

CHAPTER 11: STATEMENT OF COORDINATION

Comment:	Staff Response:
<p>A major concern, from our perspective, is the information in Chapter 11 regarding coordination with other jurisdictions. Specifically these are identified as: National Forest Service, National Park Service, Salish-Kootenai Confederated Tribes, Cities of Whitefish, Columbia Falls, and Kalispell.</p> <p>Because of the utmost importance of coordination and communication in the planning process our recommendation would be to make this Chapter 1 (first chapter) rather than Chapter 11 (last chapter) of the Flathead County Growth Policy.</p> <p>We understand that some attempts at coordination have been made, but it appears that “turfdom” dominates the process. Somehow, we have to get past this attitude!!</p> <p>Only when all the representative parties sit down together, can the Growth Policy become a working document that will unify rather than divide the county of Flathead – a precious place to all of us!!</p>	<p>Staff disagrees and no action is required.</p>
<p>Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) support the proposed policy to develop a cooperative agreement with Flathead County concerning land uses. This policy alone could have a tremendous positive impact in Flathead County. For example, current statutory language allows counties to purchase conservation easements on State Trust lands for “other public purposes”. We hope we can identify and articulate what these “other public purposes” would be for Flathead County within the cooperative agreement.</p> <p>Part 1. Chapter 11, Part 3 (Draft page 153-154) – The statement that - “<i>both agencies are responsible for managing lands for the best use of all residents</i>” – misinforms people regarding State Trust Lands (by the way, there are several agencies responsible for management of federal and state lands – not one federal and one state). It is important that local land use officials and the general public understand the distinction between State Trust Lands and state owned lands. The information provided below may help improve understanding of Trust Lands. We are respectfully requesting that a brief discussion regarding this distinction be included here as well as Chapter 10, Part 3 as noted above.</p> <p><i>MT DNRC Trust Land Management Division Mission</i></p> <p>Our goal is to manage the State of Montana's trust land resources to produce revenue for the trust beneficiaries while considering environmental factors and protecting the future income-generating capacity of the land.</p>	<p>Part 1. Staff recommends removing the statement <i>Both agencies are responsible for managing lands for the best use of all residents.</i></p> <p>And amend the next sentence to read: <i>Plans created to manage federal or state lands for the best interest of all citizens have the potential to impact the local natural and human environment and economy in a variety of ways.</i></p> <p>Staff recommends amending p.142 under the Public lands section to read: <i>The Public Lands category designates lands under federal and state land management agency administration and management control. Examples include lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. National Park Service, U.S. Corps of Engineers, MT Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, or other federal and state agencies.</i></p>

<p>Distinction Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation is charged with administration and management of the state trust timber, surface, and mineral resources for the benefit of the common schools and the other endowed institutions in Montana, under the direction of the State Board of Land Commissioners. The Department's obligation is to obtain the greatest benefit for the school trusts. The greatest monetary return must be weighed against the long-term productivity of the land to ensure continued future returns to the trusts. This obligation does not limit use of Trust Lands to traditional resource management. DNRC's Real Estate Management Plan guides the department on proposals to dispose of, or lease lands for the purposes of residential, commercial and industrial development, as well as conservation uses. The plan commits to working within the local land use regulatory framework in addition to providing other guidance on such proposals. While a vast majority of the "state lands" as the public knows them are trust lands managed for the benefit of the designated beneficiaries, it is important to note that other state agencies manage true "state owned" lands for the benefit of the residents of the State of Montana (i.e. Lone Pine State Park and Kuhn's Wildlife Management Area).</p>	
<p>Coordination with other Jurisdictions (G.46). The desire for better City-County cooperation is a common theme we hear in our meetings with local CEO's. The goals and policies in this section are appropriate and welcome.</p>	<p>Staff has no comment.</p>
<p>I'm not from here but spent my last 35 years living in Boulder Colorado. I moved here in August of 2004. Boulder was the first in the nation to have written its own charter shared by 7 neighboring town in Boulder County. It was appropriate that a half cent sales tax be added to its own city tax to purchase open space both in the city limits and in the County. I left with the area having obtained over 100,000 acres of open space with walking, hiking, biking and horse trails. I am proud to have lived most of my adult years in that town but now here. I will continue to compare each area as Boulder is successful and the Flathead is not comparable. Without any cooperation between our towns and leaders in all facets of local government, not much success will be attained. Jeff, I though with your vision this was to become a reality, and feel a bit discouraged at this point. Here are my views of</p>	<p>Staff has no comment.</p>

<p>what has been called a growth policy.</p>	
<p>Adopt the model for land use policies developed for the Whitefish Area (state lands) Plan for other similar state lands in the county to insure sound development principles of these lands in the future and to secure long-term recreational opportunities and other important resource values these lands represent.</p>	<p>Refer to Goals 1 and 49 and Policies 1.1 through 1.3 and 49.1 through 49.4.</p>
<p>1. COORDINATED PLANNING Predictability, consistency, transparency have been highly touted as desirable outcomes from the proposed Growth Policy. In Chapter 2 Land Uses, the draft Growth Policy appropriately addresses communication and coordination between the County and Federal, State and Tribal leaders. It is unclear why Chapter 11’s Statement of Coordination that refers to goals and policies pertaining to the Tri-Cities is not in Chapter 2. Why separate this out? Why wait until the last chapter before addressing County-Tri-City coordination? Why then revisit County relations with Tribal, Federal and State entities in Chapter 11? RECOMMENDATION: Move Chapter 11-Statement of Coordination goals and policies to the front of the document to Chapter 2-Land Uses. County and Tri-City coordination cannot be perceived as the “the last chapter”, or lip service, or an after-thought. The success of the County Growth Policy will most certainly depend upon the ability of the County and the large cities of Kalispell, Whitefish and Columbia Falls to communicate, cooperate and pull as a mega planning team for land use planning to proceed effectively, predictably, consistently, and transparently. Flathead County’s mosaic of rolling ag lands in the valley bottoms and timber lands skirting the mountain slopes, small cities and quaint villages; big rivers and small creeks; wetlands and glaciated mountain peaks --- all together make this area uniquely diverse, productive and attractive. Policies and planning must be coordinated as no one jurisdiction holds all of the pieces. In addition, protection of the health and safety of our land, water, people and wildlife requires maintaining a distinction between urban and rural land uses, and retaining small villages with unique character as a preferred human settlement pattern. I believe this can only be achieved if the County and cities 1) identify a common vision for where high density residential and commercial growth should be directed, and where rural character, working landscapes, and remote habitat will prevail; 2) coordinate and maximize planning expertise and tools; and 3) acknowledge the suite of benefits for all County residents that flow from coordinated</p>	<p>Part 1. Staff disagrees and no further action is required.</p>

<p>planning. For example, if the County does not have the Tri-Cities’ commitment to urban growth boundaries, annexing will encourage more residential and commercial sprawl, and such tools as Transfer of Development Rights will be useless. Moreover, the role of cities in contributing to open space is crucial to the success of an Open Space program – to preserve the Flathead goose and her golden eggs that provide the cities innumerable economic benefits. Per Chapter 9 – page 128-9: Cities must be included in contributing to open space NOT just rural communities.</p>	
<p>Instead of Flathead County communicating local needs and desires from Federal ownerships to protect public health, safety, morals, convenience, order, or general welfare (P.154), the Draft Growth Policy is silent on these critical issues as if these problems do not exist or that Flathead County can deal with the problems by regulating private land use that comprise less than 20% of the County. All these issues and record of harvest and payments to counties are discussed in “The Flathead County Natural Resource Use Policy, Custom and Culture Document” also recommended to the Planning Staff by many people in scoping meetings. I find it very disappointing that document is rarely referenced or acknowledge in the Growth Policy document and that the major issues identified are not even mentioned or addressed with goals or policy of any kind in the Draft Policy.</p>	<p>No action is required.</p>
<p>We’d suggest repositioning Chapter 11 as Chapter 2 or 3. Coordinating/co-operating with the cities within Flathead County is too important to be relegated to last place in this document. Traffic, water, air pollution etc. all cross such government boundaries.</p>	<p>Staff disagrees and no further action is required</p>
<p>Chapter 11: Statement of Coordination Policies P.49.1 to P.49.4 – We are supportive of coordination agreements between Flathead County and the Federal and State management agencies having jurisdiction within the County. While we might not always agree on the resolution of some jurisdictional issues, it is important that dialogue remain open and candid and that coordination agreements be periodically reviewed and modified as necessary. We would also welcome the participation by Flathead County officials in planning endeavors within Glacier National Park.</p>	<p>No action is required.</p>
<p>We must determine the actual need for additional general commercial and office space in the Kalispell planning area in keeping with the Kalispell Growth Policy.</p>	<p>Staff disagrees and no further action is required.</p>
<p>PAGE 151 – Add “ G.50 – Growth and development guidelines for lands, within the county’s jurisdiction, which lay alongside major roads that connect the three incorporated areas that</p>	<p>Staff disagrees and no further action is needed.</p>

<p>reflect, extend and coordinate the planning philosophies and guidelines of those jurisdictions concerning those roads. P.50.1 Communicate Flathead County’s desire to coordinate planning concerning highway corridors linking the three cities to each of the planning entities involved and ask for guidance concerning each city’s views on those corridors. P.50.2 Develop Highway Corridor Development Guidelines and submit for each city’s review. P.50.2 Incorporate the cities’ comments into a final draft that presents a unified approach to highway corridors in Flathead County. P50.3 Submit the Highway Corridor Development Guidelines to a rigorous public review process prior to adoption.”</p>	
<p>CHAPTER 11, STATEMENT OF COORDINATION, Draft page 149: The good intentions of this chapter could have been strengthened by also incorporating these ideas and principles in the Policy sections throughout the Draft. Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to comment on this important document.</p>	<p>No action is needed.</p>
<p>All quotations used by American Dream Montana (ADM) are directly taken from the draft county growth policy (DCGP). Whenever quote marks are used in this analysis, the statement is a direct quote, goal or policy as stated in the proposed DCGP. Chapter 11 Page 149, P.45.1 ADM comments: This ties the hands of Future County Commissioners to amend the interlocal agreement. Why is this even in a “Growth Policy”? Delete Page 150, P.47.1 ADM comments: Same as comments for page 149, P.45.1</p>	<p>Add to goals 45.1 and 47.1 “<i>and continue coordination and review</i>” after “Maintain the provisions.”</p>
<p>I am a business owner in Glacier Park. There was an acknowledgement of the park and connection with county and I appreciated it. I would like to see a revised policy and be able to comment further. I would follow through with coordination with other agencies. Working together is important. Flathead Basin Commission because it has specific mandates and should be utilized. It has a lot of science and can be used for the growth policy. The Flathead Basin commission is supposed to work with the county. I would look at the constitution. (Read section.) I commend you on the growth policy.</p>	<p>Thank you. Please refer to Goal 1 and Policy 1.1 in Chapter 2 and Goal 34 and Policy 34.1 in Chapter 8.</p>
<p>First, a very close coordination between the County’s Growth Policy and that of each of the three city’s Growth Policies is essential to achieve the goals of each growth policy. We</p>	<p>Refer to Goal 45 and Policies 45.1 through 45.3.</p>

<p>plan to include a statement in our Growth Policy to that effect and would request that the County's Growth Policy include a similar statement. To achieve this coordination, growth management at the edges of the city-county planning areas has to be addressed in the County's Growth Policy. Since we first began our task of formulating the Whitefish City-County Growth Policy in January, we have had several discussions about how our plan would interface with the County's, and about type and intensity of growth the County would allow just outside of our boundaries. We have been concerned that development patterns could occur on the fringes of our planning jurisdiction that would be detrimental to the County's and City's vision if not specifically addressed in the growth policies of both jurisdictions. More recently, this concern has been expressed by those attending our community visioning sessions as well. The draft does not adequately address this concern and provides us with no confidence that growth near our planning area boundaries will be managed consistently with our own goals, policies, and community vision.</p>	
--	--

DRAFT