WISCONSIN LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL ANNEXATION

[2005 SENATE BILL 460
2005 SENATE BILL 461]

January 4, 2006

RL 2005-13

One East Main Street, Suite 401 • P.O. Box 2536 • Madison, WI 53701-2536
Telephone: (608) 266-1304 • Fax: (608) 266-3830 • Email: leg.council@legis.state.wi.us
http://www.legis.state.wi.us/lc

Special Committee on Municipal Annexation

Prepared by:
Don Dyke, Chief of Legal Services, and Mary Offerdahl, Staff Attorney
January 4, 2006

CONTENTS

PART I - KEY PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS 3

2005 Senate Bill 460, Relating to Municipal Boundary Agreements and the Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Municipal Boundary Disputes 3

2005 Senate Bill 461, Relating to Department of Administration Advisory Review of Certain Annexations 3

PART II - COMMITTEE ACTIVITY 5

Assignment 5

Summary of Meetings 5

PART III - RECOMMENDATIONS INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL 7

2005 Senate Bill 460 7

2005 Senate Bill 461 9

Appendix 1 - Committee and Joint Legislative Council Votes 11

Appendix 2 - Lists of Joint Legislative Council Members 13

Appendix 3 - List of Committee Members 15

Appendix 4 - Committee Materials List 17

PART I

KEY PROVISIONS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Special Committee on Municipal Annexation recommends the following proposals to the Joint Legislative Council for introduction in the 2005-06 Session of the Legislature:

2005 Senate Bill 460, Relating to Municipal Boundary Agreements and the Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Municipal Boundary Disputes

2005 Senate Bill 460 does the following:

- Simplifies the current plan requirements for boundary agreements by a cooperative plan (s. 66.0307, Stats.) and reduces the minimum time period for developing a cooperative plan.

- Provides a procedure for a municipality to petition for development of a cooperative plan through mediation if an adjacent municipality declines to participate in the current procedure to develop a cooperative plan.

- Establishes a specific procedure for common municipal boundaries to be determined by agreement under s. 66.0301, Stats. (the general intergovernmental agreement statute).

- Limits the application of s. 66.0225, Stats. (boundaries fixed by court judgment) to contested annexations and limits the scope of a boundary determination under that procedure to that portion of the boundary "that is the subject of the annexation."

- Encourages the court and the parties to a contested annexation proceeding to consider the applicability of the current alternative dispute resolution (ADR) statute, s. 802.12, Stats.

- Requires the DOA to make available on its public website a list of persons who have identified themselves as professionals qualified to facilitate ADR of annexation, boundary, and land use disputes.

2005 Senate Bill 461, Relating to Department of Administration Advisory Review of Certain Annexations

Senate Bill 461 extends the Department of Administration (DOA) advisory review of annexations commenced under s. 66.0217, Stats. (annexations initiated by electors and property owners) to include such annexations commenced in any county, not only those commenced in counties with a population of 50,000 or more. In addition, for annexations of more than 20 acres, the bill requires the DOA in making its advisory public interest determination to consider the impact of the annexation on the tax base and property taxes.

PART II

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Assignment

The Joint Legislative Council established the Special Committee on Municipal Annexation by a May 21, 2004 mail ballot. The committee was directed to review conflicts that arise under current annexation law and practice and the consequences of those conflicts, including costs to taxpayers and other affected parties, and to determine if there is consensus on means to reduce annexation disputes and encourage more boundary cooperation between towns and cities or villages, and to make related recommendations.

The membership of the Special Committee, appointed by a July 21, 2004 mail ballot, consisted of three Senators*, four Representatives, and seven public members. A list of committee members is included as ***Appendix 3*** to this report.

Summary of Meetings

The ***Special Committee*** held three meetings at the State Capitol in Madison on the following dates:

October 12, 2004
November 18, 2004
May 24, 2005

October 12, 2004: At its first meeting, the Special Committee heard testimony on suggestions for revising annexation-related statutes, and on how to reduce conflicts and costs experienced in annexation proceedings. The hearing included testimony from representatives of the Wisconsin Towns Association, the Wisconsin Alliance of Cities, Inc., and the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, as well as from property owners and an attorney emphasizing the need to take into account the interests of property owners in studying annexation.

The committee concluded by discussing its assignment and possible areas for recommendations. Possibilities identified included revisions to current boundary agreement procedures and expanded use of ADR.

November 18, 2004: At its second meeting, committee staff briefly described Memo Nos. 1 and 2, relating to municipal boundary agreement procedures, and Memo No. 4, relating to ADR.

Representative Gottlieb then gave an overview of his proposals outlined in Memo No. 3, most of which relate to municipal boundary agreement procedures, linking them to ADR and annexation law. He stated his goals as facilitating cooperation and minimizing disputes, encouraging municipalities to enter into cooperative agreements rather than litigation, and making it easier to resolve disputes when they occur.

The committee discussed proposals to be prepared as draft legislation for further review. Chair Lasee then appointed a subcommittee to work on draft legislation for committee consideration, based on the day's discussion. Members of the subcommittee were Representative Gottlieb, Mr. Clark, Mr. Derr, Mr. Kraft, and Mr. Mooney.

---

* Senator Coggs later resigned from the committee.

May 24, 2005: At its final meeting, the committee considered the draft legislation developed by the Drafting Subcommittee. Following its review and discussion, the committee voted to recommend WLC: 0132/1, relating to municipal boundary agreements and the use of ADR in municipal boundary disputes, without amendment.

As part of the committee's consideration of WLC: 0067/1, relating to DOA advisory review of certain annexations, the committee considered an amendment offered by Chair Lasee. The amendment would require the DOA, as part of its advisory public interest review of certain annexations, to consider the effect of the annexation on the tax base and real property taxes in the existing city or village and in the territory to be annexed. After revising the amendment, the committee voted to adopt the amendment and to recommend WLC: 0067/1, as amended.

During this meeting, Chair Lasee thanked members of the committee for their work and diligence and gave special recognition to members of the Drafting Subcommittee.

The ***Drafting Subcommittee*** held three meetings at the State Capitol in Madison on the following dates:

December 9, 2004
January 19, 2005
February 4, 2005

December 9, 2004, January 19, 2005, and February 4, 2005: The subcommittee developed draft language providing for various statutory alternatives for municipalities to reach a boundary agreement, in an attempt to minimize litigation and disputes, as follows:

- A boundary agreement procedure in the context of a contested boundary action in court under s. 66.0225, Stats.
- A mediated boundary agreement procedure in the context of a longer-term DOA-approved cooperative plan under s. 66.0307, Stats.
- A boundary agreement procedure in the context of shorter-term intergovernmental cooperation under s. 66.0301, Stats.

In addition, with one member dissenting, the subcommittee developed draft legislation providing for an expansion of DOA's advisory review authority concerning proposed annexations.

PART III

RECOMMENDATIONS INTRODUCED BY THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

This part of the report provides a description of the bills as recommended by the Special Committee on Municipal Annexation.

2005 Senate Bill 460

Senate Bill 460 addresses: (1) the determination of common municipal (city, village, and town) boundaries by agreement; and (2) the use of ADR in annexation and other boundary disputes. General provisions of the bill are summarized below. For additional information, see the text of the bill and notes following individual provisions of the bill.

I. Boundary Agreements

A. Boundary Agreements by Cooperative Plan (s. 66.0307, Stats.)

1. Simplifying Current Procedure

Senate Bill 460 simplifies the current planning requirements under s. 66.0307, Stats., for boundary agreements by cooperative plan by substituting for the current detailed planning requirements a general requirement for consistency with a comprehensive plan. The current requirements specify the content of a cooperative plan as the plan relates to the physical development of territory covered by the plan. "Comprehensive plan" is defined by the bill as a comprehensive plan adopted under s. 66.1001, Stats., or, if a municipality has not adopted a plan under that section, the municipality's master plan.

The bill also reduces, from 120 to 60, the minimum number of days that must pass following the last authorizing resolution by a participating municipality, before the required public hearing on the proposed cooperative plan may be held.

2. Mediated Agreement Procedure

Senate Bill 460 creates a mediated agreement procedure under the boundary agreement-by-cooperative plan statute that provides a means for one municipality to bring an adjacent municipality "to the table" in connection with a common boundary and related issues.

A municipality may petition the DOA for mediation of a cooperative plan if the petitioning municipality has: (a) adopted a comprehensive plan and a resolution authorizing participation in the preparation of a cooperative plan; and (b) requested the adjacent municipality to adopt an authorizing resolution for a cooperative plan, which request was not honored within 60 days after the request.

The bill establishes time periods for petitioning the DOA for the mediated agreement procedure and for the nonpetitioning municipality to respond to the invitation to mediate. It also provides that if the nonpetitioning municipality refuses to engage in mediation, the petitioning municipality may not submit another petition for mediation involving the same municipality for a period of three years after notice of refusal.

Incentives to agree to engage in mediation are included in the bill:

a. If a town refuses to engage in mediation, the town may not contest any annexation of its territory to the petitioning city or village that is commenced during the shorter of the following periods: (1) the period of 270 days beginning after the town refuses to engage in mediation; or (2) the period beginning after the town refuses to engage in mediation until the town agrees to engage in mediation (the latter assumes that the town may agree to engage in mediation after first refusing).

b. If a city or village refuses to engage in mediation, an annexation of territory of the petitioning town to the nonpetitioning city or village may be contested by the town if the DOA determines that the annexation is not in the public interest and if the annexation is commenced during the shorter of the following periods: (1) the period of 270 days beginning after the city or village refuses to engage in mediation; or (2) the period beginning after the city or village refuses to engage in mediation until the city or village agrees to engage in mediation (the latter assumes that the city or village may agree to engage in mediation after first refusing).

The bill provides for selection of a mediator, states the general role of the mediator, establishes a mediation period, and apportions the cost of mediation.

Subject to specified differences, a cooperative plan developed under the new procedure is subject to the content, procedure, approval, and other requirements under s. 66.0307.

Once the mediated agreement procedure is invoked by a municipality, any contested annexation commenced within the next three years involving the petitioning and nonpetitioning municipality is subject to a requirement that the judge, unless the nonpetitioning municipality objects, order the parties to select a settlement alternative under the current ADR statute. This provision is not intended to affect the court's discretionary authority under s. 802.12 to order the parties to attempt settlement by ADR, notwithstanding the objection of the nonpetitioning (or petitioning) municipality.

B. Boundary Agreements Under General Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority (s. 66.0301, Stats.)

The bill establishes a specific procedure for common municipal boundaries to be determined by agreement under s. 66.0301, Stats., the general intergovernmental cooperation statute. In addition to determining common boundaries, an agreement under the procedure may include any other provisions municipalities are authorized to agree to under s. 66.0301 and under s. 66.0305, Stats. (agreements to share revenues). It is envisioned that this authority will be used, for example, by municipalities that wish to make minor changes in their common boundaries or by municipalities that wish to enter into an initial, shorter term agreement before developing a cooperative plan under s. 66.0307.

Currently, there is no express authority under s. 66.0301 to enter into boundary agreements and, although the section has been used for such agreements, its use in this regard has been questioned by some. For example, at least one circuit court has held that boundary agreements are not authorized under current s. 66.0301. (The bill provides that agreements previously entered into under s. 66.0301 that affected the location of a boundary between municipalities are not invalid insofar as lacking authority under s. 66.0301 to affect the location of the boundary.)

Once an agreement under the new authority expires, all provisions of the agreement expire with the exception of boundary determinations, which remain until subsequently changed. The maximum term of an agreement is 10 years. When it is desirable to have an agreement of longer duration, s. 66.0307 is available (and, presumably, another agreement under s. 66.0301 could be entered into).

The s. 66.0301 boundary agreement procedure includes: a public hearing on the proposed agreement (including individual notice to specified affected property owners); approval by the governing body of each municipality by adoption of a resolution; and an optional referendum of the electors residing within the territory whose jurisdiction is subject to change as a result of the agreement.

A boundary agreement under s. 66.0301 may provide generally that during the term of the agreement, no other procedure for altering municipal boundaries may be used to alter a boundary that is affected by the agreement.

The bill provides filing and recording requirements for boundary changes pursuant to an agreement under the new procedure and provides a statute of limitations for contesting the validity of such an agreement.

C. Stipulated Boundary Agreements in Contested Boundary Actions (s. 66.0225, Stats.)

The bill limits the application of current s. 66.0225, Stats. (boundaries fixed by court judgment) to contested annexations and limits the scope of a boundary determination under that procedure to that portion of the boundary "that is the subject of the annexation." The limitations are intended to discourage use of s. 66.0225 for boundary agreements that are more appropriately developed under s. 66.0301 (6), as created by the bill, or s. 66.0307, as revised by the bill. Retention of the s. 66.0225 procedure for contested annexations, subject to the new limitation on which boundaries may be included, recognizes the history and utility of this provision in settling annexation litigation.

The bill provides that in contested consolidations, detachments, and incorporations, the action may be settled by entering into an agreement under the new s. 66.0301 procedure or under s. 66.0307 (boundary agreements by a cooperative plan). Contested annexations may also be so settled.

II. Alternative Dispute Resolution

The bill expressly provides, for illustrative purposes, that the court and parties to a contested annexation are encouraged to consider the applicability of current ADR statute provision, s. 802.12, Stats.

The bill requires the DOA to make available on its public website a list of persons who have identified themselves as professionals qualified to facilitate ADR of annexation, boundary, and land use disputes.

2005 Senate Bill 461

Senate Bill 461 extends the DOA advisory review of annexations under s. 66.0217, Stats., to include counties with a population of under 50,000. The current 50,000 population threshold limits the DOA advisory review to 28 counties. The DOA advisory review consists of a statutorily prescribed public interest determination, based: (1) on whether the governmental services to be supplied to the territory to be annexed could clearly be better supplied by the town or by another willing and contiguous city or village; and (2) on the shape of the proposed annexation and the homogeneity of the territory with the annexing village or city and any other contiguous village or city. In practice, the advisory review also consists of a less formal "technical review" of proposed annexations by DOA staff, including accuracy of legal descriptions and maps. The annexing city or village is required to review DOA's advisory determination before final action is taken on the annexation.

The bill also creates a new factor for the DOA to consider in making its advisory public interest determination for annexations commenced under s. 66.0217, Stats., that will annex more than 20 acres. Under the amendment, in addition to the two factors the department is to consider under current law, the department would be required to consider the annexing city's or village's estimate of the annexation's ultimate impact on the tax base of and on taxes levied on real property in, the annexing municipality and in the territory proposed to be annexed. "Ultimate impact" refers to the impact at the time when the area is built-out and all resulting real property taxes generated go to all taxing jurisdictions. For purposes of the estimate, the annexing city or village is to assume that undeveloped land in the territory proposed to be annexed will be developed in accordance with the master plan or comprehensive plan in effect at the time of the annexation. The annexing municipality is required to

furnish the estimate to the department within five days after receiving the department's request and to publish a notice summarizing the estimate before adopting the annexation ordinance.

Appendix 1

Committee and Joint Legislative Council Votes

This Appendix identifies the votes by the Special Committee on Municipal Annexation and the Joint Legislative Council on the proposals that were approved by the Special Committee for recommendation to the Joint Legislative Council for introduction in the 2005-06 Session of the Legislature:

Special Committee Votes

At its May 24, 2005 meeting, the Special Committee voted as follows on its recommendations:

- WLC: 0132/1, relating to municipal boundary agreements and the use of alternative dispute resolution in municipal boundary disputes, was recommended by a vote of Ayes, 9 (Sens. Lasee and Brown; Reps. Gottlieb and Kerkman; and Public Members Clark, Derr, Kraft, Mooney, and Parmentier); Noes, 1 (Rep. Zepnick); and Absent, 3 (Rep. Kaufert and Public Members Jones and Kaster). Representative Kaufert would have voted in the affirmative had he been able to attend.

- WLC: 0067/2, relating to Department of Administration advisory review of certain annexations, was recommended by a vote of Ayes, 9 (Sens. Lasee and Brown; Reps. Gottlieb, Kerkman, and Zepnick; and Public Members Clark, Derr, Mooney, and Parmentier); Noes, 1 (Public Member Kraft); and Absent, 3 (Rep. Kaufert and Public Members Jones and Kaster). Representative Kaufert would have voted in the affirmative had he been able to attend.

Joint Legislative Council Votes

At its June 1, 2005 meeting, the Joint Legislative Council voted as follows on the recommendations of the Special Committee:

- *Introduction by the Joint Legislative Council of WLC: 0132/1 and WLC: 0067/2 passed by a vote of Ayes, 17 (Sens. Lasee, Brown, Decker, Fitzgerald, Kapanke, Miller, Robson and Schultz; and Reps. Wieckert, Ainsworth, Freese, Huebsch, Kaufert, Kreuser, Nischke, Pocan, and Schneider); Noes, 0; and Excused, 5 (Sens. Grothman, Risser and Zien; and Reps. Gard and Travis).*

The proposals that the Joint Legislative Council voted to introduce were subsequently introduced as 2005 Senate Bill 460 and 2005 Senate Bill 461.

Appendix 2

Joint Legislative Council

[Joint Legislative Council Members Who Selected and Appointed Committee and Its Membership]

Co-Chair
ALAN LASEE
Senate President
2259 Lasee Road
De Pere, WI 54115

Co-Chair
STEVE WIECKERT
Representative
1702 S. Irma Street
Appleton, WI 54915

SENATORS

RONALD W. BROWN
1112 Violet Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701

MICHAEL G. ELLIS
1752 County Road GG
Neenah, WI 54956

MARY E. PANZER
Majority Leader
635 Tamarack Drive West
West Bend, WI 53095

G. SPENCER COGGS
3732 North 40th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53216

JON ERPENBACH
Minority Leader
2385 Branch St.
Middleton, WI 53562

FRED A. RISSER
5008 Risser Road
Madison, WI 53705

ALBERTA DARLING
1325 West Dean Road
River Hills, WI 53217

SHEILA HARSDORF
N6627 County Road E
River Falls, WI 54022

ROBERT WELCH
President Pro Tempore
P.O. Box 523
Redgranite, WI 54970

RUSSELL DECKER
6803 Lora Lee Lane
Schofield, WI 54476

REPRESENTATIVES

STEVEN M. FOTI
Majority Leader
351 Lisbon Road
Oconomowoc, WI 53066

JIM KREUSER
Minority Leader
3505 14th Place
Kenosha, WI 53144

DAN SCHOOFF
1955 Pebble Drive
Beloit, WI 53511

STEPHEN J. FREESE
Speaker Pro Tempore
310 East North Street
Dodgeville, WI 53533

MICHAEL LEHMAN
1317 Honeysuckle Road
Hartford, WI 53027

JOHN TOWNSEND
297 Roosevelt Street
Fond du Lac, WI 54935

JOHN GARD
Speaker
481 Aubin Street, P.O. Box 119
Peshtigo, WI 54157

MARLIN D. SCHNEIDER
3820 Southbrook Lane
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

DAVID TRAVIS
5440 Willow Road
Waunakee, WI 53597

DEAN KAUFERT
1360 Alpine Lane
Neenah, WI 54956

This 22-member committee consists of the majority and minority party leadership of both houses of the Legislature, the co-chairs and ranking minority members of the Joint Committee on Finance, and 5 Senators and 5 Representatives appointed as are members of standing committees. [s. 13.81, Stats.]

Joint Legislative Council

[Current Joint Legislative Council Members Receiving Committee Report]

Co-Chair
ALAN LASEE
Senate President
2259 Lasee Road
De Pere, WI 54115

Co-Chair
STEVE WIECKERT
Representative
1 Weatherstone Drive
Appleton, WI 54914

SENATORS

RONALD W. BROWN
1112 Violet Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701

DAN KAPANKE
1610 Lakeshore Drive
La Crosse, WI 54603

DALE SCHULTZ
Majority Leader
515 N. Central Avenue
Richland Center, WI 53581

RUSSELL DECKER
6803 Lora Lee Lane
Schofield, WI 54476

MARK MILLER
4903 Roigan Terrace
Monona, WI 53716

DAVID ZIEN
President Pro Tempore
1716 63rd Street
Eau Claire, WI 54703

SCOTT FITZGERALD
N4692 Maple Road
Juneau, WI 53039

FRED A. RISSER
5008 Risser Road
Madison, WI 53705

GLENN GROTHMAN
111 South 6th Avenue
West Bend, WI 53095

JUDY ROBSON
Minority Leader
2411 E. Ridge Road
Beloit, WI 53511

REPRESENTATIVES

JOHN AINSWORTH
W6382 Waukechon Road
Shawano, WI 54166

DEAN KAUFERT
1360 Alpine Lane
Neenah, WI 54956

MARLIN D. SCHNEIDER
3820 Southbrook Lane
Wisconsin Rapids, WI 54494

STEPHEN J. FREESE
Speaker Pro Tempore
310 East North Street
Dodgeville, WI 53533

JIM KREUSER
Minority Leader
3505 14th Place
Kenosha, WI 53144

DAVID TRAVIS
5440 Willow Road
Waunakee, WI 53597

JOHN GARD
Speaker
481 Aubin Street, P.O. Box 119
Peshtigo, WI 54157

ANN NISCHKE
202 W. College Avenue
Waukesha, WI 53186

MICHAEL HUEBSCH
Majority Leader
419 West Franklin
West Salem, WI 54669

MARK POCAN
309 North Baldwin St.
Madison, WI 53703

This 22-member committee consists of the majority and minority party leadership of both houses of the Legislature, the co-chairs and ranking minority members of the Joint Committee on Finance, and 5 Senators and 5 Representatives appointed as are members of standing committees. [s. 13.81, Stats.]

Appendix 3

MUNICIPAL ANNEXATION

Senator Alan J. Lasee, **Chair**
2259 Lasee Road
De Pere, WI 54115

Representative Mark Gottlieb
1205 Noridge Trail
Port Washington, WI 53074

Representative Samantha Kerkman
8705 385th Avenue
Burlington, WI 53105

Roger W. Clark
Herrling, Clark, Hartzheim, Sidall, Ltd.
800 North Lynndale Drive
Appleton, WI 54914-3017

Christine Jones
Town of Linn
W3746 County Highway BB
Lake Geneva, WI 53147

Warren P. Kraft
City of Oshkosh
215 Church Avenue
Oshkosh, WI 54903-1130

Mike Parmentier
100 North Jefferson Street, Room 608
Green Bay, WI 54301-5026

Senator Ronald W. Brown
1112 Violet Avenue
Eau Claire, WI 54701

Representative Dean R. Kaufert
1360 Alpine Lane
Neenah, WI 54956

Representative Josh Zepnick
3173 South 49th Street
Milwaukee, WI 53219

Gerald Derr
Town of Bristol
1595 County Road V
Columbus, WI 53925-9121

Pat Kaster
River City Realtors
1317 Lombardi Access Road
Green Bay, WI 54304

J. Michael Mooney
NAI MLG Commercial
Brown County Planning Commission
13400 Bishops Lane, Suite 100
Brookfield, WI 53005-6237

STUDY ASSIGNMENT: The committee is directed to review conflicts that arise under current annexation law and practice and the consequences of those conflicts, including costs to taxpayers and other affected parties, and to determine if there is consensus on means to reduce annexation disputes and encourage more boundary cooperation between towns and cities or villages, and to make related recommendations

13 MEMBERS: 2 Senators, 4 Representatives, and 7 Public Members.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STAFF: Don Dyke, Chief of Legal Services, Mary Offerdahl, Staff Attorney, and Rachel Veum, Support Staff.

Appendix 4

Committee Materials List

(Copies of documents are available at www.legis.state.wi.us/lc)

May 24, 2005 Meeting

- WLC: 0132/1 (municipal boundary agreements and the use of alternative dispute resolution in municipal boundary disputes)
- WLC: 0067/1 (Department of Administration advisory review of certain annexations)
- WLC: 0217/1 (amendment to WLC: 0067/1)
- Fiscal Estimate, Initial Estimate to WLC: 0132/1, prepared by DOA
- Fiscal Estimate, Initial Estimate to WLC: 0067/1, prepared by DOA
- Handout, Key Annexation Factors*, prepared by J. Michael Mooney
- Memo, Comments on Legislative Proposals Recommended by the Drafting Subcommittee, from Curt Witynski, Assistant Director, League of Wisconsin Municipalities (5-24-05)

February 4, 2005 Drafting Subcommittee Meeting

- WLC: 0063/P3 (simplifying s. 66.0307, revising s. 66.0225, and authorizing certain boundary agreements under s. 66.0301
- WLC: 0064/P3 (cooperative boundary plan by mediated agreement)
- WLC: 0063/P4 (simplifying s. 66.0307, revising s. 66.0225, and authorizing certain boundary agreements under s. 66.0301)
- WLC: 0064/P4 (cooperative boundary plan by mediated agreement)

January 19, 2005 Drafting Subcommittee Meeting

- WLC: 0063/P2 (simplifying s. 66.0307 and expanding the application of s. 66.0225)
- WLC: 0064/P2 (cooperative boundary plan by mediated agreement)
- WLC: 0068/P2 (DOA list of qualified ADR professionals)

December 9, 2004 Drafting Subcommittee Meeting

- WLC: 0063/P1 (simplifying s. 66.0307 and expanding the application of s. 66.0225)
- WLC: 0064/P1 (cooperative boundary plan by mediated agreement)
- WLC: 0066/P1 (application of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) to contested annexations)
- WLC: 0067/P1 (expanding DOA advisory review of annexations)
- WLC: 0068/P1 (DOA list of qualified ADR professionals)
- Memo, Preliminary Draft Legislation WLC: 0063/P1, from Brian W. Ohm, Chair, State-Local Government-Private Sector Working Group & Associate Professor, Department of Urban & Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension (12-9-04)

November 18, 2004 Meeting

- Memo No. 1, Current Boundary Agreement Procedures and Suggested Revisions (11-9-04)
- Summary Comparison
- Flowchart
- Memo No. 2, Additional Background Information on Cooperative Boundary Agreements (11-9-04)
- Cooperative Boundary Agreement Checklist
- What's Unique About the Cooperative Boundary Agreement Statute
- Memo No. 3, Outline of Proposal by Representative Mark Gottlieb (11-9-04)
- Memo No. 4, Three Options for Expanding Use of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Annexation Procedures (11-9-04)
- Guide to Dispute Resolution Process
- Section 802.12, Stats.
- Algoma-Oshkosh Agreement
- Exhibit A
- Exhibit B
- Exhibit C
- Questions and Answers
- Algoma Cooperative Agreement Approval
- Handout, Proposed for Amendment 2003 Wis. Act 317, distributed by Public Member Roger Clark

October 12, 2004 Meeting and Public Hearing

- Staff Brief 04-6, Municipal Annexation (10-4-04)
- Statutes, Wisconsin's Annexation Statutes, Division of Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Administration (2004)
- Meeting Notice
- Public Hearing Notice
- Testimony, Richard J. Stadelman, Executive Director, Wisconsin Towns Association
- Testimony, Edward Huck, Executive Director, Wisconsin Alliance of Cities Inc.
- Testimony, Curt Witynski, Assistant Director, League of Wisconsin Municipalities
- Testimony, Richard J. Lukas
- Testimony, Beverly Lancaster and Marilyn Neumann
- Handout, Background on Annexation for the Joint Legislative Council's Special Committee on Municipal Annexation, Department of Administration (10-04)
- Handout, Brian W. Ohm, Chair, State-Local Government-Private Sector Working Group & Associate Professor, Department of Urban & Regional Planning, University of Wisconsin-Madison/Extension