0000	\$313,831.06
\$8,123,346	Village of Unionville	14.0412	\$114,061.53

***Does not include property used for farming but not classified agricultural for assessment purposes.

5.3 Socioeconomic Profile

Getting a better understanding of the County through socioeconomic data is an important component of the comprehensive planning process. A good socioeconomic profile will include information on population, housing, and economy. These aspects of the County have direct impacts and influences on future land use decisions. **Table 8** shows the population trend for the townships during the last decade, while **Table 9** gives an overall picture of the County today.

POPULATION TRENDS 2005-2010 **TABLE 8**

Place	2005 Population	2010 Population	Percent Change 2005-2010 ¹
City			
1. Caro (Almer & Indianfields Twps.)	4,193	4,229	-1.08
2. Vassar	2,776	2,697	-2.85
Village			
3. Akron (Akron & Fairgrove Twps.)	292	252	-13.70
4. Cass City (Elkland Twp.)	2,606	2,428	-6.83
5. Fairgrove (Fairgrove Twp.)	619	563	-9.05
6. Gagetown (Elmwood Twp.)	384	388	1.04
7. Kingston (Kingston & Koylton Twps.)	442	385	-12.90
8. Mavville (Fremont Twp.)	1,034	750	-27.47
9. Millington (Millington Twp.)	1,115	1,072	-3.86
10. Reese (Denmark Twp.)	1,365	1,448	6.08
11. Unionville (Columbia Twp.)	594	508	-14.48
Township*			
12. Akron	1,609	1,503	-6.59
13. Almer	2,151	2,115	-1.67
14. Arbela	3,338	3,070	-8.03
15. Columbia	1,433	1,284	-10.40
16. Davton	1,879	1,848	-1.65
17. Denmark	3,258	3,068	-5.83
18. Elkland	3,645	3,528	-3.21
19. Ellington	1,336	1,332	-0.30
20. Elmwood	1,235	1,207	-2.27
21. Fairgrove	1,759	1,579	-10.23
22. Fremont	3,568	3,312	-7.17
23. Gilford	875	741	-15.31
24. Indianfields	3,192	2,805	-12.12
25. Juniata	1,701	1,567	-7.88
26. Kingston	1,640	1,574	-4.02
27. Koylton	1,607	1,585	-1.37
28. Millington	4,432	4,354	-1.76
29. Novesta	1,635	1,491	-8.81
30. Tuscola	2,151	2,082	-3.21
31. Vassar	4,403	4,093	-7.04
32. Watertown	2,242	2,202	-1.78
33. Wells	1,776	1,773	-0.17
34. Wisner	757	690	-8.85
Tuscola County	58,428	55,729	-4.62

*Township population includes Village population. Source: U.S. Bureau of Census

TUSCOLA COUNTY 2010 SOCIO-POPULATION SNAPSHOT**TABLE 9****Population**

	Tuscola	Michigan
Population: 2010	55,729	9,876,187
Population: Percent change from 2000 to 2010	-4.4%	-0.6%
Persons 5 years and under	3,128	592,571
Persons 18 years and under	14,560	2,340,656
Persons 65 years and older	8,831	1,362,914
Female persons	27,783	5,026,979
Male persons	27,946	4,849,208
Households: 2010		3,872,508
Persons per household: 2010	2.52	2.53

Race/Ethnicity

White persons	53,578	7,792,312
Persons of Hispanic or Latino origin	1,571	434,552
Black persons	634	1,402,419
American Indian and Alaska Native persons	268	59,257
Asian persons	160	237,029

Demographic

Persons living in same house in 06 and 10: 5 years old +	87.4%	85.5%
Foreign born persons: 2006-2010	.9%	5.9%
Language other than English spoken in home: 10: 5 years old+	3%	8.9%
High school graduates, 25 years and older:2006- 2010	84.8%	88.0%
Bachelor's degree or higher, 25 years and older: 2006-2010	12.4%	25.0%
Mean travel time to work; in minutes: 2006-2010	28.8	23.7

Housing

Housing units	24,451	4,532,233
Occupied Housing Units	21,590	3,806,621
Home ownership rate: 2006-2010	83.2	74.2
Housing units in multi-unit structures: 2006-2010	2,005	815,802
Median value owner-occupied housing units: 2006-2010	\$112,200	\$144,200

Income

Median household income: 2006-2010	\$42,198	\$48,432
Per capita money income: 2006-2010	\$19,937	\$25,135
Persons below poverty: 2006-2010	8,805	1,461,676

Geography

Land Area: (square miles)	803.13	56,538.90
Persons per square mile: 2010 (mean avg)	69.4	174.8

5.3.1 Household Characteristics

For Tuscola County as a whole, married couple families make up 56.5% of the households, as compared to 48.0% married couple families for the state of Michigan. The highest percentage (69.6 %) is found in Tuscola Township, while the lowest percentage (41.6 %) of married couple family households is recorded for the City of Caro. Single females head up 9.9% of Tuscola County family households. The highest percentage (35.1 %) of single person households is found in the City of Caro, and the lowest percentage (16.2 %) is found in Vassar Township.

Table 10 shows the persons per household trends for Tuscola County from 1970 to 2010, as well as projections to the year 2020. As Shown in the table, the persons per household numbers have declined in the past 30 years and are expected to decline further in the next 20 years.

PERSONS PER HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS 1970 –2020 TABLE 10

Year	Persons Per Household
1970	3.41
1980	3.05
1990	2.79
2000	2.65
2010	2.64
2020*	2.62
Percent Change, 1970 – 2020	-23.2%

*Persons per Household projection derived from Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. Source: U.S. Census Reports, 1970-2000. Woods & Poole Economics, Inc. 2001 Data Pamphlet.

5.3.2 Income and Education

Average income statistics, as depicted in **Table 11**, compare family income, household income and per capita income, as well as percentage of families living below the poverty level in 2010. County income statistics in almost all categories are substantially lower than averages for the State.

The lowest (less than \$18,000) per capita incomes are found in the townships of Dayton, Indianfields and Vassar. The highest (more than \$23,000) per capita income is found in the township of Denmark. It is noted that village and city data from the Federal Government is incomplete at this time.

As of the 2010 Census, 83.9% of Tuscola County’s residents over age 25 had a high school diploma or higher, as compared to 88.4% for the State of Michigan.

In Tuscola County, 8.8% of the population over age 25 had a bachelors degree or higher, as compared to 15.5% for the State.

INCOME AND POVERTY STATUS - 2010 TABLE 11

Place	Family Income	Household Income	Per Capita Income	% of Families Below Poverty Level
City				
1. Caro	46,711	39,677	16,300	27.5
2. Vassar	56,508	49,169	17,980	17.9
Village				
3. Akron (Akron & Fairgrove Twps.) *	47,915	33,957	18,571	18.5
4. Cass City (Elkland Twp.) *	54,053	46,981	19,226	16.0
5. Fairgrove (Fairgrove Twp.) *	46,953	41,122	16,723	10.6
6. Gagetown (Elmwood Twp.) *	116,001	40,195	15,288	22.5
7. Kingston (Kingston & Koylton Twp.) *	40,182	39,408	13,809	38.5
8. Mayville (Freemont Twp.) *	67,461	53,574	20,054	12.8
9. Millington (Millington Twp.) *	48,391	42,184	17,920	16.1
10. Reese (Denmark Twp.) *	61,415	52,074	23,925	8.0
11. Unionville (Columbia Twp.) *	66,638	55,510	19,745	2.4
Township*				
12. Akron	59,851	48,664	20,177	8.7
13. Almer	66,478	55,678	22,972	8.5
14. Arbela	60,358	52,630	19,812	11.0
15. Columbia	61,164	53,408	19,662	5.0
16. Dayton	50,771	45,156	17,817	15.8
17. Denmark	61,595	53,567	23,316	10.2
18. Elkland	54,304	47,856	19,209	15.2
19. Ellington	57,293	51,574	20,352	10.6
20. Elmwood	55,334	48,770	19,917	9.0
21. Fairgrove	54,303	48,297	19,715	11.4
22. Fremont	64,473	54,438	20,790	4.9
23. Gilford	69,988	65,963	21,792	3.5
24. Indianfields	51,467	44,310	17,229	20.8
25. Juniata	55,823	52,860	20,928	14.3
26. Kingston	55,069	51,491	18,757	17.6
27. Koylton	54,078	51,249	18,061	14.6
28. Millington	65,616	58,762	21,643	6.3
29. Novesta	58,027	55,421	21,995	12.2
30. Tuscola	66,434	59,177	22,654	3.1
31. Vassar	47,616	45,387	17,681	16.0
32. Watertown	59,349	54,030	20,277	7.0
33. Wells	54,510	49,711	19,234	10.9
34. Wisner	54,423	51,906	22,941	9.4
Tuscola County	61,290	56,591	19,470	12.8
State of Michigan	73,373	61,921	24,435	11.3

5.3.3 Housing

Of the 24,420 housing units in Tuscola County at the time of the 2010 Census, 80.5% were single-family units, 4.3% were 2-4 unit structures, 2.5% were 5-9 unit structures, and .8% were more than 10 unit structures (**Table 12**). Mobile homes accounted for 11.2% of County dwelling units. The greatest proportion (93.6%) of single-family units was found in Gilford Township, and the least (63.3%) in the village of Reese. Mobile homes were most prevalent in Vassar Township, and the least in the Villages of Akron and Mayville and Tuscola Township.

Approximately three-fourths of Tuscola County's housing is owner occupied, as shown in **Table 13** (pg. 5-32). The highest rate (85.9%) of owner occupied housing is found in Arbela Township, and the lowest (53.0%) in the City of Caro.

When analyzing the age of the County's housing (**Table 14**, pg. 5-33), it was noted that the majority (51.6%) were built between 1940 and 1979. Approximately fifteen percent of the County's housing is comprised of homes built earlier than 1940. The village of Mayville, Columbia and Gilford Townships had more than 40% of the homes built earlier than 1940 while The village of Kingston had more than 50) older than 1940.

TYPE OF HOUSING STRUCTURES – 2010

TABLE 12

Place	1 Unit Structures		2-4 Unit Structures		5-9 Unit Structures		10+ Unit Structures		Mobile Homes		Total Units
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#
City											
1. Caro	1185	58.8	334	16.6	199	9.9	216	10.7	79	3.3	2013
2. Vassar	819	69.2	145	12.3	141	11.9	49	4.1	30	2.5	1184
Village											
3. Akron (Akron/Fairgrove)	172	86.9	26	13.1	0		0		0		198
4. Cass City (Elkland Twp.)	841	75.1	128	11.4	37	3.5	38	3.4	75	6.7	1119
5. Fairgrove (Fairgrove Twp.)	191	88.0	12	5.5	0		0		14	6.5	217
6. Gageton (Elmwood Twp.)	139	76.8	12	6.6	2	1.1	10	5.5	18	9.9	181
7. Kingston (Kingston/Koylton)	154	76.6	3	1.5	27	13.4	10	5.0	7	3.5	201
8. Mayville (Fremont Twp.)	318	72.8	65	14.8	49	1.2	5	1.1	0		437
9. Millington (Millington Twp.)	382	79.7	25	5.2	49	10.2	14	4.2	9	1.9	479
10. Reese (Denmark Twp.)	503	63.3	46	5.8	83	10.5	18	2.3	144	18.1	794
11. Unionville (Columbia Twp.)	235	920	9	3.4	9	3.4	0		8	3.1	261
Township*											
12. Akron	689	92	29	3.9	0		0		31	4.1	749
13. Almer***	974	70.1	43	3.1	147	10.6	61	4.4	151	10.9	1389
14. Arbela	1034	83.7	0		0		0		195	15.9	1229
15. Columbia	562	91.9	9	1.5	9	1.5	0		12	2.1	592
16. Dayton	796	84.2	21	2.2	0		0		128	13.5	945
17. Denmark	1063	72.8	46	3.1	83	5.8	18	1.2	250	17.1	1460
18. Elkland	1199	80.3	128	8.5	37	2.5	38	2.5	92	6.2	1494
19. Ellington	423	82.6	0		0		0		89	17.4	512
20. Elmwood	474	86.3	12	2.2	2	.4	10	1.8	47	8.6	548
21. Fairgrove	659	93.3	16	2.3	0		0		31	4.4	706
22. Fremont	1208	81.6	65	4.3	49	3.3	5	0.3	172	11.5	1499
23. Gilford	381	93.6	9	2.2	0		0		17	4.2	407
24. Indianfields***	1679	66.7	298	11.8	52	2.1	142	5.7	348	13.8	2519
25. Juniata	589	83.6	15	2.1	0		0		101	14.3	705
26. Kingston	537	77.9	18	2.7	27	3.9	10	1.5	97	14.1	689
27. Koylton	632	82.6	0		0		0		130	17.0	765
28. Millington	1624	89.9	25	1.3	49	2.7	14	.8	93	5.2	1805
29. Novesta	613	87.6	4	0.6	0		0		83	11.9	700
30. Tuscola	743	92.2	50	6.2	6	0.7	0		7	0.9	806
31. Vassar	1243	71.5	106	6.1	0		0		390	22.4	1739
32. Watertown	814	89.6	0		16	1.8	0		78	8.6	908
33. Wells	590	82.7	0		0		0		124	17.3	718
34. Wisner	316	89.8	0		0		0		36	10.2	352
Tuscola County	19668	80.5	1039	4.3	618	2.5	207	0.8	2732	11.2	24420

*Township numbers include Village numbers.

**Specified housing units include only one-family houses on less than ten acres without a commercial establishment or medical office on the property Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 2006-2010 Community Survey-5 year Estimate

*** Includes part of the City of Caro

HOUSING OCCUPANCY CHARACTERISTICS – 2010

TABLE 13

Place	Owner Occupied		Renter Occupied		Vacant % of Total		Total #
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
City							
1. Caro	1054	53.0	723	36.4	210	10.6	1987
2. Vassar	711	71.4	285	28.6	188	18.9	996
Village							
3. Akron (Akron/Fairgrove)	123	67.6	37	20.3	22	12.1	182
4. Cass City (Elkland Twp.)	771	65.5	253	21.5	153	13.0	1177
5. Fairgrove (Fairgrove Twp.)	179	69.6	46	17.9	32	12.5	257
6. Gagetown (Elmwood Twp.)	103	60.2	47	27.5	21	12.3	171
7. Kingston (Kingston/Koylton)	110	61.1	53	29.4	17	9.4	180
8. Mayville (Fremont Twp.)	261	60.4	108	25.0	63	14.6	432
9. Millington (Millington Twp.)	279	60.1	141	30.4	44	9.5	464
10. Reese (Denmark Twp.)	487	70.6	148	21.4	55	8.0	690
11. Unionville (Columbia Twp.)	187	79.2	31	13.1	18	7.6	236
Township*							
12. Akron	480	78.9	128	21.1	141	18.8	749
13. Almer***	975	70.2	267	19.2	147	10.6	1389
14. Arbela	1056	85.9	123	10.0	50	4.1	1229
15. Columbia	477	80.6	45	7.6	70	11.8	592
16. Dayton	610	64.6	116	12.3	219	23.2	945
17. Denmark	1110	76.0	238	16.3	112	7.7	1460
18. Elkland	1117	74.8	252	16.9	12	0.8	1494
19. Ellington	413	80.7	54	10.5	45	8.8	512
20. Elmwood	380	69.3	88	16.1	80	14.6	548
21. Fairgrove	525	74.4	114	16.1	67	9.5	706
22. Fremont	1064	71.0	212	14.1	223	14.9	1499
23. Gilford	318	78.1	36	8.8	53	13.0	407
24. Indianfields***	1566	62.2	741	29.4	212	8.4	2519
25. Juniata	547	77.6	99	14.0	59	8.4	705
26. Kingston	505	73.3	104	15.1	80	11.6	689
27. Koylton	588	76.9	79	10.3	98	12.8	765
28. Millington	1429	79.2	189	10.5	187	10.4	1805
29. Novesta	537	76.7	65	9.3	98	14.0	700
30. Tuscola	625	77.5	72	8.9	109	13.5	806
31. Vassar	1475	84.8	168	9.7	96	5.5	1739
32. Watertown	699	77.0	70	7.7	130	14.3	908
33. Wells	572	79.7	81	11.3	65	9.1	718
34. Wisner	296	84.1	17	4.8	39	11.1	352
Tuscola County	18135	74.3	3652	15.0	2633	10.8	24420

*Township numbers include Village numbers.

**Specified housing units include only one-family houses on less than ten acres without a commercial establishment or medical office on the property Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 2006-2010 Community Survey – 5 yr. Est.

AGE OF STRUCTURES - 2000

TABLE 14

Place	Year Built 1980 – 2010	Year Built 1940 – 1979	Year Built 1939 or Earlier
City	%	%	%
1. Caro	20.5	62.6	17.0
2. Vassar	22.4	46.9	30.6
Village			
3. Akron (Akron/Fairgrove)	3.0	61.6	38.4
4. Cass City (Elkland Twp.)	24.6	47.8	27.5
5. Fairgrove (Fairgrove Twp.)	12.5	49.8	37.8
6. Gagetown (Elmwood Twp.)	15.4	50.2	34.3
7. Kingston (Kingston/Koylton)	11.0	35.7	53.2
8. Mayville (Fremont Twp.)	14.0	42.8	43.2
9. Millington (Millington Twp.)	20.0	46.4	33.6
10. Reese (Denmark Twp.)	26.9	59.0	14.1
11. Unionville (Columbia Twp.)	9.2	60.6	30.3
Township*			
12. Akron	13.1	46.9	39.9
13. Almer***	31.0	58.9	10.1
14. Arbela	29.8	58.8	11.3
15. Columbia	12.0	45.4	42.6
16. Dayton	26.9	54.9	27.8
17. Denmark	21.7	55.0	23.4
18. Elkland	22.2	48.7	29.3
19. Ellington	41.2	40.2	18.6
20. Elmwood	34.7	41.4	23.9
21. Fairgrove	14.0	48.5	37.4
22. Fremont	41.3	38.0	20.7
23. Gilford	21.9	37.1	41.0
24. Indianfields***	22.7	60.4	16.9
25. Juniata	33.8	45.6	20.7
26. Kingston	28.7	42.1	28.4
27. Koylton	44.6	40.2	15.3
28. Millington	34.0	48.1	17.9
29. Novesta	36.0	31.0	33.0
30. Tuscola	18.2	49.8	32.0
31. Vassar	42.1	52.9	4.9
32. Watertown	27.0	44.3	28.6
33. Wells	44.7	42.0	13.3
34. Wisner	19.3	57.6	23.0
Tuscola County	28.9	51.6	15.5

*Township numbers include Village numbers.

**Specified housing units include only one-family houses on less than ten acres without a commercial establishment or medical office on the property Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

DISTRIBUTION OF STATE EQUALIZED VALUES - 2007 TABLE 15

Place	Ag.	Comm.	Ind.	Ind. Resid.	Cutover	Personal	Total	% Co.
City								
1. Caro		35,592,100	8,108,400	49,663,100			93,363,600	5.7
2. Vassar	91,600	8,905,400	3,419,300	42,135,400	0	8,641,700	63,193,400	3.23
Village								
3. Akron	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
4. Cass City	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
5. Fairgrove	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
6. Gagetown	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
7. Kingston	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
8. Mayville	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
9. Millington	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
10. Reese	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
11. Unionville	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Township*								
12. Akron	49,440,500	1,182,700		24,457,000			75,080,200	4.6
13. Almer	29,684,400	6,976,000		30,342,502			67,002,902	4.1
14. Arbela	25,051,157	1,094,400	316,250	51,455,689			77,917,496	4.8
15. Columbia	39,018,600	1,065,700	170,100	15,259,900			55,514,300	3.4
16. Dayton	23,919,500	529,600		38,542,200			62,991,100	3.9
17. Denmark	40,877,300	7,036,500	1,634,000	51,768,400			101,316,200	6.2
18. Elkland	29,614,700	12,536,600	2,949,900	48,268,600			93,369,800	5.7
19. Ellington	19,276,000	779,300		25,040,500			45,095,800	2.8
20. Elmwood	33,749,600	917,700	240,900	17,825,700			52,733,900	3.2
21. Fairgrove	36,176,500	1,047,000	43,900	22,920,500			60,187,900	3.7
22. Fremont	15,028,800	6,453,400	501,200	57,188,500			79,171,900	4.8
23. Gilford	40,732,000	59,900	393,500	10,376,400			51,561,800	3.2
24. Indianfields	4,854,700	6,360,600	1,632,500	46,978,200			59,826,100	3.7
25. Juniata	20,618,000	599,800	44,400	30,823,600			52,085,800	3.2
26. Kingston	21,366,918	472,675		26,167,660			48,007,253	2.9
27. Koylton	20,986,400	661,000		33,182,800			54,830,200	3.4
28. Millington	20,571,200	9,186,100	2,129,700	89,595,900			121,482,900	7.4
29. Novesta	21,081,800	494,800		19,917,100			41,493,700	2.5
30. Tuscola	32,080,300	3,577,500	385,300	41,320,600			77,363,700	4.7
31. Vassar	6,523,000	3,093,000	791,500	74,956,800			85,364,300	5.2
32. Watertown	18,509,000	312,800	1,411,800	38,148,600			58,382,200	3.6
33. Wells	17,835,900	235,900	203,900	31,169,346			49,445,046	3.0
34. Wisner	19,141,856	516,700		10,953,910			30,612,466	1.2
Tuscola	586,216,713	109,167,675	23,440,350	916,610,507			1,635,435,263	100

5.3.4 State Equalized Value

Other characteristics of County property values and the local economy can be obtained by analysis of the State Equalized Value (SEV) figures. By law the SEV, which constitutes a community's tax base, is equal to approximately one-half of the true market value of real property and certain taxable personal properties.

Table 15 shows the distribution of value among the different SEV categories for 2011, comparing the City, Townships, and Tuscola County. The majority of the County's taxable property falls under the residential category (more than one-half), followed by the agricultural category (nearly one-third). Commercial and industrial properties combined are less than eight percent of the County's total SEV.

5.3.5 Economy

The earliest white settlers, starting in 1835, were attracted to Tuscola County for its rich lumber resources. The lumber industry flourished during the second half of the 19th century as the main source of employment and income in the County. As the trees were harvested and not replanted, the lumbering industry began to decline at the turn of the 20th century. Agriculture took over as the main economic base of the County.

As a rural community, Tuscola County has only 27 principal employers with 100 or more employees. The four industrial parks in the county are: Caro Industrial Park at 73 acres; Cass City Industrial Park at 60 acres; the Millington Industrial Park at 60 acres; and the 23-acre Vassar Industrial Park.

Among the principal employers, health care is the largest industry, employing 1,673 persons at seven locations. This is followed by the manufacturing segment with 1,598 employees at eight locations, and education with 1,596 employees in eight school districts.

Due to its central location, status as the seat of County Government, and rank as the most populous local community in the County, the City of Caro is home for 14 of the 29 principal employers. The two largest employers are also located in Caro.

5.4 Transportation Profile

The County is easily accessible from I-75, which runs north-south, 10 miles west of the County. Close interstate proximity provides convenient access to many of the large mid-western population centers. Many large cities are within one-half day driving distance from the county, including:

<u>City</u>	<u>Miles</u>
Chicago	330
Cleveland	240
Detroit	90
Grand Rapids	135
Indianapolis	340
Lansing	90

Six State trunklines, M-15, M-24, M-25, M-46, M-81 and M-138, provide convenient access to all portions of the County and easy access to all parts of Michigan. (**Map 12**). M-15 and M-25 provide direct access to Bay City, M-46 and M-81 to Saginaw, M-15 to Flint, and M-15 and M-24 to the Detroit metropolitan area. Three Airports also serve the area; the Caro Municipal Airport located just outside of Caro, and just an hour away, MBS International in Freeland and Bishop International in Flint. Rail Freight lines also bisect the County.

Public transportation is available to residents in the Townships of Almer and Indianfields, and the Village of Caro through the Caro Thumbody Express. Initiated in 1984 by the Human Development Commission, the Caro Thumbody Express operates eight handicapped accessible busses. The bus service also offers rides to Saginaw two days a week.

HIGHER EDUCATION**TABLE 16**

Name	Location	Enrollment	Degrees Offered
1. Baker College	Cass City	394	Associate, Bachelor
2. Howard's Beauty Academy	Caro	85	----

LIBRARIES**TABLE 17**

Name	Location	Type
Bullard-Sanford Memorial Library	Vassar	District
Caro Area District Library	Caro	District
Columbia Township Library	Unionville	Local
Fairgrove District Library	Fairgrove	District
Jacqueline E. Opperman Memorial Library (Kingston High School Library)	Kingston	District
Mayville District Public Library	Mayville	District
Millington Township Library	Millington	Local
Rawson Memorial Library	Cass City	District
Unity District Library	Reese	District
Watertown Township Library	Fostoria	Local

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

TABLE18

Name	Location	Enrollment
Tuscola Intermediate School District	Caro	--
Tuscola Technology Center	Caro	800
Highland Pines School	Caro	197
Public Schools		
Akron-Fairgrove Schools	Fairgrove	276
Akron-Fairgrove Jr. / Sr. High School	Fairgrove	--
Akron-Fairgrove Elementary School	Akron	--
Caro Community Schools	Caro	1833
Caro High School	Caro	--
Caro Middle School	Caro	--
Frank E. Schall Elementary School	Caro	--
Ben H. McComb Elementary School	Caro	--
Caro Alternative Education Learning Center	Caro	--
Cass City Public Schools	Cass City	1122
Cass City High School	Cass City	--
Cass City Middle School	Cass City	--
Cambell Elementary School	Cass City	--
Cass City Early Childhood Education Center	Cass City	--
Kingston Community Schools	Kingston	629
Kingston High School	Kingston	--
Kingston Elementary School	Kingston	--
Mayville Community Schools	Mayville	778
Mayville High School	Mayville	--
Mayville Middle School	Mayville	--
Mayville Elementary School	Mayville	--

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS (CON'T)

TABLE 18

Name	Location	Enrollment
Millington Community Schools	Millington	1,427
Millington High School	Millington	--
Meachum Junior High School	Millington	--
Treva B. Kirk Later-Elementary School	Millington	--
S. M. Glaza Elementary School	Millington	--
Owendale-Gagetown Area Schools	Gagetown	227
Gagetown Elementary School	Gagetown	--
Owen-Gage High School	Owendale	--
Reese Public Schools	Reese	913
Reese High School	Reese	--
Reese Middle School	Reese	--
Reese Elementary School	Reese	--
Unionville-Sebewaing Area Schools	Sebewaing	819
USA High School	Sebewaing	--
USA Middle School	Sebewaing	--
USA Elementary School	Unionville	--
Vassar Public Schools	Vassar	1,397
Vassar Senior High School	Vassar	--
Vassar Junior High School	Vassar	--
Central Elementary School	Vassar	--
Townsend North Elementary School	Vassar	--
Vassar Alternative Education Pioneer Work and Learn Center	Vassar	--
Total		9,194
Non-Public Schools		886
Bethany Christian School	Decker	
Christ the King Lutheran School	Sebewaing}	
Christ the King Lutheran School	Unionville}	
Deford Christian Academy	Deford	
Juniata Christian School	Vassar	
New Salem Lutheran School	Sebewaing	
St. Elizabeth Catholic School	Reese	
St. Luke's Lutheran School	Vassar	
St. Michael's Lutheran School	Richville	
St. Paul Lutheran School	Millington	
Thumb Amish Parochial School	Cass City	
Trinity Lutheran School	Reese	

PUBLIC SCHOOL LISTING**AKRON-FAIRGROVE SCHOOLS**

AKRON-FAIRGROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
AKRON-FAIRGROVE JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL

CARO COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

CARO ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION
CARO HIGH SCHOOL
CARO MIDDLE SCHOOL
FRANK E. SCHALL ELEM. SCHOOL
McCOMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CASS CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CAMPBELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
CASS CITY HIGH SCHOOL
CASS CITY MIDDLE SCHOOL
DEFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

FRANKENMUTH SCHOOL DISTRICT

E.F. RITTMUELLER MIDDLE SCHOOL
FRANKENMUTH HIGH SCHOOL
LORENZ C. LIST SCHOOL

KINGSTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

KINGSTON ALTERNATIVE ED. CENTER
KINGSTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
KINGSTON HIGH SCHOOL

OWENDALE-GAGETOWN AREA SCHOOLS

GAGETOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
OWEN-GAGE HIGH SCHOOL

MARLETTE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

BEA McDONALD SCHOOL
MARLETTE HIGH SCHOOL
MARLETTE MIDDLE SCHOOL

MAYVILLE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

MAYVILLE COMMUNITY HIGH SCHOOL
MAYVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
MAYVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL

MILLINGTON COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

GLAZA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
KIRK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
MEACHUM JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
MILLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

REESE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

REESE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
REESE HIGH SCHOOL
REESE MIDDLE SCHOOL

UNIONVILLE-SEBEWAING AREA SCHOOLS

SEBEWAING MIDDLE SCHOOL
UNIONVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
UNIONVILLE-SEBEWAING HIGH SCHOOL

VASSAR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

CENTRAL SCHOOL
PIONEER WORK & LEARN CENTER
TOWNSEND NORTH SCHOOL
VASSAR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
VASSAR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL LISTING

CHRIST THE KING LUTHERAN SCHOOL - SEBEWAING
CHRIST THE KING LUTHERAN SCHOOL - UNIONVILLE
DEFORD CHRISTIAN ACADEMY - DEFORD
JUNIATA CHRISTIAN SCHOOL - VASSAR
MINISTRY OF THE WORD - UNIONVILLE
NEW SALEM LUTHERAN SCHOOL - SEBEWAING
ST. ELIZABETH CATHOLIC SCHOOL - REESE
ST. LUKE'S LUTHERAN SCHOOL - VASSAR
ST. MICHAEL'S LUTHERAN SCHOOL - RICHVILLE
ST. PAUL LUTHERAN SCHOOL - MILLINGTON
TRINITY LUTHERAN SCHOOL - REESE