

MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL NEXT SUBSEQUENT MEETING

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Thursday December 9, 2010**

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Keith Seward. Town representatives present: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins and Gof Thomson. Village representatives present: Jim Salter and Kevin Budsberg. Absent: Dan Gartzke. Also in attendance: Village Administrator Nicholas Owen

Announcement: All cell phones are to remain silent during the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Kevin Budsberg to approve the agenda, second by Jim Salter. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 11/11/10 Meeting: Motion by Jim Salter to approve the minutes of 11/11/10, second by Kevin Budsberg. Motion carried.

Communication Status Draft Presented by Keith Seward: Seward distributed a draft summary detailing the process that the committee has gone through so far, the items the committee has agreed upon and the remaining items to be discussed. Gof Thomson made a motion to approve the draft in substance. The committee reviewed the draft noting formatting and grammar changes. The committee expressed a desire to include language requesting/encouraging public input and participation in the project. Committee members agreed to review the document and come up with formal recommendations at next month's meeting. After discussion Kevin Budsberg seconded the motion by Thomson. Motion carried.

Refined Analysis of Town Portion of Village Recreation and Pool Figures: Administrator Owen provided a handout detailing the Village operating expenses and revenue for the pool, parks and recreation programs. The gap between the expenses revenues is currently made up using Village tax levy. This sheet divides this gap between the Village and Town based on resident participation in each of the programs. The total amount currently covered by Village levy for pool, parks and recreation is \$127,031; broken down by use the Village's share would be \$76,759 and the Town's \$50,272.

Keith Seward presented this idea on revenue sharing for the Library. Seward is proposing a formula that uses the Library's operating expense multiplied by the Town Resident's circulation percentage minus the portion of the County tax levy collected from Town taxpayers for the library. Using estimates Seward explained; the current operating budget of \$240,000 multiplied by the Town's circulation of 25% comes to \$62,500. Subtracting the amount town taxpayers contribute to the county for the library, approximately \$52,000 leaves around \$10,000 additional that the Town would contribute to the library.

The committee discussed whether debt service payments for a new library should be included in the Library's expense for the formula. The initial thoughts were that it should be. Gof Thomson stated we are really looking at three issues, current library funding, future library funding after the expansion and current parks and recreation funding and that the cost sharing may need to be phased in to ease the impact on the Town taxpayers.

Both sides are to further review and discuss the funding formal for next meeting.

Jim Salter Report on Alternate Garage Site 1 (b) or 2 if 1 (b) is Not Viable: Salter has left messages for the landowner and has not received a call back. Salter will try to stop out this weekend to see if he can have a discussion with them. Salter will also approach the owner of the 2nd priority property to determine interest. The committee discussed the issues with properties that are located farther away from Village utilities and possible limitations with septic systems. Administrator Owen will review the top potential properties with Beth Aldermen to determine site suitability and aesthetics.

Town Response to Map Language Proposed by Village: Keith Seward provided a Town response to the language proposed by Kevin Budsberg for Item #4 dated 11/5/10. Seward explained that they tried to define cooperation in relation to the Boundary agreement and to set a process for resolving conflicts. The committee discussed whether all Commercial and Industrial development would occur in the Village. Consensus was that if there are types of commercial/industrial development that are not reliant on Village water/sewer services that they could occur in the Town without extension of utilities. The committee discussed potential inconsistencies between the plan for residential growth and commercial and industrial. Committee discussed using the same type of arrangement in which all developments, commercial/industrial or residential, which are extended Village utilities without annexation will annex to the Village at the end of the agreement. The committee discussed legality of this type of an arrangement. The Village and Town will both review the language for the next meeting.

Town Response to the Expense Sheet from the Village: This item was discussed under the previous agenda item titled “Refined Analysis of Town Portion of Village Recreation and Pool Figures.”

Updates

Garage Facility Needs Assessment: Administrator Owen will contact Beth Aldermen about reconnecting on this issue as well as reviewing the alternate sites for suitability before the next meeting.

Update on Library Board offer to Purchase Property: The Library Board has made an offer to purchase land from the Swiss Center of North America.

Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: The next meeting will be on Thursday January 13th at 6:00 p.m. at Town Hall. Agenda items to include; Consideration of Change of Committee Chair, Village Response on Library Funding; Town Response on Parks, Recreation and Pool Funding, Updated Boundary Agreement Map, Garage Facility Study Update, Feedback on Alternate Garage Sites, Establish List of Remaining Negotiation Items, Status Updates on Items 5, 7 and 8 from Town’s May 13th Letter, Discussion on News Release, Discussion on Proposed Language on Commercial/Industrial Development.

Adjournment: Motion by Jim Salter to adjourn, second by Gof Thomson. Motion carried. Time: 7:58 p.m.

Nicholas W. Owen, Village
Administrator

MINUTES

11/11/2010
Joint Negotiation Meeting
Town of New Glarus Office – 1101 Hwy 69, New Glarus @ 6:00 pm

- ATTENDING:** Town Board Members: Keith Seward, Gof Thomson, and Town Deputy Clerk John Wright
Village Board Members: Jim Salter, Kevin Budsberg, Dan Gartzke and Village Administrator Nic Owen
- NOT ATTENDING:** Bob Elkins (Town)
- ALSO ATTENDING:** Suzi Janowiak, Peg Kruse, Darrel Weber (arrived 6:21), and Denise Anton Wright (arrived at 7:09 PM)
- CALL TO ORDER:** K. Seward called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.
- Proof of Posting:** Proper proof of notice was duly noted by the Chair and Town Deputy Clerk.
- Announcement:** K. Seward reminded all present that cell phones should be set to silent operation for the duration of the meeting.
- Motion:** Approval of Agenda – Motion by J. Salter, 2nd by K. Budsberg to approve the agenda as presented; motion carried.
- Motion:** Approval of Minutes of 10/14/2010 – Motion by K. Budsberg, 2nd by D. Gartzke to approve the minutes of 10/14/2010; K. Seward recommended the following changes: the second sentence of the first paragraph below the heading Town Feedback on Proposed Boundary Agreement and Map should read “*The Town agrees not to object to the annexations cleaning up the roadway on STH 69 and CTY W ...*” and to strike the word *be* in the second sentence below the heading Report on Garage Facility Needs Assessment; the minutes of 10/14/2010 were approved as amended.
- Discussion:** Village Feedback on Proposed Cooperative Boundary Agreement Map. N. Owen commented that the Village Negotiation members discussed the map given them by K. Seward but did not modify the boundaries Seward proposed (the map was color-coded areas drawn atop Map 5 from the Extraterritorial Plan—see attached). J. Salter did not recall that the Village members proposed any changes from what Seward had recommended. Salter stated that the family’s wishes to refuse annexation consideration for property north of the Industrial Park would be respected as would those of Town residents on Kristy Lane.
- J. Salter noted that those residents on Durst Road would be surrounded by the Village eventually; K. Seward disagreed that this section of the Town was an island surrounded by the Village as the land across the road was within the Town as well. Seward asked the Village representatives in attendance if they were comfortable with those areas the Town members marked as areas the Town would not object to annexation marked in blue (see attached map) as presented at the October 14, 2010 meeting. Deputy Clerk Wright asked whether Peter and Isabelle Herdeg’s existing billboards in the

location adjacent to the new brewery would be in violation of Village sign ordinances if that property were to be annexed into the Village; N. Owen noted that nothing should change as the property is already under the Village's Extraterritorial Zoning (ETZ) Ordinance rules. Owen noted that the Herdeg's would not be able to perform a major repair or replace the existing billboards under the current ETZ guidelines.

Discussion:

Village Feedback on Proposed Cooperative Boundary Agreement Items. The members present reviewed K. Budsberg's proposed amendment to item #4 of the Discussion Points to Proposal of Town of New Glarus on Cooperative Boundary Agreement. K. Seward asked about those properties described as "straddling" the Village-Town boundary. K. Budsberg pointed those areas out to the Town members that are south of the Valle Tell development off of Elmer Road, which includes properties within the Town and Village. J. Salter stated that the Village Negotiation members looked at a map to target areas that would be well-suited for an industrial park outside of the existing one; qualities included land that is relatively level and outside of a floodplain.

J. Salter stated that the area identified above could be developed jointly and possibly be included in a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District or Tax Increment Development (TID) District; however, in order to qualify for a TIF or TID the land belonging to the Town may have to be annexed. J. Salter thought there was a possibility for these types of jointly developed properties (possibly including Backtown) to be considered for revenue sharing with the Town. J. Salter noted that there were already adequate areas within the Village available for residential development; the Village was seeking additional development for business in these locations. G. Thomson noted that J. Salter used the phrase *work cooperatively* and asked K. Budsberg if this was synonymous with his phrase *joint participation*; Budsberg agreed the two were interchangeable. J. Salter thought that whichever phrase was chosen the concept to be conveyed was for both municipalities to work together to attract business to the area for mutual benefit.

K. Seward envisioned a group that could be funded jointly to actively seek to attract a proper balance of commercial and industrial development. D. Gartzke thought the Village had more available tools (legislative and legal) to promote commercial and industrial development than the Town. Gartzke asked if the Town would agree to annexation for the purpose of taking advantage of those tools for properties currently within the Town. K. Seward clarified that the Town members of the Negotiation Committee thought that development should be considered *especially* in the areas discussed, not *only* in these areas as had been interpreted by the Village members. Seward suggested the Village do additional work to refine the language and the concepts for the Town to consider. Seward noted that the current industrial park would be difficult to expand beyond its current boundaries.

J. Salter restated that these properties that may be developed jointly would be the Village's possession in name only and that the Village and Town could both benefit from its development. K.

Seward asked G. Thomson was comfortable with the proposed concept; Thomson voiced no objection. G. Thomson recommended the phrase *work cooperatively* instead of *joint participation* as proposed by K. Budsberg; without objection.

J. Salter was uncertain where it was appropriate to discuss shared costs; there were no objections to discuss this topic at this point within the agenda. Salter reported that N. Owen was asked to prepare a spreadsheet on shared costs for the Village pool and park. N. Owen stated that the figures included in the document associated with the Town are actually the total figures for all non-Village residents. D. Gartzke cited the pool use figure as an example, noting the Village estimated costs of \$35,586 (minus revenues received) for 2010 as fairly accurate; however the estimated cost associated with the Town of \$26,959 included other municipalities as well. K. Seward asked if the operation expense for the new pool house would change these figures significantly in 2011; N. Owen thought they would remain fairly constant. G. Thomson asked if heating the pool water was an expense that has been calculated separately from the general costs of operations; Owen replied that the two are combined although he did not have that cost with him this evening.

K. Seward noted that recreation participation was greater for non-Village residents than those in the Village; recreation includes Little League, softball, baseball, and volleyball, but not soccer which is not a Village-run activity. It was noted that estimated parks use was based upon recreation programming enrollment figures and may be inaccurate; however, there would be no easy way to arrive at such a figure. J. Salter thought the available non-Village resident data for the recreation program and season pool passes could be reviewed again to derive more accurate figures specific to Town usage and the associated costs to the Village. K. Seward stated sampling might be an effective way of getting a more accurate estimate with a limited investment of time.

K. Seward asked about the differences between parks expenses and parks use fee. Owen replied that a parks use fee is for the paid use of the park and is not added into the total cost; it is income. G. Thomson asked why the figures spiked in 2009 and 2010 for pool operating costs when revenue remained nearly equal. N. Owen was uncertain what accounted for that difference. J. Salter asked if the operating capital for 2009 of \$8,890 was somehow included in 2010 which is listed as \$0. J. Salter noted that in 2009 the pool heater was broken for a third of the season so there was no cost for heating for one month.

K. Seward asked what the Village's intent is for presenting these figures. K. Seward stated that philosophically from the Town's perspective the most difficult item to deal with is taxes versus user fee for the Town residential use of the Village pool. J. Salter stated that maintenance is critical to the use of the parks; if this was not done regularly the usage of Village parks would decline. N. Owen thought mowing and spraying for weeds was the largest maintenance cost. It was noted that both Town and Village residents pay user fees; however, non-Village residents pay a

higher fee. G. Thomson asked whether user fees should cover the entire cost or whether subsidization should continue. J. Salter replied that passing on the actual costs directly would likely price the Village out of the market; residents may go to Belleville or Monticello as a result.

Updates:

Priority 1 Alternate Garage Site. Seward reported that he spoke to the party in question and they are currently uninterested for a variety of reasons. There is currently a neighbor who rents the land and pays the owner. The family would like to keep the land together and there are health-related issues involved in their decision. K. Seward stated that the people in question are community-minded and would consider the propositions if no other options are possible. J. Salter volunteered to talk with the owner of the Priority 1 (b) property; K. Seward agreed to accompany Salter without objection.

Garage Facility Needs Assessment. K. Seward stated that Scott Jelle of the Village Public Works had done much of the work for the needs assessment study according to Beth Alderman, member of the Village Planning and Community Development Authority committees. N. Owen agreed to set up another meeting and will see whether it should be limited to Town Patrolman Nielson and Village Public Works Supervisor Jelle.

Discussion:

Communication Plan for Projects. The Village representatives agreed that it would be premature to submit a press release for publication. According to K. Budsberg the Village Board has been given a detailed accounting of the process of discussions that have taken place at the Joint Negotiation Committee meetings. J. Salter proposed an internal document of those discussions and the status of agreements which can be shared with the public if they receive any inquiries. It was noted that the minutes of these meetings are also a public record that are readily available. K. Budsberg noted that each municipality is refining what they are seeking from a Cooperative Boundary Agreement CBA so that their counterpart is better able to decide if or how each goal will be reached. K. Seward noted that according to the Department of Administration that Public Hearings are required and that a party could call for a referendum on Cooperative Boundary Agreements. J. Salter welcomes the public's input whether they agree or disagree because good ideas may come out of that interaction. K. Seward volunteered to put together a summary of what has been accomplished to date which will be reviewed by the group before being submitted for publication; without objection.

Update:

Alternate Library Site with Status of Floodplain Issue. K. Seward asked Library Board member Suzi Janowiak if she was able to provide an update. Ms. Janowiak reported that the Board located a site within the Village that is available for sale for an amount within the Board's budget. G. Thomson asked if the Library Board had the authority to make an offer on the property in question. It was noted that the Library Board is seeking Village Board approval on December 7, 2010. Library Director Denise Anton Wright stated there is a Special Library Board meeting tomorrow with the realtor

to determine the amount and terms of an offer. K. Budsberg asked if there were other contingencies. Ms. Janowiak replied that the Library Board is seeking an access to the north of the seller's property. N. Owen stated that he put two floodplain proposals on hold for the Old Town Hall property pending the outcome of the Library Board's offer. The Board overseeing the property for sale will meet Friday, November 19, 2010. Director Wright agreed to give an update to the Joint Negotiation Committee at their next meeting.

The next meeting date was scheduled for Thursday, December 9, 2010 at 6:00 PM at the Village Hall Boardroom.

Agenda items will include the following: Communication Status Draft Presented by Keith Seward, Update on Garage Facility Needs Assessment, Refined analysis of Recreation and Pool Figures; Jim Salter Report on Public Works Facility Alternate Site 1 (b) or 2 if 1 (b) is Not Viable; Town Response to the Map Language Proposed by the Village; Town Response to the Expense Sheet from the Village; and Update on Library Board Offer to Purchase Property.

7:13 PM - K. Seward moved to adjourn, 2nd G. Thomson; motion carried.

Adjourn

Revised 101115

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Thursday October 14, 2010**

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Keith Seward. Town representatives present: Bob Elkins, Keith Seward and Gof Thomson (6:30). Village representatives present: Jim Salter, Dan Gartzke and Kevin Budsberg. Also in attendance: Village Administrator Nicholas Owen

Announcement: All cell phones are to remain silent during the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Dan Gartzke to approve the agenda, second by Jim Salter. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 9/9/10 Meeting: Motion by Kevin Budsberg to approve the minutes of 9/9/10, second by Jim Salter. Motion carried.

Town Feedback on Proposed Boundary Agreement and Map: The Town Representatives presented a revised map indicating boundaries for future annexations. The Town agrees *not to object* to the annexations cleaning up the roadway on STH 69 and CTY W and the two houses on 2nd Street if the home owners petition for annexation. The Town Representatives disagree with allowing annexations for the homes along Durst Valley Rd and the Streiff Farm on STH 69. They spoke to the owners in both areas and they were against allowing annexation. Village members asked if they were aware we were not pursuing annexation in these areas but would accept them if they petition. Keith Seward indicated they were made aware of this. The Town also objects to the potential loss of tax base in these areas.

The Committee discussed the Village's desire to have properties that were extended utilities without annexation being required to annex at the end of the term of the agreement and the

possible legal difficulties. The Village representatives will review the Town's proposal and provide a response for the next meeting.

Feedback on Priority 1 Alternate Garage Site: Jim Salter and Keith Seward met with the landowners. The landowners understood the proposal and needed to discuss with their family before providing an answer.

Report on Garage Facility Needs Assessment: Village and Town representatives met with Beth Alderman and reviewed space needs numbers and goals for the potential shared facilities. Alderman will put the ideas together and report back.

Discussion on Communication Plan for Projects: Keith Seward discussed vehicles for communicating this committee work to the citizens and when it is appropriate to prepare a joint news release. Consensus of the Committee was that it is too early to put something together. The committees discussed having a more detailed discussion of progress with their respective Boards before the next meeting.

Discussion of Village Board/Library Board deliberations and issues pending: Keith Seward reported that Gof Thomson, Bob Elkins, Nicholas Owen and himself attended this week's library board meeting for discussion on the Old Town Hall Site. The library board is getting a bid to conduct a floodplain study for the area and seeking interest in selling from the owner of the duplex adjacent to the Town Garage. Consensus of the committee is that there is progress but more details and difficult decision are still needed.

Discussion on Definition of "Shared Revenue": The committee reviewed the Town's response to the Village's answers on the original 8 boundary agreement items from the Town's May, 7 2010 letter.

1. The Village and Town agree on the term at 20 years.
- 2 – 3. There is disagreement on the areas for future annexation as detailed in earlier discussion.
4. The Town agrees to the areas for cooperation on commercial/industrial development with the addition of the Village's "Backtown" area but without the Streiff farm. Kevin Budsberg questioned whether this item should read "should include Blue areas" or "should be limited to Blue areas." Keith Seward indicated he could see reopening of the boundary areas if the right project came along. Budsberg expressed some concern with this approach and wants to make sure everyone is on the same page. Budsberg will look at some alternate language for the next meeting.
5. The Town is open to the consideration of allowing public utilities extension to the first lot but feel zoning ordinance changes would be needed.
6. The Village and Town are in agreement to the rezoning of properties as R-N.
7. The Town agrees to the change of language to "Current Village Standards" but also acknowledge that including curb, gutter and storm sewer will require cooperation on the engineering of the storm sewer.
8. The Town is proposing a shared revenue system where a base shared revenue amount is determined, for simplification called the Total Revenue Sharing (TRS) based on an agreed percentage share of the towns benefit from Village Services. The TRS would change each year based on the Town's share of the expenses. Along with the TRS, the Town would agree

to an incremental payment based on new development, as long as the TRS was reduced by the amount of the incremental payment. For example if the original TRS was \$10,000 and an incremental amount of \$1,000 was added, the TRS would reduce to \$9,000. The Village will review this and the other proposals for the next meeting.

Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: The next meeting is set for Thursday November 11th at 6:00 p.m. at Town Hall. Keith Seward and Administrator Owen will put together the agenda.

Adjournment: Motion by Jim Salter to adjourn, second Kevin Budsberg. Motion carried. Time: 7:57 p.m.

Nicholas W. Owen, Village
Administrator

Amended 11/11/10

MINUTES
09/09/2010
Joint Negotiation Meeting
Village Hall Boardroom – 319 2nd Street, New Glarus @ 6:00 pm

- ATTENDING: Town Board Members: Keith Seward, Robert Elkins, and Pattie Salter
Village Board Members: Jim Salter, and Kevin Budsberg
- ALSO ATTENDING: Nic Owen (Village of New Glarus Administrator)
- CALL TO ORDER: K. Seward at 6:05 PM – Swiss Miss Center.
- Proof of Posting: Proper proof of notice was duly noted.
- Announcement: K. Seward reminded all present that all cell phones shall remain silent for the duration of the meeting.
- Motion: Approval of Agenda – Motion by K. Budsberg, seconded by J. Salter to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.
- Motion: Approval of Minutes of 8/5/10 – Motion by R. Elkins, seconded by J. Salter to approve the minutes of 8/5/10. K. Seward had a question regarding the discussion on joint library. K. Budsberg had made a statement about inheriting a 20 year old infrastructure, what was meant by the statement? K. Budsberg explained that he had wondered if a shorter cooperative boundary agreement might be more practical when addressing the age of the building infrastructure, commercial development and the housing market. K. Seward abstained from vote. Motion carried.
- Discussion: Review Proposed Boundary Agreement Map: N. Owen presented the committee with a markup of map 5 outlining the Villages' suggested annexable areas. J. Salter explained that the Village met and discussed the proposed boundary agreement map provided by the Town (the map with blue sections and dated May 13, 2010) from that map they marked up map 5 with their suggestions.

In addition, J. Salter went through the 8 discussion points of the Cooperative agreement

1. Term of CBA to be 20 years or more
J. Salter explained that the village had discussed a shorter agreement period of 10 years and came to the conclusion that the term of the cooperative boundary agreement should be 20 years with a provision to allow for jointly agreed upon changes.

2. Limit annexation areas (see map1, “black Line”) The Village agrees there will be no annexation of areas located with the Town “outside” of black line.
N. Owen referred to Map 5 and identified additional highlighted areas outside the black line. J. Salter explained that the Village did not feel they needed to annex all the areas identified but considered if there were areas that made sense such as properties that currently have inconsistent boundaries from prior annexations or had water and sewer running to them or had commercial development potential. The properties included The Landmark’s and K. Streiff Farm (Industrial Zone), two small areas off of W that clean up annexation lines, the area between the Village and the Neuchatel subdivision including Kristy Lane, and a portion of Durst Road, a small section off 2nd Street, a portion of the Herdeg properties (Potential Nature Orientated business), and a section off Elmer Road that would square off a previous annexation. R. Elkins noted that there is an open area near the Schwoerer farm that was not included. N. Owen explained that the committee did not see an immediate need to provide services to that area.

R. Elkins noted that it appeared that his property was included in the highlighted area off W. N. Owen explained that the map was small and did not actually include his property. The proposed annexation area was the area that cleaned up the previous annexations to the center of the road.

3. Areas where Town agrees not to object to annexation – see map 1, “Blue Area”
The “Blue Area” should be expanded to include the additional areas noted in item 2.

4. Both Parties agree to joint participation in Industrial and Commercial development efforts with all lands within area identified in item 3, “Blue Area.”

a. J. Salter reported that the Village felt that there should be additional areas identified, in particular those associated with the potential for “back town” development, and especially for highway access to the area north along 69.

b. They also believe this should be extended to any area contiguous to the Village where commercial development is desired.

K. Seward began by saying that he would defer formalized comment until after the Town Board had reviewed this information, but had a couple personal observations. He noted that the Kent Streiff property was a sensitive issue at an earlier discussion at the Town board

level. He was not sure how the board would respond to this issue. J. Salter explained that the Village was only offering the option if the landowner wishes to annex. The Village was not interested in forcing annexation.

K. Seward noted that if sewer and water were extended to Durst Valley Road would be contingent on development of that area. How that gets treated is an area for discussion.

J. Salter asked if there were several properties, like on Durst Road, and someone developed out past them and ran water and sewer out to the development, could a resident in between ask to be connected to sewer and water? N. Owen explained that the current Village ordinance does not currently extend services past Village Limits but it also says that at the time it is available the Village can require a resident to connect.

K. Seward noted that one of the elements of the Intergovernmental Agreement as it relates to the utility extensions on Durst Road would require development outside Village Limits. K. Seward explained that the Village and Town had already violated the Village's Ordinance within the Intergovernmental Agreements as it related to Neuchatel. The extension of services to accommodate Neuchatel down Durst Road would allow the residents along Durst Road the option to connect to Village services without recapture. That the developer would be responsible to run the connections to the front property lines and it was negotiated that the property owner would not be responsible for the recapture fees.

K. Budsberg asked if the issue of extending services past the Village boundary and connecting to a property outside the Village without recapture, would they need to change their ordinance if the boundary agreement went through. The answer is yes, that both the Town and Village's ordinances would likely be changed to address the language.

5. The Village agrees to allow extension of electric, sewer and water utilities into areas within currently identified future village neighborhoods as defined in the Village extraterritorial Plan, Map 5, dated Oct. 6, 2005, upon development of a fifth or more residential unit per the ETZ ordinance. Utility extensions are to be paid for by developers. Utility collections for utility service to be paid directly by users to the Utility or to sanitary districts as legally organized.
 - a. J. Salter noted that the Village wished to clarify that for consistency, the map dated September 15, 2008 would be used for future discussions.
 - b. The Village does not think the development within the Village extraterritorial plan should be limited to the fifth or more residential unit. They would like to offer Village services within the designated areas from the first residential unit. K. Seward clarified that this offer would be open to non-annexed properties as long as they were in this area.

R. Elkins asked if the Village was considering commercial or residential. He noted that a commercial developer would be more likely to want to do it. K. Budsberg noted this section had to do with residential and thought the wording for commercial would be better stated under item 4b "The Village also believes this should be extended to any area contiguous to the Village where commercial development is desired."

R. Elkins wanted to know if "contiguous" should be in there. The committee felt in the case of commercial it should be contiguous.

6. The Village agrees to not object to re-zoning requests to zone R-N (as required per ETZ ordinance) by developers when requested per item 5, above.

The Village agreed to this.

7. Town agrees to revise its ordinances to require developments located in the Town and adjacent to current Village boundaries, and adjacent to the "Black line" of map1, to install streets, curb and gutter, street lights, storm sewers, sanitary sewers, electric, gas and cable utilities, sidewalks and driveways in all developments of five or more residential dwelling units in accordance with Village standards.
 - a. The Village clarified that this should be to the then "current Village standards" if the Village changed its requirements, the Town would also revise its ordinances.
 - b. The list should be expanded to cover all similar such requirements such as water supply which should be included in item 7 but was not listed. The list should be clear it covers any future similar service super structure. This should be for all developments not just the fifth residential unit.

K. Seward stated that the Town would have to consider this item.

8. The town agrees to share with the Village a portion of the incremental tax collected from additional developments located per item 7. Such split shall be based upon a number agreed upon by the parties which represents a percentage of a calculation determining the yearly contribution of the incremental addition by the developments to the town's property tax collection. This contribution to the village shall be considered an offset to the Villages' maintenance of effort contribution to the New Glarus Library.

- a. The Village proposed scratching item 8 and prefers to set up a pilot to cover a shared revenues/service agreement since the Village cannot decrease their maintenance of effort to the library. J. Salter read from a statement "The Village supports the idea of sharing revenues from additional development but thinks this is the wrong approach. The Village would prefer to set up a pilot formula that is tied to the Village Budgets for programs and structures of most direct benefit to Town Residents such as parks and rec program and library and perhaps a sinking fund to handle repairs to infrastructure the Village inherits at the end of the term of the agreement." The agreement would then be set up based on use of the shared services such as the pool, the library, parks, the rec program, and the library. N. Owen came up with a formula for the New Glarus Home and would recommend a similar approach for the Town. It

would be based on real costs for using the services. The number would be calculated each year and tied to the number of residents.

J. Salter stated that the Village is trying to get away from the language that restricts dollars being tied solely to the library and try to bundle it more as shared services.

b. The Village further proposed that the Town and Village shall establish an on-going joint committee to review operation of this agreement for amendments, if any, on an as needed basis but no less than once every two years.

Discussion: Report on Garage Facility Needs Assessment – N. Owen explained that Beth Aldermen will do facilities needs assessment. She would like to meet on-site with the town representative, patrolman and the county.

Without objection, J. Salter and K. Seward will proceed with discussions with the parties on priority one.

Update on Library Needs Assessment:

K. Seward reported that we received budget estimates from the library board for operating an expanded library. The library board estimated a need for 14,000 -16,000 sq feet with a proposed operations cost of \$340,000 the current operating budget is \$240,000. The Library Board did not address capital requirements. K. Seward put together a few cost estimates based on the following assumptions:

Annual Operating Cost of \$340,000
Capital Cost of \$3,000,000
Old Town Hall Square Feet of 15,000
Interest Rate of 5.00%
Term of 20 years

The scenarios used were:

Option I – Borrow \$3,000,000
Annual Operating Cost \$340,000
Annual Principal and Interest \$230,000
Current Library Budget \$245,000
Maintenance and Effort would have to grow by \$325,000/yr.

Option II – Assume Gifting of \$1,000,000 and Borrowing \$2,000,000
Annual Operating Cost \$340,000
Annual Principal and Interest \$152,000
Current Library Budget \$245,000
Maintenance and Effort would have to grow by \$247,000/yr.

Option III – Assume Capital Borrowing is Reduced to \$1,000,000 via Reduced Sq. Ft, Increased Gifting or other Revenues
Annual Operating Cost \$340,000
Annual Principal and Interest \$76,000
Current Library Budget \$245,000
Maintenance and Effort would have to grow by \$171,000

K. Budsberg noted that G. Thomson also requested a space analysis be done since the one that was done is 10 years old.

K. Seward noted that the Cross Plains Library's budget was similar to ours but their space was significantly larger than what we've planned. He asked the committee members for feedback on their visit to the Cross Plains Library.

J. Salter felt that the Cross Plains library was huge. He noted that there were rooms that seemed oversized. He liked the way they partnered with other agencies like the Historical Society. They have a senior center that had a small kitchen and large meeting area that could be divided. This could be an area of revenue. Their use of green materials was good which kept their operation costs low. He liked the focus group work that was done to provide for smaller groups to have meeting space. They had two meeting rooms and a staff lounge. They spent a lot of time fundraising through major corporate donors. They had etched glass plaques recognizing their major donors that donated \$30,000 or more plus smaller plaques recognizing family donations. They had people sponsor individual book collections where the shelves had the names of those who sponsored the collection.

K. Budsberg noted that the energy efficiency development really helped in the overall operational costs. Their energy costs were about half of what would be expected for a conventional building of the same size.

K. Seward asked if the committee felt that they overbuilt the site. K. Budsberg felt the only areas that could be downsized were the staff bathrooms and the kitchen area. He felt that individual rooms were a good idea for the different groups that would be using them.

J. Salter noted that when coming up with the conceptual drawings to keep it conservative. He also noted that the Cross Plains library has limited parking and it is not a crucial issue. The Village allowed them to put angled parking in on the street adjacent to the library.

Discussion on Communication Plan for Projects:

N. Owen explained that G. Thomson had brought this up to get a unified approach to raising awareness of the pre-planning for the garage, library and similar projects.

Set Next Meeting Date October 14th at 6:00 at the Village Hall and Agenda Items:

Feedback on 8 points

Feedback from priority one site

Garage needs update

Update on communication plan

8:05 K. Seward moved to adjourn, J. Salter 2nd. Motion Carried.

Adjourn

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Thursday August 5, 2010**

Meeting was called to order at 6:08 p.m. by Acting Chair Jim Salter. Town representatives present: Bob Elkins and Gof Thomson (at 6:40 p.m.). Absent: Keith Seward; Village representatives present: Jim Salter, Dan Gartzke and Kevin Budsberg. Also in attendance: Faun Phillipson, Jane Martinson, Becky Weiss, Wayne Duerst and Suzi Janowiak (Library Board), Library Director Denise Anton Wright, Village Trustees Peg Kruse and Darrel Weber and Village Administrator Nicholas Owen

Announcement: All cell phones are to remain silent during the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Dan Gartzke to approve the agenda, second by Kevin Budsberg. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 7/7/10 Meeting: Motion by Kevin Budsberg to approve the minutes of 7/7/10, with the correction of Southwest Regional Library to South-central, second by Dan Gartzke. Motion carried.

Announcement of Closed Session: Acting Chair Salter announced that the committee will Convene into Closed Session called under State Stat. 19.85(1)(e) for the purpose of deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties, the investing of public funds or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive bargaining reasons require closed sessions: [Joint Public Works Facility Site]

Discussion on Joint Library: Jim Salter reported that the Village Board and Library Board met on Tuesday and discussed the pros and cons of creating a joint library system. Library Director Denise Anton Wright provided a list of some of the joint libraries in the state for review. Major concerns with the Joint library system center on funding and the relationships of the municipal boards. Kevin Budsberg questioned if a 10 year agreement would be more practical to ensure accurate funding for the library and for the Boundary agreement the Village would not inherit 20 year old infrastructure. The Committee discussed the possibility of amending a 20 year agreement to fit the changing needs of the municipalities or if we do a 10 year agreement would there be an option of renewing for an additional 10 years with minor amendments. Administrator Owen will contact the DOA to see if amendments would have the same waiting period as adopting the plan. The committee discussed differences between one Board opting out of a shared revenue agreement versus a joint library agreement and what would happen at the end of a shared revenue agreement if one Board opted out of the funding. A shared service agreement would likely need both Boards to agree to ending participation and with the joint library each Board would make their own decisions on continuing participation. At the end of the shared service agreement it is potential for one Board to not agree to a renewal. Faun Phillipson added that while one Board backing out of either agreement would be bad, ending a Joint library has potentially greater negative impact with the potential for being removed from the Regional Library System.

Discussion on Library Expansion: Two handouts were provided detailing projected capital and operation costs for a new library. The plans were based on the existing library budget, DPI Library standards and actual costs of recent library expansions. From the summaries provided the Village Board felt the Cross Plains Library was very comparable and staff is working on arranging a tour for the Village Board members and the Town Board members would also be welcome to attend if interested. The committee discussed the capital and operating costs listed and how those compared to our scenario. Gof Thomson stated that we need to consider all the costs community wide; possible school expansion, Village/Town Public Works Garage relocation, the new library, and come up with a plan that can be sold to the taxpayers. Faun

Phillipson added that she understands that the Village and Town Boards need to propose plans that they feel the citizens can support, but the Library Board's responsibility is to provide the best services for the library and they are willing to consider all options. The Committee requested the Library Board to have their current needs assessment reviewed, possibly by an outside source, to determine if it still accurate with the changing technology and look at cost estimates for the new library at the varying levels of service. The consensus of the committee was that this project is a high priority to the community and should proceed.

Review Proposed Boundary Agreement Map: The Village committee members have met and discussed this issue, Dan Gartzke will be preparing a summary for the next meeting.

Public Works Garage Estimates: The committee reviewed a summary of the Town Garage space needs. Gof Thomson suggested having an outside consultant review the space needs for all the garage sites. Administrator Owen will contact an individual to get details on cost and timeline.

Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: Next meeting is scheduled for September 9th at 6:00 p.m. at Town Hall. Agenda items will be Update on Boundary Agreement Map, Report on Garage Facility Needs Assessment, Update on Library Needs Assessment and Discussion on Communication Plan for Projects.

Convene into Closed Session: Motion by Dan Gartzke to convene into closed session, second by Kevin Budsberg. Roll Call Thomson – aye; Elkins – aye; Salter – aye; Budsberg – aye; Gartzke – aye. Motion carried.

The Board will Convene into Open Session: Motion by Dan Gartzke to convene into open session, second by Kevin Budsberg. Roll Call Thomson – aye; Elkins – aye; Salter – aye; Budsberg – aye; Gartzke – aye. Motion carried.

Results of Closed Session: Committee members prioritized potential sites and will contact property owners to determine interest in participation.

Adjournment: Motion by Kevin Budsberg to adjourn, second by Dan Gartzke. Motion carried. Time: 8.27 p.m.

Nicholas W. Owen, Village Administrator

MINUTES

07/07/2010

Joint Negotiation Meeting

Town Hall – Swiss Miss Center 1101 Hwy 69 New Glarus @ 6:00 pm

ATTENDING: Town Board Members: Keith Seward, Robert Elkins, and Pattie
Village Board Members: Jim Salter, and Kevin Budsberg

ALSO ATTENDING: Nic Owen (Village of New Glarus Administrator) and Wayne Duerst

CALL TO ORDER: K. Seward at 6:00 PM – Swiss Miss Center.

Proof of Posting: Proper proof of notice was duly noted.

Announcement: K. Seward reminded all present that all cell phones shall remain silent for the duration of the meeting.

Motion: Approval of Agenda – Motion by J. Salter, seconded by K. Budsberg to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

Motion: Approval of Minutes of 6/10/2010 – K. Seward handed out a redlined version of the minutes with suggested changes marked in red. Motion by K. Seward, seconded by K. Budsberg to approve the minutes of 6/10/2010 as amended.

Discussion: Proposed amendments had to do with the Village feedback paragraph and included:

1. Clarified that the area most likely for commercial development, was along highway 69 and South of the Brewery.
2. A comment was added that the committee discussed the extension of sewer and water did not impact Village taxpayers but is paid for by the developer and the rate payers.
3. A minor revision where the minutes reflect that the village would like to expand the Town's offer of sharing incremental revenue for the library ...
K. Seward is recommending to change that to the village would like to amend the Town's idea ...

K. Seward explained that the documents from the DOA detail a series of legal steps to follow in letting the public know that the Village and Town are in the process of developing a cooperative boundary plan. The first step is a letter to adjoining communities after a resolution by each of the bodies. Since this has not been done yet, K. Seward noted that he was not interested in getting too far into the negotiation until that step has been completed.

4. The other changes were minor revisions for clarification.

J. Salter stated that the amended minutes were true to discussions.

Motion Carried.

Discussion on Joint Library:

K. Seward reported that he met with Cheryl Becker with the Southwest Regional Library.

The purpose of the meeting was to try to understand how current library funding works. It is a complex process identified by State Statutes. K. Seward shared documents that outlined the steps needed to form a joint library with members present.

Seward explained that the current funding mechanism for libraries is two fold. Support from member municipalities who have libraries contribute via a number of financial vehicles, the most significant of which being maintenance of effort. The support from non-member communities, those without libraries, is based on a formula that relates to usage by the non-member municipalities. Libraries record the number of items checked out by each community including those outside Green County. Those numbers are used in a formula which the South Central Library calculates how the circulation is used. That number is compared to a

number that is calculated based upon the total dollars of all the library budgets in the county. There is a ratio calculated that shows what each community's portion is. The County is obliged to contribute 70% of that number. The County imposes a tax on each of the communities to collect that amount through their milrate. Last year through that milrate, the Town of New Glarus paid about \$54,000. That is not distributed to the library through equalized value but rather by the usage calculation.

Last year the New Glarus Library's budget was approximately \$250,000. The \$54,000 that the town of New Glarus paid was distributed through the County based on usage. If a joint library were developed, the Town of New Glarus would need to get an agreement from Green County to opt out and the Town of New Glarus would be required to pay at least as much as we paid in the previous year, in this case \$54,000. The method for distributing or for participation based upon a Joint Library's maintenance of effort would be a calculated number in the contracts.

K. Budsberg clarified that the joint library K. Seward refers to would be in the sense of continuing funding of the institution. K. Seward confirmed this.

K. Seward handed out documents that outline how to establish a joint library and issues associated with maintaining a joint library. Issues include: how should personnel be handled, under whose authority to avoid confusion; personnel compensation packages; how budget impasses would be resolved; how depreciation would be handled, etc.

Another set of documents that he received from Cheryl Becker had to do with funding the joint library. Copies were not available for those present so the Town Clerk-treasurer will send copies of the information via PDF to the Joint Negotiation members. One of the items Cheryl calculated was to assume that in 2010 the joint library became a reality. What would its impact be on the rest of the payers into the system? If New Glarus opted out of the system, the payers who did not have a library would have to make up the \$54,000.

Nic noted that Denise Anton Wright provided the Village with information on the joint library process. Nic will send us copies for our records.

K. Budsberg wanted to know why we are talking about a joint library. J. Salter explained that it is one of the major joint expenditures. K. Budsberg went on to explain that he looked at the Town's 8 point proposal and it specifies that for the library there was some type of incremental tax collected from development (.8) and some of that goes towards the Village's maintenance of effort. He recalled talking about a shared resource fund that might include parks, library and other items. He wasn't sure why we were discussing a formal joint library. K. Seward explained that in his opinion we were talking about two priority items, the boundary agreement, if negotiations are to continue the State Statutes require the public be notified through Town and Village resolutions, and the joint library was the 2nd issue. K. Seward noted that the two are closely related so it was agreed that they would be worked through concurrently but separately.

J. Salter noted that he thought the discussion was leaning more towards shared revenue rather than the whole joint library board. He thought they

were waiting to see what the library board had in mind. Finding out where the library wants to go, how big should the library be? Does the library board want a new library? If so, do they want to make it a joint library or do they want to have a different way to fund the existing library structure through shared revenue. K. Seward noted that he hadn't picked up on that variation. J. Salter thought we were talking about shared services being, parks, recreation, library a street component and garage through shared revenues. K. Seward explained that the document the town put together on the question of funding the library had to do with if there were, within the boundary agreement, an agreed upon process for the non-annexation of developments adjacent to the city where those developments would remain within the town there would be an increase in revenue akin to the TIF idea and those revenues might be shared with the Village, which could then offset the maintenance of effort concerns that the Village has. He felt that issue was different from the joint library question. He believes that the joint library question is who owns the library? Right now, the Village owns the library. If the joint library came together the funding mechanism would have to be worked out and agreed upon. He recognized that the village has concerns with how to get town participation in parks and other issues. How we go about doing that could be part of a boundary agreement or a shared revenue situation. This is an issue that needs to be addressed.

J. Salter stated that the Village is still hung up on how the library board feels about the library and what they want to do with it. He saw it leaning more toward a whole bundled approach of shared revenues tied to a boundary agreement. So basically as it develops a portion of that revenue would help offset the cost of the library and any other shared services that village provides to the town residents.

Wayne Duerst reported that when the library board first discussed a joint library they contacted all the joint libraries in the state and found that there were many problems connected with a joint library. The main issues were contracts and funding that was equitable to both parties. Wayne felt that the library board would not be in favor of a joint library. K. Seward explained that when talking with Cheryl she indicated that participation of the library board with the Town and the Village would be paramount. There are approximately 25 joint libraries in the State. In this document there are issues that echo Wayne's concerns. How do you structure it? How do you do the on-going financing? What's the term? Wayne's perception of the library board's position could be an early on decision that would have to be made. Similarly, the Town's participation would have to be blessed by the county. The library's decision on where they want to go on this is a critical and urgent decision. The Town Board would have to be convinced that it makes sense from a community participation aspect and the reality of what are the costs?

J. Salter reported that from his perspective having a joint library is not as appealing as a different funding arrangement or agreement because of the number of obstacles. He felt it may be simpler to go the shared services approach and tie it into a revenue sharing agreement in those areas that the Town doesn't want annexed. Shared Revenue formula would include the cost of the library, how much it's running right now plus how much more they would need from the Town. R. Elkins wanted clarification as to who would own the library, whatever the structure would be. J. Salter stated that would be a question for the library board

of where they want to go with it. They would need to decide if for example, the town was to construct the building and lease space to the library then the building would belong to the town and the library would still belong to the Village.

K. Seward wanted to know if the Library would be able to pay back the debt. J. Salter stated that the library would have to come up with the money now or over time.

Discussion on Library Expansion:

Meeting between the Village board and Library board is August 3.
Review next month.

Review of Village's Proposed Boundary Agreement Map:

Review next month

Review of Joint Garage Site Assessment:

K. Seward handed out a draft of the proposed future needs of the Town. Nic looked at what they have now and between the utility, public works and county their existing needs are:

7,500 sq ft utility
6,500 sq ft public works
3,200 sq ft County plus
3,600 sq ft salt storage (60 x 60 x 12' high)

4,200 sq ft Town's basic needs or
5,700 sq ft includes wish list does not include outside storage
22,900 sq ft - does not including outside storage.

Prioritization of Potential Joint Garage Sites:

After a brief discussion, Nic suggested that because of the nature of the sensitivity of this issue, the prioritization of property should be done in closed session. Without objection a closed session for this purpose will be added to next month's agenda.

Set Next Meeting Date August 5th at 6:00 at the Village Hall and Agenda Items:

Library expansion/Space and funding

Garage estimate

Boundary map

Closed session per §19.85 (e) deliberating or negotiating the purchasing of public properties

7:15 K. Seward moved to adjourn, K. Budsberg 2nd. Motion Carried.

Adjourn

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Thursday June 10, 2010**

Meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Chair Keith Seward. Town representatives present: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins and Gof Thomson; Village representatives present: Jim Salter and Kevin Budsberg. Absent: Dan Gartzke. Also in attendance: Village Administrator Nicholas Owen

Announcement: All cell phones are to remain silent during the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Kevin Budsberg to approve the agenda, second by Bob Elkins. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 5/13/10 Meeting: Motion by Kevin Budsberg to approve the minutes of 5/13/10, second by Jim Salter. Motion carried.

Village Feedback on Boundary Agreement Items from Town: Jim Salter stated that he was surprised that the Town's recommended boundary was almost identical to the current Village Limits. Salter thought the boundary agreements would be more of a parcel by parcel identification. The Village would like to see something more in line with Map 5 from the ETZ Code and Comprehensive plan that identifies areas for future Village neighborhoods and commercial/industrial growth. Salter added that these are not areas where the Village will aggressively pursue annexation but rather areas the Town would not contest annexations. Keith Seward replied that they felt the area most likely for future commercial development was *along the Hwy 69 corridor and south of the brewery*. Seward added that their main purpose is to maintain the ability to grow the Town tax base. *The committee discussed that the extension of sewer and water did not impact Village taxpayers but is paid for by the developer and the rate payers*. Gof Thomson said that in Stoughton and some other communities they prioritize developments to where Development B would not be allowed to start until Development A has reached a certain percentage of build out. The committee discussed how development in the Town impacts adds a burden to Village services such as police, library and parks and recreation. The village would like to *amend* the Town's *idea* of sharing incremental revenue for the library to a general revenue sharing agreement for the services impacted by Town development. Kevin Budsberg asked if the Town would be more comfortable with expanding the boundaries if the Village went to a prioritizing system for future developments. Keith Seward indicated he would *personally* be open to *discuss* the idea. For the next meeting the Committee would like the Village to identify specific areas for *possible* annexation on the maps (*add "blue areas"*) and *quantify* the revenue gap of Village services like the parks and recreation.

Discussion of Town's Potential Sites for Joint Garage: The Committee reviewed a list of potential sites and briefly discussed the pros and cons of each site. Consensus of the Committee was to do a needs assessment of the current Village, Town and County facilities for the next meeting, then we will work on paring down the list of potential sites.

Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: Next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday July 7th at 6:00 p.m. at Town Hall. Agenda items will be discussion on the Joint Library, Library Expansion, Review of needs assessment for joint garage site and prioritization of future site list and the Village's recommendation for the boundary agreement map.

Adjournment: Motion by Bob Elkins to adjourn, second by Kevin Budsberg at 8:07 p.m. Motion carried.

Nicholas W. Owen, Village
Administrator

JOINT VILLAGE/TOWN NEGOTIATION COMMITTEE MINUTES
THURSDAY MAY 13, 2010

Meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Chair Keith Seward. Town representatives present: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins and Gof Thomson. Village representatives present: Jim Salter, Kevin Budsberg and Dan Gartzke. Also Present: Faun Phillipson and Jane Martinson (Library Board), Darrel Weber and Peg Kruse (Village Board) Administrator Nicholas Owen.

Announcement: All cell phones shall remain silent for the duration of the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Bob Elkins, seconded by Jim Salter to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 4/29/10 Meeting: Motion by Jim Salter, seconded by Kevin Budsberg to approve the minutes of 4/29/10. Motion carried.

Report from Village on Financing of Public Library: Administrator Owen briefly reviewed a handout detailing the Library's current operating budget and some estimates for the proposed expansion. Gof Thomson expressed his frustration with the estimates and asked for a defensible proposal. Thomson feels the Village Board and Library board should sit down and develop realistic numbers for construction and operation that the public will support. The committee discussed the possibility of a joint library being established. The library representatives expressed that they would be open to a joint library setup. Consensus of the committee was to have the Village Board and Library work out a proposal for the library expansion and funding of the capital and operation costs and report back at the July meeting.

Presentation by Town of an Ideal Cooperative Boundary Agreement with the Village: Keith Seward provided a handout dated 5/13/10 detailing the town's requests for a boundary agreement. The Town requests that the agreement be for at least 20-years, detailed areas for Village annexation, no-annexation areas, a request for the extension Village utilities without annexation and increment sharing from new developments for library funding. Dan Gartzke asked if this agreement would allow for landowners outside the annexation zones to petition for annexation. It was clarified that generally these agreements do not allow for any annexations outside of the designated areas. Jim Salter added that he feels this is a good starting point, whether we agree on the details or not. Consensus of the committee was to have the Village review the list and provide input for the next meeting.

Discussion on Setting Priority Level for Determining a Library Site versus a Joint Library District Agreement: Keith Seward stated that he felt the joint library discussion and library site analysis should be separate; with this committee discussing the joint library and the Village Board and Library Board working on the library site. Seward added that he felt both items could be dealt with concurrently. The committee agreed to proceed working on the items separately and concurrently.

Discuss Whether to Set Time Limits for the Prioritized List of Discussion Items: Initially the committee agreed to set time limits for each individual item. Kevin Budsberg stated that he felt we need to make progress in a timely manner, in particular with the library site and old Town Hall renovation. Consensus of the committee was to set time limits for the boundary agreements and library issues in August.

Review and Discuss Sample Boundary Agreements: Consensus of the committee was it was premature to review the sample agreements until we know the items we want included in the agreement.

Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: The committee set the next meeting date for Thursday June 10th at 6:00 p.m. at Town Hall. The agenda item will be Village Feedback on Boundary Agreement Items from the Town. The committee also set the dates for the following two meetings as Wednesday July 7th and Tuesday August 10th. The committee discussed progress with alternate sites for the relocation of the Town and Village Public Works Facilities. Town members agreed to assist with determination of alternative sites.

Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by Dan Gartzke, seconded by Kevin Budsberg at 7:45 p.m. Motion carried.

Nicholas W. Owen, Village
Administrator

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Thursday, April 29, 2010
Town of New Glarus Office
6:00 PM**

Town representatives present: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins, and Gof Thomson (6:48).
Village representatives present: Jim Salter and Kevin Budsberg.

Not in attendance: Village representative Henry Janisch

Also in attendance: Nic Owen (Village of New Glarus Administrator), John Wright (Town of New Glarus Deputy Clerk-Plan Administrator), Dan Gartzke (Village of New Glarus candidate for appointment to Joint Negotiation Committee), Erich Schmidtke (Wisconsin Department of Administration), and Renee Powers (Wisconsin Department of Administration)

1. Chair Seward called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and confirmed proper proof of posting with the Deputy Clerk.
2. Announcement: All cell phones shall remain silent for the duration of the meeting.
3. Approval of Agenda: Motion by B. Elkins, seconded by J. Salter to approve the agenda. Motion carried.
4. Approval of Minutes of 3/24/10 Meeting: Motion by B. Elkins, seconded by K. Budsberg to approve the minutes of 3/24/10. Motion carried.

5. Discussion with Erich Schmidtke and Renee Powers of the Department of Administration: Keith Seward introduced those members in attendance including Dan Gartzke (who will be appointed by the Village as a citizen representative to this body at their next regular meeting) to the representatives from the Department of Administration (DOA). K. Seward gave a brief history of past attempts at negotiations and the present attempts which have led to a prioritized list of goals for the Negotiation Committee. One issue brought to the table by the Town is a Cooperative Boundary Agreement (CBA). Another issue important to both municipalities is the replacement of the existing Public Library which is currently owned by the Village who supports its operation by Maintenance of Effort; the balance of funding is through the redistribution of property taxes collected by Green County from municipalities who use this service. Village President Salter reviewed other issues on the list including the joint approach to some parks projects, an agreement regarding Legler Valley/14th Avenue, and commercial development.

It was noted that both communities have worked jointly to create a Joint Extraterritorial (ETZ) agreement resulting in adoption of a Village ordinance, a joint committee, and an area for Plat Review. Seward stated that Mark Roffers of Vandewalle & Associates helped the Village and the Town through the process of the joint zoning agreement. E. Schmidtke further noted that in 2007 the two municipalities also entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement for proposed development along Durst Road which is partly in both municipalities. The agreement is signed and in place although the development is currently on hold. Schmidtke stated that sometimes looking back on joint accomplishments is a good way for moving forward with future negotiations and agreements. Seward stated that B. Elkins, N. Owen, and Seward were part of the ETZ organization process and that N. Owen and Seward were part of the Intergovernmental agreement as well. Schmidtke asked whether the current Joint ETZ Committee is part of this discussion process. Seward replied that they were not as the issues don't overlap to a high degree. Seward noted that appointed citizen members tend to dominate the membership of the Village side of the ETZ Committee whereas elected Town Board members constitute the Town's representation on the ETZ body. It was noted that the CBA area and the ETZ review area will not be the same.

Chair Seward noted that Town member Gof Thomson and future Village member Dan Gartzke are attorneys and both should be able to lend a level of expertise to the process that the other members do not possess. K. Seward asked the two DOA representatives to assess where this body is relative to the entire process as well as what will be required to pass the CBA review by the DOA. He further asked what the next most important step in the process is. Seward was confident that this committee will be able to define the issues and was seeking recommendations for resources when the group needs assistance. Ms. Powers suggested a review of other sample CBAs and a review of how other communities have successfully completed the process and the pitfalls some encountered along the way.

J. Salter was uncertain what conditions the Town is hoping for the Village to agree to for a CBA. Salter stated that he knows one condition is the identification

of areas of the Town that will not be immediately considered for annexation and the duration of their exemption from consideration. Salter noted that in some cases there may be areas in the Town within a mile or mile-and-a-half where residents are willing to be annexed but are currently too far from Village services to be cost-effective. Salter asked the DOA representatives if those properties have to be considered immediately or if action by the Village can be deferred until annexation is more practicable to do. Ms. Powers replied that the Village can approve development in some areas without having to take immediate action to annex those properties in order to avoid the creation of islands of annexed developments surrounded by the Town. President Salter sees a benefit to the Town in this approach because the Town is able to retain its tax base for a longer period of time to support its main infrastructure of roads.

Schmidtke noted that some CBAs stipulate a timeline for areas of annexation whereas other communities do not allow the next phase to occur until specific conditions are met such as the sale or development of 80% of the lots in the prior phase. Schmidtke noted that an agreement can have both types of agreements based on time and development benchmarks. Ms. Powers stated that there can be a great degree of flexibility within agreements although too much flexibility can unnecessarily bog down the process; each agreement is unique to fit the needs of the parties involved. Ms. Powers confirmed that she and Mr. Schmidtke will provide concrete examples for use as reference and to familiarize this group with the language of these agreements.

Schmidtke recommended that this group choose who will facilitate their agreement. The DOA has a list of individuals available on their website, a paper copy of which was provided for tonight's meeting. Schmidtke noted that quite often these professionals are called upon when talks break down; however in this case he perceives that this group may only need outside assistance to craft the proper language for the agreement itself. President Salter noted that this group hopes to get as far in the process as they can before seeking outside, professional assistance. It was noted that given the current economy this is a perfect time to complete such an agreement. Schmidtke noted that sometimes the process encounters trouble when property owners' interest interferes with what the municipalities are trying to achieve. Schmidtke stated that the group should be mindful of the public's input. Seward noted that Public Hearings and a Resolution are inherent to the process ensuring public input. When asked about a referendum Schmidtke noted that it is not a requirement unless it is requested and if requested it is not binding. He was unaware of any previous precedents of municipalities opting for a referendum in the absence of a request to do so.

K. Seward stated that his understanding of the process is that once an agreement has been reached both municipalities must adopt the Agreement by the Resolution to complete the process. Schmidtke stated that the Resolution normally starts the process and suggested the group review the provided flowchart of the **Cooperative Boundary Plan Process**, noting the following:

- Resolutions can be passed at any point in the process
- State Statutes require notification of neighboring jurisdictions within a five mile radius of the affected area
- Class 3 notification is required

- Notification is required for the School District and County
- A minimum of 60 days is required between the plan formation period and the local plan review
- Municipalities must allow a minimum of 20 days to listen to citizen comments although those comments don't necessarily have to be included within a revision of the original proposal
- A referendum is only required in cases of dispute when 20% of electorate signs a petition to request that action
- The DOA can have their acceptance of a proposed CBA challenged by someone in the agreement area who does not agree with its passage
- Once an agreement is submitted to the DOA they have up to 90 days for review
- Agreements must be consistent with what is contained in each municipality's Comprehensive Plans and that the CBA should cite those passages in the Plans
- There are three actions the DOA can take after their review: pass, reject, or submit it back to the two bodies or the two bodies and those in the affected area to consider revisions or clarifications
- Drafts can be sent prior to the formal submission for review by the DOA for correction
- If a CBA is to be abandoned it requires both parties to agree; it cannot be undone unilaterally
- An agreement can be amended between the Public Hearing and Adoption to consider included or excluding certain properties

K. Seward stated that the Town and Village has been complying with Open Meeting Laws by posting public notice of meetings and keeping minutes of their discussions. K. Seward asked what local plan review means. K. Budsberg asked for clarification of the process; if there is no input at the Public Hearing or if the two municipalities choose to ignore the input that is given then is there any technical difference between the agreement prior to the Public Hearing and that post hearing if there are no changes. Mr. Schmidtke replied that the majority of draft agreements and final agreements are identical or nearly so. In response to a question from Seward regarding whether other municipalities seek more input than that required Ms. Powers stated that there is no limitation on the amount of outreach that the municipalities put forth to encourage interaction.

J. Salter asked about the need for justification within the CBA if it is intended to exceed 10 years in duration. Schmidtke replied that the boilerplate from other agreements can be used to justify an extension beyond that limitation. There was brief review of the amendments; see bulleted points above. K. Seward presented the DOA representatives a hypothetical situation of an owner of property within the Town adjacent to the Village whose property was not in the affected area for annexation consideration during the effective time period of the agreement; if they wanted to be annexed could they request that? Schmidtke replied that they could not as the agreement usurps the statutory rights of landowners; this is why it is important that they voice their concerns during the discussion process and the Public Hearing.

K. Seward asked if he was aware of CBAs that address the issue of sewer and water through the use of a Sanitary District. Schmidtke stated that normally he

sees the opposite; Village services are extended to Town properties that are not annexed. Seward was aware of that scenario but wondered how common the practice was of publicly owned utilities within annexed areas. Schmidtke estimated half of the agreements have Sanitary Districts. B. Elkins asked if an Agreement that includes a specific date for annexation then can it be amended or is it better for it not contain a time frame at all. Schmidtke replied that the date could be set far enough in the future that most current land owners would be gone by that time; however, a time frame can be amended. Schmidtke noted that an individual cannot request that change unless they convince both municipalities to agree to it. J. Salter asked if a future amendment requires the CBA to be resubmitted. Schmidtke replied that the process begins over again using the same flow chart; however, there are two routes for amendment: expedited and full. For those amendments that include a boundary change it must follow the entire process (i.e. full); however, changing minor details removes the Public Hearing from the process (i.e. expedited).

K. Seward noted that George Hall (now retired from the DOA) had suggested having attorney review of the draft agreement. Schmidtke noted that attorneys are geared to fight and write and that they should be encouraged to focus on writing what each side wants rather than finding faults. Nevertheless, Powers did suggest an attorney review the agreement because it is a binding contract; they should make certain that the municipality's interests are being met. J. Salter reviewed which sample CBAs should be reviewed by this group:

- #4 City of Dodgeville and Town of Dodgeville
- #6 City of Oconomowoc and Town of Summit
- #11 City of Mauston and Town of Lemonweir
- #21 Village of Paddock Lake and Town of Bristol

Schmidtke recommended #22 (City of Baraboo and Town of Greenfield) as well. Powers noted that the recent agreements (after #17) are available online on the DOA's website.

D. Gartzke asked if failing private wells and septic systems are an issue. K. Seward noted that the County would continue to be the authority for well and septic. Schmidtke reviewed the criteria listed on the **Cooperative Boundary Agreement Approval Checklist**. Schmidtke stated that there are two major criteria that the DOA looks for in those proposed CBAs that are submitted. The first is whether a layperson can easily understand the implications of the agreement and the language that is use. The second criterion looks at whether the agreement is consistent with each municipality's Comprehensive Plan. K. Seward asked what happens if some problems are encountered during the DOA's review. Schmidtke replied that the DOA begins their review early within the 90 day period so that problems potentially can be addressed and resolved before the end of the period. Another criterion for judging CBAs is whether the proposed boundaries are rational; the DOA wants to avoid islands or peninsulas. Schmidtke noted that the final criteria regarding an extension of the 10 year limit had already been discussed above.

B. Elkins asked if several issues are being addressed in a CBA is there a preference to send it piecemeal or as a package. Schmidtke stated that the

preference is to receive the whole so that the bargaining give and take can be seen between the two municipalities. Powers noted that not all details must be spelled out for a CBA; for instance the library can be described as it currently exists and future detail can be added separately as an amendment to the approved CBA. Schmidtke proposed another strategy whereby the CBA could be an umbrella agreement for which a separate joint library agreement is beneath in addition to the Intergovernmental Agreement referenced above. K. Seward felt such an umbrella structure would be more complex. Schmidtke disagreed and stated that the CBA can recognize previous joint agreements including those for the ETZ. By including reference to other agreements it suggests that they are still valid and are not superseded by the CBA. Schmidtke cited Racine Sewer Service Area Agreement as an agreement that addressed a joint library in addition to a whole host of other items. It was noted that most general agreements for library funding do not require DOA approval or review.

6. Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items: K. Seward thought the next step for the library issue is for the Library Board, the Village Board, and the Town Board to discuss the site defined at the Annual Town Meeting. President Salter thought a better starting point is discussion of a Joint Library District to fund all that would be required for use of that particular site. B. Elkins agreed with Salter's suggestion to discuss the funding issues first. J. Salter thought a discussion of site versus funding could be a possible agenda item for the next meeting. Another item to be included on the agenda is a discussion of model CBAs. Chair Seward recommended that the Town and Village each hold a caucus to discuss what they would like to achieve in a CBA to bring back to the next meeting as a report. President Salter thought a better approach would be for the Village representatives of this body to react to what the Town wants from the CBA. Chair Seward confirmed that B. Elkins and G. Thomson were available to meet as a subcommittee prior to the next Joint Negotiation meeting to work towards drafting the Town's preferences for a CBA.

Thomson expressed his opinion that financing is the key issue which impacts whether projects can be approached jointly or individually and that priorities need to be established. J. Salter noted that the first official meeting after this committee's inception was to prioritize the list of items most important to each and/or both municipality(ies). G. Thomson noted that those priorities were established in absence of detailed discussion and that as the talks become more detailed the order of priorities may well shift, potentially making the CBA the last item to be resolved. K. Seward agreed that this body is in the process of focusing on the details including the Village's request to get details regarding the Town's involvement in a proposed joint library and the Town's wish list for the CBA. Seward did not see a conflict between the discussion of these details and the order that was previously agreed upon. Thomson countered by saying one issue that is not being addressed is the level of interest from both municipalities in the development of Backtown. Seward stated that until the Village asks for the Town's opinion or participation it is a Village issue unless the site adjacent to the Old Town Hall is chosen for a library. Thomson noted that the existing Town garage would then need to be relocated if the previously mentioned library site is accepted. Seward agreed that acceptance of that site would force the garage relocation to be considered.

J. Salter restated his rationale for suggesting how the library is funded is more important than where it is sited; a joint library district should be formed first to work out funding details while in the current space before determining a site for a new building. Thomson thought the answer to whether to consider a joint library district or not should be based upon the maximization of available dollars. K. Seward stated that in order to agree to fund a joint library, the Town would first have to opt out of the obligation with the County, if they would allow that action. However, Seward observed that if the Town were to opt out of its obligation with the County, the cost to the Town for the library would increase and the cost to the Village would decrease. Seward sees the larger issue to be what this community wants its library to be in ten to fifteen years; if that vision is an increase in size then both municipalities should realize that the amount required would increase for both.

G. Thomson stated that revenue from the Backtown development could make the increase in funding for the library less painful. G. Thomson wondered if figures for considering capital projects such as a joint library or joint garage should be discussed to find out what is possible. The group briefly reviewed the agenda items being considered and requested whether there were more to be considered. K. Budsberg stated that a review of the ETZ development summary while working towards a CBA would be worthwhile and a discussion to consider time limits for the discussion items. B. Elkins asked if K. Seward was requesting for the Village to report on the current funding, on joint funding, or on future funding. Chair Seward's reply was that he was looking specifically for the Village to report on how they would independently finance a new library in a growth scenario (i.e. the new structure would exceed the current 2,000 ft² and the contributions from other municipalities including the Town would be by way of the existing redistribution of funds collected by Green County based upon assessed value). Seward realized that the figures for construction and operations would realistically be projected for a maximum of three years. Chair Seward also noted that financing issues would be the Library Board's responsibility and will depend in part upon amounts of bequests and fund raising. There was brief discussion of the existing TIF District 2.

The next meeting location is in the Village Hall Board Room on Thursday, May 13, 2010 at 6:00 PM. Agenda items will include: Discussion to Set the Priority Level for Determining a Library Site versus a Joint Library Agreement; Review and Discuss Sample Boundary Agreements; Discuss Whether to Set Time Limits for the Prioritized List of Discussion Items; Presentation by Town of an Ideal Cooperative Boundary Agreement with the Village; Discussion of Extraterritorial Zone Development Process/History; and Report from the Village on Financing a New Public Library.

7. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by B. Elkins, 2nd by J. Salter at 8:07 PM. Motion carried.

revised 100507

**Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Wednesday, March 24, 2010
Town of New Glarus Office**

6:00 PM

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by Chair Keith Seward. Town representatives present: Keith Seward; Village representatives present: Jim Salter, Kevin Budsberg, and Henry Janisch

Not in attendance: Town representatives Bob Elkins and Gof Thosmson

Also in attendance: Nic Owen (Village of New Glarus Administrator), Jim McGuire, Denise Anton Wright (NGPL Director), John Wright (Town of New Glarus Deputy Clerk-Plan Administrator), and Library Board members: Barb Anderson, Jane Martenson, Wayne Duerst, Darrel Weber, Susie Janowiak, Linda Hiland, and Fawn Phillipson

8. Chair Seward called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and confirmed proper proof of posting with the Deputy Clerk.
9. Announcement: All cell phones shall remain silent for the duration of the meeting.
10. Approval of Agenda: Motion by J. Salter, seconded by H. Janisch to approve the agenda. Motion carried.
11. Approval of Minutes of 2/11/10 Meeting: Motion by H. Janisch, seconded by K. Budsberg to approve the minutes of 2/11/10. Motion carried.
12. Discussion with New Glarus Public Library Board: The members were provided with a report dated November 5, 2007 originally prepared for the Town of New Glarus Impact Fee Committee (see attached). The report highlights the results of the 2001 and 2006-2007 Needs Assessment studies that were performed by Deb Haeffner from the South Central Library System (SCLS). Members also were provided with USDA guidelines for Community Facilities Loans and Grants for Rural Libraries (see attached). Chair Seward briefly recapped the Joint Negotiation meeting discussions to date. Seward noted that a joint library and boundary agreement are the top two discussion items as identified by the Joint Negotiation Committee.

K. Seward asked where the Library Board would want to be in 10-15 years in terms of services, space needs, staff needs, and operating needs. Library Board President B. Anderson stated that the Strategic Plan has just been approved at the most recent Library Board meeting and is being printed. The Board used guidelines established in an American Libraries Association publication entitled **Strategic Planning for Results**. Library Director Denise Anton Wright stated that there were eighteen possible dimensions suggested in the publication; of those dimensions patron fluency, meaning a patron's ability to identify information and use that information was ranked first. The next most important objective was for patrons to have the ability to visit a comfortable place, i.e. the library would act as a community commons available to all. The third most important function of the library was determined to be as a source of community information, i.e. a clearing house.

B. Anderson stated that a meeting and programming space is also something desired in a future space. K. Budsberg asked which issue was most pressing at this point in time; B. Anderson replied space was. Anderson realizes that all the identified uses of space in the SCLS plan might not be approved; however, work space, space for the collection, and space for technology are absolutes. K. Budsberg noted that currently some programming is taking place in the current space. F. Phillipson reported that most well-attended programs actually occur in the Village Hall Community Room, noting that they cannot be held in the current library space. F. Phillipson further noted that the library staff has found many sources of funding of programming beyond taxation (e.g. grants, private donations, corporate donations, etc.) and that space limits the use of available funds and the amount and type of programming that can be offered. Ms. Phillipson briefly reviewed the long list of functions for the current space. She cited the largest table in the space as an embodiment of the problems created by the small size of the current space. This table is used for tutoring, book repair, book and periodical processing, and study space; she noted that no two functions can occur simultaneously requiring scheduling and compromises. Phillipson noted that some spaces in a new library are mandatory such as restrooms and mechanicals.

Ms. Wright noted that if the building was a joint space with another business or governmental body, then many of the spaces could be shared. Wright noted that some of the future wants such as a computer lab are less essential, but highly desired. K. Budsberg asked if estimates for space are based on current or future trends. Ms. Wright stated that the current trend is for more meeting space with an equal balance of high tech and high touch. According to D. Wright tutoring, small group sessions, and computer classes now depend on borrowing equipment from the SCLS in Village Hall space that must be scheduled ahead of time. Wright used a genealogy workshop an example of programming that is desired by not practical with the current resources.

J. Salter asked if of the approximately 120 periodicals offered by the library how many actually get checked out. Wright stated that there are approximately 100 periodicals and many local newspapers. New periodicals are non-circulating, whereas older periodicals are available for checkout. Ms. Wright stated that she does not keep statistical data on periodicals, however, from observation she estimated that approximately 120 of the circulating items are checked out each month. Director Wright stated that Verona Public Library of a municipal population around 10,000 has a reading room specifically for periodicals, which is larger than the entire space for New Glarus. B. Anderson noted that the periodical rack from Embury that was donated by the Town of New Glarus has saved space compared to the previous rack system that had no storage space; it is modular and can easily be moved to a new space and added onto as needed. B. Anderson stated that a larger facility would cost more to operate; however, the emphasis would be on efficiency of space to minimize staff and on energy efficiency to reduce utility bills.

K. Seward asked for the best guess for space requirements to meet desired programming and collection needs as compared to the high-end estimate recommended by the SCLS study. D. Wright replied a minimum of 13,000-

14,000 ft² would fulfill the space requirements of the current population and meet the top goals cited in the Strategic Plan. She cited Cross Plains and Brodhead which have both built facilities within the last few years for a similar service population (around 5,000) have built facilities approximately 14,000 ft². She noted that both those facilities were built in locations that can expand if needed in the future. Seward asked if the Library Board had considered what impact a new space would have on their current budget. It was reported that the current budget is \$230,000 per year; however, the library doesn't currently pay the Village for utilities beyond internet and phone. J. Salter stated that in one of the possible building locations near a flood plain, 20,000 ft² would not work without adding a second floor and noted that elevators for ADA compliance would add significantly to the cost.

K. Budsberg asked if resource sharing with the local schools would result in possible savings based on the concept of an economy of scale. L. Hiland noted the school and public library already participate in resource sharing. Each type of library has contrasting resource lending and use rules which complements each other in her opinion. B. Anderson noted that a public library is inclusive and some of those visitors would be inappropriate around younger school children; to make a shared space feasible would require separate entrances and separate collections, resulting in diminished savings. D. Wright noted that the only time a shared collection works is when both sides want it to happen. Ms. Wright went on to note that the internet connections of the computers are not filtered at the Public Library in contrast to the school library which takes responsibility for the student in lieu of the parent. K. Seward asked if anything is current duplication of effort between the two facilities. Ms. Wright noted a few materials may be duplicated, but noted that State tax-supported electronic resources provided through Badgernet provides an incredible cost savings for public schools. Ms. Anderson noted that certain shared books are heavily used to support the schools' curricula and extra-curricular activities.

H. Janisch asked about the cost per square foot estimate prepared by Patrick McGowan. Seward stated that the most expensive option of the study that included the purchase of the Old Town Hall, the land and some real estate between that building and the Town Garage, and a new library and Town Hall was estimated to cost approximately \$3.5 - 4.1 million. K. Seward gave a brief summary of the goals of the **Old Town Hall Feasibility Study** noting that the Town was not designing a library, but investigating whether the size proposed in the SCLS study would fit an existing site. Seward noted that the Town electorate will have the opportunity to make their opinions know at the Annual Town Meeting on April 13, 2010 on this **Feasibility Study**. There was brief discussion regarding the maximum footprint possible for a library within this location without having to work with the DNR within the zone designated within a flood plain.

K. Seward asked the Library Board to response to the impact that would happen when shifting from a Village-owned space to a joint space. B. Anderson stated that the biggest worry for her was the funding. She noted that currently the Village funds the facility through Maintenance of Effort, which is the minimal amount of funding figured from the average of the preceding three years. D. Wright noted that the Library Board currently has authority over how the money is spent and the Village Board determines the amount; the amount for the past

eight years has been equal to Maintenance of Effort. Wright noted that the most recent reimbursement from Exeter, York, Monticello, Town of New Glarus, etc totaled \$63,000. K. Seward stated that per the Green County Treasurer the Town's portion of that amount was \$52,000. Anderson stated the Board's hope would be to at least fund at the current level. K. Seward stated that Green County would have to agree to release the Town from that obligation for redistribution of funds if the library was to be funded jointly between the Town and Village.

Seward asked if the Library Board has borrowing capacity. Ms. Wright responded no; borrowing is through the Village of New Glarus. K. Seward asked if there was any seed money available to begin the fund-raising process outside of municipal support, to which Ms. Wright replied yes. D. Wright contacted Jay Jones the regional representative for the USDA regarding a rural library grant, noting that the per capita income in the area is too high for grant eligibility. Jones stated that a 20-year loan at 4% interest was possible. Ms. Wright noted that in the annual report to the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), the amount for utilities paid by the Village are able to be included, which results in a higher return for the library. She stated that the current annual estimate for utilities submitted to DPI is less than \$6,000 per annum. It was noted that Cross Plains was able to keep utility costs on their 14,000 ft² space nearly identical to the previous 3,000 ft² space it replaced. K. Budsberg asked about the USDA Grant and the impact if done jointly would the Town's median income allow for eligibility; it was noted that it would not as the median income is higher in Town. N. Owen noted that green granting is something a current Village Utilities staff member is has familiarity researching. Ms. Wright noted that a joint library would eliminate County reimbursement from the Town, but would still allow redistribution of funds by the County that is collected from the smaller communities within the service population.

13. List Questions for April Meeting with Department of Administration

Representative: K. Seward had composed some questions which he inadvertently left at home. K. Seward reported that he spoke briefly with Erich Schmidtke who is also working with the Village of Belleville and the Town of Montrose. Seward would like to set a date for the next meeting so that he can contact Schmidtke regarding his availability. Seward asked the group if they had any questions for Schmidtke or comments. K. Budsberg stated at this body's last meeting he got a better understanding of each municipality's concerns. He hopes to learn the bigger picture process by meeting with the DOA representative. J. Salter asked Nic Owen what did not work the last time Joint Negotiations were approached in hopes of not repeating that failed process. Owen briefly reviewed his memory of how discussions eventually came to a halt. Deputy Clerk Wright thought he had prepared a summary of the history of the negotiation process through excerpts of Town and Village minutes which he was willing to share with the group if requested. Seward stated that he has a set of resources in a binder that is available to review, if any committee members desired to review them. Seward stated that the group did not get far enough in discussions to review any particulars. J. Salter announced that Dan Gartzke may be willing to serve as a citizen representative on the Negotiations Committee once he is off the Village Board.

14. Consideration of Prioritization of Industrial/Commercial Development to Negotiation Items: H. Jannisch moved to untable this item that was tabled at the February 11, 2010 meeting; 2nd J. Salter. No further discussion. Motion carried. Seward reviewed the existing list in descending order of importance: boundary agreements, joint library, stormwater issues, joint participation of parks, joint garage, and 14th Avenue/ Legler Valley. Seward noted that joint industrial/commercial development was added to the list at the previous meeting, but had not been prioritized. J. Salter thought this issue was lower in priority than joint boundary discussions. K. Seward voiced his opinion that it was slightly more important than the 14th Avenue/Legler Valley issue. J. Salter moved to make industrial/commercial joint development the sixth item in descending order of importance; H. Janisch 2nd. During discussion it was agreed that 14th Avenue/Legler Valley becomes the seventh most important item by default. Motion carried.
15. Report for Keith Seward on Belleville's intergovernmental Agreements: Chair Seward reported that he spoke with Belleville Village President Terry Kringle and Montrose Town Chair Roger Hoedel. Seward explained that both communities decided to work on this after dealing with issues that arose when developers from outside the community wanted agricultural land to be annexed and the Village of Belleville did not want to extend services. Both municipalities wanted a plan containing answers/strategies to deal with similar requests in the future. N. Owen asked if they have an ETZ. Wright stated that their most recent agenda did not indicate that to be the case. K. Seward stated that the Town of Montrose did not want prime agricultural land to be lost to residential development and that both parties hope to complete the process within a year. The group will have some pro-bono legal assistance, have people on their board who are qualified to deal with these issues, and plan on working without the aid of a facilitator.
- Seward continued that the Village of Belleville and the Town of Montrose have been engaged in discussions regarding an Intergovernmental Agreement. Part of those discussions is to determine the length of the agreement, to establish a joint planning commission and establish its powers, and to define the extraterritorial jurisdiction territory. K. Seward had a packet given him by Kringle that were documents from the DOA. Residents within five miles of the affected area are to be notified of the resolution of cooperative boundary plan. It was noted that the terms boundary plan and agreement are synonymous in these documents. Seward noted that other communities have worked on similar agreements including Stoughton and Pleasant Springs, as well as Waunakee and Westport. K. Seward instructed Deputy Clerk Wright scan the documents to Adobe Acrobat format to share by email with the members of this Committee.
16. Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by K. Budsberg, 2nd by H. Janisch at 7:32 PM. Motion carried. The next meeting location is in the Town Office on Thursday, April 29, 2010 at 6:00 PM with April 21, 2010 as an alternate date. Agenda items will include: Discussion with DOA Representative.

Revised 100413

6:00pm

Meeting was called to order at 6:00pm by Chair Keith Seward. Town representatives present: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins. Village representatives present: Jim Salter, Kevin Budsberg.

Announcement: All cell phones shall remain silent for the duration of the meeting.

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Bob Elkins, seconded by Kevin Budsberg to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes of 1/21/10 Meeting: Motion by Bob Elkins, seconded by Jim Salter to approve the minutes of 1/21/10. Motion carried.

Consideration of Addition and Prioritization of Industrial/Commercial Development to Negotiation Items: Motion by Jim Salter, seconded by Bob Elkins to add the Addition and Prioritization of Industrial/Commercial Development the next meeting agenda and prioritize at the next meeting. Motion carried.

Discussion of Boundary Agreements

- a. Review of Boundary Agreement Handouts from 1/21/10 Meeting: Handouts were discussed and due to missing committee members some time was spent covering affected areas on maps as well as some review of past efforts.
- b. Discussion of items to include in Boundary Agreement: Committee members will bring items to discuss to the next meeting and prepare for the April meeting. An attempt will be made to have the April meeting attended by a representative of the State of Wisconsin who has been an advisor in such matters.

Consideration of time period for completion and methods to employ should an extension of time be requested: Motion to set a time period for completion of individual items and the method to employ should more time be requested would be by a simple majority vote of the majority of the body by Keith Seward, seconded by Bob Elkins. Motion passed.

Discussion on Joint Library: The Committee decided to invite members of the Library Board to the next meeting to give the Committee an idea of the direction they would like to go and what their needs are.

Adjournment: Motion to adjourn by Kevin Budsberg, seconded by Bob Elkins at 8:20pm. Motion carried.

Jim Salter, Village President

**Town of New Glarus
Joint Village/Town Negotiation Committee Minutes
Thursday, January 21, 2010
6:00 PM**

Town Attendance: Keith Seward, Bob Elkins, and Gof Thomson (6:03 PM)
Village Attendance: Jim Salter, Henry Janisch, and Kevin Budsberg
Also in Attendance: Nic Owen, Village Administrator

Meeting called to order at 6:00 PM by Chair Seward.

1. Proper proof of posting was attested to by Chair Seward and Deputy Clerk-Plan Administrator Wright.
2. B. Elkins moved to approve the minutes of 091210; 2nd J. Salter. Minutes were approved as presented.
3. Chair Seward noted that each municipality was instructed at the December meeting to prioritize the items to be discussed from their perspective based upon an agreed upon list. H. Janisch inquired about the 14th Avenue/Legler Valley Road topic. Chair Seward noted that this item will be discussed later in the agenda. Seward stated that it was his understanding that the items discussed in December were the items to be prioritized this meeting. B. Elkins stated that his understanding was that each member of this body was to create their own list. K. Budsberg asked why the group should prioritize; J. Salter responded to give the group a focus.

J. Salter asked the meaning implied by the fenceline on Seward's list. K. Seward replied that State Statutes make responsibilities of fence maintenance by halves to the right of the property owner's point of view. Seward noted that this is impractical when multiple lots abut an existing agricultural operation. Seward suggested an agreement which would make the entire maintenance of an existing fence or installation of a new fence and its future maintenance the responsibility of owners of residential properties that abut and agricultural operation. G. Thomson expressed his opinion that the existence of animal units today should determine the policy. B. Elkins made a motion to add the fenceline issue to the list; 2nd G. Thomson. Motion carried.

K. Seward asked the group how they would prioritize the issues. H. Janisch believes the joint library topic is premature because no building site has been determined. K. Seward summarized the Village's perspective regarding the public library as the funding is not equitable. The Village pays based upon a Maintenance of Effort Agreement which is calculated upon the average of the prior three years' contributions. In the Town the vehicle is through the County; taxes which are collected by the County are redistributed based upon use; the Village's contribution is not based upon use. J. Salter stated that operational cost-sharing could be discussed prior to considering construction of a new library.

H. Janisch asked if the topic of the pool house would include the current construction or operations. N. Owen stated that his understanding was the Parks and Recreation programming overall. Deputy Clerk Wright explained that the Town and Village Parks groups had discussed how to equalize fees for pool passes when they met jointly in the past although then Parks and Recreation Chair Lloyd Lueschow did not present the Town with a dollar amount that would achieve that goal. Current Village population is approximately 2,100 Village and the Town approximately 1,300 Town. Nic Owen provided Assessed Valuation figures from 2008 of \$165,000,000 for the Village and \$139,000,000 for the Town.

K. Seward referred the members to the list marked up by B. Elkins. He asked if the rest of the members would like to do the same. Seward asked where each member would prioritize the importance of the following topics:

	Boundary Agreement	Joint Library	Joint Participation of Parks	Joint Garage	Stormwater	Legler Valley 14 th Ave
Budsberg	2	5	4	3	1	6

Thomson	2	1	3	1	2	6
Janisch	3	4	1	5	2	6
Salter	2	1	3	4	5	6
Seward	1	2	4	5	2	6
Elkins	1	2	3	4	5	6
	11	15	18	22	17	36

K. Budsberg questioned whether fencing should be combined with Boundary Agreement; the group agreed without objection. K. Seward tallied the priority totals from highest to lowest as follows: Joint Boundary, Joint Library, Stormwater, Joint Parks, Joint Garage, and Legler Valley Road/14th Avenue.

4. Chair Seward asked the group to determine how difficult each item that was prioritized will be to achieve. K. Seward then asked whether difficulty of achievement should even be considered as a criterion. All agreed with B. Elkins ranking except H. Janisch would rank a Boundary Agreement as a 10. G. Thomson observed that Joint Boundary is probably more difficult for the Village and the Joint Library would be more difficult for the Town. Perhaps, he suggested that parity could be achieved if both sides addressed the most difficult topic for each.
5. H. Janisch moved to approve Boundary Agreement and Joint Library as the two first topics to discuss; 2nd K. Budsberg. K. Budsberg agreed with G. Thomson that the two issues may overlap and have mutual goals. J. Salter asked N. Owen how previous talks progressed. Owen stated that they did not come to a resolution. H. Janisch thought realizing that the issues may be isolated rather than quid pro quo. Motion carried.
6. B. Elkin's Mission Statement was reviewed by the group which read as follows:

It shall be the purpose of the joint negotiation committee to carry out honest, energetic discussion of the issues and problems facing the Village of New Glarus and New Glarus Township and further to make a concerted effort to bring these issues and problems to a timely conclusion, acceptable to both parties.

G. Thomson presented a Mission Statement for the group to consider as well that was in the form of a resolution as follows:

Where as the Town of New Glarus and the Village of New Glarus have agreed to negotiate an appropriate boundary agreement, so that the respective parties can make economical, political and land use decisions that they expect to confront in the future,

Now therefore, the undersigned, upon proper authority, declare that they are committed to a good faith effort to conclude a boundary agreement that is mutually beneficial and perceived as such by our respective constituencies, that results in improved cooperation between the municipalities, and that result in specific areas of shared services for the benefit of both Municipality's taxpayers and residents.

G. Thomson expressed that his phrase “to conclude a boundary agreement that is mutually beneficial and perceived as such by our respective constituencies, that results in improved cooperation between the municipalities, and that result in specific areas of shared services for the benefit of both Municipality's taxpayers and residents” could possibly be amended. J. Salter recommended replacing the aforementioned phrase with “to conclude resolution of mutual issues.” K. Seward supported taking the final Mission Statement to the respective boards so that it has official endorsement and thereby greater credibility. G. Thomson recommended listing the issues in order of importance below the Mission Statement. Salter noted that many shared services currently blur the lines between Town and Village including: fire protection, EMS, School District, etc.

J. Salter expressed his opinion that the creation of the Joint Negotiations Committee itself was approved by the Village Board and that to also endorse the Mission Statement would be an unnecessary duplication. G. Thomson suggested a minor change to B. Elkins language to read “mutually beneficial” instead of “timely” and “good faith” instead of “concerted”. H. Janisch stated that he likes B. Elkins’ Mission Statement as presented without Thomson’s proposed changes, noting that some solutions may not be mutually beneficial, yet are acceptable. K. Budsberg wanted the process to be open enough to allow future items to be added. N. Owen requested that the group add a phrase to state that the negotiations will be ongoing. After continued discussion, J. Salter made a motion to approve the following Mission Statement:

It shall be the purpose of the Joint Negotiation Committee to carry out honest, energetic discussion of ongoing issues and problems facing the Village of New Glarus and Town of New Glarus and further to make a good faith effort to bring these issues and problems to mutually acceptable, timely conclusions.

The motion received a 2nd from H. Janisch. There was no further Discussion. Motion carried. J. Salter made a motion to approve the Mission Statement as amended; 2nd H. Janisch. Motion carried.

7. K. Seward noted that there was not enough time to cover the remaining agenda items. H. Janisch moved to table the balance of the agenda until a future agenda; 2nd J. Salter. There was no discussion. Motion carried.
8. The next meeting was scheduled for February 11, 2010 at 6:00 PM. The meeting will take place at the Village Hall Board Room. H. Janisch made a motion to adjourn; 2nd B. Elkins. The meeting was adjourned at 6:57 PM.

MINUTES ARE NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL NEXT SUBSEQUENT MEETING