

**COOPERATIVE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE**  
**VILLAGE OF DRESSER & TOWN OF OSCEOLA**  
**MINUTES – FEBRUARY 20, 2017**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a Cooperative Boundary Committee meeting was held on Monday, February 20, 2017, in the Dresser Municipal Office, 102 W Main Street, Dresser WI. Gustafson called to order the meeting at 6:02 PM. Roll Call was taken. Members of the committee present: Neil Gustafson, Mike Wallis, and Wayne Moberg. Jim Thanig Absent. Also present Jodi A Gilbert, Clerk/Treasurer Village of Dresser and Attorney Tim Laux. Members of the public present: The Standard Press/Ledger Newspaper and the Inter-County Leader Newspapers were present.

Motion Moberg/Wallis to approve the minutes of the Cooperative Boundary Committee Meeting, January 23, 2017. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Citizen Comments – Nothing Stated.

Discussion was held regarding the development of a Cooperative Boundary Agreement between the Village of Dresser and the Town of Osceola. Attorney Tim Laux was in attendance to review proposed changes. Wallis presented a document to the committee with Section 4 changes. The highlighted sections are additions or one/two word changes that I rewrote Wallis stated. In some places I deleted a paragraph and then rewrote/combined paragraphs. There are a lot of things in the plan talking about cooperation between the municipalities. Laux stated if there are additional attachments they would be included as appendixes. Such as the Comprehensive Plans for each municipality. Laux stated for the introduction I could tie the first two sentences together. “The Village and the Town adopted Comprehensive Plans that this Cooperative Plan uses to address issues and problems and create opportunities as noted in the following areas below:” Laux asked - in section 4.01 where is the similar paragraph that focuses on the Village? The Village’s paragraph would be something in relation to expansion Wallis stated. In Jim’s notes that he submitted for tonight’s meeting on Page 2 the very last item Section 2.7 may fit. Laux stated my thought was in Section 2.6 Objective #3 and #1 as well. We need to have a similar paragraph that addresses the Village of Dresser. Need to see two sides of the coin. You need to say that the reason you are working together is that the Comprehensive Plans say that they should work together. Need to determine what are efficient and compatible land use patterns. The municipalities are continuing to work together regarding shared services even though the town doesn’t have utilities. It would be fairly easy to put together another paragraph and make it 4.01.01. Need to list what is important to the town and what is important to the village and then talk about specifics. Does that make sense? Some of the wording may be identical so you can just say that they both say the same thing. Gustafson stated this sounds like simple change to make. Laux stated you just need to expand on this paragraph. From a legal stand point the functions are different, but as you say what is in both plans they are identical. What you currently have now is the Town’s focus. The next sections when reading the titles reference the Village. The objective needs to work for both municipalities. Laux asked so how do you plan to do that? Wallis stated I guess we sort thru them and determine if

## **Page 2 of 3 – Cooperative Boundary Meeting Minutes – February 20, 2017**

there is something new to add. After I did the Town's section and I realized I didn't have a link to the Comprehensive Plan. Some of this is right out of the Dresser's Comprehensive Plan. I guess that is what you had in mind Tim? Laux stated yes. Because that is what the law requires. Demonstrates how the Cooperative Boundary Agreement moves forward the Comprehensive Plans for both Municipalities. That is it in a nut shell. Laux look at Section 4.02 orderly development within the Village Growth Areas. The town also has areas that they want to preserve. Are growth areas the correct term to be using. The town has an interest in having some kind of longer range planning. This is not to prevent annexation but it is an agreement between the two municipalities over their respective growth areas. Another area identified is the Highway 35 Corridor up to Dresser. You have a residential area in the town section and you have plans or want to work with Dresser so that you don't lose tax base. You want to continue to provide services. You want to have an orderly growth agreement with the Village because neither of you wants to have a kind of uncontrolled hodge podge of roads/utilities that don't mesh. Section 4.02 addresses why the Village is interested in orderly development and there should be similar concern's in the town's Comprehensive Plan. That second paragraph is pretty good. Wallis stated the first paragraph on the second page hits on some things you have mentioned. Moberg asked does that say it well enough. Laux stated in that 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – orderly growth etc... Take that middle sentence and find the Economic Development Section of the Village Plan 2.5 and you should find similar objectives. Take the principle in this Section on the bottom of 1<sup>st</sup> page and make a similar statement of the Village and then launch into the comment section agreement in this paragraph that demonstrates those two jump off points and you have now reached an agreement. I think that would make sense. It is a little disjointed right now. Go to each of the Comprehensive Plans and find similar sections and what do we agree to do together to address those issues. Jim has identified areas to look at in the document he submitted. Laux stated look at what you have in intergovernmental cooperation, infrastructure, orderly development, economic development, the Highway 35 Corridor, and then Jim has similar items. I am not sure what in terms of land use you agree to? Wallis so the points where we come together. I think what you have here already you have gone well into firming up your draft. As part of the driving force behind the document look at land use more specifically. It is not mandatory, but you may want to take a look at the growth areas. Longer time for growth, times for infrastructure regarding road and utility extensions. Do you have a reasonable plan of development? Wallis asked do we need to go into that much detail. It wouldn't hurt to be as specific as you can. You don't want to go over board. Gustafson stated when reading Section 4.01 and taking Jim's notes make it both Comprehensive Plans. We worked on them together before. Laux stated that would put you right back on track. Wallis stated in regards to land use – compatible land use – one of the differences is the character of those areas. Laux stated in reading both Comprehensive Plans you talk about areas of growth and development. In your mapping and land use identify where you can go with development and where you can't. It is pretty clear your plan talks about types of plans that are not suitable for development. Comment about the underlying trap rock and that you can't drill a well. Issue of preservation of agricultural uses. Where that is possible and where it is not. There is discussion in both plans where there are differences, but also where the

**Page 3 of 3 – Cooperative Boundary Meeting Minutes – February 20, 2017**

focus is similar. Can you come to the same conclusion for future development? That may be an area you have already agreed to and it is in the document. You need to address it the same way. Gustafson stated there is good land use on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page. Wallis stated back to what describing why one of the major drivers was the growth areas was the blocking in – the odd shape of Dresser and trying to make it more boxy. Our Comprehensive Plan addresses the area to the North and the East of the Village so we didn't go to these areas for these reasons. Laux stated it makes sense to you and it does to me. You need to tell the Department of Administration and this will likely increase your chance of being approved. Bring the two Comprehensive Plans together and move them forward. Wallis and Jim took different approaches to this. Make it easy for the reader to understand the better off you are. Wallis stated I will make the edits and send them out by email. We will still need to meet as a committee to vote on the final. Do we set a meeting date now – Wallis stated how quickly can I do this? I will shoot to have this done by the 6<sup>th</sup> of March.

The committee agreed that the next meeting would be March 20<sup>th</sup> at 6PM.

Motion Wallis/Moberg to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 PM.

Jodi A Gilbert, Clerk Village of Dresser      These minutes have not been approved.