Land Use Policy for Michigan: Views from Stakeholders

Forest Resources and Products
Agricultural Production
Agricultural Processing
Planning Officials and Planning
Tourism and Recreation
Mining

Prepared by Thomas Dietz
Director, Environmental Science and Policy Program
Michigan State University
May 2003

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a survey of the views on Michigan land use policy and issues held by diverse stakeholders. The statements included represent a variety of views. Not every individual in each group agreed with every view expressed. Unless otherwise indicated in the report, the views are not a consensus of any group but rather a sampling of the range of stakeholder issues and concerns.

The Michigan Land Use Leadership Council asked Michigan State University to assess the views of stakeholders regarding land use policy. We have asked six stakeholder groups to offer their views about what the council should recommend. This report provides those recommendations in the stakeholders' own words.

The key question asked of each stakeholder groups was: **What would you recommend that the council recommend?** We have rearranged some of the lists of recommendations by topical area to make them easier to read, but the suggestions are exactly what each stakeholder group offered. Note that the groups chose not to assign priorities to the recommendations. *In addition, please note that not every member of every group endorsed all the suggestions offered by the group*. The process used was intended to reflect the diversity of views held by stakeholders rather than to assess the proportion of stakeholders holding various views.

Annexes to the report describe the process used to elicit stakeholders' views, the exact questions asked of them, and the participants in each session. The full text of each group's answers to several other questions is also included as an annex, as is a short consensus statement by the tourism and recreation stakeholder group.

FOREST RESOURCES AND PRODUCTS GROUP: POLICY SUGGESTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: The group decided not to prioritize the list of recommendations out of the concern that those designated as lower priority would be overlooked. However, the first two statements were seen as the highest priority items by the entire group.

Highest Priority

Promote the primacy of the forest products industry within a comprehensive statewide forest management and economic development plan—the state must have a statewide economic development plan.

Support statewide forestry advisory group composed of multiple stakeholders (public, private, small and large landowners, industry, etc.) with a direct line to governor and legislature.

Other Suggestions

Use a market approach to the land fragmentation process.

Address land ownership trends, tax incentives, and conservation easements.

Tax incentives:

- Maintain CFA
- Expand Private Forest Reserve Act to provide incentive to private woodlot owners enrolled in certified and active management
- Other tax policies to sustain forest management
- Business climate, income tax and inheritance tax reforms

Provide property tax incentives (including green credits) for private landowners to retain managed forest land and discourage conversion to other uses.

Analyze current tax policy (property, income, inheritance, business) impact on land use in Michigan.

Incentives are preferable to regulations (effective/efficient).

Address lack of forest management on public lands by creating a state forest management division and state forester in charge of public lands … coordinating policy on federal lands.

Collect updated data—FIA—and develop public outreach information for forestry education.

Create public interest/value in a healthy forest products economy (renewable, environmental, good for people).

Consolidate/analyze current land use policies and their impact on social, economic, and ecological systems (both intended and unintended consequences—e.g., Subdivision Control Act).

Increase outputs/productivity of public forest land.

Consider impact of changing government ownership:

- State ownership to county (e.g., Luce County)
- Private ownership to state (e.g., Simmons Woods)
- Federal ownership to state

Review/update state policy for private landowner assistance.

Review the effectiveness and efficiency of the DNR in meeting the needs of the forest community.

Barriers statement:

1. The cost of doing business in Michigan is expensive due to laws and regulations not found in neighboring states. Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regulations and interpretation of laws and overenforcement is causing manufacturers and other businesses to leave the state. Michigan is rich in natural resources and forests. It also has many primary manufacturers of forest products. However, many of those products leave the state, as secondary manufacturers reside in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

2. Improve public knowledge and understanding of the importance of forestry and the forest industry (economic, social, and biological) through state communication networks. Networks include organizations such as MFPC, MFRA, MFA, etc. People in the know. Use communication tools such as Web, advertising, and public forums.

Review and amend current policies that inhibit intensive management of public forests. Example: Michigan owns a large amount of wooded acreage in the I-75 and US-27 medians—yet no revenue is generated from the forest growing there. Forestry educational opportunity also exists by managing forests in highway medians through the use of interpretive signs. This is one small example of utilizing an available resource. The larger emphasis should be on the approximately four million acres of state forest.

Benefit: Improving economics of state and urban/rural communities through intensive forest management.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS GROUP: POLICY SUGGESTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: The group decided not to prioritize the list of recommendations out of the concern that those designated as lower priority would be overlooked. However, the first statement was seen as an overarching priority by the entire group.

General Statement

Provide information and create incentives so land use decisions are not driven solely by short-term economics.

Other Suggestions

Take politics out of land use policy.

Make decisions based on good science/information.

Land use policy should involve long-term economic analysis and a regional land use approach.

Provide tools for local governments to accurately predict short- and long-term costs of different development strategies:

- Risks to natural resources
- Quality of life considerations

Information and analysis are needed to make good decisions.

Assessment and analysis of current conditions.

Cost/benefit analysis of alternatives/changes, both short- and long-term.

Understand productive capacity of both the land and its people.

Implement policies that facilitate multi-township/county/regional partnerships and collaboration.

Find ways to encourage developers to redevelop urban centers:

- Tax incentives
- Tax abatements
- Urban revitalization

Educate policymakers and general public about land use issues—MSU's role in this education is critical.

Develop plans that emphasize ecological and social relationship between agricultural community and natural resources connected with urban sprawl.

Develop program to educate legislators and policymakers on issues of land use and natural resource issues (including water use, agricultural and public needs) to set good policy.

Develop educational tools for schools and the general public regarding land use and its importance to agriculture and natural resources.

Economics should drive land use, not emotion (a disputed recommendation, leading to the following).

Creative economics should drive land use—enhanced economics, manipulated economics (incentives).

Develop a rolling strategic long-term land use plan for the state.

Need more consistency in township, maybe regional plans designating growth areas.

Create a process that allows for "new and innovative" planning.

Encourage up-to-date planning.

Reevaluate current land use policies and programs and **fund** those that are effective.

Provide incentives for communities to take into consideration long-term and larger scale/scope costs.

State should enable local governments to use new tools to generate their own revenues for appropriate land use decisions.

Livestock and animal agriculture: not only maintain but also strengthen right to farm laws.

Update and reevaluate land diversion act.

Analyze and clarify consumption vs. diversion—education and research need to be broadly interpreted and understood.

Try to develop local usage of farm producers as much as possible.

Promote value-added ventures.

Agricultural consumption of water needs to be protected.

Land Use Council members and legislators should participate in the "Ultimate Farmland Preservation" tour (in eastern states this summer).

Land Use Council should spend enough time together to know and understand each other and the issues that need to be addressed.

AGRICULTURAL PROCESSORS GROUP: POLICY SUGGESTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: The group decided not to prioritize the list of recommendations out of the concern that those designated as lower priority would be overlooked. However, the first statement was seen as an overarching concern by the entire group.

General Statement

Our recommendations are made out of concern for the sustainability of agricultural production, processing, and supporting industry. (Agriculture needs recognition as a vital component of Michigan's economy, as the number-two industry in the state.)

Other Suggestions

Fully or adequately funded PDR/TDR.

Continuation of PA 116—those who live and work on the land provide better stewardship.

Encourage successful farms to better the community through creation of jobs and other markets.

Provide access to industrial revenue bonds/funds to agricultural industry as all other industries.

Provide incentives to lenders to support agriculture.

Redefine agricultural land, i.e., develop a standard operational definition for agriculture given today's environment (what qualifies?).

Develop incentives, i.e., tax reductions for land meeting these agricultural land definitions.

Maintain individual landowner's rights (right to farm or sell).

New owners moving into an area must recognize and sign off disclosure of current situation (zoning or master plan).

Protect producers and industry utilizing accepted production practices from lawsuits resulting from encroaching residential owners.

Land use should be driven by free market with control local units of government.

Must have regulations based on sound science that is economically feasible.

Regulatory agency should offer list of solutions and adequate time to implement rather than shutting the operation down, e.g., DEQ and groundwater discharge.

Conduct cost/benefit analysis to determine wastewater regulations.

Provide a mechanism for new entrepreneurism through tax incentive or an apprenticeship training to bring in new potential farmers.

Encourage urban renewal.

Urban and rural areas need to create partnerships.

Support brownfield sites over renaissance sites.

Review "best practice" examples from other states, areas, municipalities, etc., when making land and water use decisions and policies.

Encourage standardization and longevity of rules and regulations concerning land use.

PLANNING OFFICIALS AND PLANNERS GROUP: POLICY SUGGESTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: The group decided not to prioritize the list of recommendations out of the concern that those designated as lower priority would be overlooked.

Intelligent land use/vision.

MLULC should develop a vision for Michigan's future providing coordination and guidance to state and local policies for land use, urban development, agriculture and open space preservation, environmental protection, and transportation.

Comprehensive, systematic monitoring of land use changes throughout the state, also provide guidance and technical assistance to local planning agencies through strong county and/or regional planning systems.

Improve enabling legislation and develop programs to: (1) provide more planning tools—transfer of development rights (local option), equitable ways to fund infrastructure, amortization of nonconforming uses and signs; (2) enhance and streamline platting process, (3) standardize notice requirements for land use decisions; and (4) establish a municipal land use court within each circuit to expedite and enhance land use decisions.

Revise current legislation to give local communities the tools to promote smart growth and protect the environment.

Incentives to encourage cooperation among local units including sharing infrastructure, municipal services, tax base sharing, and regional growth management.

Same set policies statewide, i.e., unified code for housing, commercial, agriculture.

While most land use decisions occur at the local government level, such decisions should occur within the context of a regional or areawide (local?) planning process.

Create a vision of the state's future to provide local communities with a reference in their efforts to create a local vision.

Redefinition of policies and objectives—at state, city, township, village levels.

Smart growth by legislation.

Tax incentives—grants, financial assistance for utilities, streets, farmland retention.

How to fund the vision? Tax, tax deductions, tax credits, grants, tax abatements, TIFA, private investment.

Encourage investment in historically established town centers.

Target incentives to benefit disadvantaged areas.

Preserve state economic base—farm, forest, urban.

Agriculture and resource preservation should be a priority.

Encourage provision of multi-modal transportation choices.

Support policies and provide funding for a balanced transportation system: roads (cars and trucks), rail, bike, walking, shipping/ports.

Statewide education effort outlining today's and tomorrow's options, with reference to locations where new ideas exist, work, and are accepted. (One goal is to change perceptions of planning commissions, zoning boards, etc. Another is to make it easily understood by broader range of citizens—a PR campaign.)

Barriers are resistance to change, misunderstanding of the value of planning, and "control" mindset of some officials.

Recognize the connection between good planning policies and economic development.

A final statement by the group: There needs to be a more permanent body to oversee land use planning in Michigan, along with sustained leadership.

TOURISM AND RECREATION GROUP: POLICY SUGGESTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: The group decided not to prioritize the list of recommendations out of the concern that those designated as lower priority would be overlooked. This group also provided a consensus summary of their discussions, which is included as an Annex to the report.

Coordinated effort needed

- Land-based industry interdependency
- Environmental quality
- Trails
- Water access

Policy should support adaptive reuse of developed environment

- Brownfields
- Historic structures
- Transportation corridors
- State recreation facilities
- Water access

Need longitudinal information. Over time look with comparable data at:

- Land-based industry level
- Land use
- Recreation activity
- Tourism industry
- Economy

Key is information that is: uniform, regular, accessible, and communicable.

Don't reinvent the wheel. Case studies of successes and failures:

- Downtowns
- Greenways
- Enterprises
- Public recreation systems
- Historic structures

Recognize that much of Michigan tourism is ecotourism—tourism dependent on environmental quality.

Splendor of Michigan is the Michigan Grand:

- Woods
- Waters (Great Lakes, etc.)
- Open space
- Wildlife

Realistic economic evaluation of land use alternatives

- build out analysis, etc.

Restoration of existing land, overall "public" interest incentives.

Identify key land use metrics and consider Michigan's rank and set goal of improved ranks.

Establish statewide policy for waterfront development/redevelopment that focuses on tourism rather than industrial use—ecotoursim and recreation.

Recommend that all future land use decisions be based on studies, using science, economic impact. Looking at benefits, costs and risks to reach an informed decision (case base and longitudinal).

Target downtown redevelopment on tourism (entertainment and culture) … already has an existing concentrated population base where there is an infrastructure in place.

Tourism/recreation should be a sector that is tracked/monitored within a larger information. System: national/state.

Place tourism on an even playing field with other sectors in terms of economic impact, R.O.I., and jobs development.

Consider (include) tourism/recreation in all local and state "master" plans.

Develop state-based incentives for multijurisdictional planning. Plans based on census bureau MSAs.

Identify additional funding sources (federal and private) and create state legislation (or appropriate funds) to take advantage of them.

Create incentives to follow land use plans.

Create incentives to reinvest where infrastructure exists.

Council asks for comprehensive review or permitting and land use laws so they complement each other.

Review of compatibility between land use laws and drain code, with the objective of creating watershed management districts.

Remove barriers to natural resource conservation.

- Permitting for wetland restoration
- PILT

Under the umbrella of expertise, require appropriate training program in land use and planning for local officials.

Gather data regarding land use changes, demographics, and cost of development/use for decision-making and make part of public record.

Develop state land use vision to help guide local planning.

Ask council to consider the importance of view shed and landscape preservation with tourism industry in mind, and preservation of the landscape as a quality of life amenity for residents.

MINING GROUP: POLICY SUGGESTIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Note: The group decided not to prioritize the list of recommendations out of the concern that those designated as lower priority would be overlooked.

Policy:

- Recognizes the need for mining and oil and gas production
- Recognizes the benefits of mining and oil and gas
- Has a long-term perspective (minimum of 10 years)
- Provides for coordination
- Statewide mining statute that is preemptive of local and county ordinances for metallic and nonmetallic (sand and gravel, limestone, etc.) minerals
- Promotes public education about mining, oil and gas—gather and distribute information

Benefits:

- Resources will be available to the public
- Jobs and economic benefits
- Expectations are better understood (there will be a new mine here—but not here)
- Plan for sequential "best use" of land
- Reduce confusion about rules and regulations

Information needed:

- Mapping and data
- Public information/education
- Public opinion surveys on mining and oil and gas production
- Analysis of impacts of restrictions on mining and oil and gas developments near markets
- Generalized mineral, oil, and gas deposit information

Issues

- Large lot zoning (10+ acres) and overrestrictive zoning
- Public planning vs. private/property rights (need for planning)
- Lack of information on technology (GIS/GPS), lack of funding for distribution of information; identification of resources
- Too many laws, permits (and places to get them)—overlap/gaps in regulations and inconsistency in compliance/action
- Public needs to better understand mining, oil, and gas (current image is negative)

Policy

- Integrated local land and regional planning using a resource inventory
- Tax incentive/tax stabilization
- Reduced real estate taxes related to reclamation/bioremediation
- Allow/expedite wetland banking
- Incentives for brownfield development
- Enhanced access for multiple and sequential use of public and private lands.

Education

- People's need for mineral and fuel resources
- Use of resources
- Methods of extracting natural resources
- Remediation of properties
- Need for different materials for different levels of understanding

ANNEX 1: GROUP PARTICIPATION

Please note that affiliations listed are for identification purposes only. The ideas expressed do not necessarily represent those of the organizations with which participants are affiliated. Also please recall that there were diverse views within each group. Not every member of each group agreed with every suggestion offered by others in the group.

Forest Resources and Products

Paul Call, Weyerhaeuser Company
Kevin Korpi, Michigan Forest Products Council
Peter Grieves, Michigan Association of Timbermen
Gerald Grossman, Grossman Forestry Company
Frank Laurence, Jr., Georgia-Pacific Corporation
Todd Siegert, Packaging Corporation of America
McClain Smith, Michigan Forest Association
John Beck, Facilitator

Agricultural Producers

Gary Bardenhagen, Cherries, Lake Leelanau
Kent Houghtaling, Sugar Beets/Dry Beans, Reese
Barbara O'Kelly, Equine, Dansville
Agness Schmidt, Field Crops, Auburn
Tom Smith, Golf/Turf, East Lansing
Dan Somalski, Nursery, Essexville
Ray VanDriessche, Sugar Beets/Dry Beans, Bay City
Bob Zeeb, Hay, Bath
Mike Polzin, Facilitator

Agricultural Processors

Arthur A. Loeffler, President, Star of the West Milling Co., Frankenmuth
Brad Wendzel, General Manager, Coloma Frozen Foods, Coloma
Bruce Noel, Leslie
Don Stinchcomb, President/Owner, Purity Foods Inc., Okemos
Kim Baiers, Director of Operations, Birdseye Foods Michigan, Fennville
Mike Polzin, Facilitator

Tourism and Recreation

David Brakhage, Ducks Unlimited, Ann Arbor
William W. Connellan, Detroit CVB, Detroit
Charles Curtiss, Saginaw Basin Land Conservancy, Bay City
Jason Dinsmore, MUCC, Lansing
Chris MacInnes, Crystal Mountain, Crystal Mountain
Bill Manson, Michigan Snowmobile Association, Grand Rapids
Bill Sheffer, MARVAC, Okemos
Van Snider, Michigan Boating Industries Association, Livonia
Scott Staelgraeve, Cabela's, Dundee
Art Tebo, Boyne USA, Boyne Falls

Tom Woiwode, SE Michigan Greenway International, Detroit
Bill Zehnder, Bavarian Inn, Frankenmuth
John Beck, Facilitator

Planning Officials and Planners

Rodney L. Arroyo, Bichler Arroyo Associates, Southfield
Edwin A. Bayer, City of Warren, Warren
Deborah K. Schutt, Schutt & Company, Bloomfield Hills
David Schneider, Livonia
Gerald A. Rowe, SEMCOG, Detroit
John M. Perkowski, City of Southfield, Southfield
William F. Caya, Flint Downtown Development Authority, Flint
J. Douglas Piggott, Rowe, Inc., Flint
William F. Hoyt, Grand Rapids Planning Department, Grand Rapids
Kenneth Detloff, McKenna Associates, Northfield
John Beck, Facilitator

Mining

Michael Barratt, Michigan Oil & Gas Association, Lansing
Tammy Rabideau, Insight Environmental Services, Howell
Steven Wilson, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Lansing
Donald Ryan, Cleveland Cliffs, Inc., Marquette
Anthony Bauer, Okemos
Milton A. Gere, Jr., Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing
Michael Newman, Michigan Aggregates Association, Lansing
John Beck, Facilitator

MSU Faculty and Staff

Jeffrey Armstrong, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Gale Arent, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources
Ken Beer, Environmental Science and Policy Program
John Beck, School of Labor and Industrial Relations
Thomas Dietz, Environmental Science and Policy Program
Joseph Fridgen, Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources
Ian Gray, Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station
Peter Kakela, Department of Resource Development
Daniel E. Keathley, Department of Forestry
Gary D. Lemme, Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station
Larry Libby, Basic Science and Remote Sensing Initiative
Mike Polzin, School of Labor and Industrial Relations
Eric J. Strauss, Urban and Regional Planning Program
Carol Weissert, Institute for Public Policy and Social Research

ANNEX 2: PROCESS

Experts at Michigan State were asked to identify individuals from the six sectors who would be knowledgeable and articulate about land use issues. A letter of invitation framed the task as follows:

"At this meeting we will ask you to reflect on the following general questions:

- ***What do you see as the most pressing land use issues that will influence quality of life and sustainability in Michigan over the next decade?***
- ***What kinds of information and analyses will be needed to make good decisions about these issues?***
- ***What policies, approaches, and initiatives might be effective in dealing with these issues?***
- ***What are the benefits, costs, and risks for urban and rural Michigan associated with these policies, approaches or initiatives?***
- ***What are the barriers to implementing these approaches?***
- ***What role can incentives, markets and economic development strategies play?***

We will then ask the group to suggest answers to the following question:

What would you recommend that the council recommend?"

The first six questions were intended to provide more detailed information to the council and also to stimulate the thinking of the participants.

At the group meetings, after introductions, a formal group process led by a professional facilitator was used to elicit answers to the questions. The process began with silent idea writing in response to the first six questions. Participants then wrote their responses to each of these six questions on sheets posted around the meeting room. This was followed by a discussion of the listed responses. Participants were then divided into three teams and each team was asked to use the responses to two of the initial questions as inspiration for answering the last question about recommendations. The ideas produced by the teams were then listed and discussed. Each group was asked explicitly if it wanted to rank the items on the resulting list. In some cases the group discussion produced an overview statement or further structuring of the items listed, in other cases it did not.

ANNEX 3: ANSWERS TO INITIAL QUESTIONS

Checkmarks after an item indicate that persons other than the item's author endorsed the idea. Thus, one check means that one person other than the author wanted to endorse the item, two checks means two endorsers in addition to the author, and so on.

What do you see as the most pressing land use issues that will influence quality of life and sustainability in Michigan over the next decade?

Forest Resources and Products Group

Parcelization of large tracts of private forest land (inheritance tax is sometimes a trigger)
Fragmentation due to development √
Road infrastructure—increased demand resulting in increased money to build and maintain
Land fragmentation and development of agricultural and forest land, as well as other lands; horizontal development
Public land of understanding of forests and forestry
Erosion of private property rights
High taxes on forested land
Lack of adequate collaboration between urban and rural leaders
Lack of adequate management of our public lands by both DNR and Forest Service—local revenue shortfall; return to local government
Inheritance tax
Lack of appreciation for value and opportunities in our forests and wood production: improves environmental quality, improves economy

- Land use decision authority/structure (political power)
- Urban vs. rural
- Local vs. Lansing vs. Washington
- Forest vs. agriculture
- Forest/agriculture vs. residential/urban

Unintended consequences of decisions
Problem of trying to have one standard for large, multifaceted state
Income tax policy—632 (b) and amortization
Need for more economic impact assessment

Agricultural Producers Group

Water use issues as they pertain to development √√
Livestock
Expansion of utilities such as water and gas lines—leads to sprawl
Management of invasive species √√
Loss of farmland and open space √√√
Quality of life—real √
Urban sprawl √
Potable water (sufficient)
Room to breathe
Conservation of natural resources/environmental stewardship

Overcoming the ignorance of the general population regarding environmental and agricultural issues, such as where food comes from and how land use decisions impact natural systems and resources
Fragmentation of land
Urban blight √
Sagging farm economy √√√
Desire to be in homogeneous community (e.g., rich)
"Property rights" vs. stewardship ethic
Misinformation on development costs—short-term vs. long-term costs, high income vs. other development
Livestock—sometimes there are conflicts with township planning and zoning, mostly with urban sprawl. Also, conflicts with preferences of new residents
Water policy may limit the availability of that resource for agriculture

Agricultural Processors Group

Change of agricultural land under the tax base to residential due to not farming or being less than half farmed
Housing development on productive agricultural lands
Who controls land use? State, local or individual property owner
Right to farm or process laws
Spatial development—Green space, open space, farmland (are they the same?)
Water rights—Great Lakes issues, aquifer issues, waste water issues, irrigation
Genetically modified organisms vs. traditional crops, and the right to farm/plant side-by-side
Competitiveness of Michigan farmer as a low-cost producer
Noncrop loss of farmland
Could also mean loss of products associated with crop
"Nuisance" lawsuits (related to who controls land use—owner or community)
Is the right of the individual sacrosanct?
Changes of ownership of agricultural land—decisions being made by multiple interests (often nonagricultural)
Personal property rights (land or real estate) vs. the community voice
Who has the right to decide what is done with the land? (No clear definition)
"Best use" determinations can dramatically affect value of agricultural land and lead to rezoning, further leading to loss of agricultural land

Planning Officials and Planners Group

No mandate to cooperate at the metropolitan or regional level
Preservation of farmland √
Preservation of water quality
Sprawl? √
Revitalize the condition of urban areas
Too many governments—local control is an illusion √√
Inadequate public transit
Creation of new housing, intelligent land use √
Addressing the strong market for large lots
Redevelop urban and industrial base (brownfields, grayfields)

Tax equity (City, township, county)
Leap-frog development (discontiguous development)
Aging infrastructure/lack of financial resources to address
Lack of accountability, i.e., townships have control over land use, but no responsibility for things like roads
Loss of natural areas
Loss of "sense of place"
Inadequate regional mass transit infrastructure
Lack of a vision for the future
Fragmentation of land parcels
Lack of impact planning by developers

Tourism and Recreation Group

Retail development—chain, retail—homogenizing the landscape. Losing downtowns and main streets. Balancing social, economic and environmental objectives
Increasing fragmentation/loss of natural resources √
Loss of recreational opportunity on private land increasing pressure on public recreation resources and cost to maintain facilities
Loss of waterfront property to non-water dependent uses
Change in the physical landscape and all that goes with it, including habitat loss and water-quality concerns
Adaptive reuse of land adjacent to original urban freeways √
Recapture industrial waterfront for 21st century uses
Localized planning, often by townships without planners, without county, regional: state power—"home rule"
Reduced water quality
Payment in lieu of taxes on public ownerships
Need for permanent trail system
Effort by waterfront property owners to limit or restrict public's access to water resources
Use land that is good for agriculture for agriculture and develop poor land √
Personal agendas township/county/state/federal and common sense
Lack of recognized interdependency among land-based industries (e.g., tourism, forestry, etc.)
Loss of public-owned natural areas or reduced capacity for public-owned natural areas

Mining Group

Long-term planning
Negative image of mining and, oil and gas
Opportunity for exploration and extraction of natural resources with environmental protection
Long-/short-term concerns regarding groundwater quality
Public doesn't understand the benefits of mining and oil and gas production
Identification and protection of resources
Access to both state and private lands for some resource development
Need for annual state mineral lease auctions
Overrestrictive zoning
Lack of information/understanding of the need for geologic information

Public planning vs. private property rights
Roadside view of "bad" examples. Public is not aware of "good" reclamation examples
Lack of access to new technologies—GIS/GPS, 3D models
Large lot planning
Limited knowledge by small community governments
Jumble of laws, rules, and permits needed to develop minerals/land overlap/gaps in regulations
Lack of funding and/or coordination of information regarding production and distribution
Locking up and breaking up of land parcels (again large lot planning)

What kinds of information and analyses will be needed to make good decisions about these issues?

Forest Resources and Products Group

Land use/ownership trends:
- Use vs. ownership
- Ownership structures
- Industry—TIMO
- Conservation easements
- Increased government involvement

Economic—land, forest, open space
- Intrinsic and extrinsic values—current use and outputs

Sustainable forest management—criteria and indicators in understandable and useful form
Effect of high taxes on land use
How do policies affect landowners?
Identify researchers, literature and authors on sound land use management (e.g., Jim Bowger, Julian Simon, Patrick Moore)
Analysis/understanding of changing technologies and their impact
Techniques to make forestry education more efficient and widespread
Who, what, where, when of owners

Agricultural Producers Group

Future Community development plans
Development of "best practices" standards √
Information on cost of superstructures must be familiar with land and its uses
Real cost of various alternative land uses and development strategies—short and long term √√
Township and county planning department growth data √√
Population growth projections (The Nature Conservancy has this information)
Production capabilities of land
Real cost of various alternative land uses/development strategies √√
Cost/benefit analysis √
Forecast—learn from the future
Census data √
Grand Rapids model—details, evaluation (has to do with development rights)
Present condition—analyze where we are today √

Analyze where we will be with the current direction
Inventory of threatened landscape ecosystems and threatened and endangered species

Agricultural Processors Group

Land use changes over 50 years and projections for the next 50 years
Sound science and specific parameters related to new policies and legislation
Population size changes
Land values/growth patterns
Water issues: Aquifer levels, drawdowns, Great Lakes protection
Land use policy successes in other states
Tax information
Results from other states
Pick crop—Identify top producing states 30 years ago and what happened

Planning Officials and Planners Group

Models for assessing cost/benefit
Identification of cost of duplication of services and infrastructure
Rate of sprawl
MSPO "Trend Future" studies (Michigan State Planning Officials)
Development of a vision for the state and communities
Better understanding of dynamics between economic regions vs. natural systems vs. political
Comprehensive, systematic inventory of land use changes throughout the state (MIRIS update)
What others are doing (states)
Data on feasible alternatives to marginal farmland
Gap financing methods
Analysis of existing laws (current effect of current laws)
Possible changes of land use calmly analyzed
Sharing planning databases, policies (inventory available sources and benchmarks)
Census data—analysis of this to the pertinent issues
Mass transit feasibility

Tourism and Recreation Group

Best practices/case studies from other states (communities)
Data on underutilization of urban land/buildings
Build complete infrastructure of trails and users
Cost benefit analysis √
Impact of development on Great Lakes water quality, especially sedimentation in bays, marinas during low water cycle
Inventory water access sites (total) and number of new site development in the past 10-15 years (trends)
Analysis how waterfront property "uses" are changing
Population (growth/decline)
Periodic, regular complete land use mapping of Michigan to accurately track changes/trends
Scientific-based info, not emotion

What people find appealing about living in Michigan
Full fiscal analysis of costs/benefits of different types of development (locally) √
Trends in land use
Take advantage of existing studies such as relative risk report and Myron Orfields's soon-to-be released study on the urban landscape
"Brownfields" rescue the land, facts
Complete ecological studies of the likely changes in the landscape before those changes take place
Agricultural output—output of farmland
Build out analysis—see how land is currently zoned and what the capacity of it is with projected growth patterns of people and business
Changing the new role of downtown, what can they be?
Comparable data measures across sectors
User surveys, downtown (how people are shopping?)
Recreational interest trends

Mining Group

Projected growth studies
Survey public opinion in Michigan about mining and, oil and gas production
Analysis of impacts by prohibiting aggregate mining near markets
Mapping—2D, 3D, metadata
Basic data—tons, barrels of oil, cubic feet of gas and dollar value of products
Resource inventories
Curriculum materials for grade school, middle school and high schools
Use/need for minerals, oil and gas, and other natural resources
Information for land use
Public opinion—education on the geologic history of Michigan—glaciers, plate tectonics vs. other states and why we have what we have, why it is as valuable as it is
Databases—lithological/geological logs, GIS, groundwater, etc.
Inform public of mineral and natural resources location constraints—they are where they are, not where we might wish
Help public understand there are limitations on where and how mining, and oil and gas exploration and production can be done
Location of resources prior to development is good, continually updated scientific database

What policies, approaches, and initiatives might be effective in dealing with these issues?

Forest Resources and Products Group

Classify and tax managed forest land as agricultural
Classify forest acreage that cannot be managed because of various policy restrictions—i.e., over two million acres already in wilderness and old growth
Forest policy—professional licensing of foresters
Provide property tax incentives for private landowners to retain managed forest land in larger tracts √√

Provide statewide advisory group on essential forest policy—three editions under Governors Milliken, Blanchard, Engler √
Incentives to redevelop unused areas (vacant lots)
Amend Commercial Forest Act to make it possible to enroll without requiring unlimited public access
Conservation easements √
Subdivision restrictions √
Michigan Subdivision Control Act often circumvented
Contributes to horizontal development
Tax agricultural and forest land at current use value
Sustainable Forestry Initiative—keep it intact, use it as a standard and guide
Support scientific management
Evaluate effect of government polices on private owners
Consolidate/analyze Michigan Land use Policies (re: unintended consequences—Subdivisions Act/Tax policy)
We believe that incentives work better than regulations

Agricultural Producers Group

Purchase and transfer of development rights √√√
Tax structure—requires change, build equity within the structure, best definition of highest and best use √√
Incentives for conservation √
Consumer education as to the value of conservation and agriculture √√
Bring in faith-based communities, re: conservation stewardship
Strong leadership from top—all the way through implementation. Create a cohesive strategy and make a long-term commitment
Build consistency across the state in assessment policy
Consider need
A statewide growth plan √
Revitalize urban communities
Define consumption/diversion, e.g., Evian or Perrier water plant
Multitownship/county collaboration and/or partnership √
More understandable information to everyone, e.g., local newsletters
Innovative planning strategies (e.g., cluster development, common sewers)
Local input has to have a way to be the driver of the final formula for that locality
May need to re-evaluate current policies (e.g., USDA CREP program)

Agricultural Processors Group

Guidelines, feasibility studies, or "what if" scenarios, leave final decisions to local community
Purchase of development rights
Leave agricultural land as agricultural unless it is actually developed
Michigan branding—building partners from <u>all</u> sectors
Zoning regulations and public policy are too easily changed
When a person moves into an area, they should be made to understand existing zoning regulations
Statewide growth strategy

Regulatory agencies directed to work to find solutions rather than just eliminate source
Encourage low-cost producers or specialty crops
Reduce taxes, investment credits, employer credit (reduce payroll costs)
Right to process a crop during that crop season
No good standards, clarification and communication mechanisms in place to guide processors as new, unexpected situations arise (current policies, either)

Planning Officials and Planners Group

Improve state-enabling legislation
Impose impact fees on development
Form consolidated metropolitan governing structure
TDR/PDR (Transfer or Purchase of Development Rights)
Intercity uses
Target historic communities for assistance
APF's—Adequate Public Facilities ordinances (requirement of developers)
Incorporate best practices of other areas/states, etc.
Make school districts subject to local zoning planning and building
Overhaul plat process—needs to be streamlined
Change image of American dream to value urban life
Land banking to preserve farmland and natural areas
Allow cities to grow
Overhaul variance/appeals—consider municipal court in each circuit (need prompt decisions)
Connection between land use intensity and transit availability
State to provide dollar incentives for local cooperation
Set standards on where and when to extend water and sewer lines
Preserve unique resources—natural and historical
Developers should be required to contribute to schools and parks (impact fees)
Eliminate township government
Urban development must be served by urban infrastructure, limit use of septics and wells
Prioritization of growth areas (areas contiguous to cities first, rural areas lost)
Role of state planning

Tourism and Recreation Group

Ability to capture urban land for redevelopment √
Stop government agency from (personal agendas), and being judge, jury, and executive, lack of recourse
Work with users to accommodate all uses
State-established rules and regulations
Target environmental restoration efforts for private landowners beyond agriculture, some parity for other 18 million acres √√
Density w/preservation of resources for residential (open space developments), business (industrial parks), and retail (shopping districts, leap frog development)
Strong leadership and support for efforts to protect and restore natural features on the landscape √
Directing and encouraging rather than limiting or controlling
Encourage redesign and reconstruction of existing rural, urban and suburban housing

Use state funding to encourage appropriate land use and stop subsidizing inappropriate land use
Coordinate planning by city, townships and counties w/input from stakeholders
Statewide land use plan
Polluter pay
Tax policies to encourage restoration/rehabilitation rather than new construction √
State and local government should prioritize "public's" right to access water resources
Incentive-based solutions, regulation-based solutions
We need to broaden the notion of "impact" in impact studies to include economic
Policies that better reflect thoughtful analysis of transportation (all) and sprawl intersection and development of other public projects √
Maintain rather than build new
Define and refine our "brand" as a state
New legislation governing land division
Eliminate drain commissioners/create watershed managers

Mining Group

Allow for land alternatives/exploration
Needs a long-term perspective
Coordinated policies—zoning/planning
Permit process that recognizes limits and realities, need local input with state administration and regulation
Development and integration of resources that prioritize long-term use benefits
Need a "transpolitical" process—beyond term limits/funding/parties
Statewide mining statue
Statewide inventory program
Tax incentives for mineral development and reclamation rights
Land use master plans to include mining, resources (as a right and specified use permit)

What are the benefits, costs and risks for urban and rural Michigan associated with these policies, approaches or initiatives?

Forest Resources and Products Group

Urban risk—loss of access for a "piece of the North"
Rural—increasing demand for local service
Improved commerce and transportation
Law suits, protests, delay of access, $$
Retention of forested landscape (wildlife habitat, source of raw materials for forest industry, etc.)
Prevent conversion of forestland to other uses
Unintended consequences (limited/poor analysis) (example: Michigan Subdivisions Act, Policies, SCD activities
Property tax incentives could lower local tax base if state government didn't step in to make up difference
Government overstepping its bounds
Potential infringement of personal property rights

Improved management of public lands would improve forest health (growth), habitat, and business retention
Public knowledge helps prevent bad policies
Large ownership—less burden on local governments
Encourage developers to target old sites
Better access to stumpage by industry with larger managed tract
Risk: Lost opportunities—economic and social health and forest health

Agricultural Producers Group

Improvement in the quality of life √√
Short-term costs have always taken precedent over long-term costs √√√
Loss of property rights √√√
May lose federal-matching funds favoring new construction, sprawl, etc.
Risk is for all communities – both urban and rural
Risk to natural resources and ecosystems
Reduce sprawl (benefit) √√√
Substitution of efforts? —cost
Alignment of cost to demanded services (benefit)
Urban sprawl is natural (risk)
Cost savings on public utilities and services

Agricultural Processors Group

Tax incentives—short term considerations Lost dollars for long-term gain (re: zones, brownfield development)
Successful farm operation will bring more dollars to community = more jobs
Much of what state has done requires community investment and some Multiplan match, where do dollars come from?
Any tax reduction would impact current service level
Risk—Urban vs. rural disputes, i.e., overcontrolled growth without loss of most productive agricultural land
Slow down urban sprawl
Give more opportunity for nonfamily people to take over a farm (cost)
To meet water quality standards that are expected will take public money (cost)

Planning Officials and Planners Group

Smart growth might lead to restructuring of auto industry (more public transit = less cars and/or less auto travel)
Stabilize older cities
Improved government services, less waste
Massive cost of improving aging infrastructure √
Livable communities—order, secure investments
Energy efficiency (B), $ (C), Build it and they don't come (mass transit) (R)
Improved public health
Parties learn from each other
Preserve local community identity √
Loss of character/preservation of character √

Effective farmland preservation (B), Educational effort (C), Inadequate local implementation
Infrastructure in place
Conserve energy (public transit)
Import—export?
Preserve economic base in agriculture, forestry

Tourism and Recreation Group

Risk: financial failure of units of government
Job loss/less than base
Benefit: opportunities for partnerships to pool resources to achieve common objectives √
Risk: ability to attract new business into the state
Cost: increased cost of maintaining infrastructure versus open space √
Recreation: value to quality of life
Risk: bad economy will burden taxpayers
Benefit: increased tax revenue
Central (Lansing) control without local township action
Risk: community services/infrastructure won't be in sync with population—great demand for services in rural without $/taxes to pay for them
Tourism needs natural benefits and wildlife for visitors to enjoy
Splendor of state
Vibrant Detroit area a must for national/international image—to attract visitors to entire state, without it we risk long-term economic development
Recreation boosts local economic status
Government has mixed track record—results will vary
Benefit: urban development in major Michigan cities
Import/export people problem

Mining Group

Better land use
Reduced environmental impacts by allowing mining aggregate in urban areas with guaranteed reclamation (allows shorter hauls, less environmental disruption)
Reduced wear and tear of local roads
Reduced fuel consumption
Less expensive urban renewal
Job development
Receive economic benefits of mining, oil and gas, and other natural resource
Infrastructure cost and loss of alternate use
Risk of regulatory "ego"
Sustained development
Natural resources produced locally reduce need for imports

What are the barriers to implementing these approaches?

Forest Resources and Products Group

Natural resources and habitat destruction/intrusion (protest of)

Limited resources allocated by government often leads to unintended consequences and poor outcomes
DEQ regulation/overregulation
Bias against use of genetic materials
Belief in free market approach and private property rights—barrier to the notion that the government is the answer
Poor knowledge by public
Apathy/lack of understanding of personal connection
Current laws √√
Topography/sensitive areas are natural barriers to road development
Decline in research dollars for traditional forestry management research
Liberal bias in general media
Political correctness (pro-environmental) in universities (against free speech!) training people to have a particular point of view, rather than making a judgment for themselves
Expense of doing business in Michigan
DEQ regulation/overregulation
Current policies of public agencies do not promote more intensive management of public lands
Precautionary principle—i.e., to require knowing everything about everything before doing anything—doing nothing!!

Agricultural Producers Group

Segmentation of authority for land use (township, etc.)
Education of general public regarding land use issues (or lack thereof—about farmland preservation, relationship of food to farms, impacts of sprawl, etc.) √√
Loss of rights to landowner √√√√
Legislative bureaucracy √√
Money √
Township and county ordinances √
Executive/legislative split
"Turf" protection
Inertia against change for all stakeholders √
Local government's ability to raise revenue
Alienation of out-state from Detroit, racism
Specific opposition of people who benefit from current policy

Agricultural Processors Group

Developers vs. current land
Perceptions/lack of education
Landowners' resistance
Money
Township assessors are pressed to raise the tax base
Requires cooperation with taxpayers, taxing districts, state legislature, etc.
Us vs. them results in net losses of land base and raw materials for value-added and jobs/taxes

Variability in interpretation of laws and regulations by DEQ personnel (inconsistency due to turnover)
Politics—people play politics rather than what's good for the state

Planning Officials and Planners Group

Perception
"Me, too"
Private property rights
Greed, shortsightedness, stubbornness √
Michigan's fragmented decision-making system √
Existing zoning blocks to multiple uses
Image of fulfilling the American dream
Populist opposition to "master planning," except when used to protect single-family housing
Opposition by development community
Free market/land use rights
Duplicative levels of government
Racial division
Existing laws
Local control
Change is not easy
Influence of election cycle

Tourism and Recreation Group

Fragmented land use planning (if any planning at all)
Parcelization
ISMs
Public awareness, support √√
Speculators holding unused urban buildings, land
Townships
Conscientiousness of stakeholders
Who pays for restricted use of land?
Costs—unwilling sellers and supporters, restrictive zoning policies
Lack of political will to develop policies
Existing codes and laws—relevancy
Operating costs to "green" improvement such as nonmotorized transportation
Failure to achieve common vision
Land use planning expertise at all levels, especially locally (townships)
Failure to plan for or recognize the common good √
Private land rights √√
Huge capital costs for redevelopment
Lack of understanding of term "partnership"
Lack of $

Mining Group

Personal property rights
Lack of knowledge/interest

Politics
No resource priority (protection) policies (local level)
Attitude—Not in my backyard
Time needed to formulate and implement policies
Public perception/lack of ownership
Variable commitment of aggregate to good urban land use practices (one bad apple)
Different than what is being done now or in the past
Short-term profits
Cost benefit vs. environmental impacts
Conscientiousness of stakeholders
Who pays for restricted use of land?
Lack of energy policy

What role can incentives, markets and economic development strategies play?

Forest Resources and Products Group

Question: Will greater economic development within communities lead to increased demand for land development? Is this good or bad?
(Create) Incentives to maintain large properties and keep them intact
Update 1980s Statewide Forest resources plan previously endorsed by all major public and private groups
Incentives are preferable to laws and regulations
Provide incentives, tax breaks, and credits to municipalities, developers, landowners for maintaining green, open space, forests, buffers
Market strategies and better technology can help make forestry operations more profitable for landowners and industry
Private sector will allocate resources (time and money) based on opportunities and perceived/real barriers
Grassroots support from local governments and industry to promote more active management of public lands to maintain economic base
Statewide advisory group is needed—put in a permanent structure
    Have multiple stakeholders—private, public, government, university, small and large landowners
    Periodic meetings (2–4 a year)
Increase productivity of public land/trend the productivity of land by ownership (a piece of information needed)

Agricultural Producers Group

Innovation is key, markets and economic must drive √√
In rural areas—put water, gas, sewer, etc., only in areas suited for housing or commerce
Smart growth √
Rural development as well as urban open space preservation and stewardship must be priorities √√√
Understanding needs are key!
Need to remove disincentives to farmland preservation, e.g., property tax

People won't do something because it's "right," but because it makes economic sense—short and long term

Agricultural Processors Group

Legislative considerations
- Co-op/Limited Liability Corporation law and investors
- Need to make it easier for nonproducers to invest

Control urban growth
Use incentives rather than positive rewards to achieve goals
Help local communities develop land use plan
Incentives will speed up new policies
Processors can expand with more incentives
Give incentives to farmers so the processor can continue to work here

Planning Officials and Planners Group

Market-based TDR
Agreed policies—directed state programs to policies √
Raise gasoline tax to support all transportation needs √
Cluster housing incentives
Bonus densities in zoning (use zoning as a carrot, rather than a hammer)
Rework PA 116
Target smart growth
Grant match (cost-sharing) reduction in target communities
Target MEDC incentives to prioritized growth areas and cities √
First, create core philosophy and belief system
Tax incentives to encourage urban redevelopment √√
Encourage regional areas to become self-sufficient (self-governing—expanded tax base sharing)
Grants
Capture increase in property values around transit stations to help underwrite development costs
Enable amortization to eliminate nonconformities
Amend DDA act to reflect "Main Street" program activities approach
Tax incentives to encourage utilities to go underground in urban areas
Control light pollution
Urban growth boundaries
State land use plan
Change annexation rules
Give cities a voice in extraterritorial jurisdiction planning control (1½ mile)
Required education for planning commissions and planning/zoning boards

Tourism and Recreation Group

Changing tax policy on agricultural land
Incentive-based tax structure to achieve land use objectives √
Market incentives for city infilling, streamline permitting procedures for natural resources, i.e., wetlands
Use regional/statewide strategies; not single city/county approaches √

Integrate public land/private tourism planning
Incentive for brownfield and city planning √
Everything—i.e., covenant not to sue
Fully fund existing land preservation incentive programs such as wetlands reserve, conservation reserve enhancement, etc.—state of Michigan has not been a full partner where it could be to gain substantial matching federal dollars √√√
Streamline government
R & DEQ & DNR stick together
Challenge private sector to join effort to reverse the negative effects of current growth pattern
"Marine" zoning/tax incentives
Economic impact studies
Improve and expand existing facilities √
Use "entertainment/culture" as driver for urban redevelopment
Encourage greenway planning
Acquire permanent easements or fee simple trail corridors to maintain/enhance such opportunities in the face of fragmentation
PDR/TDR, state-enabling legislation

Mining Group

Encourage development of natural resources
Economic development should include tax incentives
Tax breaks for reclamation, remediation and pre-planning for after mining and, oil and gas production
Inform and educate public of mineral, oil and gas, and other natural resource needs
Encourage "brownfield" renewal/development and leave potential resource areas open for multiple/sequential use
Resource protection districts
Additional tax incentives for brownfield redevelopment and education
Show interrelationships of minerals, jobs, quality of life/multiplier of mine jobs, etc.

ANNEX 4: SUMMARY COMMENTS FROM TOURISM AND RECREATION GROUP

The Tourism and Recreation Group used an e-mail process to develop its own summary statement. We include this as an annex so that the materials presented in the body of the report are comparable to that available for the other groups.

It seems that the group agreed on the following key points:

- Across Michigan, tourism, travel, and recreation are environmentally dependent. Our land use decisions related to recreation and tourism should develop and strengthen Michigan's "brand" image as a great place to live, recreate, and visit.
- It was agreed that market-based incentives should be a high-priority method.
- The council needs to look at case studies and findings from elsewhere to guide decision making here in the state. This is to include longitudinal studies and the gathering of comparative, uniform data to inform decision making.
- The impacts of various land uses are very important; information and studies that define economic, environmental and social impacts are critical to the land use decision-making process.
- Adaptive redevelopment of existing infrastructure and uses should be a high priority for the state.
- Land use policy should be coordinated across state, regional, and local levels.
- Policies that hold investors harmless or manage risk should be encouraged.
- The state should fully fund existing state, federal, and regional programs that work.
- The group noted that land use successes and failures in Detroit are related to successes and failures out in the state.

For further information, contact:

Thomas Dietz
Director, Environmental Science and Policy Program
6H Berkey Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1111
Phone: 517-353-8763
Fax: 517-353-6734
E-mail: tdietz@msu.edu