

---

# *Urban Growth Boundaries*

*A Policy Brief for the Michigan Legislature*

*Urban and Regional Planning Program  
Department of Geography  
Michigan State University*

*Kelly Kolakowski, Research Assistant  
Patricia L. Macheimer, Assistant Professor  
June Thomas, Professor  
Roger Hamlin, Professor*

*December 2000*

*Funded by:  
Michigan State University Applied Public Policy Research Grant*



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

### Definition

Urban growth boundaries (UGB) have proved to be, in many parts of the country and in at least two local areas in the state of Michigan, a successful tool for managing urban sprawl. Such boundaries allow a unit of government to publicly declare that a specific area surrounding a municipality will be the target for urban growth, and thus indicate that areas beyond that boundary will not be supported with public infrastructure services. Such boundary lines are typically enforced by limiting water or sewer services, rather than extending them constantly to help support suburban development. Other terms that describe related concepts are designated growth areas, urban service district areas, or public utilities boundaries.

### Current Use Nationwide

While numerous communities across the nation have implemented UGB program, only seven states have mandated the use of UGBs at the local level. These states include Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, and Washington. The concept has existed for a number of years, however, beginning with a first example of an urban growth boundary in Kentucky in 1958. Since the 1970s a number of statewide programs have been created, including the most famous, established in Oregon in 1973. The Portland, Oregon regional area has seen perhaps the most dramatic results in the country from its UGB.

Although the Oregon state mandate for UGBs did not exist until 1973, many regional planning efforts had existed before then. In 1977 the Portland area's association of governments proposed a metropolitan service district. It was given responsibility for an urban growth area based upon the capacity of the sewer system for twenty years in the future. The program has since encouraged a great deal of infill development and protection of rural areas in the Portland region.

### Michigan

This report focuses on two existing growth boundary programs in the state of Michigan, in Frankenmuth, and in Midland. The two situations are very different. In Frankenmuth, the creation of an urban growth boundary occurred because of the close historical and cultural ties between the City of Frankenmuth and Frankenmuth Township. A survey administered in the early 1980s identified how close the opinions of the citizens in their two areas were, and revealed their support for such innovations as a joint master plan and a protected greenbelt of agricultural land. This survey led local officials to create a joint master plan, and to establish a Growth Boundary Limit. A formal intergovernmental agreement in 1996 cemented the process. The result has been mutually agreeable limits on growth, with clear parameters governing city expansion.

In Midland, the incentive for UGB came from a history of conflict rather than one of cooperation. Several attempts to annex land on the part of the City, through requiring such annexation in order for surrounding areas to receive water service, backfired, because the costs of annexation soon outran the benefits. This report describes this history and notes that a number of regional improvements have come because of increased cooperation about where growth and expansion should take place.



## INTRODUCTION

It has been well documented that urban growth boundaries are a successful tool when used to manage and curb urban sprawl. Numerous communities across the United States have adopted urban growth boundary programs or variations of urban growth boundary programs (See Table 1). Seven states mandate the use of urban growth boundaries at the local level. These seven states are: Washington, Tennessee, Oregon, New Jersey, Maryland, Maine, and Hawaii. In some states, such as Florida, urban growth boundaries are not required, but the state has recognized their importance, and as a result they have encouraged their local governments to adopt urban growth boundary programs. As evident in Table 1, the majority of state governments have left the decision of whether or not to adopt urban growth boundary programs up to their localities.

Of the urban growth boundary programs that have been established throughout the nation the case of Portland, Oregon is often cited as the most successful. A portion of its success is attributed to the “top-down” style of government under which it was created, but urban growth boundary programs have also proven very successful in states, such as California, that have adopted them under a “bottom-up” approach.

This report examines urban growth boundary programs and their relationship to interjurisdictional cooperation. More specifically, the concept of urban growth boundaries fostering interjurisdictional cooperation will be analyzed and the findings will be applied to the State of Michigan. A qualitative method was used for this study. Three case studies are utilized; one at the national level and two at the state level.

## BACKGROUND

Urban growth boundaries have been defined in a number of different ways. Douglas Porter writes, “Urban growth boundaries restrict urban growth to a specific area around a community and prevent the spread of development into the surrounding countryside” (Porter 1997, p.44). Porter also states that growth boundaries are typically based on twenty years of projected development and that they are “intended to promote more efficient use and extension of infrastructure systems, encourage more compact development, and preserve open space and natural resources in rural areas” (Ibid., 44). Furthermore, urban growth boundaries have been defined as:

“A perimeter around each urban area to contain urban growth. Land outside of this boundary is maintained at much lower densities and receives no sewer or water services. This approach aims at establishing cities with edges, where the boundary between urban and rural is clear (Williams 1991, p.5).”

“The designation of urban growth areas identifies where growth should occur, and with a cordon of boundary line, establishes the geographical extent to which development is permissible. It is an indirect means of controlling growth in that it channels development rather than limit it (Burrows 1978, p.73).”

The term “urban growth boundary” is rather ambiguous when applied to the United States. Other terms used to describe comparable entities are: designated growth areas, urban service districts or areas, urban service boundaries or districts, general service districts, and public utilities

**Table 1: Existing National Urban Growth Boundary Programs**

Location	Level	Concept	Examples
Florida	State	Strongly Encourages	Metro Dade, Sarasota, Polk, Orange Counties
Hawaii	State	Requires Designation	
Maine	State	Requires Designation	
Maryland	State	Requires Designation	Baltimore and Ann Arundel Counties
Minnesota	State	Required for the 5 county region	Minneapolis - St. Paul
New Jersey	State	Requires Designation	Cape May County
Oregon	State	Requires Designation	Portland Region, Clackamas County
Tennessee	State	Requires Designation	
Washington	State	Requires Designation	King County
Arizona	Local	Left to Localities	Tempe
California	Local	Left to Localities	Approx. 22 programs have been established
Colorado	Local	Left to Localities	Cities of Boulder, Fort Collins, and Westminster
Illinois	Local	Left to Localities	Kane County
Kentucky	Local	Left to Localities	Lexington/Fayette County Metro Area
Massachusetts	Local	Left to Localities	Plymouth
Nebraska	Local	Left to Localities	City of Lincoln and Lancaster County
Pennsylvania	Local	Left to Localities	Buckingham Township and Lancaster County
South Dakota	Local	Left to Localities	Sioux Falls
Vermont	Local	Left to Localities	Manchester
Virginia	Local	Left to Localities	Virginia City

boundaries. "Urban service limits and similar boundaries focus on defining areas easily and inexpensively served by infrastructure systems" (Porter 1997, p.61). Similar in concept, public utility boundaries base boundary lines on infrastructure capabilities. The public utility boundaries are often based on a "tiered" system of development gradations. San Diego has one of the best-known examples of a tiered system. Established in 1979, their system defines urban, urbanizing, and urban reserve areas, each with its own set of development standards (Porter 1997, p.62). Urban service areas or districts are typically less rigid than urban growth boundaries, and density increases within the service area do not always occur. The urban service areas are "more flexible in expansion because they are drawn mostly consistent with the economics of planned public facilities . . . whereas, urban growth boundaries have many more policy objectives in addition to providing efficient services" (Nelson et al. 1995, p.75).

## ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

As with any growth management program, urban growth boundaries can present both advantages and disadvantages. Possible advantages include: 1) reduced local government costs because of more geographically efficient provision of services and infrastructure; 2) less urban sprawl, promoting preservation of open space, farmland, and environmentally sensitive areas; and 3) more compact development and increased opportunities resulting from high density development such as affordable housing and better public transportation. Several related disadvantages include: 1) segmented real estate markets; 2) increased land prices inside of boundaries and reduced prices outside; and 3) increased overall housing costs.

Some feel even the disadvantages lead to advantages. Higher land prices in urban areas might induce in-fill development and brownfield remediation. Lower priced rural land might decrease farm taxes and reduce farmland conversion.

## HISTORY

The nation's first formal example of an urban growth boundary occurred in Lexington/Fayette County, Kentucky, in 1958. The city and the county's joint planning efforts go back to 1928 when a joint city/county department and commission were formed to perform the local planning functions of the region. In 1958 their comprehensive plan included an urban service area that designated a central por-

tion of the county as an area of concentrated urban growth (Porter 1996, p.152). Within the urban service area the plan called for the logical and economical development of both public and private urban services and facilities (Ibid., p.152). In 1964, another example of an urban growth boundary was created in King County, Washington. Although it was not titled as a type of urban growth boundary, it was still a plan to designate specific areas of growth (Ibid., p.227). Since the 1970's urban growth boundary programs have been established in a number of states and localities throughout the nation. One of the most well known state mandated urban growth boundary program was established in Oregon in 1973. The state created enabling legislation that "required all cities to define urban growth boundaries separating areas intended for development from those expected to remain in agricultural or forest use" (Ibid., p.218). In Michigan, urban growth boundary programs have been authorized in approximately thirteen municipalities (See Table 2). The earliest Michigan urban growth boundary case was started in 1969 in the City of Midland. Most communities that have adopted urban growth boundary programs in Michigan adopted them throughout the 1990's.

To examine the variations between program structures this report will review the following cases: Portland, Oregon, Frankenmuth, Michigan, and Midland, Michigan. Portland, one of the oldest urban growth boundary programs, has often been cited as a successful example of urban growth boundaries (DeGrove 1991, p.33; Porter 1996, p.216). The Frankenmuth case study represents a local program that was established as part of an interjurisdictional agreement. The Midland case study represents a case with a considerable history; it was initiated in 1969.

In order to understand the Portland region's urban growth boundary program one must first note the differences between Oregon's land use planning framework and Michigan's planning framework. One significant difference between the two states is that Michigan has an additional classification of local government. In Michigan, there are cities, counties, townships, and villages whereas Oregon only has cities and counties. Another significant difference is the fact that Oregon mandated land use planning and urban growth boundaries for all municipalities at the state level in 1973. Michigan is known for being a strong home rule state that delegates most of its power to the local units of government. Although the two states are structured differently, this does not preclude the use of urban growth boundaries in Michigan communities. State enabling legislation may make it easier to implement, but localities can implement growth boundaries without such legislation, as evident by the thirteen communities that have authorized urban growth boundary programs in Michigan (Table 2).

Table 2 Urban Growth Boundary Programs in Michigan

Location	Level	Concept
Allegan	County	
Dewitt	Township	Urban Growth Staging
Eaton Rapids	City/Township	
Emmet/Petoskey	City/County	Public Services District
Frankenmuth	City/Township	Intergovernmental Agreement
Grand Rapids	Water & Sewer Authority	Policy Statement
Kalkaska	Village/Township	Joint Agreement
Leelanau	County	Public Services District
Marion	Township	Urban Services District
Meridian	Township	Urban Service Boundary
Midland	City	Midland Urban Growth Area (MUGA)
Tyrone	Township	Policy Statement
Williamston	City	

## PORTLAND, OREGON CASE STUDY

### Setting

It was the year 1973 when the State of Oregon passed legislation requiring the creation of urban growth boundaries in all municipalities and requiring negotiations between the cities and counties so that they would agree on the boundary lines (Nelson 1995, p.76). The 1973 legislation also created the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), which was assigned the task of creating state goals and guidelines for the local governments to conform to (Porter 1997, p.245). One of the goal statements created by the commission established seven factors intended to help local governments guide the adoption of, and amendment to, an urban growth boundary. The seven factors of that goal statement are as follows:

- 1.) the demonstrated need to accommodate long-range urban population growth requirements consistent with LCDC goals;
- 2.) the need for housing, employment opportunities, and livability;
- 3.) the orderly and economic provision for public facilities and services;
- 4.) the maximum efficiency of land uses within and on the fringe of the existing urban area;
- 5.) the environmental, energy, economic, and social consequences;
- 6.) the retention of agricultural land...;
- 7.) the compatibility of the proposed urban uses with nearby agricultural activities (Mandelker et al., 1995, 873).

### History

In 1966, the communities of the Portland region joined forces to discuss the issue of future urban growth (Metro 1999). These discussions resulted in the creation of a regional planning program in 1971 (Ibid., p.1). When the state passed the 1973 legislation requiring urban growth boundaries in every Oregon community, Portland’s regional government, called the Columbia Region Association of Governments, took action. In 1977, they proposed the lines of the region’s first urban growth boundary (Ibid., p.1). In 1977, the state legislature approved the creation of a Metropolitan Service District and referred it to the voters (Metro, 1999). In 1979, the voters approved the merger of the Columbia Region Association of Governments (CRAG), which was responsible for land use and transportation planning with the Metropolitan Service District (Metro). An elected council and an elected executive officer governed this new Metropolitan Service District. Metro was given responsibility of the urban growth boundary and within one year it had a state approved urban growth boundary (Ibid., p.2). The approved boundary was based on existing and projected twenty-year sewer service capabilities (Porter 1997, p.63). The boundary encompassed 234,000 acres and it included three counties and twenty-four municipalities. (Porter 1996, pp.217, 237)

### Program Description

As well as creating the boundary, Metro is responsible for its management. More specifically, the state legislature granted Metro the power to: “Coordinate between regional and local comprehensive plans and . . . review for and require consistency of local comprehensive plans with state-wide and regional planning goals” (Metro 1999). This power is what promotes and encourages interjurisdictional cooperation among the region’s municipalities. Metro

works with the state level Land Conservation and Development Commission to create the “standards and procedures for coordinating development in accordance with state goals” (Porter 1997, p.252). Metro addresses regional concerns by negotiating with and building consensus among its local governments (Porter 1996, p.36). The urban growth boundary helps to guide local development decisions by establishing the areas where major public facilities will be needed and it fosters interjurisdictional cooperation because Metro determines and manages changes to the urban growth boundary by reviewing the plans of its localities (Ibid., p.36).

## Conclusion

As a result of Oregon’s state mandate and Metro’s strong regional implementation powers the Portland region serves as an excellent example of an urban growth boundary’s ability to encourage and create interjurisdictional cooperation. This program’s success can be attributed to: the local government’s cooperation, the regional government’s power and influence, and the state legislation requiring and building the capacity of regional and local governments to cooperate.

## FRANKENMUTH, MICHIGAN CASE STUDY

### Setting

Frankenmuth is a small community located in mid-Michigan. The town was founded by German immigrants in 1845. The main industries of Frankenmuth were lumbering, milling, and agriculture until 1958. In 1958, the construction of the I-75 freeway, located only five miles from Frankenmuth, was completed. The location of the freeway began attracting hospitality-type business and consumers to the community and today it has become one of Michigan’s largest tourist attractions (Wyckoff 1984, p.8).

### History

In spring of 1982, the City of Frankenmuth approached Frankenmuth Township with the idea of the two municipalities conducting a joint City/Township survey (Graham 1999). The Township supported the idea and the community officials went to the Saginaw County Cooperative Extension office to get help to conduct the survey. (Wyckoff 1984, p.8). The community officials were interested in a survey of community opinions that could be used as the basis for City and Township planning (Ibid., p.8).

Dr. William Kimball, a professor of community development with MSU’s Resource Development Department,

worked with graduate students to come up with a survey of 300 questions. The 35-page questionnaire was distributed by random sample to City and Township residents. An amazing 91% of City households surveyed and 95% of Township households surveyed completed and returned the questionnaire (Fear 1982). “Since this return rate resulted in a response from nearly one-half of all housing units in the City, and over one-half of the units in the Township, its contents had the potential for carrying a “mandate” of local opinion” (Ibid., p.9).

The results of the survey showed that City and Township residents viewed the loss of farmland as one of the ten most serious problems. The survey also showed that seventy percent of the respondents favored: more significance placed on maintaining rural character; the creation of a joint City/Township master plan; and a greenbelt of agriculture retained around the City (Ibid., p.9). Fifty percent of surveyed residents said they would like to see City boundaries limited, growth in the City restricted, and City expansion directed southward away from the prime agricultural lands north of town (Ibid., p.9). The goals and objectives of the residents surveyed are very similar to the results that have been achieved by urban growth boundary programs throughout the United States.

### Program Description

The high level of survey participation and the support for a joint master plan prompted the City and the Township to look at the task of creating a joint plan. A Master Plan Advisory Committee was established in May of 1983 “to serve as an information bridge between a professional consultant and the City and Township Planning Commissions, and to serve as the forum for the initial discussion of critical issues” (Ibid., p.9).

The nine person Master Plan Advisory Committee consisted of university faculty and other professionals, and four local residents from the city and township. A nonprofit planning consulting organization, Proactive Institute, was retained to develop the plan based on the survey results, the direction of the joint City/Township Planning Commission and the advice of the advisory group. After two years of hard work by all groups, the plan was presented to local organizations and before local public hearings (Proactive 1985). The joint plan was adopted by the city and the township in 1985 and given an award by the Michigan Municipal League in the same year.

The joint plan not only created growth boundaries, but defined fifteen prioritized residential development districts and two commercial development districts to guide growth for the next forty years. All growth was to be contiguous to

the urban core, gradually expanding the growth boundary to each growth district in priority order. A growth time-table was set up to schedule expansion of infrastructure, utilities and services (Proactive 1985). This strategy addressed the concerns brought out by the survey to limit growth rates and preserve prime agricultural land.

Generally, the plan has been followed, but the growth boundary concept was not legally formalized until 1996 (Graham, 1999). In 1996, the City and Township adopted The Frankenmuth Township-City of Frankenmuth Intergovernmental Agreement. The provisions of this intergovernmental agreement are authorized by the Urban Cooperation Act, Act 7, P.A. 1967 and the Inter-Governmental Transfer of Function and Responsibilities Act, Act 8, P.A. 1967, both as amended (Agreement, 1996, p.1). The agreement stated “ all property located within the Urban Limits, set forth and described in the Agreement, should be provided with sewer and water services by the City and annexed to the City” (Resolution 96-52, p.1). The Urban Limits set parameters for the city’s future growth. The limits included some Township land and the agreement establishes that all property within the urban limits will be annexed to the City and be provided with City water and sewer services (Agreement, p.1). The Intergovernmental Agreement was adopted to be based on a twenty-year time frame.

## Conclusion

Frankenmuth City Manager, Charlie Graham, does believe that their Growth Boundary program helped to increase cooperation between the City and the Township (Graham 1999). He attributes this success to the City and Township’s ability to think pro-actively. According to Mr. Graham, the City realized that many issues they faced did not stop at their boundaries. Rather than argue over annexations in the future the City and Township saw the benefits of cooperating in the present to prevent contention in the future (Graham 1999).

According to Mr. Graham, another key factor in the communities’ success must be attributed to the residents of the area. The community has a strong religious heritage and the residents of both the City and the Township have the same backgrounds and beliefs. The history of both communities is closely connected. These factors resulted in an attitude among residents in which the people are willing to work and cooperate together (Graham 1999). The survey reinforced this attitude when the people of both the City and the Township answered questions similarly. These similarities showed the community officials that it would not be difficult to get the two districts to cooperate with one another (Graham 1999).

In summary, the key to Frankenmuth’s Urban Growth Limits success revolves around three issues. The first issue is that the people supported the project. The second issue is that there was compromise on both sides (City and Township) and the final issue was the attitude of cooperation, both between residents and between the municipalities (Graham 1999).

## MIDLAND, MICHIGAN CASE STUDY

### Setting

The City of Midland is located on the eastern side of Michigan’s lower peninsula. It is the fourteenth largest city in the state in terms of area and thirty-first in terms of population (Schroeder 1998, p.1). The city and its surrounding area have been both blessed and cursed with brackish groundwater. The groundwater was a blessing for Herbert Dow whose Dow Chemical Company used the brine to produce Bromine, its first product. However, it was a curse for the communities and residents of the area because it was unusable for drinking water (Ibid., p.2). Due to the limitations of this brackish groundwater, in 1946 the City of Midland entered into an agreement with the City of Saginaw to procure water from Lake Huron through a 70-mile pipeline. The availability of clean water served as a major growth stimulus for the City of Midland (Ibid., p.2).

### History

Prior to 1969 the city had a “No Annexation/No Water” policy that essentially became an annexation incentive for the surrounding townships because it was the only way to get clean water. The annexations that resulted were good for the City because they expanded their tax base, but they were very unpopular with the townships that were helpless to prevent them (Ibid., p.4). In 1953, the City annexed a large fifteen square mile piece of property. When the City began to develop this parcel in 1969 they found that the demand for public facilities, such as new roads, water, and sewer, exceeded their financial resources (Ibid., p.6). This realization was evidence that the No Annexation/No Water policy was inefficient. The city could not keep up with the land it was acquiring through the annexations.

Around the same time that the City was feeling the strain on its financial resources, the small Village of Sanford Lake was looking for a drinking water source (Ibid., 6). The Village was too far away from the City for annexation so Midland amended its No Annexation/No Water policy to the Midland Urban Growth Area (MUGA) policy in 1969 (Schroeder 1998, p.6).

## Program Description

The newly initiated Midland Urban Growth Area policy stated that any area within approximately two miles from the then existing City limits would be the future area of the City. Lands within that boundary could not have water without annexation and the city would only provide water outside the boundary by contract (Ibid., p.6). The City then financed water districts through contracts for the Sanford Lake Village area and the Townships of Lincoln and Homer. Although this was viewed favorably by the Village of Sanford Lake, Lincoln Township, and Homer Township, the townships that were adjacent to the City were not happy with the program (Ibid., p.7).

During the early 1990's the City's growth began to expand into neighboring Larkin Township (Ibid., 9) Larkin Township did not have the capacity to meet new developments' water and sewer needs so it turned to the City of Midland to try to negotiate a mutually acceptable solution (Ibid., p.9). Thus, the city and its adjacent townships began to realize that they would need to work together and cooperate with one another to sufficiently deal with the consequences of growth. On June 24, 1991, the City and Larkin Township came up with an Urban Cooperative Agreement in which a consensus was reached on land use planning, the Midland Urban Growth Area policy, and on revenue sharing. This agreement turned out to be the first of three agreements between the City and Larkin Township.

One of the townships most negatively affected by the City's No Annexation/No Water and Midland Urban Growth Area policy decisions was Midland Township. Two main issues angered Midland Township officials and residents. First, the city was essentially carved out of the township's land. A 1953 annexation took fifteen square miles from the township and since 1968 the city has annexed Township property seventeen times. These annexations have reduced the Township's size to eight and a half square miles and increased the City's size to thirty-four square miles (Ibid., p.7). Secondly, the annexation of a natural gas plant called the Midland Cogeneration Venture (MCV) reduced the township's tax base substantially. As a result of the Midland Cogeneration Venture the City's tax base increased by \$500 million and Midland Township was left to deal with the construction of disrupted roads, noise from plant generators bothering adjacent residents, and increased traffic problems from the sites ingress and egress traffic (Schroeder 1998, p.10). The Midland Cogeneration Venture was an issue that discouraged cooperation. It would take another industrial land use issue to ultimately force negotiation and consensus.

The industrial lands adjacent to the Midland Cogeneration Venture were owned by Midland Township. The growth of the generating plant could be increased by the placement of satellite industrial sites on the township's industrial land (Ibid., p.11). The Township did not have the capacity to provide adequate infrastructure to the potential sites and the lack of City/Township cooperation made recruiting industrial prospects for the satellite plants difficult. These problems led to negotiations between the City and the Township to replace the unilateral Midland Urban Growth Area policy with a bilateral policy (Ibid., p.12). An agreement was reached in December 1992 that included a bilateral agreement on the city's growth area, a joint resolution process for approving annexations, revenue sharing from the tax base of annexed lands, and an agreement to extend water out of the Midland Urban Growth Area boundary only to serve low-density residential (Ibid., p.16).

## Conclusion

According to James Schroeder, the Director of Planning and Development for the City of Midland, their Urban Growth Policy has increased cooperation between the City and its neighboring townships. The Midland Urban Growth Policy and interjurisdictional cooperation was a result of the region's unique water situation and the major annexation battles caused by the Urban Growth Policy from the 1960's to the 1990's (Schroeder 1999). The annexation battles created confrontation and animosity between the City of Midland and its surrounding townships. After years of disagreement the townships sought a more effective distribution of water and sewer services. They found that the only way to handle the situation was to negotiate with the City, and to develop mutually acceptable agreements. James Schroeder believes that the success of their program can be attributed to the revenue sharing concept of their Urban Cooperative Agreements, their ability to hold cooperative and productive meetings and the willingness of the Townships and the City to negotiate with each other (Schroeder 1999).



## CASE STUDY FINDINGS

### Top-down vs. Bottom-up Approach

Clearly, the success of urban growth boundary programs is not contingent upon a top-down style government. Although Portland, Oregon's top-down mandated is frequently considered the most successful, it is not the only successful program. Both Midland's and Frankenmuth's urban growth boundary programs were established under a bottom-up framework. These programs managed to discourage urban sprawl and preserve open space and farmlands while fostering cooperation among jurisdictions.

### Program Timing and Development

The Portland, Oregon case was implemented very quickly due to the state mandate and the regional entities (METRO'S) ability to encourage cooperation. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the quickest route to urban growth boundary success starts with a mandate at the state government level. State government has the authority to force compliance, whereas a local government entity is very unlikely to give itself a "due date".

In Frankenmuth, the urban growth boundary program was approved in 1985, but was not formalized until 1996 in the joint Intergovernmental Agreement. In the City of Midland, the urban growth boundary program was created in 1969, but it was not until 1991, that it had evolved to a state in which it could be considered successful. In either case, the result is the same. Currently, both cities have functional and successful urban growth boundary programs that encourage and foster cooperation among and between municipalities.

### Factors Contributing to Success

The reasons for the success of these programs vary widely. Portland, Oregon's programs success can be attributed to the careful planning and decision-making performed at the state level regarding the mandate. The criteria for state approval and the creation of capacity and cooperation building regional agencies assured that all programs would be equally and integrally completed. One common bond between the two Michigan examples is the fact that each community capitalized on their uniqueness. Frankenmuth recognized its unique qualities through the joint survey and Midland's unique water situation was the driving force behind its program.

In Frankenmuth, cooperation was the result of a cooperative planning process. The joint City/Township survey showcased the deep-rooted heritage, strong religious beliefs, and homogeneity of the area resident's opinions. Knowing this, community officials were able to come up with a plan that was focused on exactly what the residents wanted. The cooperative atmosphere under which the plan was formulated resulted in an implementation style focused on cooperation between the City and the Township.

In Midland, cooperation was the result of confrontation. The lack of cooperation and coordination among municipalities caused numerous battles between the City and its adjacent Townships. After many years of conflict the City and its surrounding Townships realized that success could only be achieved through mutually acceptable agreements. The evolution of Midland's policy has created a final product where success is a result of the community's vision of cooperation and coordination between the City and the townships interested in its water.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, urban growth boundaries are a successful tool when used to increase cooperation among municipalities. Whether implemented at the local level or mandated from the state, cooperation is an achievable goal. In instances where time is of importance, a state mandate is most likely the best bet, although with proper guidance and planning. An urban growth boundary program could be implemented with relative quickness at the local level. We recommend examination of the Oregon experience to provide guidance concerning creation of a state program.

For local communities considering establishing an urban growth boundary program this report can recommend a number of critical steps to achieve success. First, the unique character of the community should be assessed. In Frankenmuth, this was achieved through the joint City/Township survey. Completing such a survey can determine what the residents view as important and can also identify any hurdles that may affect the boundary's effectiveness. The second recommendation of this report is that once the unique characteristics of a community are established, they must be integrated into a plan. Simply recognizing the issues is not enough, somehow, they must be integrated into the program. Lastly, the program must be implemented. Boundary lines must be drawn and the parameters to achieve success must be set. There should also be a provision for review and revision of the boundary.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burrows, Lawrence B., *Growth Management: Issues, Techniques and Policy Implications*, (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, Center for Urban Policy Research, 1978).

DeGrove, John M. (ed.), *Balanced Growth: A Planning Guide for Local Government*, (Washington, DC: International City Management Association, 1991).

City of Frankenmuth, Resolution No. 96-52: Inter-governmental Agreement, (Frankenmuth, Michigan, 1996).

Fear, Frank, William J. Kimbal, et al. *Frankenmuth Community Opinion Survey*. (Michigan State University, Department of Resource Development, 1982)

Mandelker, Daniel R., Roger A. Cunningham, and John M. Payne, *Planning and Control of Land Development: Cases and Materials*, 4th ed., (Charlottesville, Virginia: MICHIE, 1995).

Metro, Urban Growth Boundary, (<http://multnomah.lib.or.us/metro/growth/ugbursa/ugb.html>, 1999).

Nelson, Arthur C., et al., *Growth Management Principles and Practices*, (Chicago: Planners Press, American Planning Association, 1995).

Porter, Douglas R., *Profiles in Growth Management*, (Washington, DC: Urban Land, 1996).

Porter, Douglas R., *Managing Growth in America's Communities*, (Washington, DC: Island Press, 1997).

Proactive Institute, Inc. *Future of the Frankenmuth Community: Report Three: Master Plan Report*. (Frankenmuth, Michigan, 1985)

Schroeder, James H., *Evolution of the City of Midland Urban Growth Policy (MUGA) and Urban Cooperation Agreements with Adjoining Townships*, (Presentation Outline, 1998).

Williams, Kristine M., *Urban Service Areas: A Tool to Control Urban Sprawl*, (Lansing, MI: Planning and Zoning News, September 1990).

Wycoff, Mark A., *Growth Management in Frankenmuth: City and Township Develop Joint Plan and Annexation Agreement*, (Lansing, MI: Planning and Zoning News, November, 1984).

## INTERVIEWS

Charles Graham, Frankenmuth City Manager, (December 13, 1999).

James Schroeder, Planning and Development Director, City of Midland, (December 13, 1999).