Journal of Rural and Community Development

Sustainable Development or Integrated Rural Tourism? Considering the Overlap in Rural Development Strategies

Author: Holly Barcus

Sustainable Development or Integrated Rural Tourism? Considering the Overlap in Rural Development Strategies

To the children of Bayfield, with the sincere hope that their city may always retain some of the unique qualities that their fathers and grandfathers knew and loved; that Bayfield may never sacrifice its genuine character and its outstanding scenic beauty for shortsighted and short-lived gain; and that it may always be a place which they can be proud to call "my home town".

Dedication of the Blueprint for Bayfield, 1970

Holly Barcus
Department of Geography
Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota, USA
barcus@macalester.edu

Abstract

U.S. Rural development has been influenced by numerous philosophies and varies significantly by locality. As rural economies have restructured, communities have struggled to evolve and adapt their images and economies in order to survive. One approach embraced by communities is Sustainable Development. While the intricacies of sustainability and ability of communities to fully embrace sustainable development have been widely debated, communities have nonetheless sought to operationalize the concept to enhance their development prospects. More recently the concept of Integrated Rural Tourism has been promoted as a means of facilitating more holistic rural development, incorporating cultural, economic, and environmental considerations at the local scale. This paper utilizes interviews with local community members to review the process by which one upper-Midwestern community adopted and implemented sustainable development questioning whether the outcome is more reflective of an integrated rural tourism approach and seeking to better understand the conceptual and applied overlap between these two models of rural development.

Keywords: Bayfield, sustainability, integrated rural tourism, rural development

---

1.0 Introduction & Background

Tourism is big business. In 2011, direct spending on leisure travel in the United States reached $564 billion, as compared to only $249 billion on business travel (The U.S. Travel Association, 2012). For rural communities, tourism often seems like a reasonable tactic for increasing or maintaining local economic vitality. As a development strategy, such an approach seeks to identify and exploit particular rural assets, thereby attracting tourists to experience rural life or activities, spending money in the rural locale thus infusing the local economy with external

cash resources. It offers numerous advantages to rural communities, including job creation, infrastructure development and in-flow of cash from non-local sources. Increasing discretionary incomes, lower transportation costs, shorter work weeks, and 'hospitable environments for tourists' have made tourism more desirable and attainable for consumers worldwide (Eadington & Smith, 1992, p. 1). Tourism, however, has a less attractive side as well. As Shaw and Williams point out (2002, pp. 283-284), different consumers of the rural environment may have vastly different expectations, conflicts may occur between newcomers and long-term residents, residents and second home owners, farmers and recreationalists, and those who anticipate quiet leisure activities and those whose pursuits are noisier. Disillusionment with models of 'mass' tourism and contentious situations that emerge from new types of development have led many communities and scholars to seek alternative tourism models (Eadington & Smith, 1992, p. 3); Sustainable Tourism (ST) and Integrated Rural Tourism (IRT) are two such models. Both strategies offer new ways to conceptualize rural development while placing local communities and natural environments at the center, rather than the periphery, of a development strategy.

These alternatives, however, are not distinctly different models. Rather, IRT incorporates many of the components of Sustainable Tourism, but emphasizes the importance of networks and linkages more explicitly than does ST. Although numerous case studies document the successes and challenges of implementing ST, it is often criticized as difficult to operationalize (Sharpley, 2003). In contrast, IRT provides a more detailed framework for rural communities to develop tourism infrastructures, including a sustainability component. Given the synergy between these two models, it seems useful to understand whether elements of IRT are present in places heretofore thought of as successful sustainable rural tourism economies. The City of Bayfield, Wisconsin, offers just this opportunity (See Figure 1). Bayfield has been exceptionally successful in embracing a ST development strategy, as evidenced by the numerous awards and recognitions received by the community.

The purpose of this case study is to examine Bayfield's success through the lens of the IRT model. Bayfield embraces sustainability on a community-wide scale and has been successful at promoting and branding itself to outsiders, potential tourists, as a "sustainable community". While the Chamber of Commerce and local businesses successfully "sell" or brand Bayfield, it is the citizenry who actively embrace sustainability principles and shape its outcomes. Top-down and bottom-up networks, as understood through the IRT model, may help flesh-out details or characteristics of Bayfield's success in a way that makes them replicable in other communities. Bayfield's ability to harness tourism as a development strategy is notable; elucidating the nuances of its success contributes to our understandings of rural development strategies and may provide insights to further refine policies directed towards enhancing rural development, particularly in very small or isolated communities.

This article is divided into five additional sections; following the introduction is an overview of current literature and debates. The third section is a description of the study area and rationale for choosing this case study. The fourth and fifth sections detail the methods and findings and are followed by concluding thoughts and questions for further research.

Figure 1: Bayfield, Wisconsin and the Apostle Islands.

2.0 Literature Review

2.1 *Sustainability or Sustainable Development in Rural Tourism*

The concept of "sustainable development" finds its roots in the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WECD) and the resulting Brundtland Commission Report "Our Common Future" (1987). In this report, sustainable development is defined as development that "…ensure[s] that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (WECD, 1987, p. 16). Since publication, the application of

the concept and term has permeated much of the development literature, including tourism development debates.

There are three general components of sustainability including social equity, environmental stewardship, and economic vitality (Weinberg, 2000). Communities seeking to achieve sustainability work towards creating a community in which development is beneficial to all residents. This development also, ideally, maintains the ecological or environmental integrity of an area and provides sufficient economic growth to benefit the community without impairing the environment or local people. Sustainable tourism thus embraces these same principles albeit as a component of a specific type of economic development focused on tourism.

Debates surrounding sustainable tourism development generally take two forms, definitional and operational (Sharpley, 2003, p. 38). Definitional debates center on the ambiguity of the term "sustainable". Lack of definitional clarity problematizes operationalization and outcomes are difficult to measure (Slee et al., 1997). Additional critiques include the challenge that it is not "a universally applicable framework for developing tourism" (Sharpley, 2003, p. 39) and that the success of rural tourism development is subject to forces outside, and well beyond the control, of the rural community. Despite these debates, Sharpley (2003, p. 38) argues that "…the concept of sustainable tourism development has become almost universally accepted as a desirable and politically appropriate approach to, and goal of, tourism development".

The popularity of sustainability as a tourism development strategy is evidenced by the many examples of communities in both the Global North and Global South that utilize this development model. Rural community examples come from Ireland (McGrath, 1998), the United States (Weinberg, 2000), Spain (Hunter-Jones et al., 1997), Goa and the Seychelles (Wilson, 1997), Malaysia (Hamzah, 1997), Madagascar (Parsler, 1997), Crete (Prinianaki-Tzorakoleftheraki, 1997), and Scotland (MacLellan 1997). This selective short list highlights the popularity of sustainability in developing tourism economies for rural communities, despite the concept's shortcomings and the challenges associated with replicating or transferring the model from one community to another.

2.2 Integrated Rural Tourism – A New Model for Rural Tourism Development

The IRT model builds on the concept of sustainable tourism development, extending and refining the means by which communities might work towards developing their tourism industry. IRT, however, differs from sustainable tourism dialogs in its focus on linkages, networks and information exchange across different resource areas (such as social, environmental and economic) (Saxena et al., 2007). Development of the IRT model grew out of recent shifts in the EU's agricultural policy (Saxena et al., 2007). This change broadens EU policies, envisioning rural communities as "multi-faceted economies comprised of agriculture plus other resources and products such as tourism and specialty foods" including "new niche consumer markets" and "green methods of production", rather than exclusively agriculture and resource based strategies. This shift "encourage[s] rural communities to incorporate new sources of income as complements to rather than substitutes for existing activities" (Saxena et al., 2007, p. 4-5).

Similar to the sustainability model, IRT is a tourism model that provides a multiple win situation for communities in which there are social, environmental, and economic benefits (Clark & Chabrel, 2007, p. 372). At its core, IRT focuses on the linkages, networks, and structures that connect the economic, social, cultural, natural and human dimensions within specific localities (Jenkins & Oliver, 2001; Saxena et al., 2007). Rather than focus on economies of scale, which are often unattainable in rural areas, communities focus on marketing the distinctive qualities of a locality, including culture, environment and locally-produced goods. This commodification empowers local entrepreneurs and contributes to the growth of the local economy (Cawley et al., 2007). An important characteristic of IRT is the specific focus on integration not only of the economic, institutional, human resource, social and policy dimensions, but also of the pathways or networks by which this integration facilitates more successful rural tourism (Saxena et al., 2007, p. 8-9). This focus purportedly leads to more sustainable rural tourism (Saxena et al., 2007). It is also important that these networks are place-specific; they are embedded in the locale in which rural tourism is being developed, thereby reinforcing identity within the community, further strengthening linkages in a place. There are seven dimensions of IRT, including empowerment, scale, sustainability, endogeneity, embeddedness, networking and complementarity (Jenkins & Oliver, 2004, p. 67-70) (See Table 1). It is the integration of these dimensions, rather than their stand-alone qualities that lead to successful tourism development. While not as extensively utilized as ST, IRT is incorporated into the EU SPRITE (Supporting and Promoting Integrated Tourism in Europe's Lagging Rural Regions) project, and has been evaluated in Ireland, France, United Kingdom, Czech Republic, Greece, and Spain (Clark & Chabrel, 2007).

While IRT and Sustainable Tourism are each considered viable alternatives to mass tourism models for rural development, there are inherent challenges in each model, as noted above. The seven characteristics of IRT are a useful framework for evaluating Bayfield's success as a sustainable community because IRT recognizes the complexity of interactions among community members and across scales of both geography and governance that so strongly influence the outcomes of any type of development in a rural community.

3.0 Methodology

Given the potential advantages of IRT it seems reasonable to consider that this model could be applied to rural communities in the United States. This study began with the simple question of "why has Bayfield been so successful in developing its tourism-based economy?" A first and obvious reason might be its stunningly beautiful landscape, which includes Lake Superior and access to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore (See Figure 1). But these factors alone do not offer sufficient explanation. There are other communities in the region, and indeed across the U.S., with similarly advantageous natural amenities that are far less successful at initiating and managing tourism-based economies in ways that appeal to and benefit residents, environments, and local economies. Indeed, although the number of permanent-year-round residents declined from 611 in 2000 to 487 in 2010 in the City of Bayfield (although the Town of Bayfield, which surrounds the city, gained population, increasing from 625 in 2000 to 680 in 2010) (US Bureau of Census 2000, 2010), Bayfield emerged as a leader in sustainable communities, recognized regionally, nationally, and internationally as a successful model of sustainable community development.

Table 1: *The Seven Characteristics of IRT*

Networks	"IT [Integrated Tourism] …focuses on networks, relationships and partnerships." "[These] may be historically layered, providing actors with a sense of attachment to place, or newer forms… they may be vertical [formation of extra-local alliances] … or horizontal [coordinating local activities]"
Scale	"…Refers to the size and extent of tourism resources and the volume and impact of tourism activities in relation to existing economic, social, cultural and resource base." "[Can] range from small scale […niche markets…] to large scale […economies of scale…]" but IT must be conducted at the appropriate scale with regard to local structures.
Endogeneity	"…Sets development within a local framework … and centers both on motivating development within a locality and on the relationships between a locality and its wider economic and political environments." "…Based on place-specific resources;… retain maximum benefits by using, and adding value to, local resources, and focusing on the requirements, capacities and values of local people."
Sustainability	"…Closely linked to notion of sustainable development" (normative and relative). Useful concept in "stimulat[ing] and organiz[ing] discourse around a problematic issue without the rigor of a precise definition." "IT overlaps with sustainable tourism."
Embeddedness	"…Emphasiz[es] the importance of relationships and networks" and that … "networks are embedded within localities." "…Implies resources or activities are directly linked to place, but also that relationships are formed within particular socio-cultural contexts in particular localities, and the unique socio-cultural characteristics and identities which are embedded in places help shape relationships and networks."
Complementarity	"Tourism may be complementary (i.e. … takes place alongside traditional agriculture …) or substitutional (i.e. … may replace farming such as caravan sites on coastal farms)." "Complementarity … is likely to lead to increased partnership and synergy while substitution … is likely to lead to competition and conflict."
Empowerment	"Emphasis on place, endogeneity, embeddedness, community involvement and networks, IT is … associated with empowerment. Empowerment is the manifestation of local control over resources and activities …." "… May be reflected in decision-making —inclusive and participatory and which takes into account values and aspirations of local actors involved in tourism …"

Source: Jenkins and Oliver, 2004, 67-70

Thus in order to understand its success, a case study approach is embraced, which relies on historic and contemporary planning documents and semi-structured interviews with 12 key informants from the Bayfield area. Informants constitute a

core group who are active community leaders. They participate in the Chamber of Commerce, planning activities and especially volunteerism across numerous community organizations and local events. A simple snowball sampling method identified these key individuals and interviews were conducted in February, May and June of 2011.

4.0 Case Study: Bayfield, Wisconsin

The City of Bayfield, Wisconsin began a series of community conversations about sustainability in the early 1990s. While the community has maintained much of its physical character it has also become a destination for amenity and retiree migrants. New businesses have emerged to serve the large seasonal tourist influx and many longtime businesses, including fish and fruit producers, maintain a foothold, although many have re-imagined themselves to appeal to the changing tourist demographics.

In evaluating ST and IRT models, Bayfield[1] emerges as a good case study area for several reasons. First, it is located in northern Wisconsin, an area identified by the USDA as a region of declining population and low amenity ratings. Despite its appealing natural amenities, Bayfield County ranks 3 on a scale of 1(low)-7(high) for amenity value (See USDA 1999 for details). Not unlike many northern tier rural communities, Bayfield's population is aging (36.6% percent of the population is 60+ with less than 17% under age 20) and declining (20.2% decline between 2000 and 2010). It is located approximately 4.5 hours driving time from the Saint Paul-Minneapolis metro area and eight hours from the Chicago metro area – the two largest population concentrations in the region. Tourism and retail trade dominate the county's economy, with 30% of employees working in retail trade and 49.6% in Accommodations/Food, Arts, Entertainment and Recreation (U.S. Bureau of Census, 2007). Without substantive industrial development, the Bayfield economy is heavily dependent on tourism. While many communities depend on tourism, few are able to balance the demand for employment and job growth with environmental and social needs and desires of a community as effectively as Bayfield.

This balance is evidenced by Bayfield's recognition as a successful "sustainable city". As a certified member of Wisconsin's Travel Green program, Bayfield boasts the greatest number of green businesses of any city in the state (Bayfield Chamber of Commerce, 2011). The website states: "We are committed to conserving our precious water and energy through state-of-the-art wastewater treatment, recycling, clean energy initiatives and more" which is augmented by a copy of "Living a Sensible Life in Bayfield" with tips on living more sustainably (Bayfield Chamber of Commerce, 2011). Other recent awards and honors include the 2011 Governor's Tourism Stewardship Award, and recognition as one of the top 38 sustainable communities in the country by Global Environmental Management (Chamber of Commerce, 2011). Mayor Larry MacDonald has spoken widely about Bayfield and its challenges and successes in seeking to become sustainable. He was a keynote speaker at the First European Green Capital Conference, with Bayfield identified as one of the "Green Success Stories –

---

[1] *"*Bayfield" includes both the City of Bayfield and Township of Bayfield, unless specifically noted otherwise. "Bayfield-area" refers to the communities on the peninsula (See Figure 1).

America's Best Practices". These accolades underscore Bayfield's success and the degree to which this success is celebrated locally, nationally, and internationally. Additionally, since the 1970s Bayfield residents have taken an active role in directing development and specifically tourism infrastructure development through a wide range of community-based groups that are active and vocal in maintaining a balance between tourism needs and quality of life in the community.

4.1 Becoming a "Sustainable" City

Founded in 1856 by Henry Rice, Bayfield boomed in the 1880s as R.D. Pike employed hundreds in logging camps and sawmills throughout the area and "tourists and travelers, filled the hotels and boarding houses" (Peterson, 2006, p.4). Two large fish processing plants and a variety of fruit farms also provided employment. By the 1930s and continuing through the Great Depression and World War II, the population declined and Bayfield transformed from a bustling town with several schools, railway connections, an active harbor and extractive industries to a total population of less than 1,200 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1930). Little development or growth occurred in Bayfield between 1930 and the early 1960s.

While the process of becoming a sustainable city is ongoing, the mid-1960s is notable as a turning point in the community's development outlook. Several key events, according to Mayor Larry MacDonald, laid the foundation for Bayfield's current success (personal interview, March 4, 2011). These include the designation as a National Lakeshore in 1970, the development of a comprehensive plan in 1971 (updated in 1979 and 2001), the 1994 court case *Neil Schultz vs. the City of Bayfield,* and formation of the Alliance for Sustainability.

Designation of the Apostle Islands and surrounding lakeshore as "National Lakeshore" emerged as the first important catalyst for discussions about potential long-term impacts of tourism. The 1960s saw continued population decline and a stagnant economy. Decline in the fishing and lumber industries and limited tourism characterized this period. Despite the potential for increased tourism that might accompany the official designation of National Lakeshore, residents were reluctant to embrace tourism as a viable development strategy. This potential initiated a conversation among residents about the economic and quality of life implications of this designation. Official designation came on 26 September 1970 with legislation introduced by U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson (founder of Earth Day). The park includes 21 islands and 12 miles of scenic shoreline. Early on, the park attracted tourists seeking an outdoor experience – hiking, camping, sailing, and kayaking. Today, the park boasts old growth forests, historic lighthouses, Ojibwe Indians, "pristine natural landscapes" (Bayfield Chamber of Commerce, 2011) and was recently ranked as the second of 55 parks on the Stewardship Index by National Geographic Explorer Magazine (Tourtellot, 2005) Visitors to the park in 2009 numbered more than 170,000 (National Park Service, 2011, p.200).

The *Blueprint for Bayfield* (1970) emerged from these debates. This report was based on community focus groups, interviews and consultations conducted in 1967-68. From this report, and with the aid of planners from the University of Wisconsin – Madison, the first Comprehensive Plan for the City was written and adopted by City Council in 1971 (Bayfield Comprehensive Plan, 2001, p. 5). A task force of representatives from across the community as well as a public visioning process that included 120 residents and a household survey developed

the new plan (Bayfield Comprehensive Plan, 2001). Such widespread community participation in the planning process is a key element of the plans' long term success. As is evidenced by the quote at the beginning of this article, one of the driving forces behind the plan was the belief in maintaining the integrity of Bayfield as a community and as a natural area.

The 1971 plan, updated in 2001 as the 2002-2022 plan, includes goals pertaining to intergovernmental cooperation, transportation (including multi-modal), utilities and community facilities, land use, housing and agriculture and natural resources. It is clear from the goals that the plan is heavily influenced by the principles of sustainability. For example, land use goals include preserving historical character and protecting the unique rural character of Bayfield and its surrounding landscape (Bayfield Comprehensive Plan, 2001, p. 89). Today, with the adoption of the 2002-2022 Comprehensive Plan, the ideals of preservation, conservation and quality of life remain a core focus of the document. The success of Bayfield both as a tourist destination and as a Sustainable City underscore the ideals articulated during the first planning process in the 1960s.

The third key event highlights the significance of the Comprehensive Plan. In 1994, the basic tenets of the Comprehensive Plan were tested in *Neil Schultz vs. the City of Bayfield*. In this case, a local developer challenged the land use plan after a development proposal was denied by the City of Bayfield. Mayor MacDonald argues that the outcome, in favor of the City, gave the comprehensive plan "teeth", buoyed the City's commitment to maintaining its landscape and development goals and bestowed upon the public planning process a level of legitimacy that discouraged further challenges.

The fourth key event was the 1994 founding of the Alliance for Sustainability. A primary goal of the organization is to engage community members in ongoing discussions about sustainability through education and workshops. A key annual summer event, *Pie and Politics*, is a program that hosts a nationally regarded speaker to discuss sustainability. Held outdoors at the Big Top Chautauqua, the public lecture is followed by a social hour featuring locally-made pies. Conversation over pie flows naturally from the speaker's comments and serves as an important event for community members and tourists, while also maintaining dialog around the concepts of sustainability. The Alliance continues to be intimately engaged in community education and initiatives, including organized reading groups and other events to engage public discussions about sustainability (Alliance for Sustainability, 2011).

Lastly, all respondents noted the importance of strong leadership as a key factor in Bayfield's success. Many credit Mayor MacDonald for his strong and out-spoken advocacy. Another key person was Mary Rehwald who initiated the first conversations about sustainability after a trip to Sweden in the early 1990s. Rehwald worked, through her position at Northland College (a local private liberal arts college) to convene a series of reading groups that discussed the concepts of sustainability, thus initiating interest in these ideas. The Alliance for Sustainability grew out of these reading groups. While these individuals, who were mentioned by the majority of interviewees, were key to the process of Bayfield's evolution, respondents were quick to point out that Bayfield and the surrounding area are full of leaders who step-up to forward a variety of interests, many of which can directly or loosely be tied to concepts of sustainability, land conservation and preservation, and the maintenance of local quality of life.

5.0 Sustainability or IRT? Can We Understand Bayfield's Success through the IRT Framework?

Using the seven key characteristics of IRT (See Table 1), this section compares the development process in Bayfield with the principles of IRT. Each of the paragraphs below highlights the ways in which Bayfield's current development state is characterized by these attributes and the manner in which these attributes evolved, as portrayed by either interviewees or historic and current planning documents.

Bayfield Development and the Seven Characteristics of IRT:

1. *Networks and relationships*

   It is clear from the interviews that there are several layers of social networks at work in Bayfield and that these networks overlap in a myriad of ways. Networks include individuals and non-profits interested in a wide-range of ideas, but which loosely connect to a general theme of preserving a particular quality of life within Bayfield. For example, there are networks surrounding the arts community, events planning, land preservation & conservation, food (particularly locally produced), and recreation. These are not stand-alone networks but rather overlap in complex ways. For example, aspects of the food networks are inter-twined with tourist-oriented activities such as restaurants and festivals while other parts of this network focus primarily on the well-being of local food producers or provision of local foods to local people, as well as land conservation and farmland preservation activities. Each of these networks has multiple dimensions and overlaps with multiple dimensions of other networks. As one respondent noted, "there are a few dozen of us who volunteer in several different organizations so networks and the flow of information between people, less so than organizations, is alive and healthy" (Personal Interview, SE622).

   These networks are by no means limited to Bayfield, but rather have both intensive, within Bayfield nodes, as well as nodes that are rooted in near-by communities and distant cities. These networks act as pathways for different events and accumulation and sharing of knowledge about various subjects, as well as fund-raising activities. Some networks are formalized, such as the Bayfield Regional Food Producers Cooperative (BRFP) but most are less formal.

   Some are deeply embedded in tourism, such as the B&Bs, restaurants and agri-tourism operations, while others stand outside of this structure, yet contribute to the broader sense of and connection to Bayfield. For example, land conversation and preservation organizations actively work to preserve the landscape and environment in Bayfield, which, as one respondent noted, "…is a reinforcing cycle – tourism is dependent on the natural environment and its continued preservation and the ability to continue to live in the area economically, is dependent on tourism" (Personal Interview, SS623). A separate interviewee noted that there is "incredible synergy" between old-timers and newcomers when it comes to promoting and enhancing Bayfield as a place to live (Personal Interview, CO628).

2. *Scale*

Tourism in Bayfield is exemplified by small-scale local enterprises ranging from locally-owned hotels and shops to multi-generational apple and other fruit orchards. But locally-owned businesses are only one component of the overall tourism industry. While the vast majority of businesses are locally owned, fully 75% of these businesses are owned by transplants to Bayfield, rather than long-time residents (Personal Interview, CO628). Much coordination across the peninsula occurs through the non-profits as well as through other networks such as BRFP. Each organization in turn connects to broader extra-local networks. Bayfield Apple Company, for example, strategically places its apple products in local schools, as well as food cooperatives and grocery stores such as Whole Foods in the Twin Cities. They also started work with a distributor to make their products available in other Midwestern states. Finally, the "Something Special from Wisconsin" branding, a state-wide initiative to promote Wisconsin-made goods, also helps in marketing Bayfield Apple Company products (Personal Interview, JH627).

Activity at multiple-scales, although focused primarily on the local, facilitates tourism and the production of consumer goods that complement the local economy and environment while maintaining engagement with networks that create linkages between Bayfield and other cities, organizations, or programs.

3. *Endogeneity*

Bayfield tourism development is clearly set within a local framework and seeks to emphasize the local environment and community attributes. Bayfield markets itself as a getaway destination with activities and attractions oriented around its primary natural resource of Lake Superior and the Apostle Islands. The website teaser reads:

How far away is Bayfield? Just far enough. Far enough to let you escape from strip malls. And drive-thru meals. And 3pm budget meetings. And all the other hassles, hype and "have-to's" of everyday life. Here, stress and schedules just sort of drift away on the sun-kissed waves of Lake Superior. And you can relax and re-charge in one of the most beautiful natural settings on Earth, let alone the Midwest. Try kayaking out to our famous water-sculpted sea caves. Catch the ferry over to Madeline Island or take a boat tour of the historic lighthouses on the other Apostle Islands. Hike out into the sunny berry fields and apple orchards to pick your own sweet, juicy bounty. Or just hunker down with a good book and savor the wide, soul-restoring vistas of the Big Lake. In Bayfield, Wisconsin, you'll discover a million things you'll want to do. And not one you have to do. (Chamber of Commerce, 2011)

Other evidence of endogeneity is found in the non-profit organizations' focus on local resource preservation and conservation, the Travel Green program, and local arts that are embraced by the community. For example, a stroll through the local Artists Cooperative in downtown reveals not only paintings and sculptures of the local area but jewelry created with stones

from the lake such as hematite (a locally occurring mineral), and agates (also regionally symbolic of Lake Superior).

4. *Sustainability*

The concept of sustainability is infused into the activities, organizations, and awards discussed in the previous section. An example of how this is both embraced and branded for Bayfield businesses can be seen in Figure 2. Applehill Orchard is locally owned.

Figure 2: This sign is promoting Applehill Orchard products at the 2010 Bayfield Apple Fest.

5. *Embeddedness*

As the discussion of BRFP and Scale above indicates, there is a strong connection between local businesses and sense of place and identity that have evolved in Bayfield. There are many local artists including potters, painters and sculptors that utilize Bayfield's natural beauty as inspiration for their work. The Big Top Chautauqua is an outdoor, largely music and performance venue that, while hosting national names and groups, also hosts an exceptionally wide range of local musicians and performers. Some performances focus on local history, creating songs and dialog to take the visitor through the history of the area. These performances reinforce a local sense of place and the importance of the local that permeates much of what is referred to as "the Bayfield experience".

6. *Complementarity*

Tourism in Bayfield is complementary in several aspects. Recreation activities are oriented around the Apostle Islands and include ferry rides to the islands, light house tours, kayaking, sailing and hiking. Many businesses feature local produce, such as apples, cherries and berries. Festivals coincide with harvest seasons, such as the Apple Blossom Festival, Apple Fest in October, Fall Harvest Celebration, Run on Water

(when the lake is frozen), Hometown Holiday Season, Apostle Islands Sled Dog Race, Festival of Arts and others (Chamber of Commerce, 2011). The Travel Green Wisconsin program and Eco-Municipality designation also complement the focus on local foods, local artists and a "simple way of life" that seems to embody the lifestyles in Bayfield.

7. *Empowerment*

Empowerment is described by Jenkins and Oliver (2004) as "local control over resources – inclusive and participatory decision-making that takes values and aspirations of local actors into account" (p. 70). Empowerment in Bayfield can be seen through the use of surveys, focus groups and volunteerism. The Township and City of Bayfield and the Chamber of Commerce utilize surveys, focus groups, and public meetings to generate feedback and input about the types and direction of development that each entity should embrace. While these are specific examples of how public input is solicited and utilized, it also reflects a spirit of openness that exists among agencies and within the community. In essence, Bayfield is what the residents of Bayfield create. The third form of empowerment comes from the extensive volunteer efforts that sustain many activities in Bayfield. Interviewees suggested that the number of volunteers totaled a few dozen people but the level of activity sustained was quite extensive and, importantly, there is a tremendous amount of overlap in volunteers. Most volunteers are committed to more than one organization so the networks among individuals engaged in volunteer activities are extensive, even if the formal connections between organizations are less so (Personal Interview, SE622).

There are several additional key factors that create sustainability in Bayfield. These include first, having a catalyst for an initial conversation about the future development prospects of the community (discussed above). Second is a spirit of volunteerism that coalesces around a common theme. Sustainability, as a concept, is broad and encompasses many issues. This allows organizations to pursue goals that implicitly, if not explicitly address the core ideas of sustainability, such as preservation of land and life ways, environmental, social and quality of life causes. The overlap in membership translates into strong and viable social networks that allow groups to complement, rather than compete with one another. This coordinated volunteerism coalescing around complementary themes means that there are numerous projects occurring simultaneously and a range of volunteers to contribute to the development of ideas and to perpetuate the ideals embraced by different organizations. This common vision is shared by many constituencies and focuses on quality of life, not just tourism. Tourism brings money into the community, but managing tourism to produce a desirable outcome for local residents is more difficult.

Finally, strong leadership is of utmost importance to Bayfield's success. This leadership however, is not embodied by a single individual although there are several key leaders in the community. As several interviewees pointed out, there are many leaders in Bayfield who are comfortable initiating and carrying-out projects as well as contributing as volunteers on projects initiated by others. This spirit of cooperation and willingness to lead and follow creates a dynamic exchange of ideas and energy for initiating new projects. This leadership is also

embodied in the many facilitators who see the connections between groups and can encourage linkages between individuals and groups.

While strong leadership and volunteerism are key to creating "sustainable" Bayfield, the question of whether this will continue into the future is critical. Opinions about whether the level of volunteerism, and by extension, the commitment to sustainability can be maintained, are mixed. One interviewee, reflecting on the age composition of volunteers (largely 50+) thought the future was quite worrisome while another, admitted being more engaged with the younger members of the community, was more optimistic, suggesting that life stage factors prevented current volunteerism among particular age groups (specifically those with young children) but that these individuals would likely become more active volunteers in the future.

6.0 Conclusions

The primary objective of this paper is to consider Bayfield's development success within the framework of the IRT model. It is clear that many of the elements that make Bayfield successful reflect the characteristics of IRT. As is widely acknowledged within the IRT literature, the model overlaps quite a bit with ST. This is certainly a key factor in Bayfield where "sustainability", although a difficult-to-define and operationalize, provides a rallying point for supporters. Exact definitions by community members and organizations vary but because there is enough flexibility in the definition, there is general agreement that sustainability is a valuable community goal and helps facilitate a common vision, as is evidenced by the language in the comprehensive plans. The concept also creates linkages between many non-profits and local government entities, generating a common set of goals. Key characteristics that are not directly addressed in IRT or ST were also present in Bayfield and include having a catalyst for change[2], strong leadership, and a culture of volunteerism and cooperation.

The composition of residents, new vs. long term, part-time vs. full-time, are an important characteristic of the Bayfield community. Unlike other rural areas, Bayfield actively recruits new residents. This influx of newcomers has several important implications for the community. First, it brings in new residents. This is not simply a numerical advantage. Many of the newcomers are choosing to leave urban areas and settle in Bayfield, bringing with them financial and professional resources and expertise. Many businesses are owned by individuals who had experience in the corporate world or previously owned businesses in other locations. Their experience and knowledge are thus transplanted in Bayfield and contribute to complement the wealth of human and social capital that facilitates local development.

Secondly, since many transplants move to Bayfield because of what Bayfield is, they are keen to preserve the characteristics that initially drew them to this area. Interestingly, this is exactly what creates conflict in other amenity destinations. Why does it work for Bayfield? This is not entirely clear but likely reflects the empowerment associated with re-locating to a place with other like-minded people and the strong social relationships that exist between long-term residents and newcomers.

---

[2] Saxena et al., 2007, pp. 14-16 discuss the importance of a crisis or catalyst for change as an important component of network formation.

Will Bayfield be able to maintain this success? People keep moving to Bayfield, although their numbers are quite small, the implications of their transplanted human capital are notable. The community embraces sustainability and the momentum and commitment to these principles and the community development results it creates seem to be sustained, even during the current economic crisis.

References

Alliance for Sustainability (2011). Website for the Alliance for Sustainability. Retrieved June 11, 2011 from http://www.allianceforsustainability.org/

Bayfield Chamber of Commerce (2011). Website for Bayfield, Wisconsin. Bayfield Chamber of Commerce. Retrieved June 11, 2011. www.bayfield.org

Cawley, M., Marsat, J. – B., & Gillmor, D. A. (2007). Promoting integrated rural tourism: Comparative perspectives on institutional networking in France and Ireland. *Tourism Geographies, 9, (4)*, 405-420.

Chamber of Commerce. (2011). Bayfield Chamber of Commerce. Retrieved May 31, 2011 from http://bayfield.org/

Clark, G., & Chabrel, M. (2007). Measuring integrated rural tourism. *Tourism Geographies, 9, (4)*, 371-386.

Bayfield Comprehensive Plan (2001*). City of Bayfield, Wisconsin comprehensive plan 2002-2022*. Bayfield, WI: City of Bayfield.

Blueprint for Bayfield (1970). *A design study for preserving and enhancing the scenic quality of a Great Lakes community*. Department of Landscape Architecture, School of Natural Resources, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Eadington, W. R. & Smith, V. (1992). Introduction: The emergence of alternative forms of tourism. In V. Smith & W. Eadington (Eds.), *Tourism alternatives* (pp. 1-12). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Edington, J. M. & Edington, M. A. (1997). Tropical forest ecotourism: Two promising projects in Belize. In M. J. Stabler (Ed.), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice* (pp. 163-168). New York, NY: CAB International.

Hamzah, A. (1997). The Evolution of small-scale tourism in Malaysia: Problems, opportunities and implications for sustainability. In M. J. Stabler (Ed.), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice* (pp. 199-217). New York, NY: CAB International.

Hunter-Jones, P. A., Hughes, H. L., Eastwood, I. W., & Morrison, A. A. (1997). Practical approaches to sustainability: A Spanish perspective. In M. J. Stabler (Ed.), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice* (pp. 263-274). New York, NY: CAB International.

Jenkins, T., & Oliver, T. (2001). *Integrated tourism: A conceptual framework*. (Working Paper 1. SPRITE Project). Aberystwyth, United Kingdom: University of Wales.

Jenkins, T., & Oliver, T. (2004). Conceptualizing integrated tourism in Europe's marginal rural regions. In R. Byron, J. C. Hansen, & T. Jenkins (Eds.), *Regional development on the north Atlantic margin* (pp. 61-86). Vermont: Ashgate.

MacLellan, R. (1997). The effectiveness of sustainable tourism policies in Scotland. In M. J. Stabler (Ed), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice* (pp. 305-322). New York, NY: CAB International.

McGrath, B. (1998). Environmental sustainability and rural settlement growth in Ireland. *The Town Planning Review, 69, (3)*, 277-290.

National Park Service (NPS) (2011). *Apostle Islands national lakeshore general management plan, wilderness plan, environmental impact statement*. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior.

Parsler, J. (1997). Tourism and the environment in Madagascar. In M. J. Stabler (Ed.), *Tourism sustainability: principles to practice* (pp.357-374). New York, NY: CAB International.

Peterson, S. C. (2006). Celebrating 150 years: Bayfield, Wisconsin, Sesquicentennial, 1856-2006. Bayfield, WI: City of Bayfield Sesquicentennial Committee.

Prinianaki-Tzorakoleftheraki, E. (1997). Local environmental protection initiatives in Crete. In M. J. Stabler (Ed), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice* (pp.335-345). New York, NY: CAB International.

Saxena, G., Clark, G., Oliver, T., Ilbery, B. (2007). Conceptualizing integrated rural tourism. *Tourism Geographies, 9, (4)*, 347-370.

Sharpley, R. (2003). Rural tourism and sustainability – a critique. In D. Hall, L. Roberts & M. Mitchell (Eds.), *New directions in rural tourism* (pp. 38-53). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

Shaw, G., Williams, A. M. (2002). Critical issues in tourism: A geographical perspective, 2nd edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

Slee, W., Farr, H, & Snowdon, P. (1997). Sustainable tourism and the local economy. In M. J. Stabler (Ed.), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice.* (pp. 69-87). New York, NY: CAB International.

Tourtellot, J. B. (2005). Special report: destination scorecard national parks. *National Geographic Traveler*, July/August, 80-92.

The U.S. Travel Association (2012). U.S. travel answer sheet: facts about a leading American industry that's more than just fun. Retrieved September 19, 2012, from http://www.ustravel.org/sites/default/files/page/2009/11/USTravelAnswerSheet.pdf

USDA (1999). *Natural amenities data.* Retrieved June 6, 2011 from http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/NaturalAmenities/

U.S. Bureau of Census (1930). *Census of population: Wisconsin*. Washington, D. C.:U.S. Bureau of Census.

U.S. Bureau of Census (2000). *Census of population: Summary file 1*. Retrieved November 2, 2012 from http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Bureau of Census (2010). *Census of population: Summary file 1*. Retrieved November 2, 2012 from http://factfinder2.census.gov

U.S. Bureau of Census (2007). *Economic census.* Retrieved June 6, 2011 from http://factfinder.census.gov

Weinberg, A. S. (2000). Sustainable economic development in rural America. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 570,*173-185.

Wilson, D. (1997). Strategies for sustainability: Lessons from Goa and the Seychelles. In M. J. Stabler (Ed.), *Tourism sustainability: Principles to practice* (pp. 173-197). New York, NY: CAB International.

World Commission on Environment and Development (WECD) (1987). *Our Common Future.* Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.