

## STATE OF MINNESOTA MUNICIPAL BOARD

Suite 165 Metro Square 7th & Robert Streets St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

March 23, 1983

Secretary of State c/o Donna Scott State Office Building Saint Paul, Minnesota STATE OF MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF STATE FILED JUL 1 1 1985

Gen anderson thouse Secretary of State

RE: Municipal Board Docket Number 0A-109-2 Fergus Falls

30120

## AMENDMENT TO ORDER DATED MARCH 23, 1983

The subject order of the Minnesota Municipal Board makes the following changes in the population of the named units of government:

The population of	City of Fergus	Falls		
	60			
is increased by	90			
The population of	Town of Fergus	Falls		
	60			
is decreased by	90-		<u> </u>	
A new municipality named				
has been created with a	population of			
The		*		•
		4.16		

has been dissolved.

Official date of the Order March 23, 1983 for annexation effective April 27, 1983.

Official date of Amendment to Order: July 8, 1985.

C.C. Commissioner

Department of Revenue c/o Wallace O. Dahl, Director Tax Research Division 205 Centennial Building

R. Thomas Gillaspy, Ph.D. State Demographer 101 Capitol Square Building Patricia D. Lundy

Assistant Executive Director

Dated this 8th day of July 1985.

Patricia D. Lundy
Assistant Director

OA-109-2 Fergus Falls Fergus Falls Township

BEFORE THE MUNICIPAL BOARD

OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

STATE OF MINNESOTA'
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
FILED
JUL 1 1 1985

Jean Anderson Showe
Secretary of State

Robert Ferderer Kenneth Sette Richard Sand Sydney G. Nelson A. Hubert Nordgren Chairman
Vice Chairman
Member
Ex-Officio Member
Ex-Officio Member

IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT )
RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF )
FERGUS FALLS AND THE TOWN )
OF FERGUS FALLS FOR THE )
ORDERLY ANNEXATION OF )
CERTAIN LAND TO THE CITY )
OF FERGUS FALLS PURSUANT )
TO MINNESOTA STATUTE 414

AMENDMENT TO ORDER, Dated March 23, 1983

The above entitled matter came on for hearing before the Minnesota Municipal Board on April 29, 1981, and resulted in an Order dated March 23, 1983, directing the annexation of certain described property to the City of Fergus Falls. That Order was subsequently affirmed by the District Court of the Seventh Judicial District. On November 13, 1984, the Minnesota Court of Appeals, however, ruled that a referendum should be held upon the annexation pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 414.031, subd. 5. This holding was based entirely upon the Court's determination that the City and Town had unambiguously provided for such a referendum in their Joint Resolution for Orderly Annexation and that such agreement of the parties should be given effect in the circumstances of that case.

The City of Fergus Falls petitioned the Minnesota Supreme Court for further review. On or about December 27, 1984, while that petition was pending before the Minnesota Supreme Court, the City and Town entered into a stipulation for settlement of the appeal concerning the matter. That stipulation provides inter alia

1. That the area approved for annexation should be reduced to an area which has been specifically described by agreement through counsel for the City and Town as:

The Southeast Quarter (SE1/4) and the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (SE1/4SW1/4) of Section 25, of Township 133 North, Range 43 West, not presently within the City of Fergus Falls.

containing a population of 60 persons, and

2. that this reduced area may be considered annexed without the holding of any referendum or further judicial consideration.

The Board finds that this area and population is entirely contained within the area previously approved for annexation by the Order dated March 23, 1983.

In addition, the stipulation contains various agreements concerning amendments to the existing Joint Resolution for Orderly Annexation between the City and Town as respects possible future annexation of property to the City. Pursuant to this stipulation the City's Petition for Judicial Review was withdrawn on March 8, 1985, and the matter returned to the Municipal Board for further action.

As always, the Board supports the efforts of parties to reach mutually agreed settlement of their differences. Upon review of all the records and proceedings herein, the Board has determined that, in this matter, the annexation of the reduced area as described by the parties without the necessity of referendum is consistent with the findings and conclusions made by the Board on March 23, 1983, with the decision rendered by the Minnesota Court of Appeals entered on November 13, 1984, and with the best interest of the public and the parties concerned.

NOW THEREFORE the Minnesota Municipal Board makes the following:

## ORDER

1. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: That Article 1 of the Minnesota Municipal Board's Order on OA-109-2, dated March 23, 1983, is amended to read as follows:

That the property described hereinafter be, and the same is hereby annexed to the City of Fergus Falls, Minnesota, the same as if it had been originally made a part thereof:

The Southeast Quarter (SE1/4) and the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (SE1/4SW1/4) of Section 25, of Township 133 North, Range 43 West, not presently within the City of Fergus Falls.

2. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That Article 3 of the Order above-mentioned in Article 1, herein, is amended to read as follows:

That the population of the City of Fergus Falls has been increased by 60 persons.

- 3. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That Article 4 of the Order above-mentioned in Article 1, herein, is amended to read as follows:

  That the population of the Town of Fergus Falls has been decreased by 60 persons.
- 4. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That the Order of March 23, 1983, as herein amended is in all respects ratified and confirmed and applies, with respect to the property described in Article 1 as herein amended continuously from April 27, 1983.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED: That this Order is effective immediately upon issuance.

Dated this  $8^{th}$  day of yu

<u>,</u> 1985.

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

Terrence A. Merritt Executive Director

## MEMORANDUM

The Board commends the parties for their cooperative efforts in resolving their differences concerning the present annexation, and hopes that this cooperation will continue and will serve to benefit the community as a whole in addition to the interests of the City and Town. The Board notes that a number of the provisions of the settlement stipulation address amendments to the orderly annexation agreement with respect to the manner and timing of potential future annexations. While the Board is not presently in a position to enter findings or orders upon annexations which may or may not occur at a future date, the Board asks the cooperation of the parties and their counsel in structuring their amendments and future annexations in the manner prescribed by statute and rules of the Board. The Board recognizes that the decision of the Minnesota Court of Appeals holds that the parties to a Joint Resolution for Orderly Annexation may preserve the statutory provisions for referendum as it would exist absent a joint resolution. However, the Board does not believe that the holding of the Court of Appeals calls for general abrogation of the applicable procedures set forth in statute for annexations within a designated area in deference to pre-existing agreement of the City and Town. Thus, for example, the Board is not presently able to determine whether or not the area described in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the stipulation will, in 1988, satisfy statutory criteria or will require a public hearing pursuant to statute. However, there do

48/08

exist statutory procedures which might be considered by the City and Town for the effectuation of their agreement when the time arrives. E.g. Minn. Stat. § 414.0325 provides, in part:

If a joint resolution designates an area as in need of orderly annexation, provides for the conditions for its annexation, and states that no consideration by the board is necessary, the board may review and comment, but shall, within 30 days, order the annexation in accordance with the terms of the resolution.

Absent an intervening change in the statutes or case law, this provision together with the decision of the Court of Appeals might be used in the future when a specific annexation is desired to avoid the necessity of a Board hearing while reserving the opportunity for referendum. TAM 7-8-85

\$36/28 0.D