

COOPERATIVE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE
VILLAGE OF DRESSER & TOWN OF OSCEOLA
MINUTES – JULY 27, 2015

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a Cooperative Boundary Committee meeting was held on Monday, July 27, 2015, in the Dresser Municipal Office, 102 W Main Street, Dresser WI. Members of the committee present: Mike Wallace, Neil Gustafson, Wayne Moberg, and Jim Thanig. Also present Jodi A Gilbert, Clerk/Treasurer Village of Dresser. Members of the public present: Jeanne & Jim Rochford, Glyn Thorman, and other members of the public. No press were in attendance at this meeting. Meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Neil Gustafson. Gustafson called for roll call. All members of the committee were present.

Motion Moberg/Thanig to approve minutes of the Cooperative Boundary Meeting – June 29, 2015. All in Favor. Motion carried.

No citizen comments were made.

Discussion was held regarding the development of a Cooperative Boundary Agreement between the Village of Dresser and the Town of Osceola. Gustafson asked how did we all do with our studying and homework. This is quite over whelming. Thank you to Gilbert for the maps. Gustafson continued now that everyone has had some time to review each municipality's comprehensive plans should we look at terminology for the boundary areas. Any suggestions on how far out from the boundaries do we go. Gustafson stated on the state web page since 1996 30 different boundary agreements have been approved in Wisconsin and they are all over the board regarding the different issues. In my personal opinion I would not want to create an agreement that goes beyond 2030 since that is how long our comprehensive plans are good for. Wallis stated it is important to decide how long the agreement should be because that would affect how we approached the plan. Gustafson stated I have been reviewing the future land use maps of both municipalities. Are there any areas that jumped out for anybody? Wallis stated this comp plan was written out to 2030, so some of the areas that may have been typed one way are now different then what I originally thought. On the south west boundary the town has future use as agriculture versus the village typed it as planned neighborhood development. I am seeing that the town felt some things would stay the same until 2030 versus the village saw something else. Wallis continued that particular area I would be expecting it to be an area of interest for the village in the future. Thanig stated there is future industrial for Dresser versus residential for the Town of Osceola which is another difference. Gustafson stated in your opinions how far out should we go? Obviously Dresser has some ideas out into the Township. Do we want to focus on an area that far out or be closer to the boundaries. Thanig stated I believe extraterritorial view was 1 ½ miles. Wallis suggested specifically addressing the border areas and outside that area any annexation would follow normal procedures. Wallis stated when I was trying to pencil things in on the maps I took an approach I have used on other plans – I would look at blocking areas and there are great efficiencies with block areas versus jagged areas. This would be the meat of the agreement. There will be some areas that are less under the

Page 2 of 3 – Cooperative Boundary Agreement Meeting July 27, 2015

microscope. The township would be willing to forego five years of tax payments in exchange for other areas not to be annexed or need town approval. Gustafson stated when you look at the map and draw a line down from East Avenue this area is mainly residential. When you look out to 2030 will this area be agricultural or residential. In Dresser's comp plan they talk about promoting the trailer park to relocate off of State HWY 35 in order to promote business along that area. Wallis continued how soon would the village want to pursue that. There is the start of residential out by Peace Lutheran on Clark Road. That is township housing. Thanig stated when you look at each of the blocks what is the distance there? They are 40 acres usually. Gustafson stated the term rural preservation is on Dresser's plan what is the idea behind that? Thanig read the description from the comp plan. Thanig asked the question I wonder how many vacant lots are in the Village. Gustafson stated I am considering contacting some representatives from the New Richmond/Star Prairie agreement and see how they worked through this process. The DOA flow chart is very vague. It may be very beneficial to talk to other local municipalities that have done this. Wallis asked would you get together with them as a group or one or two talk to them. Gustafson stated I was thinking of at least starting some communication and see if they would give us any advice. Moberg stated it would be nice if all of us could be there – that may be more beneficial. Gustafson suggested maybe someone from DOA would come and give us some coaching on this. Wallis stated they may offer some facilitators from the DOA - I don't know if there is a charge involved, but they may come and get us moving on this. Gustafson stated I will get hold of New Richmond and Star Prairie. Wallis stated I will talk to DOA. Moberg maybe they could be at the next meeting based on their availability. Gustafson stated we should plan our next meeting and we could always change it. Gustafson stated the New Richmond/Star Prairie agreement is very complex - 105 pages. Wallis stated there is another example that was much simpler. Thanig it helps if there are not so many utilities. Most of the other samples are pretty big cities. Wallis stated a minor simplification to all of this is that the north boundary is Town of St Croix so we don't have to worry about that one. Wallis asked about a small parcel on MM by Lotus Lake that is owned by the village. That appears to be the old village dump site. Gustafson stated it may be good to compare terminology in the comp plans and look at what it is being used for. For instance the Town of Osceola uses the term residential – Dresser has low density residential and medium/high residential – do we want it that specific? Thanig stated we could just say residential for this purpose. Commercial/Commercial that is the same terminology. The town uses agricultural – Dresser has rural preservation and resource preservation. Gustafson stated in this sample they have a description of agriculture/open spaces. Thanig stated would that be the same as rural preservation? Wallis stated we have an existing land use map – there more may be more description on the existing versus future land use map. Gustafson stated I am just trying to see how these may mesh all together. Wallis asked when has the village had annexation in the past. Gilbert stated she would have to check village files. Wallis stated that would be good information for the next meeting. It would show where the trends have been and explain the shape of the village. Gilbert stated she would pull dates and what property in the past was annexed. Gustafson stated OK if we look at what is similar between the two plans: Commercial is in both, Industrial is in both, do we need to break down residential into subgroups?

Page 3 of 3 – Cooperative Boundary Agreement Meeting July 27, 2015

Gustafson stated I wasn't involved in the town's comp plan and I don't want to make any assumptions. Gustafson starts to look at the other descriptions. Wallis stated I am not sure where you are heading with these comparisons. These may help predict what areas may be subject to annexation. If someone wants to build in the town they would probably annex in for other services. A lot will depend on how the plan is written for an area. It was asked I wonder how the Town of St Croix Falls would view any of this. Gustafson stated each area needs to fit somewhere. What about public institutional areas. Transportation and utilities play into all of this. Wallis stated in some areas I don't know what was the originally intended use. Wallis stated I don't know if we need private recreation. That would be for the ski hill, private campgrounds, private recreation. Gustafson stated there is a large chunk of that area on the map. Are there any plans to expand – it doesn't provide for expansion – it seems to account for most of the recreational area. Gustafson stated leave that definition in there. Right now I have 7 different areas that the boundaries could be classified as and there are some definite similarities between the two communities. Wallis stated I can see the value of that – in that analysis leads us to the next step of the plan tying areas back to the DOA documents. Agreements may state where there is no annexation. The agreement may have annexation with conditions such as one area developed next to it then it can be developed. Some areas may be considered for annexation but need to have both communities approve. There may be some changes with no contesting from the town. Areas likely to be candidates for annexation have those other categories – won't collect the 5 years of taxes. Areas that are not impacted would follow the current annexation procedures and not be part of the plan. Gustafson stated Ok Wallis you are going to contact the DOA and I will get hold of New Richmond/Star Prairie. Wallis continued we could simplify it – a category called urban expansion – an area that the town recognized as potential for expansion and we give up the tax payments. There would be an area not annexed during the life of the plan. Wallis stated putting together the terminology is simple the filling in of the boxes is more difficult. I see two areas that would be attractive to the Village. Are there any other areas? Thanig stated we can't go out very far. I would need to talk to board members and see what their thoughts are. Wallis stated we are putting this as an agenda item for our plan commission.

The committee agreed that the next meeting would be Monday, August 31st at 6:00 PM.

Motion Moberg/Wallis to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 PM. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Jodi A Gilbert – Dresser Clerk/Treasurer

These minutes have not been approved.