



Intergovernmental 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 intergovernmental coordination. 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 intergovernmental coordination. 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 F (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 transportation coordination, housing coordination, regional coordination, 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.

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. Regional Cooperation (Across Counties)

Both Morrison and Crow Wing County have similar policies regarding regional cooperation. They both agree that a cooperative relationship with other county agencies should be encouraged and enhanced. Todd, Cass, and Wadena County do not address this issue.

II. Land Use 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 IIB1a 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 IIC 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 IIC4 below for more information on unique policies.

III. Transportation Coordination

Morrison, Cass, and Wadena County all have very similar policies regarding the coordination of transportation planning. They all agree that transportation planning within the County should be coordinated with federal, state, cities, and townships. Similarly, Todd County says that they should work with townships and cities to repair priority roads. Uniquely, Cass County says they should coordinate their transportation plan with the transportation plan of the Region. Crow Wing County does not address this issue.

Additionally, Todd and Morrison County have similar policies regarding the Minnesota Department of Transportation. They both agree that transportation access management should be coordinated or consistent with MNDOT. Cass, Crow Wing, and Wadena County do not address MNDOT.

Furthermore, many counties have unique policies regarding the coordination of transportation planning. For more information please refer to IIIB2 below.

IV. Housing Coordination

Cass and Crow Wing County both have similar policies regarding the coordination of housing in the county. They both support cooperative efforts among housing agencies. Crow Wing County's policy is slightly more detailed saying that they support cooperative efforts by municipalities, non-profits and regional housing agencies to create a county-wide housing action plan. Uniquely, Cass County encourages joint planning between local governments on infrastructure expansion. Todd, Morrison, and Wadena County do not address this issue.

V. Economic Development Coordination

Cass and Wadena County both have similar policies regarding the coordination of local governments relating to economic development. They both agree that local governments should be included to help develop the county economically. However, the cooperation between local governments and other agencies/institutions differs. For example, Cass County says that efforts between the County, municipalities, state and federal agencies, and tribal government should be coordinated to assure economic development. Wadena County says that they support regional cooperation between local governments, educational institutions, and businesses to create high skill living wage jobs. Please refer to VA1 and VA2 below for more detail. Todd, Morrison, and Crow Wing County do not address this issue.

VI. Water and Natural Resources Coordination

No counties have similar policies regarding the coordination of water and natural resources within the county. For unique policies regarding this issue please refer to VIA1 below.

VII. Park, Trails, Open Space, and Recreation Coordination

Regarding trail coordination, Cass and Wadena County both have somewhat similar policies. They both agree that a trail system should be established. However, each county has different municipalities or groups that they believe should work cooperatively. Cass County states that ATV clubs, users, and the Cass County Land Recreation Advisory Committee should work together while Wadena County states that there should be a cooperative effort between the county, county municipalities, and townships. Somewhat similarly, Todd County supports the efforts and continuation of the Todd County Parks and Trails Board. Morrison County says they explore the possibility of maintaining a County Parks and Recreation Department. Additionally, Wadena County encourages the development of a county-wide tourism plan to incorporate the municipal tourism efforts with the county recreation areas. Crow Wing County does not address this issue in any form.

Todd and Wadena have somewhat similar policies regarding recreation coordination. Todd County states that they encourage participation and partnership among local units of County government to plan and implement public and private recreation. Wadena County also encourages cooperation between the County and municipalities to link recreation opportunities. They also state that public and private partnerships should be encouraged to enhance recreation opportunities and services. For more information on these policies as well as unique policies please refer to VIIA1 and VIIA2 below. Todd, Cass, and Crow Wing County do not address this issue.

VIII. Citizen /Community Based Participation

Both Todd and Wadena County have somewhat similar policies regarding public participation in the planning process. Todd County's policy states that a community-based framework for all future decisions and actions related to the implementation of the County's Comprehensive Plan should be established. Wadena County encourages resident participation in all local decision-making procedures. Similarly, Todd County has a policy to promote community based planning. Additionally, Crow Wing County's policy reads "improve the public hearing process regarding consistency of ordinance enforcement and the perception of fairness by providing education to citizens about what the procedures are, what the board is required by law to look at when making a decision, and not letting personal viewpoints get in the way of the facts and procedures."

Furthermore, Todd and Crow Wing County have unique policies regarding this issue. Please refer to VIIIA3 below for more detailed information. Morrison and Cass County do not address this issue.

Policy Analysis

I. Regional Cooperation (Across Counties)

A. Regional Cooperation

1. Similar

- a) **A cooperative relationship** with officials **from adjoining counties** should be encouraged.
- b) **Enhance intergovernmental cooperation with other county**, state and federal **agencies**.

II. Land Use 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 (IIA1)

- 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 (IIC1)

- 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 (IIC1)

- 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.

III. Transportation Coordination

A. State, Federal, City and Township Coordination

1. Very Similar

- a) **County road planning should be coordinated with Federal, State, City and Township road plans.**
- b) **Coordinate efforts with county, state, tribal, and federal transportation planning.**
- c) **To encourage Cities and Townships to coordinate their transportation planning with the County.**
- d) **County road planning should be coordinated with Federal, State, City, and Township road plans.**

2. Similar to Above (IIIA1)

- a) **Work with the townships and cities to repair priority roads.**

3. Unique

- a) **To coordinate this plan with the transportation plan of the State and Region.**

B. Coordination with Minnesota Department of Transportation

1. Similar

- a) **Develop and adopt access management standards** to guide the location of driveway and public roadway locations on the County highway system **that are consistent with MNDOT accepted standards.**
- b) **Support and participate in the incorporation of Minnesota Department of Transportation Access Management Guidelines** on all trunk highways within Morrison County.

2. Unique

- a) A cooperative relationship with officials from adjoining counties should be encouraged.
- b) **To coordinate this plan with the** transportation plan of the State and **Region.**
- c) **Coordinate efforts with** county, state, **tribal**, and federal transportation planning.
- d) To foster cooperation and reduce institutional barriers between all entities involved in providing transportation to the County.
- e) To maximize public involvement in the transportation planning process.
- f) Work with County economic development officials, transportation planners, the planning department, cities, and townships to identify and designate growth corridors and high-growth areas within those corridors.
- g) Transfer road jurisdiction to appropriate municipalities that do not meet county road traffic counts.

IV. Housing Coordination

A. Coordination Among Housing Agencies

1. Similar

- a) **Partnering efforts among the existing housing agencies** to give unified approach.
- b) **Support on-going cooperative efforts by** municipalities, non-profits and **regional housing agencies** to create a county-wide housing action plan.

2. Unique

- a) Encourage joint planning between local governments on infrastructure expansion.

V. Economic Development Coordination

A. Coordination Among Local Governments

1. Somewhat Similar

- a) **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.**
- b) **Support regional cooperation between local governments, educational institutions, and businesses to create high skill living wage jobs.**

2. Unique

- a) Refer industrial use issues to municipalities and economic development authorities.
- 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) **Support regional cooperation between local governments, educational institutions, and businesses to create high skill living wage jobs.**

VI. Water and Natural Resources Coordination

A. Water and Natural Resources Coordination

1. Unique

- a) Encourage the coordination of land-use planning and water planning efforts in the County to help protect groundwater resources.

- b) 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.
- c) Support the forestry management practices, programs, and policies of the Minnesota DNR and the Camp Ripley Military Reservation.
- 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.
- e) Coordinate with the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe on land use regulation and natural resource protection efforts.
- f) Work cooperatively with other departments and agencies to provide accurate, useful environmental information.
- g) To work cooperatively with other agencies in implementing plans and projects based on watershed-wide priorities.
- h) Identify the Wadena Soil and Water Conservation District Office as lead agency for jurisdictions for all wetlands in the County.
- i) Work with and give technical advice to Sportsmen Clubs within the County on the development of Wildlife Refuges and Wetland Areas.

VII. Park, Trails, Open Space, and Recreation Coordination

A. Trail and Park Coordination

1. Somewhat Similar

- a) **Work with ATV clubs, users, Cass County Land Recreation Advisory Committee to define and establish trail network.**
- b) **Promote a cooperative effort between the county, county municipalities, and townships in designing and implementing a county trails system.**

2. Somewhat Similar to Above (VIIA1)

- a) Support the efforts and continuation of the Todd County Parks and Trails Board.
- b) Explore the possibility of maintaining a Morrison County Parks and Recreation Department to maintain all County parks and trails within the County as well as other cultural resources.
- c) Encourage development of a county-wide tourism plan to incorporate the municipal tourism efforts with the county recreation areas.

B. Recreation Coordination

1. Somewhat Similar

- a) Encourage active and ongoing participation and partnership among local units of County government to plan and implement public and private recreation.
- b) Encourage cooperation between Wadena County and municipalities if efforts to link recreation opportunities.
- c) Public/Private partnerships should be encouraged and developed to enhance recreation opportunities and services.
 - i. Create a network of business and organizational providers of recreation, leisure and cultural opportunities in the County in order to coordinate seasonal calendars of activities, expand services, and create viable business opportunities in areas of need.

2. Unique

- a) County should transfer ownership of existing sites to federal or state.
- b) County should develop a uniform enforcement plan with state, federal, and tribal input to minimize confusion and cost.
- c) To implement a county strategy for enforcement of non-game recreation laws.

VIII. Citizen /Community Based Participation

A. Citizen/Community Based Participation

1. Somewhat Similar

- a) **Establish a community-based framework for all future decisions and actions related to the implementation of the County's Comprehensive Plan.**
- b) **Encourage and utilize resident participation in all local decision-making procedures.**

2. Similar to Above (VIII A1)

- a) **Promote a community-based planning process with broad citizen participation** in order to build local capacity to plan for sustainable development.
- b) **Improve the public hearing process** regarding consistency of ordinance enforcement and the perception of fairness by providing education to citizens about what the procedures are, what the board is required by law to look at when making a decision, and not letting personal viewpoints get in the way of the facts and procedures.

3. Unique

- a) Promote cooperation and collaboration among communities to work toward the most efficient, planned and cost-effective delivery of government services.
 - i. Facilitate cooperative agreements among adjacent communities.
 - ii. Coordinate planning to ensure compatibility of one community's development with development of neighboring communities.

iii. Provide basic public services and facilities to as many citizens of the County as possible without creating any substantial hardships or economic problems.

iv. Develop monitoring programs that help account for the full environmental, social and economic costs of new development, including infrastructure costs such as transportation, sewers and wastewater treatment, water, schools, recreation, and open space; plan the funding mechanisms necessary to cover the costs of the infrastructure.

b) Monitor citizen satisfaction with the planning and zoning department.