An Equal Opportunity Employer

Phone: 296-2428

STATE OF MINNESOTA
MUNICIPAL BOARD

Suite 165 Metro Square
7th & Robert Streets
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

August 16, 1978

Mr. Mark Winkler
Deputy Secretary of State
State Office Building
Saint Paul, Minnesota

Re: Municipal Board Docket Number A-3298 Medford

Dear Mr. Winkler:

The subject order of the Minnesota Municipal Board makes the following changes in the population of the named units of government:

The population of The City of Medford

is increased by (no change)

The population of The Township of Medford

is decreased by (no change)

A new municipality named _____

has been created with a population of _____

The _____

has been dissolved.

Official date of the Order August 11, 1978

C.C. Mr. Wallace O. Dahl
Director
Tax Research Division
205 Centennial Bldg.

Patricia D. Lundy
Assistant Executive Director

Hazel Reinhardt
State Demographer
101 Capitol Square Bldg.

Mr. Arthur C. Roemer
Department of Revenue
201 Centennial Bldg.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
FILED
AUG 17 1978
Joan Anderson Growe
Secretary of State
#31618
OD

A-3298

BEFORE THE MUNICIPAL BOARD

OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Gerald J. Isaacs	Chairman
Robert W. Johnson	Vice Chairman
Thomas J. Simmons	Member
L. R. Rhoades	Ex-Officio Member
Robert Jurgenson	Ex-Officio Member

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION NOTICE) OF INTENT FOR ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN) LAND TO THE CITY OF MEDFORD)	FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the Minnesota Municipal Board pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 414, as amended, on June 9, 1978 at Medford, Minnesota. The hearing was conducted by William A. Neiman, Executive Director, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 414.01, Subd. 12. Also in attendance were County Commissioners L. R. Rhoades and Robert Jurgensen, ex-officio members of the Board. The City of Medford appeared by and through Mike Gillen, the Township of Medford appeared by and through Larry Rietz, and the petitioners appeared by and through Mark Walbran. Testimony was heard, and records and exhibits were received.

After due and careful consideration of all evidence, together with all records, files, and proceedings the Minnesota Municipal Board hereby makes and files the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On February 14, 1978, a copy of a petition for annexation by the sole property owner was filed with the Minnesota Municipal Board. The petition contained all the information required by statute including a description of the territory subject to annexation which is as follows:

> The West 25 acres of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter and all of that part of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter all in Section 16, Township 108 North, Range 20 West, lying East of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad right of way.

An objection to the proposed annexation was received by the Minnesota Muncipal Board by Medford Township on March 8, 1978. The Municipal Board upon receipt of this objection conducted further proceedings in accordance with M.S. 414.031, as required by M.S. 414.033, Subd. 5. Further, the City of Medford did not favor the proposed annexation.

2. Due, timely and adequate legal notice of the hearing was published, served and filed.

3. Geographic Features

a. The area subject to annexation is unincorporated and abuts the City of Medford.

b. The total area of the territory subject to annexation is 58.81 acres.

c. The perimeter of the area to be annexed is bordered by the municipality by a very small percentage.

d. The natural terrain of the area, including general topography, major watersheds, soil conditions, rivers, lakes and major bluffs is as follows: Steep slope and irregular topography. Wooded with some minor agricultural use.

4. Population Data

a. The City of Medford has experienced modest growth.

b. The area subject to annexation has 0 population.

5. Development Issues

a. What, if any, are the plans for the development of the property proposed for annexation and/or the annexing municipality, including development projected by the state planning agency. There are somewhat ambiguous plans regarding residential development.

b. Does the city require future growth space? No, not for the foreseeable future.

c. Development of the following types is occuring: limited growth.

1) In the area subject to annexation: No development, (but adjacent to the property is a heavily used girl scout camp, located in a protected rural setting).

d. What will be the effect, if any, of the annexation on adjacent communities? None.

6. Governmental Services

a. Presently, the Township of Medford provides the area subject to annexation with the following services: None are required other than fire which is by contract.

b. Presently, the City of Medford provides its citizens with the following services:

1) Water - Yes
2) Sewer - Yes
3) Fire Protection - Yes
4) Police Protection - Yes, by contract
5) Street Improvements - Yes
6) Street Maintenance - Yes
7) Recreational - Yes

c. Presently, the City of Medford provides the area subject to annexation with the following services: None.

d. Plans to extend municipal services to the area subject to annexation include the following: Services could be extended upon development; however,

utility plans were not specific.

e. There are existing or potential pollution problems which are: Services, including storm sewer, would be required to avoid pollution if developed.

7. Is annexation to the City of Medford the best alternative.

a. Could governmental services be better provided for by incorporation of the area subject to annexation? No

b. Could governmental services be better provided for by consolidation or annexation of the area with an adjacent municipality other than Medford? No.

c. Could Medford township provide the services required? Yes, the area is undeveloped and requires only protection against brush fires.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Minnesota Municipal Board duly acquired and now has jurisdiction of the within proceeding.

2. The area subject to annexation is not about to become urban or suburban in character.

3. Municipal government is not required to protect the public health, safety, and welfare in the area subject to annexation.

4. The best interest of the area subject to annexation will not be furthered by annexation.

5. An order should be issued by the Minnesota Municipal Board denying the annexation.

O R D E R

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: That the petition requesting the annexation of certain property in the County of Steele, State of Minnesota, be and the same is hereby denied without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That the effective date of this order is Aug. 11, 1978.

Dated this 11th day of August, 1978

MINNESOTA MUNICIPAL BOARD
165 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

William A. Neiman
Executive Director