

# Issues connected to Intergovernmental Cooperation

*Refined 3/24/04 – Steering Committee Meeting*

Members were asked to rate each issue as a positive, a neutral and a negative and discuss why they thought each belonged in a certain category. Each issue on this list has the potential of being addressed in the intergovernmental cooperation element or being removed.

The items below in **Bold** are, after an initial staff review, addressed in some minimal way in the previously existing County goals and objectives worked on at the 3/24/04 Steering Committee meeting. (To be verified, and modified by the steering committee.)

Are there any topics on this list where the steering committee needs more information or a speaker to come in and address the group?

Additionally, there was some initial confusion as to what some of these terms mean. The steering committee should deliberately define each term to make clear which part of each term will and will not be covered in the Dane County Comprehensive Plan.

- **Cost Savings (+)**
  - Are Efficiencies Achievable?
- Bigger service centers/areas (0)
  - Bigger not always better
- **Higher Levels of services (+)**
  - Better Service is Good
  - Expanded area could expand costs, etc.
  - Goal is to improve the quality of service.
  - Balancing act of levels of service and cost/budget issue.
- Local Control (+)
  - In parallel with Cooperative Agreements
  - Regional Services
  - Value of local, grass roots government
  - Community Identification/Separation (+)
    - Verona vs. Sun Prairie
- Politics (-)
- **Regional Government (+/-)**
- **Address Regional Issues (0)**
- Early Identification of Issues (+)
  - Addressing Concerns and Issues before “position” can be taken.
- Reduced Litigation (+)
  - Contract Lawyer
  - County Template?
- **Consistency (+)**
  - Other County Plans
  - Other Comprehensive Plans in Dane County
- Predictability (+)
- **Understanding (+)**
- **Trust (+)**
  - History of success (+)

- Waunakee – Westport
- ~~Service to citizens~~
- **Cooperative Development/Boundary Agreements (+)**
  - (EG Rutland/Stoughton; Burke/City of Sun Prairie; Bristol /C. Sun Prairie; Town of Oregon/Village of Oregon/Village of Brooklyn)
- Liability (+/-)
  - Multijurisdictional service providers
  - Intergovernmental Agreement should be thorough. (Need of a good contract lawyer)
- Accountability (+)
- Annexation (+/-)
  - Cooperation a must: otherwise results in conflict.
  - Discussions included some sort of revenue sharing mechanism
- **Revenue Sharing (+)**
  - Good if part of a cooperative agreement (EG. §66.30)
  - Is this the only way it can occur?
- Historic Competition (-)
- Communication (see also, “Trust”) (+)

Part of the discussion alluded to the fact that without trust and communication, these types of agreements are hard to come by. The successes and failures in Dane County show us that Intergovernmental Cooperation can be a worthwhile endeavor. A good first step is just getting everyone to the table and facilitating the dialog as proposed for the Intergovernmental Summit.