

Land Use Policy Analysis

For Todd, Morrison, Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena Counties

Prepared by
Michael Dorfman
University of Minnesota
Regional Sustainable Development Partnership



Region Five Photos at <http://s1184.photobucket.com/home/mnregionfive>

Prepared for the
Central Minnesota Regional Sustainable Development Project

September 18, 2011

Introduction

The following document analyzes Todd, Morrison, Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena County policies relating to housing and residential development. This document is one piece of a larger analysis that addresses the five counties' policies regarding topics of land use, transportation, housing, economic development, parks, trails, open space, and recreation, water and natural resources, intergovernmental coordination, and healthcare. To ensure clarity, each topic is analyzed separately in its own document. Research and analysis was undertaken to provide the Region Five Development Consortium with a clearer understanding of how current policies relate and differ from each other across counties. The following analysis will be helpful for workgroups to develop regional policies and recommendations, which will be adopted by the full consortium to guide the future growth and development of Region Five in a sustainable manner.

Methodology

The following policies were taken from Todd, Morrison, Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena County's most recent Comprehensive Plans. This document addresses the similarities, differences, and potential conflicts between county policies regarding land use. Due to the uniqueness of each plan, not all counties addressed similar issues around the topic at hand. For this reason, policies were only included if at least two of the five counties addressed the issue. To see what county policies were included or dismissed in this analysis please refer to Appendix C (separate document). Additionally, each county's policies are written at a different level of specificity making it difficult to compare/contrast a detailed policy with a vague policy. For the purpose of this analysis, policies were considered similar to each other even when they differ on the level of detail.

For this analysis, sub-topics were created to guide the reader throughout the document. For example, this document contains sub-topics of agricultural land use, residential land use, rural residential land use, and so forth. Under each sub-topic, similarities, differences, and conflicts between county policies on an issue were analyzed and grouped into categories. Categories are listed as follows: Very Similar, Similar, Somewhat Similar, Unique/Potentially Conflicting, and Unique. Policies in the Very Similar category are ones that relate to each other at a clear level of specificity; policies under the Similar category are ones that relate in vision but not in detail; policies under the Somewhat Similar category relate to each other more similarly than uniquely; policies under Unique/Potentially Conflicting category are in potential disagreement with other policies pertaining to the same issue; and policies that are considered unique have some relationship to the issue at hand but are not similar to each other. Due to policies relating to more than one sub-topic, it is possible that the same policy will be included across sub-topics and categories. It is also possible that not all categories were used in this document, depending on how county policies relate to each other.

All five counties addressed land use in their Comprehensive Plan. Since many counties' policies also addressed issues of housing, transportation, and economic development in the land use section of their Comprehensive Plan, they may not be included in this document. However, more detailed analyses regarding these issues will be located in separate documents.

To make it clear to understand, each policy has been assigned a color that corresponds with a county. The county color code can be seen in the footer of each page. Additionally, text that is bolded and highlighted signifies the relationship between policies under a category. Furthermore, a sources list is included below in this methodology section to provide readers with links to each county's most updated comprehensive plan.

Sources

1) Todd County 2030 Comprehensive Plan:

http://www.co.todd.mn.us/HTML_Files/Departments/Documentation/ToddCounty2030ComprehensivePlan.pdf

2) Morrison County Comprehensive Plan (adopted 2005):

<http://morrisonmn.govoffice3.com/vertical/Sites/%7BC8FCCAFF-AECD-45DC-91B1-016A998EB4A8%7D/uploads/%7B77B3A859-82C4-4E06-AC2D-04350EE16357%7D.PDF>

3) Cass County Comprehensive Plan (2008-2012):

http://www.co.cass.mn.us/esd/pdfs/comp_plan.pdf

4) Crow Wing County Comprehensive Plan (2003-2023):

http://www.co.crow-wing.mn.us/planning_zoning/ordinances/docs/2004_COMPREHENSIVE_PLAN.pdf

5) Wadena County Comprehensive Plan (1999):

<https://r5dcscrp.basecamphq.com/projects/7032816/file/85211367/WadenaCountyCompPlan.pdf>

Findings

I. Agricultural Land Use

All counties address the issue of agricultural land use in their comprehensive plans. However, policies regarding the preservation of agricultural land use differ between counties. Morrison and Wadena County are the only two that explicitly state they would like to preserve and protect agricultural use throughout their County. Todd County's policy regarding the issue states that they should only identify the highest quality agricultural areas in the County...without conflicting with existing agricultural operations (refer IA2 below). Todd County does not explicitly state they would like to protect high quality agricultural areas, they only say they would like to identify them. Cass County says they discourage reclassifying agricultural land to other uses and encourage agriculture as the primary use in historically farmed areas. Crow Wing County recognizes the need for agricultural land for agricultural purposes but allows marginal farmland along existing roads and services to be developed. Todd County also states that they should identify areas where rural residential housing could be developed.

In this respect, Crow Wing and Todd County have policies that potentially conflict with Morrison, Wadena, and Cass County policies (refer to IA3 below). Their policies state to identify agricultural areas that could be potentially developed while other counties specifically state they would like to preserve agricultural land use and not reclassify it to other uses.

Uniquely, Morrison County has policies in place to use agricultural land for agricultural technology uses such as for the production of biodiesel fuels, ethanol, wind and solar production, etc. They would also like to maintain small and family farms. Wadena County has unique policies that focus on encouraging sound farming practices that protect environmentally sensitive areas and natural systems (refer to IA4d below).

II. Residential Land Use

Cass and Wadena County both have similar policies in place regarding the location of high-density residential development. They both state that high-density residential development should be located near municipalities or growth areas that will support public facilities and services for this type of development. Similarly, Todd County encourages the location of residential subdivisions and major developments in or

immediately adjacent to cities and growth areas where urban services can be provided (refer to IIA2 below). Morrison and Crow Wing County do not address this issue.

Regarding multi-family housing Todd and Wadena County are the only two counties that address the issue. Similarly to high-density development, Todd County encourages multi-family residential development only in areas where public or community sewer and water facilities are available. Wadena County's policy regarding this issue is vague, stating they encourage development of multiple family housing units in areas deemed appropriate. They do not define what appropriate areas are. Morrison, Crow Wing, and Cass County do not address this issue.

Addressing the issue of open space within developments, Morrison and Crow Wing County policies are similar in that they both encourage open space within developments to address infrastructure concerns (refer to IIC below). Morrison County's policy is specific in that they encourage this open space for future central service districts for septic systems. Crow Wing County simply says they would like to permanently preserve green space in new developments with appropriate infrastructure or environmental concerns. Somewhat similar to Crow Wing's policy that briefly addresses the environment, Cass County encourages cluster development as an alternative in environmentally sensitive areas. However, they do not state what cluster development would be an alternative to. Todd and Wadena County do not address this issue.

III. Rural Residential Land Use

Todd and Crow Wing County are the only two counties that encourage new development to take happen in existing agricultural areas. Todd County states that they should identify areas where rural residential housing could potentially be developed. Crow Wing County is a little more specific, stating that they allow marginal agricultural properties that are located close to existing roads and services to be developed.

Morrison and Cass County have policies that potentially conflict with this. Morrison County says that they should focus decisions about new residential in or adjacent to agriculturally zoned land on the land's crop production rather than on potential use of the land for residential development. Additionally, they say they should consider alternatives to non-farm development in prime agricultural areas to preserve prime farmland. Cass County discourages reclassification of agriculture land to other uses and would like to keep the 40-acre parcel limit. They also say to limit rural development density. Wadena County does not address this issue.

Regarding rural residential cluster development, Todd and Morrison Counties are the only two counties that explicitly state that they should encourage cluster and conservation development designs when planning for rural residential development. Similarly, Cass County also encourages cluster development. However, they do not specify that they

encourage it in rural areas, they say only as an alternative in environmentally sensitive areas. Somewhat similarly, Crow Wing County says they should identify and develop incentives, standards, and other tools to encourage subdivision designs that preserve open or green space. Additionally, they say they should research cluster development and overlay districts. Potentially conflicting to policies that encourage cluster development and conservation designs, Cass County has a policy that reads limit rural development density (refer to IIIB4 below). Wadena County does not address open space within developments or cluster development.

IV. Open Space

Similarly, Morrison, Crow Wing, and Wadena County all state that they should preserve open space. Relating to this, Morrison and Wadena County specify they should preserve the rural character of the county and that open space is a way to do so. Morrison, Crow Wing, and Wadena County also state that they should protect and preserve the County's environmentally significant areas such as high quality natural areas, woods, and streams. Wadena County also says they should preserve the County's woods and streams. Additionally, Wadena County is the only county that says how to preserve the rural character, farmland, woods, streams, and open space: by directing development to growth areas. Relating to the preservation of open space, Morrison and Cass County say they encourage the use of cluster development. Uniquely, Morrison County says they should use open space as a buffering tool between incompatible land uses. Todd County does not address this issue.

V. Compatible Residential and Agricultural Land Uses

All counties address conflicts between residential and agricultural land to some degree (refer to VA below). Todd County simply states that they should promote compatible agricultural and rural residential development. Morrison County says that through buffering, cluster development design, and other practices they will minimize impacts of residential development on agricultural use and vice versa. Cass County also states that buffers should be provided between developments and agricultural land. Crow Wing County says that specialized agricultural operations that do not conflict with residential land uses are encouraged. Wadena County also agrees that steps should be taken to reduce potential conflicts with non-farming property owners living adjacent to agricultural zones where farming operations are taking place.

Regarding feedlots, Todd and Morrison County have similar policies that state that impacts feedlots have on development should be minimized (refer to VB1 below). Morrison County goes into detail as to what can be done to minimize these impacts. Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena County do not address this issue.

VI. Commercial Development

Regarding the location of commercial development near urban areas, Crow Wing and Wadena County both encourage commercial development to occur in or adjacent to urban areas (refer to VIA below). Similarly, Morrison County and Crow Wing County state that commercial development should only occur in areas capable of handling such development with adequate infrastructure and services. Additionally, Crow Wing County discourages commercial uses in rural townships without adequate infrastructure. Todd County also agrees that more intense development should be located in or near cities where urban services are provided. However, it is unclear if commercial development falls under the definition of Todd County's intense development. Cass County does not address the location of commercial development within or near urban areas.

Addressing the location of commercial development near transportation nodes, Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena County all have similar policies (refer to VIB below). Cass County encourages commercial business to occur at or near major transportation intersections. Crow Wing County specifies that commercial development should be along transportation nodes along growth corridors on trunk highways. Wadena County encourages commercial development in areas adjacent to major transportation routes. Morrison and Todd County do not address the location of commercial development near transportation nodes.

Furthermore, Todd, Morrison, and Crow Wing County have policies that unique from each other but relate to the issue of commercial development (refer to VIB below). Todd County states that commercial land use should be located in cities that have public water and sewer systems. Morrison County encourages commercial development impacts on adjacent land uses to be mitigated. Crow Wing County encourages the redevelopment of vacant and abandoned commercial lots in cities and along growth corridors.

VII. Orderly Development

Todd and Morrison County both promote the use of "orderly development" in the County (refer to VIIA1 below). Morrison County's policy goes more in depth stating how to do so. They say that "the use of "orderly development" and "Smart Growth" planning should be increased by focusing higher density or higher impact commercial development to existing lands within or adjacent to urban areas, or "in-fill" of vacant land for commercial development". Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena County do not address this issue explicitly.

VIII. Spot Zoning

Todd and Morrison County both discourage spot zoning (refer to VIIIA1 below). Morrison County's policy states that they would like to reduce the impacts of spot zoning by carefully considering the adverse secondary impacts of the potential business and its future use.

IX. Intergovernmental Coordination

All counties address the topic of intergovernmental coordination regarding land use in some form. However, some counties only address one sub-topic within this topic. For example, Morrison County only addresses coordination between local municipalities while other counties may also address state and federal coordination.

Regarding land use planning coordination between state and federal agencies, Todd and Cass County have similar policies. They both agree that planning efforts should be coordinated between state and federal agencies. Although it is implied in Todd County's policy that these efforts should be coordinated to assure wise land use, Cass County explicitly states this. Similarly, Crow Wing County believes that partnerships should be formed between townships, cities and neighboring counties, state agencies, and non-governmental groups to make land use decisions. However, they do not incorporate federal agencies in this policy. Morrison and Wadena County do not address state and federal agency coordination.

Regarding land use planning coordination between non-governmental agencies, Todd and Crow Wing County have similar policies. They both agree that planning should be coordinated with non-governmental groups to make land use decisions. Todd County goes into more detail as to what non-governmental groups should be involved in the decision-making. For detail on the non-governmental agencies that Todd County lists in this policy please refer to IXB1a below. Morrison, Cass, and Wadena County do not address non-governmental agency coordination in their comprehensive plans.

Regarding land use planning coordination between local municipalities, Todd, Cass, and Crow Wing, and Wadena County all have similar policies. They all agree that efforts should be coordinated among local governments. Some counties explicitly state efforts should be coordinated between the County, municipalities, and townships, while others just say local governments. Somewhat similarly, Morrison County says the County will work with municipalities to develop urban growth boundaries. Please refer to IXC below for more detailed information. Uniquely, most counties have policies that do not relate to each other in detail regarding the coordination of land use planning. For example, Cass County is the only county that says efforts should be coordinated with tribal governments to assure wise land use. Please refer to IXC4 below for more information on unique policies.

Policy Analysis

I. Agricultural Land Use

A. Preservation of Agricultural Land Use

1. Similar

- a) **To focus on long-term preservation and promotion of existing agricultural use of land** including, but not limited to crop production, animal husbandry, dairy production, pasturelands, and similar uses.
- b) **Protect agricultural use** throughout the County.

2. Similar to Above (IA1)

- a) **Identify the highest quality agricultural areas in the County** as well as areas where rural residential housing could potentially be developed without conflicting with existing agricultural operations or creating detrimental impacts to natural resources.
- b) During the development review process, **consider alternatives to non-farm development in prime agricultural areas to preserve prime agricultural land.**
- c) **Encourage municipalities adjacent to agricultural zoned land to address future agriculture land development or preservation** within their local Comprehensive Plan.
- d) **Encourage agriculture as the primary use in historically farmed areas** as part of a diverse economy and respect the settlement characteristics of agricultural areas.
- e) **Discourage reclassification of agriculture land to other uses, and keep the 40-acre parcel limit.**
- f) **Recognize the need for agriculture lands for agricultural purposes** while allowing marginal agricultural properties that are located close to existing roads and services to be developed.

3. Unique/Potentially Conflicting to Above (IA1, IA2b, IA2d, IA2e)

- a) **Identify** the highest quality agricultural areas in the County as well as **areas where rural residential housing could potentially be developed** without conflicting with existing agricultural operations or creating detrimental impacts to natural resources.

- b) Recognize the need for agriculture lands for agricultural purposes while **allowing marginal agricultural properties that are located close to existing roads and services to be developed.**
- i. **Allow marginal farmland along existing roads to be developed at higher densities to allow development** while preserving areas for agricultural production, and to discourage piece-meal lot splits and rezoning.

4. Unique

- a) Increase the use of agricultural land for agricultural technology uses such as for the production of biodiesel fuels, ethanol production, wind and solar electricity production, and similar uses.
- b) Develop incentives and support legislation providing tax incentives to maintain small or family farms.
- c) Natural features and resources that may be unproductive for farming (wooded areas, wetlands, floodplains) are also important components of natural systems and rural character which the County wishes to preserve.
- d) The County should support and promote county and state programs that encourage sound farming practices relating to surface water protection, soil erosion control, nutrient management, sedimentation control, and manure controls in an effort to minimize conflicts.
- e) Agricultural zoning should be designed to protect environmentally sensitive areas for forest and open space purposes.

II. Residential Land Use

A. Location of Residential Development

1. Similar

- a) **Encourage high density residential development to be located in or near municipalities.**
- b) **Encourage development of higher densities in growth areas to encourage efficient development** that will support public facilities and services and preserve open space.

2. Similar to Above (IIA1)

- a) **Encourage the location of residential subdivisions and major developments in or immediately adjacent to cities, including the community growth areas** as shown on Figures 53, 54 and 55, where urban services can easily be provided.

B. Multi-Family Housing

1. Somewhat Similar

- a) **Allow the location of multi-family residential development only in areas where public or community sewer and water facilities are available.**
- b) **Encourage development of multiple family housing units in areas deemed appropriate.**

C. Open Space within Developments

1. Similar

- a) **Encourage open space within developments that provide sufficient space for future central service districts for septic systems.** Examine possible sites for utilities to ensure Quality Surface and Ground Water resources in the area of development.
- b) **Encourage developers and landowners to permanently preserve green space in new developments with appropriate infrastructure or environmental concerns.** In other areas, encourage developers and landowners to permanently preserve green space and give them options to do so.

2. Somewhat Similar to Above (IIC1b)

- a) **Encourage cluster development as an alternative in environmentally sensitive areas.**

III. Rural Residential Land Use

A. Rural Residential Development

1. Somewhat Similar

- a) **Identify** the highest quality agricultural areas in the County as well as **areas where rural residential housing could potentially be developed without conflicting with existing agricultural operations** or creating detrimental impacts to natural resources.
- b) **Recognize the need for agriculture lands for agricultural purposes while allowing marginal agricultural properties that are located close to existing roads and services to be developed.**
 - i. **Allow marginal farmland along existing roads to be developed at higher densities to allow development while preserving areas for agricultural production**, and to discourage piece-meal lot splits and rezoning.

2. Unique/Potentially Conflicting to Above (IIIA1a, IIIA1b)

- a) **Focus decisions about new residential development in or adjacent to agricultural zoned land on the land's crop production rather than on potential use of the land for residential development.**
- b) During the development review process, **consider alternatives to non-farm development in prime agricultural areas to preserve prime agricultural land.**
- c) **Discourage reclassification of agriculture land to other uses, and keep the 40-acre parcel limit.**
- d) **Limit rural development density.**

B. Rural Residential Cluster Development

1. Similar

- a) Develop and adopt provisions in development ordinances that encourage innovative site and housing unit designs. **The County encourages developers to consider cluster and conservation development designs when planning new rural residential developments** and the construction of community water and sewer systems.
- b) **Promote the use of cluster development** in any rural residential development.

- c) **Increase the use of cluster designs for rural residential development**, especially in development scenarios where open space areas can be used for buffering residential and agricultural land use areas.

2. Similar to Above (IIB1)

- a) **Encourage cluster development as an alternative in environmentally sensitive areas.**

3. Somewhat Similar to Above (IIB1)

- a) **Identify and develop appropriate incentives, standards and other tools to encourage affordable subdivision design(s) that provide for direct public benefit such as the provision of affordable housing, preservation of open or green space**, or minimization of impact on public infrastructure.
 - i. **Research incentives such as density increases for developers to build cluster developments (except in shoreland). Research cluster overlay districts.** Research a TDR ordinance and identify where it achieves community benefits.
 - ii. **Find a balance between larger lot sizes and clustered development.**
 - iii. **Hold workshops and put together an information fact sheet on cluster developments.**
 - iv. **Review the option of a cluster overlay district in an updated zoning map.**

4. Potentially Conflicting to Above (IIB1, IIB3)

- a) **Limit rural development density.**

5. Unique

- a) Prohibit the location of rural housing with septic tanks and drainfields in areas of high bedrock or water table or steep slopes to minimize pollution problems.
- b) Use soils and other natural resource information as a basis for establishing minimum lot sizes for rural housing with septic tanks and drainfields.

- c) Control the location of new rural residential housing near existing feedlots and other commercial agricultural operations that is likely to cause nuisance problems or disrupt farming operations.

IV. Open Space

A. Preservation

1. Similar

- a) **Preserve open spaces** for uses permitted by ordinance and statute, including hunting, fishing, cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, hiking, biking, etc., as well as reasonable spaces for recreating on motorized vehicles such as ATVs, snowmobiles, etc.
 - i. **Protect and enhance the existing open spaces that are already present** in Todd County.
- b) **Preserve open space within Morrison County to protect and enhance the rural character and atmosphere of the County** and require buffers between agricultural and residential uses.
- c) **Identify environmentally significant or critical open spaces or green spaces** within the County **and protect those spaces from future development.**
- d) Maintain and enhance parks, recreation, and open space for Crow Wing County residents and visitors by providing diverse recreational opportunities that are accessible to people of all ages and abilities, while **preserving the County's high quality natural areas and open space.**
- e) **Preserve Wadena County's rural character, farmland, woods, streams, and open spaces** by directing development to growth areas.

2. Somewhat Similar to Above (IVA1)

- a) **Promote the use of cluster development** in any rural residential development.
- b) **Encourage cluster development** as an alternative in environmentally sensitive areas.

3. Unique

- a) Use open space as a buffering tool between incompatible land uses.
- b) To focus on long-term preservation and conservation of land and open space along the Protected Waters within Morrison County including, but not limited to first, second and potential third tier development.

V. Compatible Residential and Agricultural Land Use

A. Conflict Mitigation

1. Similar

- a) **Promote compatible agricultural and rural residential development** in the County.
- b) Increase the use of buffering, cluster development design, or similar practices to **minimize the impacts of residential development on agriculture use, and agriculture use on residential development.**
- c) **Encourage specialized agricultural operations that do not conflict with residential land uses.**
- d) Wadena County should **take steps to reduce potential conflicts with non-farming property owners living adjacent to agricultural zones where farming operations are taking place.**

2. Similar Within and to Above (VA1)

- a) Preserve open space within Morrison County to protect and enhance the rural character and atmosphere of the County and **require buffers between agricultural and residential uses.**
- b) **Use open space as a buffering tool between incompatible land uses.**
- c) **Provide buffers between developments and agricultural land.**

B. Feedlot Conflict Mitigation

1. Similar

- a) Control the location of new feedlots and other animal confinement areas in

the County to **minimize land-use conflicts, pollution and nuisance problems with existing rural residential development.**

- b) **Minimize the impacts of feedlots on all existing and future development** within the County, and the impacts of all existing and future development on existing feedlots.

2. Similar to Above (VIA1)

- a) **Develop setback requirements which provide sufficient space between all new development and all new and existing feedlots.**
- b) **Recommend the use of biofilters and similar technology to minimize the impacts of feedlots on the natural and human environment.**
- c) **Review studies related to the regulation of feedlots and recommend changes as necessary.**
- d) **Recognize the issues of feedlots and animal confinement areas with other land uses such as residential and commercial development and utilize new and existing controls to minimize conflicts and issues.**
- e) **Review the impacts of livestock, poultry, exotic animals, and others on small parcels in all zoning districts of the county by establishing specific standards in the Land Use Ordinance.**

VI. Commercial Development

A. Location of Commercial Development (Near Urban Areas)

1. Similar

- a) **Encourage the location of additional commercial development to existing cities** and discrete nodes along growth corridors on trunk highways.
- b) **Encourage future residential, commercial, and industrial development adjacent to urban areas.**

2. Similar to Above (VIIA1)

- a) **Promote the location of more intense development in or near cities where urban services can easily be provided and extended.**

- b) **Limit commercial and industrial development only in areas capable of handling such development with adequate infrastructure and services.**
- c) **Locate heavy commercial or industrial uses in existing industrial parks or in nodes along growth corridors that have adequate infrastructure.**

B. Location of Commercial Development (Near Transportation Nodes)

1. Similar

- a) Encourage location of commercial businesses **at or near major transportation intersections.**
- b) Encourage the location of additional commercial development to existing cities and **discrete nodes along growth corridors on trunk highways.**
- c) Encourage commercial and industrial development **in areas adjacent to major transportation routes** in order to prevent routing truck traffic through residential areas.

2. Unique

- a) Locate commercial and industrial land uses in cities that have public water and sewer systems.
- b) Mitigate impacts of new commercial and industrial development on existing adjacent land use and the impacts of existing adjacent land on new commercial and industrial development.
- c) **Redevelop vacant and abandoned commercial and industrial lots in cities and along growth corridors.**

VII. Orderly Development

A. Orderly Development

1. Similar

- a) **Promote and guide the orderly development and growth** in Todd County in a fair and common sense manner.

- b) **Increase the use of “orderly development” and “Smart Growth”** by focusing higher density or higher impact commercial development to existing lands within or adjacent to urban areas, or “in-fill” of vacant land for commercial development.

VIII. Spot Zoning

A. Spot Zoning

1. Similar

- a) **Discourage “spot zoning”** in the County.
- b) **Reduce the impacts of spot zoning** by carefully considering the adverse secondary impacts of the potential business and its future use.

IX. Intergovernmental Coordination

A. State and Federal Agencies

1. Similar

- a) **Support the coordination of planning and implementation efforts between** the Sauk River, Watershed District, lake associations, Todd SWCD, Planning and Zoning Department, and **state and federal agencies.**
- b) **Coordinate efforts between** the County, municipalities, townships, **state and federal agencies**, and tribal government **to assure wise land use**, economic development, and the protection of natural resources.

2. Similar to Above (IXA1)

- a) **Foster partnerships with** townships, cities and neighboring counties, **state agencies**, and non-governmental groups **in land use decisions** that impact them.

B. Non-Governmental Agencies

1. Similar

- a) **Support the coordination of planning and implementation efforts between the Sauk River, Watershed District, lake associations, Todd SWCD, Planning and Zoning Department, and state and federal agencies.**
- b) **Foster partnerships with** townships, cities and neighboring counties, state agencies, and **non-governmental groups in land use decisions** that impact them.

C. Local Municipalities

1. Similar

- a) **Coordinate plans and work with all local governments and agencies responsible for the delegation and regulation of land use.**
- b) **Coordinate efforts between the County, municipalities, townships, state and federal agencies, and tribal government to assure wise land use, economic development, and the protection of natural resources.**
- c) **Foster partnerships with townships, cities** and neighboring counties, state agencies, and non-governmental groups **in land use decisions** that impact them.
- d) **Achieve an ongoing relationship between County, Cities, and Townships in all matters related to planning.**
 - i. **Recognize issues and concerns and work cooperatively with all municipalities.**

2. Similar to Above and Within (IXC1)

- a) **Encourage all townships and cities in the County to** either 1) properly budget, develop and administer a coordinated system of land-use regulations or 2) **coordinate land-use controls with the County.**
- b) **Encourage all cities and townships to develop community growth area plans** to help guide where future development should be located.

3. Somewhat Similar to Above and Within (IXC1)

- a) **Morrison County will work with municipalities to develop urban growth boundaries** in and around their cities.

4. Unique

- a) Encourage all townships and cities in the County to either 1) properly budget, develop and administer a coordinated system of land-use regulations or 2) coordinate land-use controls with the County.
- b) Enforce the County's and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's standards concerning on-site sewer systems.
- c) Encourage the coordination of land-use planning and water planning efforts in the County to help protect groundwater resources.
- d) **Coordinate efforts between the County, municipalities, townships, state and federal agencies, and tribal government to assure wise land use, economic development, and the protection of natural resources.**
 - i. Coordinate with the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe on land use regulation and natural resource protection efforts.
- e) Refer industrial use issues to municipalities and economic development authorities.
- f) **Foster partnerships with townships, cities and neighboring counties, state agencies, and non-governmental groups in land use decisions that impact them.**
- g) The County should support and promote county and state programs that encourage sound farming practices relating to surface water protection, soil erosion control, nutrient management, sedimentation control, and manure controls in an effort to minimize conflicts.