

BEFORE THE MUNICIPAL BOARD

OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Robert J. Ferderer	Chairman
Robert W. Johnson	Vice Chairman
Kenneth F. Sette	Member
Robert Finbraaten	Ex-Officio Member
Art Vogel	Ex-Officio Member

IN THE MATTER OF THE RESOLUTION)	
FOR THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN LAND)	
TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN PURSUANT TO)	<u>FINDINGS OF FACT,</u>
MINNESOTA STATUTES 414)	<u>CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,</u>
	<u>AND ORDER</u>

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the Minnesota Municipal Board pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 414, as amended, on June 9, 1982 and was continued from time to time at Austin, Minnesota. The hearings were conducted by Robert J. Ferderer, Chairman, and Terrence A. Merritt, Executive Director, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 414.01, Subdivision 12. Also in attendance were Ken F. Sette, Member of the Municipal Board and County Commissioners Art Vogel and Robert Finbraaten, Ex-Officio Members of the Board. The City of Austin appeared by and through Kermit Hoversten and the Town of Austin appeared by and through David Jackson, Supervisor. Testimony was heard and records and exhibits were received.

After due and careful consideration of all evidence, together with all records, files and proceedings, the Minnesota Municipal Board hereby makes and files the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. On January 21, 1982, a copy of a Notice of Intent to Annex was filed with the Minnesota Municipal Board by the City of Austin. The Notice of Intent contained all the information required by statute including the statement that the area proposed for annexation is 60% or more bordered by the city and 40 acres or less in size and the description of the territory subject to annexation which is as follows:

Out Lots 40 and 41 of Crestwood Hills 3rd Addition;
and all adjoining street right-of-ways.

An objection to the proposed annexation was received by the Minnesota Municipal Board from Austin Township on March 18, 1982. The Municipal Board upon receipt of this objection conducted further proceedings in accordance with M.S. 414.031, Subdivision 3 and 4 as required by M.S. 414.033, Subdivision 3.

II. Due, timely and adequate legal notice of the hearings was published, served and filed.

III. The area subject to annexation is unincorporated, approximately .84 acres in size and abuts the City of Austin by approximately 74% of its border. The City of Austin is approximately 5,583 acres in size.

IV. The area proposed for annexation is composed of two residential dwelling lots and the adjacent southern half of the Eighth Avenue Southwest right-of-way.

V. In 1970 the City of Austin had a population of 26,210, its 1980 population was 23,020 and it is projected that by the year 1985 it will have a population of 23,368.

VI. The Town of Austin in 1970 had a population of 2,777, its 1980 population was 2,386 and it is projected that by the year 1985 it will have a population of 2,422.

VII. In the area proposed for annexation it is estimated the population is 6.

VIII. The City of Austin had land in residential use, institutional use, commercial use, industrial use, agricultural use and vacant land.

IX. In the Town of Austin land is primarily agricultural or residential use, with some commercial and industrial use, also.

X. In the area proposed for annexation the land is used for residential purposes.

XI. The City of Austin has a zoning ordinance, subdivision regulation, flood plain ordinance and a planning commission.

XII. Mower County zoning applies to the area proposed for annexation.

XIII. The area proposed for annexation is presently zoned rural.

XIV. If annexed, it is anticipated the area proposed for annexation would be zoned single-family residential, which is consistent with the zoning and land use presently in the area around the area proposed for annexation.

XV. The City of Austin presently provides its residents with water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, solid waste collection, fire protection, police protection, street and road improvement and maintenance, administrative services, recreational opportunities and a library.

XVI. The Town of Austin provides its residents with street and road improvement and maintenance, administrative services, and fire protection through a contract with the City of Austin.

XVII. The City of Austin presently provides the area proposed for annexation with natural gas and electrical service, fire protection through a contract with the township and police protection as assistance to the sheriff.

XVIII. The City of Austin has sewer and water lines adjacent to the area proposed for annexation. These lines have the capacity to service the area proposed for annexation. The City of Austin is willing and able to provide all the services to

the area proposed for annexation which it presently provides its residents.

XIX. The northern half of the area proposed for annexation is made up of silt loam, silty clay, clay loam, heavy loam soil, with a general slope of between 2-6%. The southern half of the area proposed for annexation is made up of a silt loam, loam, heavy loam soil.

XX. Water samples showed that there is fecal coliform in surface water samples in the area adjacent to the area proposed for annexation.

The soil conditions of the area proposed for annexation are not conducive to effective on-site septic system use.

XXI. Presently one half of the Eighth Avenue Southwest right-of-way adjacent to the area proposed for annexation is located within the Township and the remaining area to the immediate west and north of the annexation area is within the city.

XXII. The City of Austin is serviced by federal, state, county and city roads.

XXIII. In 1982, the City of Austin has an assessed valuation of \$85,247,723. Its mill levy is 30.440. The City of Austin has a total bonded indebtedness of \$7,795,000.

XXIV. In 1982, the Town of Austin has an assessed valuation of \$13,178,155. Its mill levy is 2.277. It has a special taxing district with a mill levy of .751. The Township does not have any current bonded indebtedness.

XXV. The mill levy for the County of Mower in 1982 is 23.311. The school district mill levy for the area proposed for annexation and the City of Austin is 41.278.

XXVI. The City of Austin has a fire insurance rating of 5. The Town of Austin has a fire insurance rating of 10.

XXVII. Austin Township can continue to function without the area subject to annexation.

XXVIII. The City of Austin is the only municipality adjacent to the area subject to annexation.

XXIX. All necessary governmental services can best be provided to the area subject to annexation by its annexation to the City of Austin.

XXX. There is no evidence that the annexation of the area subject to annexation to the City of Austin will have any adverse effect on the school district in the area.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I. The Minnesota Municipal Board duly acquired and now has jurisdiction of the within proceeding.

II. The area subject to annexation is now or is about to become urban or

suburban in nature and the annexing municipality is capable of providing the services required by the area within a reasonable time.

III. Municipal government is required to protect the public health, safety, and welfare in the area subject to annexation.

IV. The best interests of the area subject to annexation will be furthered by annexation.

V. The remainder of the Town of Austin can carry on the functions of government without undue hardship.

VI. There is a reasonable relationship between the increase in values to the City of Austin and the value of benefits conferred upon the area subject to annexation.

VII. An order should be issued by the Minnesota Municipal Board annexing the area described herein.

ORDER

I. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: That the property described in Findings of Fact I and the same is hereby annexed to the City of Austin, Minnesota the same as if it had been originally a part thereof.


II. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That the population of the City of Austin is increased by six.

III. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That the population of the Town of Austin is decreased by six.

IV. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That the effective date of this order is January 4, 1983.

Dated this 23rd day of December, 1982.

MINNESOTA MUNICIPAL BOARD
165 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101



Terrence A. Merritt
Executive Director

M E M O R A N D U M

In approving the annexation in A-3890, the Board notes that the area adjacent to the area proposed for annexation as well as the annexation area itself has been a patchwork of City and Township areas. This haphazard approach to annexation, has resulted in the need for cleaning up of boundaries through this and similar proceedings. The Board is aware that in the past the City has focused its annexation efforts on responding to requests from property owners who wish to be annexed. This posture has resulted in an extremely irregular boundary and the incumbent inefficiencies for service delivery as well as jurisdictional questions. The Board finds this type of boundary adjustment posture to be economically inefficient at a time when local units of government are struggling to fiscally make ends meet. The Board urges the parties to work together and realize that the annexation of only interested properties results in governmental headaches for all parties which must be addressed at a later time. Both the Township and the City must realize that at times good government requires more than the annexation of merely a single lot whose owner desires it. Such a realization, though politically difficult, must lead the parties perspective if duplication of effort is to be avoided. The Board realizes that such an annexation posture requires that both sides address difficult issues realizing that self interest has no part in the negotiations. The Board notes that orderly annexation was attempted, but failed. The Board urges the parties to reopen the orderly annexation discussions realizing that certain concessions must be made. The parties must approach discussions with an open mind and if members of either side have a preset notion on the matter, they should remove themselves from the discussion. Also, a truly workable agreement is one where the parties keep the line of communication open.

The Board notes with dismay that many of the people present at the proceeding and some of the participants of the proceeding themselves felt that the September 22, 1982 hearing was directed at an orderly annexation agreement being discussed between the City of Austin and the Town of Austin. This information received by those people in the audience resulted in unnecessary trauma and concern given the limited scope of the proceeding before the Board. It is hoped that while the parties work together to improve their lines of communication, they do not neglect the necessary communication with their residents on a forthright and honest basis.

12-23-82-JM