

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Many cities, townships, villages, and counties begin cooperative arrangements to lower costs and promote efficiency. Most arrangements involve only two governmental units, but there are also agreements among multiple units. Intergovernmental cooperation may range from formal joint power agreements to unwritten understandings. Two cities may have an unwritten agreement about sharing road repair equipment, or a cluster of cities and townships may have a written agreement concerning snow removal or economic development. The opportunities for intergovernmental cooperation are endless.

This section takes a closer look at intergovernmental cooperation including advantages and disadvantages. It examines what the Village of Blanchardville is doing today and what they may consider in the future. Intergovernmental cooperation is an effective way for local governments to respond to changing and diverse needs by working together with their neighbors, while maintaining their own identity. If an agreement can be reached among two or more units of government, services can often be provided with substantial cost savings. Cooperation can also eliminate unnecessary duplication of services or purchasing of equipment.

**Wisconsin State Statute 66.1001(2)(g)****(g) Intergovernmental cooperation element.**

A compilation of objectives, policies, goals, maps and programs for joint planning and decision making with other jurisdictions, including school districts and adjacent local governmental units, for siting and building public facilities and sharing public services. The element shall analyze the relationship of the local governmental unit to school districts and adjacent local governmental units, and to the region, the state and other governmental units. The element shall incorporate any plans or agreements to which the local governmental unit is a party under [s. 66.0301](#), [66.0307](#) or [66.0309](#). The element shall identify existing or potential conflicts between the local governmental unit and other governmental units that are specified in this paragraph and describe processes to resolve such conflicts.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION POLICIES

The following are the intergovernmental cooperation policies for the Village of Blanchardville.

➤ **Maintain established intergovernmental relationships.**

The Village of Blanchardville does share some services with other jurisdictions and this should be continued as long as they are beneficial.

➤ **Explore new opportunities to cooperate with other local units of government.**

As costs continue to rise for providing many facilities and services, the exploration of additional ways to cooperate may prove to be beneficial in order to contain costs.

➤ **Establish written intergovernmental cooperation agreements.**

Often time, intergovernmental cooperation agreements are established based on verbal agreements. Changes in leadership can cause problems with agreements if the specifics have not been identified in writing. It may prove to be beneficial to have all intergovernmental agreements in writing to avoid any disputes or misunderstandings.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

A solid working relationship between neighbors is important. Intergovernmental communication and cooperation can benefit everyone. A sound relationship with interjurisdictional county, regional, and state entities can provide economical, environmental, and political advantages for a jurisdiction. Best of all, a positive intergovernmental relationship fosters and supports a sense of community and good fellowship. Table G.1 shows Blanchardville's rating of its intergovernmental relationships with various governmental units.

Table G.1: Village of Blanchardville Intergovernmental Relationship Ratings

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	NA
Adjacent jurisdictions (general)					
Adjacent jurisdictions (specific) – Towns of Blanchard, Moscow, York, Villages of Argyle and Hollandale		X			
Wisconsin DNR			X		
Wisconsin DOT		X			
Wisconsin DOC		X			
UW Extension		X			
Iowa County (general)		X			
Iowa County (specific) – Sheriff Dept., Highway Dept.		X			
Local School District – Pecosonica		X			
Other					

EXISTING AREAS OF COOPERATION

- **Fire Protection** - Joint fire protection sharing with the Village of Blanchardville and the Towns of Blanchard, York, Moscow, Fayette, and Perry. There are also mutual aid agreements established with fire and rescue services.
- **Ambulance Service** - Agreement with the Towns of Blanchard, York, Moscow, Fayette, Perry, Waldwick, and the Village of Hollandale.
- **Law Enforcement** – The Village of Blanchardville is able to call on the Sheriff of Lafayette County, if need be. The village also has access to the services of the Iowa County Sheriff.

- **Planning and Zoning** – Together with Iowa County, the Village of Blanchardville is working on its Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan.
- **School Systems** – The Village of Blanchardville is part of the Pecatonica Area School District and as such, shares its park facilities, including the football and baseball fields, as well as sharing the school building for meetings. Also, the village shares its swimming pool with the Argyle School District. Blanchardville allows the school to use the Village Park for physical education classes, sport practices, and games. The school benefits Blanchardville through the Viking Volunteer program, assisting in village clean-up days, and FFA projects on village property.
- **Public Library** – The library in Blanchardville is shared with adjoining towns and the Village of Hollandale.
- **Recreation Programs** – Blanchardville's McKellar Park is shared with adjoining towns and the Village of Hollandale.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONFLICTS

The Village of Blanchardville does not identify any existing conflicts but do think there could be potential conflicts in the future such as poorly handled annexations. The village has zoning ordinances that give them extraterritorial rights. These rights have not been exercised but could lead to conflict if they were. Also, rural subdivisions have been approved by the Town of Blanchard that do not meet village subdivision requirements resulting in problems if the sub-division was annexed in the future.

OTHER INTERGOVERNMENTAL CONCERNS

The Village of Blanchardville is in both Lafayette and Iowa Counties; Green County is less than a mile from the village limits and some of the village's fire and school districts are in Dane County (est. 4 miles). Finding ways to communicate and not being the "forgotten corner of four counties" is a challenge although the village likes to take the attitude they are "in the heart of the four county area". The village's concern is how to interact with the other jurisdictions in other counties as part of the preparation of their comprehensive plan?

POSSIBLE FUTURE COOPERATION EFFORTS

As the list above indicates, the Village of Blanchardville is already cooperating with other jurisdictions for services and facilities. The list below identifies possible areas of cooperation in the future.

- **Police Protection** – The possibility exists of sharing police protection and equipment (i.e. speed monitor) with the Village of Argyle or other interested municipalities or towns.
- **Assessment Services** – The possibility exists of the Village of Blanchardville sharing the services of the County Assessors Office.
- **Meeting Facilities** – The village envisions the possibility of sharing its meeting facilities with the Pecatonica Area Schools, the Town of Blanchard, or other interested towns.
- **Polling Place** – Although current election law does not allow the sharing of polling locations, the Village of Blanchardville is interested in finding a way to share polling places with the Town of Blanchard in order to save costs.
- **Mapping** - Cooperative project with counties in Foto-Fly 2005 plan.

COMMUNICATION WITH NEIGHBORS

The Village of Blanchardville has no regular communication with its neighboring municipalities, although the local newspaper, The Pecatonica Valley Leader, covers local activities for the Villages of Blanchardville, Hollandale, and Argyle and the surrounding townships. The Village of Blanchardville keeps track of its neighbors through published reports and notices. However, there have been no regular lines of communication.

FORMAL AGREEMENTS WITH NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS

The Village of Blanchardville has formal agreements with

- Towns of Blanchard, York, Moscow, Fayette, and Perry – Fire Protection agreements that are renewed yearly.
- Towns of Blanchard, York, Moscow, Fayette, Perry, Waldwick and the Village of Hollandale – Ambulance Service agreements that are renewed yearly

ADVANTAGES OF LOCAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

Intergovernmental cooperation has many advantages associated with it including the following:

Efficiency and reduction of costs: Cooperating on the provision of services can potentially mean lower costs per unit or person. Although these are by no means the only reasons, efficiency and reduced costs are the most common reasons governments seek to cooperate.

Limited government restructuring: Cooperating with neighboring governments often avoids the time-consuming, costly, and politically sensitive issues of government restructuring. For example, if a city and township can cooperate, the township may avoid annexation of its land and the city may avoid incorporation efforts on the part of the township, which may hinder the city's development. Cooperation also helps avoid the creation of special districts that take power and resources away from existing governments.

Coordination and planning: Through cooperation, governments can develop policies for the area and work on common problems. Such coordination helps communities minimize conflicts when levels of services and enforcement are different among neighboring communities. For example, shared water, sewage, and waste management policies can help avoid the situation in which one area's environment is contaminated by a neighboring jurisdiction with lax standards or limited services. Cooperation can also lead to joint planning for future services and the resources needed to provide them.



Expanded services: Cooperation may provide a local unit of government with services it would otherwise be without. Cooperation can make those services financially and logistically possible.

DISADVANTAGES OF LOCAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

Intergovernmental cooperation also has drawbacks, which may include the following:

Reaching and maintaining an agreement: In general, reaching a consensus in cases in which politics and community sentiments differ can be difficult. For example, all parties may agree that police protection is necessary. However, they may disagree widely on how much protection is needed. An agreement may fall apart if one jurisdiction wants infrequent patrolling and the other wants an active and visible police force.

Unequal partners: If one party to an agreement is more powerful, it may influence the agreement's conditions. With service agreements, the more powerful party, or the party providing the service, may have little to lose if the agreement breaks down, it may already service itself at a reasonable rate. The weaker participants may not have other options and are open to possible exploitation.

Local self-preservation and control: Some jurisdictions may feel their identity and independence will be threatened by intergovernmental cooperation. The pride of residents and officials may be bruised if, after decades of providing their own police or fire protection, they must contract with a neighboring jurisdiction (and possible old rival) for the service. In addition, and possibly more importantly, a jurisdiction may lose some control over what takes place within their boundaries. And although government officials may lose control, they are still held responsible for the delivery of services to their electorates.

STEPS TO BEGINNING SUCCESSFUL INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION EFFORTS

As expressed earlier in this section, intergovernmental cooperation should be thoroughly reviewed. Below are some ideas and concerns that should be considered.

- Identify other local governments that may share a common problem or may stand to benefit from cooperation.
- Identify whether the county is cooperating with other jurisdictions on a similar service. What type of arrangement do they have? Are the participating jurisdictions satisfied with the quality and quantity of the service?
- Although cooperation on several services may be desired, analyze each one separately. Initially, it may seem logical to lump services. However, it is best to first understand from a cost and non-cost perspective what cooperation in each service area entails.
- Look at the potential cost savings of each option. This should be done on a per resident or per unit-of-service-provided basis. For example, will the cost of fire protection per person decrease if the jurisdictions cooperate? Or, can the jurisdiction lower per resident costs of providing snow removal if it plows other jurisdictions' streets?
- Consider the costs associated with each form of cooperation. What type of administrative or insurance costs might be necessary with each option?
- How would residents respond to the change in the level of services they receive? And how would taxpayers respond to additional government expenses? Would they reject it?
- Are the residents willing to give up some control over a particular service? This may take considerable polling to determine and will likely vary depending on the type of service in question. For example, it may be all right to share snow removal and street repair equipment, but residents might not be willing to give up their own police department and the security they feel it provides.
- Keep the public and local officials informed throughout the entire process. Present the options and invite public comment. If residents and officials feel they have played a role in the effort, or at least been given the opportunity to provide their input, they will be more likely to support the initiative. Plus, some creative ideas may be generated.
- Patience is important. The more governments involved in the negotiations, the longer it will take to develop an agreement and reach a consensus. In addition, negotiators may have to go back to their city councils, town, or county boards several times for directions or approval.

ADDITIONAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IDEAS

The Intergovernmental Cooperation Element Guide published by the Wisconsin Department of Administration provides several ideas for cooperation including the following listed below. These are only ideas to consider.

(Note: the following ideas were taken directly from the Intergovernmental Cooperation Guide.)

Voluntary Assistance: Your community, or another, could voluntarily agree to provide a service to your neighbors because doing so makes economic sense and improves service levels.

Trading Services: Your community and another could agree to exchange services. You could exchange the use of different pieces of equipment, equipment for labor, or labor for labor.

Renting Equipment: Your community could rent equipment to, or from, neighboring communities and other governmental units. Renting equipment can make sense for both communities – the community renting gets the use of equipment without having to buy it, and the community renting out the equipment earns income from the equipment rather than having it sit idle.

Contracting: Your community could contract with another community or jurisdiction to provide a service. For example, you could contract with an adjacent town or village to provide police and fire protection, or you could contract with the county for a service in addition to that already routinely provided by the county sheriff's department.

Routine County Services: Some services are already paid for through taxes and fees. Examples are police protection services from the county sheriff's department, county zoning, county public health services, and county parks. Your Intergovernmental Cooperation Element could identify areas where improvements are needed and could recommend ways to cooperatively address them.

Sharing Municipal Staff: Your community could share staff with neighboring communities and other jurisdictions – both municipal employees and independently contracted professionals. You could share a building inspector, assessor, planner, engineer, zoning administrator, clerk, etc.

Consolidating Services: Your community could agree with one or more other communities or governmental units to provide a service together.

Joint Use of a Facility: Your community could use a public facility along with other jurisdictions. The facility could be jointly owned or one jurisdiction could rent space from another.

Special Purpose Districts: Special purpose districts are created to provide a particular service, unlike municipalities that provide many different types of services. Like municipalities, special purpose districts are separate and legally independent entities.

Joint Purchase and Ownership of Equipment: Your community could agree with other jurisdictions to jointly purchase and own equipment such as pothole patching machines, mowers, rollers, snowplows, street sweepers, etc.

Cooperative Purchasing: Cooperative purchasing, or procurement, is where jurisdictions purchase supplies and equipment together to gain more favorable prices.

TECHNIQUES AND PROGRAMS FOR MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY COOPERATION

As the Village of Blanchardville continues to grow, it may be necessary to consider some type of boundary agreements. Municipal boundaries can be altered in a number of ways including the following:

- **Annexation**

Annexation is the process of transferring parcels of land from unincorporated areas to adjacent cities or villages. More detailed information on annexation can be obtained from Wisconsin State Statute Sections 66.0217-66.0223.

- **Detachment**

Detachment is the process by which territory is detached from one jurisdiction and transferred to another. Essentially detachment is the opposite of annexation. More detailed information on detachment can be obtained from Wisconsin State Statute Sections 66.0227 and 62.075.

- **Incorporation**

Incorporation is the process of creating a new village or city from unincorporated territory. More detailed information on incorporation can be obtained from Wisconsin State Statute Sections 66.0201-66.0215.

- **Consolidation**

Consolidation is the process by which a town, village, or city joins together with another town, village, or city to form one jurisdiction. More detailed information on incorporation can be obtained from Wisconsin State Statute Section 66.0229.

- **Intergovernmental Agreements**

Intergovernmental Agreements provide communities with a different type of approach because it is proactive rather than reactive. There are two types of intergovernmental agreements that can be formed including cooperative boundary agreements and stipulations and orders. More detailed information on intergovernmental agreements can be obtained from Wisconsin State Statute 66.0307 (Cooperative Boundary Agreements) and 66.0225 (Stipulations and Orders).

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS–MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY REVIEW (DHIR-MBR)

Municipal Boundary Review regulates the transition of unincorporated areas to city or village status through municipal annexation, incorporation, consolidation, or by joint city-village-town activities involving cooperative boundary plans and agreements. Such agreements may change territorial boundaries and may provide for the sharing of municipal services. Staff members are available upon request to meet with local officials and citizens to discuss annexation, incorporation, consolidation and cooperative boundary plans.

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARY REVIEW

**Office of Land Information Services
Municipal Boundary Review
17 S Fairchild, 7th Floor
Madison, WI 53702**

Phone: 608-266-0683

<http://www.doa.state.wi.us/dhir>