

# LEGISLATIVE ISSUES AND PRIORITIES FOR 2009

*A Survey Report for State Municipal Leagues*

DECEMBER 2008



National League of Cities

## **ABOUT THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES**

The National League of Cities is the nation's oldest and largest organization devoted to strengthening and promoting cities as centers of opportunity, leadership and governance. NLC is a resource and advocate for more than 1,600 member cities and the 49 state municipal leagues, representing 19,000 cities and towns and more than 218 million Americans.

**Copyright 2008 by the  
National League of Cities  
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1763  
(202) 626-3000  
[www.nlc.org](http://www.nlc.org)**

**All rights reserved**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	i
Summary of Findings.....	ii
Part I: Legislative Issues.....	1
Part II: Advocacy Strategies.....	17
Part III: Statewide Ballot Initiatives.....	22
Part IV: Contract Lobbyists.....	29
Part V: Coalitions and Opponents.....	31
Part VI: League Legislative Conferences.....	40
Part VII: Survey Contacts.....	42
State Legislative Links.....	43

# NLC SURVEY OF STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUES LEGISLATIVE ISSUES AND PRIORITIES FOR 2009

## INTRODUCTION

NLC conducts an annual survey to collect and share information on the top legislative priorities of state municipal leagues as they begin their legislative sessions. Thirty-one state municipal leagues responded to the 2009 survey. This report is distributed to all state municipal leagues via the state league page of the NLC website.

The Summary of Findings provides information on: the important fiscal and non-fiscal issues that are priorities for state leagues during their 2009 legislative sessions; legislative victories and setbacks in 2008; successful legislative advocacy strategies; and data on the use of contract lobbyists. Continued from the past two years is a section on anticipated statewide ballot initiatives affecting municipalities in 2009 and statewide ballot initiatives that state leagues were involved in during 2008.

The survey report consists of seven parts:

- **Part I** of the survey report is a summary table of each state municipal league's top 2009 legislative priorities, other issues for the 2009 sessions, 2008 legislative victories, and 2008 legislative setbacks.
- **Part II** of the report provides a brief summary of legislative advocacy strategies that state municipal leagues will use in their 2009 sessions, or have used previously.
- **Part III** summarizes anticipated statewide ballot initiatives affecting cities and towns in 2009, and those that were on the ballot in 2008.
- **Part IV** discusses contract lobbyists.
- **Part V** reports on coalitions and traditional opponents of state leagues in legislatures.
- **Part VI** provides the dates and locations of state league legislative conferences in 2009, as well as any special activities scheduled to take place at those conferences.
- **Part VII** lists each of the state league contacts for this survey.

The survey report was prepared by Lesley-Ann Rennie, Staff Associate, State League Programs, National League of Cities. For additional information on a particular state league's priorities, advocacy strategies, and/or resource materials, please contact the state league directly.

Comments or suggestions regarding the NLC publication, *Legislative Issues and Priorities for 2009: A Survey Report for State Municipal Leagues*, may be directed to Scott Morris at (202) 626-3021, or at [morris@nlc.org](mailto:morris@nlc.org) or Lesley-Ann Rennie at (202) 626-3134, or at [rennie@nlc.org](mailto:rennie@nlc.org).

## Summary of Findings

Thirty-one state municipal leagues responded to the NLC legislative issues survey for 2009:

The five most often cited fiscal and budget issues of primary or secondary concern are:

1. Protection of local tax and revenue base (AR, FL, IL, IN, IA, KY, MA, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, OK, OH, OR)
2. Infrastructure/transportation funding (CO, GA, ID, IA, MI, MT, NE, OK, OR, PA, VA, WA)
3. Property Tax Caps and Exemptions (GA, MI, ND, NH, TX, WA, WI)
4. Property Tax Reform and Relief (CT, FL, IA, NJ, SC)
5. State-shared revenue (ID, MI, OH, WI)

The five most often cited non-fiscal and non-budget related issues that were of concern include:

1. Personnel/Labor Issues (CT, IL, IA, IN, KY, MA, MI, MO, MT, NE, NH, OK, PA)
2. Land Use/Smart Growth (CT, FL, MD, MT, VA)
3. Annexation (CO, NC, TX, VA, WA)
4. Open Meetings/Open Records (IL, IA, MO, NE)
5. Public Safety Issues (GA, MD, VA, WA)

Legislative victories for state leagues in the 2008 session included:

1. Repeal of state tax rate limit on municipalities.
2. Defeat of huge unfunded state mandates for police and firefighters.
3. The passage of TIME-21 legislation, which established funding mechanisms and additional fees to create money for infrastructure funding at the state and local level.
4. The enactment of a major city-state jail unification bill that will permanently cap the property tax exposure of all county jail operations at the 2008 level.
5. The passage of a comprehensive transportation funding package.

Legislative defeats for state leagues in the 2008 session included:

1. Failure to enact comprehensive reform of state retirement system.
2. Enforcement of immigration laws being added to the purview of local government.
3. Failure to enact legislation to give cities additional authority to deal with federal storm water mandates.
4. Failure to secure passage of legislation that would have provided a tool for cities to fund road maintenance and reconstruction.
5. Failure to pass comprehensive transportation funding legislation.

The most successful legislative advocacy strategies reported are as follows:

1. Greater use of technology to communicate with and organize municipal officials in order to make the league's message much clearer to legislators and the general public.
2. Collaboration with other associations on issues of common interest.

3. Utilization of executive board members to establish coalitions within their county and/or region.
4. Publishing a comprehensive “State of the Cities” report and interim reports, which present an in-depth look at a specific topic.
5. Providing ongoing and new resources to educate members and encourage them to engage key influencers in their communities. Formalizing grassroots networks using legislative committee members, board members, and staff contacts.

Of the 31 state leagues responding to the survey, 10 leagues reported possible ballot initiatives in 2009 that would affect municipalities in issue areas that include:

- transportation tax increase with local shareback;
- a taxpayers bill of rights (TABOR);
- an organized effort to vastly increase per pupil common education spending;
- real estate tax exemption for disabled veterans;
- an initiative that would direct some revenue sources toward specified traffic congestion relief activities into a new state account;
- a citizen initiative that would significantly cut the motor vehicle excise tax rates of cars and trucks in their first few years of existence.

Of the 31 leagues responding, contract lobbyists are currently employed in 12 of them (32%). Ninety-three percent of the leagues responding have member municipalities that employ contract lobbyists. Seventy-four percent of the leagues that have members retaining contract lobbyists report that the contract lobbyists coordinate their efforts with the respective leagues on league priority issues.

## PART I: 2009 STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Arkansas</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protection of tax and revenue base.</li> <li>2. Increase maximum fine for ordinance violations.</li> <li>3. Improved “State of City” process.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for statewide trauma system.</li> <li>• Anti eminent domain proposals.</li> <li>• Uniformed employees retirement issues.</li> </ul>	No regular session in 2008. Severance tax was increased from less than 1% to 5% and dedicated to highways and streets.	None
<b>Colorado</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure funding (water/wastewater, transportation).</li> <li>2. Fighting attacks on urban renewal and tax increment financing.</li> <li>3. Preserving local control.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government immunity.</li> <li>• Condemnation.</li> <li>• Annexation.</li> <li>• Tax collection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeal of state tax rate limit on municipalities.</li> <li>• Expansion of mitigation funding for energy impacted communities.</li> <li>• Retaining local control of land use policies.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Connecticut</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Property tax reform.</li> <li>2. Intermunicipal/regional cooperation.</li> <li>3. Unfunded state mandates reform.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevailing wage rate reform – increasing threshold.</li> <li>• Binding arbitration reform.</li> <li>• Smart growth.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extending the real estate conveyance tax for two years – brings \$40 million annually to towns and cities.</li> <li>• Fought off huge unfunded state mandates for police and firefighters (heart disease, infectious and contagious disease and cancer presumptions).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No increases in payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOT) for towns and cities.</li> <li>• Healthcare pool for municipal and state employees.</li> </ul>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Florida</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional property tax reform/limits on local government revenue sources.</li> <li>2. Growth management reform.</li> <li>3. Home foreclosures/affordable housing.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efforts to dictate how cities provide citizen participation in council meetings and workshops.</li> <li>• Dedicated transportation funding.</li> <li>• Fighting unfunded mandates.</li> <li>• Preemptions under the guise of “stimulating the economy.”</li> </ul>	None	Further limits on millage rates.
<b>Georgia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transportation financing.</li> <li>2. Municipal option sales tax.</li> <li>3. Accuracy and efficiency in sales tax collections.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property tax assessment cap proposals and local tax and expenditure limitation proposals.</li> <li>• Water resource planning, environmental program funding, solid waste company legislation weakening municipal authority to regulate solid waste collection, strengthening recycling/metals theft regulation and energy legislation.</li> <li>• Public safety issues, such as allowing guns in public places including city facilities, fine add-ons to pay for statewide trauma care funding, and red light camera repeal legislation.</li> </ul>	Defeating the so called “GREAT Plan” proposed by the Speaker of the House.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to pass comprehensive transportation funding legislation.</li> </ul>

<b>State</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Priorities</b>	<b>Other Issues in 2009</b>	<b>2008 Victories</b>	<b>2008 Setbacks</b>
<b>Idaho</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transportation funding – additional fuel tax and registration fee revenue, local option sales tax.</li> <li>2. Video franchise legislation – consensus bill with industry that preserves local control of rights-of-way, revenue, and PEG channels.</li> <li>3. Preserve state shared revenue.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Election consolidation.</li> <li>• Building codes.</li> <li>• Urban renewal.</li> </ul>	None	None
<b>Illinois</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protecting local revenues.</li> <li>2. Further pension reforms.</li> <li>3. Workers compensation reform.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police and fire pension issues.</li> <li>• Open meetings/Freedom of Information Act issues.</li> <li>• Labor issues.</li> <li>• Destination sourcing.</li> <li>• State-wide building codes.</li> </ul>	Pension reform legislation.	None
<b>Indiana</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Timely revenue distributions from counties.</li> <li>2. Local responsibility for funds management.</li> <li>3. Protect against the erosion of TIF revenues and local authority over TIF by placing TIF replacement mechanisms outside of the circuit breaker caps.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibiting municipal employees from serving on the council for which they work.</li> <li>• Remove the state police and the Bureau of Motor Vehicles from the gas tax and MVH/LRS revenue stream.</li> <li>• Municipal adoption of Local Option Income Taxes (LOIT).</li> <li>• LOIT for circuit breaker losses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property tax reform.</li> <li>• Annexation.</li> <li>• Riverfront Development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property Tax Reform – while we were able to prevent some negative components of HEA 1001 from becoming part of the final piece of legislation, there were still many areas that were detrimental to municipalities.</li> </ul>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Indiana Continued</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permit statewide local adoption of food/beverage taxes and innkeeper's taxes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Iowa</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Disaster recovery legislation (due to flooding and storms this summer).</li> <li>2. City revenue options and property tax reform (alternative revenues).</li> <li>3. TIME-21 funding (road and bridge infrastructure funding).</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Union issues – collective bargaining/prevaling wage.</li> <li>• Open meetings/open records legislation.</li> <li>• Water infrastructure funding and water quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The passage of TIME-21 legislation which established funding mechanisms and additional fees to create money for infrastructure funding at the state and local level.</li> <li>• Defeating detrimental open meetings/open records legislation, and successfully opposing Doctor Choice in public pension systems.</li> <li>• Creation of new economic development tax credits for brownfields and greyfields and the creation of a new economic development program focused on riverfront redevelopment, as</li> </ul>	<p>The passage of collective bargaining legislation, however; the Governor later vetoed this bill.</p>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Iowa Continued</b>			well as the successful preservation of existing TIF laws.	
<b>Kentucky</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue efforts toward pension reform that would provide for lower employer contribution rates.</li> <li>2. Correct a \$22 million shortfall that local governments face from the telecommunications tax.</li> <li>3. Protect cities from unintended consequences of firefighter overtime.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide more revenue flexibility.</li> <li>• Protect current revenue options for cities.</li> <li>• Pursue fairness in charter county governments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insurance premium tax reform.</li> <li>• Pension reform legislation.</li> </ul>	The revenue issues that were most important to cities were not addressed by the legislature.
<b>Maine</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protecting school subsidy, municipal revenue sharing and local road funding.</li> <li>2. Authorizing the levy of service charges for municipal services provided to large-scale tax exempt institutions.</li> <li>3. A variety of administration issues in the areas of codes, wind turbine regulation, petition processing, etc.</li> </ol>	Focused on balancing the state budget with a \$600-\$700 million (biennial) structural deficit, which is a sizable deficit for Maine.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The enactment of a major county-state jail unification bill that will permanently cap the property tax exposure of all county jail operations at the 2008 level.</li> <li>• A bill that amended the school district consolidation legislation of 2007, which was probably the most sloppy written major piece of legislation ever</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building code legislation was enacted that includes a state mandate to enforce certain codes that are not enforced locally at present.</li> <li>• Legislation was enacted that would allow municipalities and the state to provide less expensive public notice in news-papers, but the Governor vetoed the bill.</li> </ul>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Maine Continued</b>			<p>enacted in Maine's history.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only a limited raid on municipal revenue sharing of \$2.5 million (out of a \$130 million annual distribution).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The limited (\$2.5 million) raid on municipal revenue sharing was a raid, nonetheless. Those raids are becoming an annual event these days.</li> </ul>
<b>Maryland</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of a Municipal/Local Government Revenue Task Force.</li> <li>Establishment of a local government energy assistance program.</li> <li>Passage of speed camera legislation.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land use/smart growth legislation.</li> <li>\$1 billion state budget deficit that may impact local revenues.</li> </ul>	<p>Passing legislation to earmark all funds from a state parks and playgrounds program for municipalities. In the past, we shared these monies with counties.</p>	<p>Not passing legislation to allow municipalities to impose their own transfer tax on top of an already imposed county transfer tax.</p>
<b>Mass.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public employee health insurance cost containment.</li> <li>Municipal revenue alternatives to the property tax.</li> <li>Education and school finance reform.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State revenue shortfalls and municipal aid cuts.</li> <li>Costly expansion of public employee retirement benefits.</li> <li>Public construction and procurement return.</li> </ul>	<p>Expansion of school aid.</p>	<p>No expansion of municipal taxing authority.</p>
<b>Michigan</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit/transportation.</li> <li>Revenue sharing and other budget appropriations.</li> <li>Changes in binding arbitration law to allow locals to achieve public safety cost savings.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional property tax caps.</li> <li>Tax cuts for business that would further reduce funds for state budget</li> </ul>	<p>To be determined. Could be legislation being pushed in lame duck to allow for tax increment financing around transit oriented development. Otherwise, it could be the 2 percent increase</p>	<p>Not getting the original budget recommendation of a 4% increase in revenue sharing.</p>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Michigan Continued</b>			in revenue sharing obtained in 2009 budget.	
<b>Minnesota</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Preserving local government aid (state aid for cities).</li> <li>2. Moderating or repealing levy limits.</li> <li>3. Securing funding sources for construction, preservation, and maintenance of infrastructure (primarily sewer, water, and transportation).</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserving and expanding economic development tools.</li> <li>• Protecting public pensions.</li> <li>• Defending against unfunded mandates that may be proposed due to state financial challenges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passage of a comprehensive transportation funding package in spite of a gubernatorial veto.</li> <li>• Preservation of tort caps while I-35W Bridge victim compensation package enacted.</li> <li>• A notice requirement when a heat source is shut off on a vacant property.</li> <li>• Clarification pertaining to interstate assistance by local government.</li> <li>• A fix for the deficiency in the Minnesota Post-Retirement Investment Fund of the state's public retirement systems.</li> <li>• Authorization to establish trust funds for other post employment benefits (OPEB) under the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imposition of levy limits.</li> <li>• Failure to secure passage of legislation that would have provided a tool for cities to fund road maintenance and reconstruction.</li> <li>• Prohibition on new local option sales taxes.</li> </ul>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Minnesota Continued</b>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further clarification of disability pension laws pertaining to public safety employees.</li> <li>• New regulations pertaining to dangerous dogs.</li> </ul>	
<b>Missouri</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protection of sales tax revenue.</li> <li>2. Public employee collective bargaining.</li> <li>3. Retaining owner/renter joint liability for delinquent water and sewer bills.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State preemption of local zoning in reference to billboard enhancements and permitting.</li> <li>• An increase in the penalty for open records violations as well as mandatory training.</li> <li>• Property tax revenue protection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A change in future sales tax holidays to allow cities to “opt in” instead of “opt out.”</li> <li>• Inclusion of a VoIP amendment to allow this form of communication to be taxed as other telecommunications are now.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement of immigration laws will be added to the purview of local government.</li> <li>• Mandatory use of E-Verify for local government and mandates to withdraw local business licenses for violations.</li> </ul>
<b>Montana</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expansion of local tourist tax authority.</li> <li>2. Protection of municipal tax revenue following reappraisal.</li> <li>3. Capital project funding.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restriction of local land use powers.</li> <li>• Protecting state transfer payments.</li> <li>• Increases in public employee pension costs.</li> </ul>	Montana has biennial sessions.	None

<b>State</b>	<b>2009 Legislative Priorities</b>	<b>Other Issues in 2009</b>	<b>2008 Victories</b>	<b>2008 Setbacks</b>
<b>Nebraska</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding for streets and other infrastructure.</li> <li>2. Modifying recall statutes.</li> <li>3. Modifying open meetings act statutes.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police pensions.</li> <li>• Incentives for volunteer firefighters.</li> <li>• Public officials' involvement with ballot issues.</li> </ul>	Change motor fuel taxes to preserve funding for highways and streets, grant cities and villages additional authority for bidding, railroad crossings, natural gas.	Failure to enact legislation to give cities additional authority to deal with federal storm water mandates.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reform of state retirement system.</li> <li>2. Maintain current levels of funding for municipalities in state budget.</li> <li>3. Repeal legislation enacted last year that includes an evergreen clause in all public employee collective bargaining agreements.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional labor issues – binding arbitration, right to strike.</li> <li>• Property tax exemptions and credits.</li> <li>• Assessing issues (e.g., excluding the use of a view factor in determining market value)</li> </ul>	Enactment of legislation updating and clarifying the state's Right-to-Know law (open government law).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to enact comprehensive reform of state retirement system.</li> <li>• Enactment of legislation that includes an evergreen clause in all public employee collective bargaining agreements.</li> </ul>
<b>New Jersey</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Affordable Housing.</li> <li>2. Property Tax Relief.</li> <li>3. Economic Stimulus.</li> </ol>			
<b>North Carolina</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. City-initiated annexation.</li> <li>2. Preservation of municipal funds.</li> <li>3. Infrastructure funding – water, sewer, transportation</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water – drought issues, water withdrawal, stormwater management.</li> <li>• Energy efficient practices.</li> <li>• ABC establishments – enhanced authority to regulate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stopping a moratorium on city-initiated annexations</li> <li>• Successfully managing drought legislation.</li> </ul>	Some damage to city/town image, re: annexation issues.
<b>North Dakota</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adequate funding for transportation and infrastructure.</li> <li>2. Budget flexibility.</li> <li>3. Extraterritorial zoning</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property tax caps.</li> <li>• Home rule limitations.</li> <li>• Unfunded mandates.</li> </ul>	Sessions only in odd-numbered years.	Sessions only in odd-numbered years.

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<p><b>Ohio</b></p> <p><b>Ohio Continued</b></p>	<p>authority.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State revenue sharing with local governments.</li> <li>2. Insuring funding for the final phases of state economic stimulus package.</li> <li>3. Defending the integrity of the municipal income tax.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More intrusions on municipal home rule.</li> <li>• Unforeseeable problems stemming from a tanking state budget.</li> </ul>	<p>Passage of a \$1.6 billion economic stimulus package, of which about \$1 billion goes for environmental and other infrastructure grants/loans to local government and stopping a number of bills that were bad, but so esoteric, no one outside of Ohio could possibly be interested in them.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Oklahoma</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support legislation to redistribute funds collected under the Oklahoma Vehicle License and Registration Act to increase the amount of funds allocated to cities and incorporated towns for transportation needs.</li> <li>2. Initiate and support legislation to increase the amount of the fine which could be charged by municipal courts “not of record” to \$500 without triggering a jury trial.</li> <li>3. Initiate legislation for approval for change orders that may be delegated to the City Manager with reporting requirements to council up to 10% of any contract.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose actions that erode municipal revenues and services to citizens such as sales tax exemptions, sales tax holidays and elimination of grocery sales tax.</li> <li>• Oppose actions that would require municipalities to increase the percentage that they put into the various retirement systems.</li> <li>• Support legislation to sunset sales tax exemptions every two year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passed legislation making it a felony for unauthorized use of “police-strength” tasers or stun guns against police and fire personnel, EMT’s, and others providing emergency services while the person is acting in the course of their official duty.</li> <li>• Passed legislation that amends current statutes to provide additional liability protection for 911 operators and other emergency personnel to clarify</li> </ul>	<p>The passage of HB 1739 was a very complicated bill that took private utilities four years to pass. This took up a good majority of our time fighting, strategizing, and trying to prevent this bill from becoming law. This piece of legislation threatens the need for franchises, takes away the citizens right to vote, and has the potential of increasing consumers bills.</p>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
Oklahoma Continued			<p>language to include all public agencies, as well as to cover new types of communication technologies such as VOiP and wireless services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passed legislation clarifying the definition for “appointed” officials for purposes of mandatory training for newly elected and appointed officials to ensure this does not include appointed judges, attorneys, and other professional staff.</li> <li>• Preventing legislation that would have redistributed “sales tax” based per population per city. The legislator’s intent of this bill was to give the smaller cities and towns their portion of sales tax he felt was lost by shopping in bigger communities. However, from the numbers he put</li> </ul>	

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Oklahoma Continued</b>			together some of the big cities would have gained revenue while some of the very smallest cities could have lost.	
<b>Oregon</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ethics reform.</li> <li>2. Transportation funding.</li> <li>3. Infrastructure recapitalization.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance and taxation.</li> <li>• Telecommunications.</li> <li>• Ensure that cities may collect franchise fees from all electricity providers that utilize city owned rights-of-way.</li> </ul>	<p>2008 Interim Session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB1069: Directed Water Resource Department to provide grants and direct services payments.</li> <li>• SB 5556: Budget reconciliation bill</li> <li>• SB5100: Authorized \$76 million in certificates of participation to fund the creation of the Oregon Interoperability Network.</li> <li>• HB 3607: Established Oregon Declared Emergency Recovery Fund.</li> </ul>	None
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local share of 1% sales tax increase.</li> <li>2. Pension reform.</li> <li>3. Blight remediation.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taxation of gas wells and drilling issues such as water usage and local road repair.</li> <li>• Transportation infrastructure funding.</li> <li>• Prevailing wage.</li> </ul>	None	None

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>South Carolina</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comprehensive tax reform.</li> <li>2. Annexation reform.</li> <li>3. Protecting the flexibility/authority of local governments (home rule).</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Truth in spending legislation, spending caps, assault on business license.</li> </ul>	Stopping the legislation to impose a local spending cap.	Continuing to fight encroachment on home rule, new limits on spending, challenges resulting from millage caps, lack of leadership on annexation reform.
<b>Texas</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Oppose any and all property tax revenue caps and appraisal caps.</li> <li>2. Oppose any erosion of municipal authority regarding eminent domain and other land use issues.</li> <li>3. Oppose any erosion of sovereign immunity and increased municipal exposure to liability claims.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any attempts to limit the ability of city officials to communicate with members of the legislature and to pay dues to any organization that lobbies.</li> <li>• Erosion of annexation authority.</li> <li>• Erosion of municipal authority over city rights-of-way and/or erosion of municipal authority to charge a fee for use of municipal rights-of-way.</li> <li>• Erosion of cities' authority to regulate the location of billboards.</li> </ul>	The Texas legislature did not meet in 2008.	The Texas legislature did not meet in 2008.
<b>Virginia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protection of funding for local governments in state budget.</li> <li>2. Protection of state funding for local police departments in state budget.</li> <li>3. Protection of state funding for</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsible transition from Virginia's cash proffer in rezonings to an impact fee law.</li> <li>• Additional authority to deal with blight issues.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Defeat of impact fee bill that had harmful caps.</li> <li>• Budget issues defeated – state limits on teacher salary</li> </ul>	Budget cuts from state.

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Virginia Continued</b>	K-12 education. 4. Protection of state funding for transportation projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural resource funding, including adequate funding of the Virginia Water Quality Improvement Fund.</li> <li>• Funding for purchase of development rights and conservation easements.</li> <li>• Further restrictions on eminent domain – constitutional limitations.</li> <li>• Immigration laws that put unfunded mandates on local governments.</li> <li>• The authority to prohibit carrying dangerous weapons in local government buildings.</li> <li>• Limit the right to use foster care to deal with truancy and delinquency</li> <li>• Technical and funding improvements in the comprehensive services act to help local governments deal with children and distress.</li> </ul>	funding; public safety employee state funding.	
<b>Washington</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Infrastructure funding.</li> <li>2. Oppose the requirement to tape executive sessions and oppose the attempt to limit public agencies attorney client privilege.</li> <li>3. Oppose diversion from public works trust fund.</li> <li>4. Mitigating the medical costs for offenders.</li> <li>5. Fiscal aid for distressed cities</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional local sales tax authority.</li> <li>• Property tax – require county valuations and revise cap for EMS.</li> <li>• Funding for gang intervention and prevention activities.</li> <li>• Limiting liability for local government.</li> <li>• Oppose legislation that</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gang task force recommendations – this legislation provides a number of useful tools for cities to address the rising problem of gang activity. Among those tools are clarification of what constitutes a</li> </ul>	Due to the anticipated state revenue shortfall, AWC recognized it was unlikely that our high priority issue of infrastructure funding would be addressed in any significant fashion in the 2008 session because most

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Washington Continued</b>	and counties with low tax base.	<p>erodes cities' ability to reject all bids and manage contracts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance transition associated with annexations.</li> <li>• Climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>gang and gang activity; limited funding for law enforcement and graffiti abatement; and additional penalties for gang-related offenses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State revenues for public safety – this legislation will initiate a biennial appropriation to provide resources for a new LEOFF 2 benefit enhancement. Distribution begins in 2011-13.</li> <li>• Local solutions to climate change – provides a stakeholder process to determine what should be the appropriate responses from cities to address climate change.</li> </ul>	<p>of those carry a high price tag. However, we did make progress in communicating cities' and towns' need for infrastructure assistance and other financial aid, hopefully setting the stage for significant action in the future.</p>
<b>Wisconsin</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elimination of levy limits.</li> <li>2. Maintain funding for state shared revenue program in wake of record state budget deficit.</li> <li>3. Eliminate certain property tax exemptions.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow municipalities to levy a first responders surcharge on telephone bills.</li> <li>• Enact enabling legislation allowing two or more municipalities to create regional transportation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of TIF authority.</li> <li>• Restoration of ability to charge developers fees in lieu of land dedication for parks</li> </ul>	<p>Continuation of property tax levy limits.</p>

State	2009 Legislative Priorities	Other Issues in 2009	2008 Victories	2008 Setbacks
<b>Wisconsin Continued</b>		authorities with taxing authority.	at time of subdivision approval.	

## PART II: STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY STRATEGIES

State	Strategies
<b>Arkansas</b>	Listserv will be used along with blast faxes.
<b>Connecticut</b>	Beef-up our grassroots approach to lobbying by using more community groups like the PTA as well as unions (to fight for property tax reform). Still assessing 2008 and developing lobbying strategies for 2009.
<b>Georgia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2008 session, GMA worked closely with various partners (school board association, AARP, county commissioners association, educators, and the Georgia Budget &amp; Policy Institute) to defeat the tax plan introduced during the last legislative session. We plan to continue to work with this alliance as the assessment cap and tax and expenditure limitation legislation is proposed.</li> <li>• One reality that city officials must deal with is the lack of knowledge among legislators of the basic role, duties, and challenges of running a city. To better explain how cities work, we asked our members to invite legislators during the interim between sessions to hear how cities operate, how they set their budgets, and show how the cities partner with other governments to serve their constituents. GMA has called this program the “Hometown Connection” for the past four years, but really pushed for cities to educate their House and Senate members this past summer. For more information, see: <a href="http://www.gmat.com/HometownConnection.aspx">http://www.gmat.com/HometownConnection.aspx</a>.</li> </ul>
<b>Idaho</b>	2008 strategies included regional luncheon meetings with legislatures before session begun. Legislative day meetings and luncheon attended by 95% of legislatures. Coalition developed with: building contractors, industry, bankers association, hospital association, counties association, highway districts association, and municipal electrical utilities association to sponsor a constitutional amendment on municipal debt policy.
<b>Illinois</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Code Survey – In 2008, a new strategy was used to oppose Senate Bill 2654, state-mandated building code for new commercial construction. The IML mailed a one-page explanation of the legislation with a tear-off questionnaire at the bottom to those municipalities with a population of 5,000 and under. Those local officials who responded whose municipalities did not currently have a building code were called to attend meetings with ten targeted downstate senators in their district offices with IML lobbyists. The legislation was expected to be called during the recently completed Fall Legislative Session. However, it was not brought up.</li> <li>• New Legislator Home Town Visits Program – The IML plans to continue the Program. Five senators and twelve representatives have recently retired, were defeated, or ran successfully for Congress. Therefore, the IML plans to schedule visits during the months of December of 2008 or January of 2009 during the non-session time to meet with the newly elected members of the General Assembly at a location of their choosing. The IML will invite a regional council of government and/or an elected local official to attend.</li> </ul>

<b>State</b>	<b>Strategies</b>
<b>Illinois Continued</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conference Calls with the IML Legislative Committee – In 2008, the IML for the first time put together a conference call for the IML Legislative Committee. The IML plans to offer three conference calls for the committee for 2009. We found it a valuable tool to keep the communication open and help the committee members more engaged in the legislative process.</li> </ul>
<b>Iowa</b>	<p>The Iowa League has hired a full time Research and Fiscal Analyst, who will support legislative informational and research needs.</p>
<b>Kentucky</b>	<p>2008 Session and Interim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renewed focus on board input and involvement in setting the legislative agenda.</li> <li>• Increased number of city visits and legislative wrap-ups.</li> <li>• Placed emphasis on improving overall communication strategy with members and improved a number of policy/legislative publications.</li> </ul> <p>New Tactics for the 2009 Session:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New legislative bill tracking feature to KLC’s website.</li> <li>• Revamping the e-mailed legislative bulletin and alert.</li> <li>• Renewed emphasis on coalition building.</li> </ul>
<b>Maine</b>	<p>No changes are being contemplated.</p> <p>Our advocacy strategy, such as it is, is primarily based on open communication to the municipal and legislative communities.</p> <p>Our members generally rely on us to deliver the message to the legislators in Augusta while they lobby the issues back home.</p> <p>We very rarely implore our members to Augusta, stage the hearings, or do the other choreographies other associations engage in.</p> <p>We are not particularly high-tech. We communicate both electronically and in hard copy. We generally communicate openly to the wide (non-strategic) audience.</p> <p>Our Experience when going out on the road, however, is that our members are very aware of the municipally-related legislation on the table, and their legislators are very aware of their positions on that legislation. In that respect, the essential goal of our advocacy strategy has been achieved.</p>
<b>Maryland</b>	<p>New strategies were not utilized in 2008. In 2009, MML plans to hold their own legislative reception rather than partnering with sponsors as they have done in the past. This will allow them to showcase municipal government and talk specifically about their legislative priorities at the very beginning of the 2009 General Assembly session.</p>

State	Strategies
<b>Massachusetts</b>	<b>2008:</b> Introduced web and e-mail-based advocacy system. 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of Friday morning breakfast meetings with legislatures, local officials, and media. (10 meetings spring and fall around state).
<b>Michigan</b>	For 2009, MML will continue to make use of 1) coalition building with organizations not typically involved in local government issues; 2) a public policy issue advocacy campaign around the state budget, and 3) utilizing social media to a greater extent. All intended to help bolster our legislative initiatives.
<b>Minnesota</b>	In 2008, the League of Minnesota Cities collaborated with other associations on issues of common interest. These associations included the Minnesota Association of Townships, the Minnesota School Boards Association, and the Association of Minnesota Counties.  In 2009, the League of Minnesota Cities will begin using new association management software, Aptify, to track, among other things, member interests and expertise.
<b>Missouri</b>	This year, the Missouri Municipal League will employ their policy committees more during the committee hearing process as well as with general lobbying. In addition, we will make a presentation during the legislative conference on how local officials can use the league's legislative e-mail system. Changes to our legislative website will also make it more user friendly.
<b>New Jersey</b>	Utilizing executive board members to establish coalitions within their county and/or region of the state.
<b>North Carolina</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Thank you for serving” events.</li> <li>• Formation of association coalition on more strategic level.</li> <li>• High-road, long-term partnerships with key groups (vs. issue-driven).</li> </ul>
<b>North Dakota</b>	North Dakota League of Cities continues daily website updates, weekly conference calls, and Cities Day at the legislature.
<b>Ohio</b>	The Ohio Municipal League work in 2009 will be the same as in 2008. The one change that was made in 2008 is that OML ended the mailed Legislation Bulletin and now just informed the members on legislation and many other items through e-mail. That doubled the readership and, at least, tripled the amount of information that is sent out to the members.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	There are plans to market the League and the issues better. OML will be working with a PR person from one of their member cities to help create a marketing tool to help the cities get the message out to the citizens on issues such as municipal funding, water, and transportation. They will continue to do the Grassroots Involvement Program to inform their members of any action that is needed at the legislature.

State	Strategies
Oregon	<p>The Oregon League is engaged in a very comprehensive analysis by committees in nine issue areas of opportunities to take focused initiatives in passing legislation of importance to our members. The result is a prioritized list of three top legislative agendas that the League will try to achieve in 2009, two that have multi-session possibilities, and 19 others that will be addressed as opportunities and resources allow.</p> <p>This is different than past pre-legislative agendas in that it is a shorter, more focused list.</p>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach communication: Communicate MASC legislative strategy to legislators, partner organizations, and the media in a context that illustrates the effect of legislation on the citizens/taxpayers involved rather than on the government entity incorporating the three value messages of <i>Hometown, SC</i>. They are value, partnerships, and resources.</li> <li>• Member involvement: Continue to provide ongoing and new resources to educate members and encourage them to engage key influencers in their own communities. Formalize MASC's grassroots networks using legislative committee members, board members, AMS, and staff contacts.</li> <li>• Key influencer grassroots participation: Mobilize our growing network of key influencers to advocate on behalf of strong cities. Cultivate and educate these key influencers through ongoing contact from municipal officials and association staff.</li> <li>• Staff leadership: Provide pro-active leadership to stay ahead of legislative issues informing members and key influencers, working directly with legislators and staff, coordinating with partner organizations, and gathering information to strengthen our case.</li> </ul>
Texas	<p>During the 2007 legislative session, the League used a variety of methods to keep membership informed of legislative action during the session. These strategies will be used during the 81<sup>st</sup> legislative session beginning in January 2009.</p> <p>Legislative Updates: Legislative updates were routinely issued (weekly) with new bill filings, committee actions, floor actions, and requests for action. These were issued via e-mail and in print. Legislature Updates include articles on legislation, talking points to use with legislators, and background information on specific subjects.</p> <p>E-Lists: Membership is allowed to sign up to be included on various e-lists sorted by subject. Current subjects include: Annexation/ETJ, Billboards, Civil Service, Code Enforcement, Collective Bargaining/Meet and Confer, Disaster Response, Disease Presumption, Economic Development, Elections, Electric Utilities, Emergency Services Districts/EMS, Ethics, Gas Utilities, GFOAT, Land Use (eminent domain, permit vesting, etc.), Municipal Court, Open Meetings/Open Records, Personnel, Property Tax (revenue/appraisal caps, etc.), Public Safety/Fire, Public Safety/Police, Purchasing, Sales Tax, Telecommunications, Transportation, and Water.</p>

<b>State</b>	<b>Strategies</b>
<b>Texas Continued</b>	If action is needed on a particular subject (i.e., SB 1119 relating to Billboards); an email alert would be sent to those members with interest in that area requesting them to take action.
<b>Virginia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using internet-based survey to gather information from members.</li> <li>• Developing list of local government experts in various areas as resource.</li> <li>• Revamped semi-weekly Legislative Bulletin – shorter, more targeted to priority issues of the day. (As a Dillon Rule state, we face numerous bills to limit local authority and therefore have to respond to many issues.)</li> <li>• Daily VML legislative staff meetings during session.</li> <li>• More time spent training local officials on how to lobby.</li> <li>• Increased efforts to coordinate with affiliate organizations.</li> </ul>
<b>Washington</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coalition building, working with various new stakeholders for infrastructure funding where AWC may have competed with these groups in the past.</li> <li>• Published a “Washington’s Infrastructure in Crisis” brochure – outlining the issues and our proposed solutions.</li> <li>• Will publish our comprehensive “State of the Cities” report (December) – The “State of the Cities” is our ongoing research effort to explore the fiscal health and trends of Washington’s cities and towns. The comprehensive “State of the Cities” report is released every four years at the beginning of each gubernatorial term. Interim reports, which present an in-depth look at a specific topic, are released annually between full reports.</li> </ul>

### PART III: STATEWIDE BALLOT INITIATIVES

State	Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009	Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome
<b>Arkansas</b>	No, odd year elections.	<p>Arkansas Municipal League is opposed to a proposal for annual legislative session.</p> <p>AML supports \$300 million water, wastewater, and drainage bond issue.</p> <p>AML supports clarification and update of election language proposed for the state constitution..</p>
<b>Colorado</b>	Transportation tax increase with local shareback.	<p>Referendum O: support Makes it easier to put statutory initiatives on the ballot and harder for constitutional amendments.</p> <p>Amendment 50: support Limited stakes gambling increase – new revenue to go to community colleges.</p> <p>Amendment 59: support State can retain and expend all revenue (currently limited by TABOR), repeals K-12 constitutional spending requirements</p> <p>Amendment 52: oppose Diverts portion of severance tax to Interstate 70 projects, and locks the requirement in the constitution.</p>
<b>Connecticut</b>	No	<p>Yes. CCM opposed a state Constitutional Convention that would, among other things, likely allow for state referendum. The initiative was defeated on November 4.</p>

State	Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009	Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome
<b>Florida</b>	Hometown Democracy Amendment, but it would not be on ballot until 2010. It would require any change in local comprehensive plans be approved by city's electorate rather than governing body.	The Florida League took no position on the 2008 constitutional amendments.
<b>Georgia</b>	Potential ballot initiatives would not likely be on the 2009 ballot, but instead would appear on the general election ballot in 2010. These could include property tax assessment caps and tax and expenditure limitations for both state and local governments.	Three ballot initiatives appeared on the 2008 general election ballot. One provided a constitutional tax break for tracts of timber land for 15 year time periods. GMA was neutral on this proposal. Another, if passed, would reverse a Georgia Supreme Court opinion that ruled that education taxes for "tax allocation districts" (TADs) could not be used to incentivize development. GMA was supportive of this legislation. The third would allow for "infrastructure development districts" which would have the ability to issue tax free bonds and levy assessments to pay for development. GMA initially opposed this measure, but negotiated language favorable to cities and then adopted a "neutral" position. Our county counterparts have information on all three on their website at <a href="http://www.accg.org/content.asp?ContentID=628">http://www.accg.org/content.asp?ContentID=628</a> .
<b>Idaho</b>	No	No
<b>Illinois</b>	No	In November of 2008, the ballot for the General Election included a question on whether to authorize a new constitutional convention (con-con) to consider changing some or all of the existing Illinois Constitution, which was adopted in 1970. The Illinois Municipal League's Board of Directors decided to oppose the calling of a constitutional convention. In reaching this decision, the Board considered the current political climate in the state, the serious potential limitations on municipal authority that could arise, and other potential harm that could have resulted from a con-con. The measure was defeated.

State	Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009	Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome
<b>Indiana</b>	No	No
<b>Iowa</b>	No	No
<b>Maine</b>	<p>Maine will likely be voting on a TABOR initiative in November 2009 (nick-named “TABOR II”) which is a pared down version of the TABOR initiative that was defeated by the voters in Maine in 2006.</p> <p>Also, Maine will be facing a citizens initiative in 2009 that would significantly cut the motor vehicle excise tax rates of cars and trucks in their first few years of existence. The impact will reduce municipal revenue for road and bridge maintenance and construction by 40%, or by approximately \$80 million a year.</p>	<p>Of the three statewide ballot questions on November 4, the only one that MMA was involved in (and supported) is a small \$3.4 million bond issue for drinking and wastewater infrastructure loans. We believe that initiative will be approved by the voters on November 4.</p>
<b>Maryland</b>	No	<p>Maryland just passed slots by referendum on the 2008 ballot. Although none of the monies come directly to municipalities, the revenues are supposed to help plug the huge hold in the state budget. This would help municipal governments by freeing up monies at the state level intended for local government.</p>
<b>Massachusetts</b>	No	<p>Yes. Question 1 would have repealed the state’s personal income tax (\$13 billion/40% of state revenues). MMA opposed it. It lost 70/30.</p>
<b>Michigan</b>	Additional property tax caps.	<p>Michigan Municipal League was not involved in any state-wide ballot initiatives in 2008.</p>
<b>Minnesota</b>	No	<p>The only ballot initiative on the 2008 ballot was a sales tax increase to fund environmental and arts projects. The League of Minnesota Cities did not take a position on this amendment; however, many individual cities were supportive. The initiative passed.</p>

State	Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009	Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome
<b>Missouri</b>	Only have ballot initiatives in even year.	A ballot proposal failed to garner enough signatures that would have done away with a municipality's ability to deal with nuisances. This was a well funded campaign that appeared to have enough signatures early on, but after verification of names, fell short. Missouri Municipal League anticipates this subject will be back in two years as it met a similar defeat two years ago.
<b>Montana</b>	No	No
<b>Nebraska</b>	No. There are no statewide elections in 2009. It is very possible that a TABOR-type initiative will be attempted in 2010. A similar effort failed in 2006.	<p>The League of Nebraska Municipalities supported two ballot issues in 2008. In the May primary election, the League supported an amendment to the Nebraska Constitution to allow cities with a population above 5,000 to invest endowment funds under the prudent investor rule. It passed.</p> <p>In November general election, the League supported a proposed amendment to the Nebraska Constitution to allow cities and villages to use funds other than general tax revenue for economic development. It failed.</p>
<b>New Hampshire</b>	No	No.
<b>New Jersey</b>	No	Ballot question to allow towns to establish joint or regional judges. Question failed due to misinformation noted on interpretive statement.
<b>North Carolina</b>	Possibly	No
<b>North Dakota</b>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Income tax reduction measure. State league opposed. Outcome – measure defeated: 36% to 64%.</li> </ul>

State	Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009	Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome
<b>North Dakota Continued</b>	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oil tax trust fund measure. No state league position. Outcome – measure defeated 30% to 70%.</li> </ul>
<b>Ohio</b>	No	<p>Ohio Municipal League is supporting a state issue that will double the amount (to \$400 million) of state bonds for local government green field and brown field projects. That should pass.</p> <p>OML is opposing a constitutional amendment, on technical grounds, that purports to protect the rights of property owners regarding the groundwater under their properties. No idea what will happen on that one.</p> <p>OML is opposing an issue that would repeal state legislation that put a cap on pay day loans at 28%. If the repeal wins the pay day lenders would be allowed to take their loans back up to 391% annually.</p>
<b>Oklahoma</b>	<p><b>The Helping Oklahoma Public Education (HOPE)</b> initiative is an organized effort to vastly increase per pupil common education spending. This mandate would come at a cost of \$850 million to our state budget. The proposal does not include an identified revenue stream and would ultimately have catastrophic effects on Oklahoma families and essential state services including road and bridge funding, corrections, healthcare, and social services.</p>	No
<b>Oregon</b>	Measure 56 – If passed would eliminate the double majority requirement and amends Oregon’s constitution to provide that May and November property tax elections are decided by majority of voters voting.	Oregon law doesn’t allow League of Oregon Cities to support or oppose ballot initiatives.

State	Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009	Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	No	Bond issue for water and sewer infrastructure. PCLM supported. The referendum passed.
<b>South Carolina</b>	No	Yes, there was an amendment to the state constitution on the ballot in November that would have allowed local governments to invest in equities in trust funds established to comply with GASB 45. There was a similar amendment for state government. Both were soundly defeated. We believe this was due almost in its entirety to the economic situation because similar amendments have passed every county in recent elections. We plan to try again in 2010.
<b>Texas</b>	Probably eminent domain measures in November as a result of legislation considered in the 81 <sup>st</sup> Legislative Session.	No
<b>Virginia</b>	Eminent domain could become a constitutional amendment, but will not happen until 2010, if at all. Legislation will likely be introduced in 2009 session.  Real estate tax exemption for disabled veterans – bill likely will be introduced in 2009.	No
<b>Washington</b>	Initiative 985 – would direct the following revenue sources toward specified traffic congestion relief activities into a new state account: 15 percent of the 6.5 percent state sales and use tax imposed on motor vehicle sales; 0.5 percent of all state transportation capital funding; certain excess toll revenues; and revenue generated from local traffic safety camera infractions. In addition, carpool lanes must be opened	Initiative Measure 960 – passed by the voters in 2007, concerns tax and fee increases imposed by state government. The measure requires two-thirds legislature or voter approval for tax increases and legislature approval for fee increases, and new e-mail publishing requirements.  Initiative Measure 747 – passed in 2001, limiting annual

<b>State</b>	<b>Possible Ballot Initiatives Affecting Munis. in 2009</b>	<b>Ballot Initiatives that League was Involved in During 2008; Position of League; and Final Outcome</b>
<b>Washington Continued</b>	<p>to all traffic during non-peak hours. State and local governments must synchronize traffic lights on heavily-traveled arterials and streets, and rapidly respond to traffic accidents and other highway obstructions, within their respective jurisdictions. The state auditor must establish certain congestion relief performance benchmarks and provide updates to the public regarding various activities required under the initiative.</p> <p>This initiative is on the November ballot. AWC provides its members educational materials that can be shared with elected officials, staff, and the community. AWC's staff is also available to help cities evaluate the issue and its impacts.</p>	<p>property tax levy increases for each tax district to one percent. In November 2007, the Washington Supreme Court ruled that I-747 was unconstitutional – in its opinion it stated that the initiative failed to accurately inform voters of the impact of the change, because the text of the law used in the initiative showed that the initiative reduced the general property tax levy from a limit of two percent to one percent.</p> <p>The Legislature convened in November 2007 for a one-day special session to reinstate the provisions of I-747. HB 2414 reinstated the one percent cap and eliminated any new banked capacity as a result of the court decision.</p> <p>AWC testified against the bill in the hearings, along with county representatives, requesting instead that the Legislature consider placing the limit at a rate of inflation, the implicit price deflator (IPD), which has been a legislative priority of the association for several years. AWC recognized the decisions regarding the bill's provisions were agreed to by the time the legislature had returned to Olympia; the intent was to remind them of the impact on cities.</p>
<b>Wisconsin</b>	No	No

## PART IV: STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE CONTRACT LOBBYISTS

State	Does the league employ contract lobbyists?	If yes, for what?	Do any of your cities employ contract lobbyists?	Are the efforts of the city contract lobbyists coordinated with league priority issues?
<b>Arkansas</b>	No		No	
<b>Colorado</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Connecticut</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Florida</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Not directly.
<b>Georgia</b>	No		Yes	No
<b>Idaho</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Illinois</b>	Yes	General and specific purposes.	Yes	Yes and No: In 2008 the League formed a Municipal Contractual Lobbyist Coalition that met twice by conference call. In January of 2009, the League plans to be more proactive by first setting up a meeting/conference call for the mayor or city manager that employs contractual lobbyists. It is the League's hope that this will result in more open communication and more witness slips in committee on key issues impacting municipalities. The League's goal is to meet monthly with the municipal contractual lobbyists during the months of February, March, April, May and during the Fall Legislative Veto Session.
<b>Indiana</b>	Yes	General purpose and finance issues lobbying.	Yes	No
<b>Iowa</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Yes
<b>Kentucky</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Yes
<b>Maine</b>	No		Yes	Sometimes...the cities do not generally employ contract lobbyists for issues that we are working on at the league level. It is

<b>State</b>	<b>Does the league employ contract lobbyists?</b>	<b>If yes, for what?</b>	<b>Do any of your cities employ contract lobbyists?</b>	<b>Are the efforts of the city contract lobbyists coordinated with league priority issues?</b>
<b>Maine Continued</b>				more typically for such matters as local education funding cost share arrangements, special transportation subsidies, private and special laws, etc.
<b>Maryland</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Mass.</b>	No		Yes	No
<b>Michigan</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Minnesota</b>	No		Yes	Sometimes.
<b>Missouri</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Montana</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Nebraska</b>	Yes	Specific issues: for the top 2 or 3 issues each year.	Yes	It varies.
<b>New Hampshire</b>	No		No	
<b>New Jersey</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>North Carolina</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>North Dakota</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Yes
<b>Ohio</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Yes
<b>Oregon</b>	No		Yes	No
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	Yes	For a specific issue.	Yes	Yes
<b>South Carolina</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Yes
<b>Texas</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	No
<b>Vermont</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Virginia</b>	Yes	General purpose lobbying.	Yes	Sometimes yes.
<b>Washington</b>	No		Yes	Yes
<b>Wisconsin</b>	No		Yes	No

## PART V: STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE COALITIONS & OPPONENTS

State	Coalitions	Issues	Opponents	Issues
<b>Arkansas</b>	No			
<b>Colorado</b>	Yes			
<b>Connecticut</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education Association.</li> <li>2. Council of Small Towns, AFSCME, PTA/PTO.</li> <li>3. Chambers of Commerce, construction industry, Council of Small Towns, boards of education.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education aid increases.</li> <li>2. Prevailing wage rate reform.</li> </ol>	Various municipal unions	Labor issues.
<b>Florida</b>	No		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy/fire unions.</li> <li>2. Florida Chamber of Commerce.</li> <li>3. Florida Homebuilders Association.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pension/collective bargaining.</li> <li>2. Property tax reform.</li> <li>3. Growth management.</li> </ol>
<b>Georgia</b>		GMA has worked with other coalitions on transportation and environmental issues.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Georgia Association of Realtors.</li> <li>2. Solid Waste Association.</li> <li>3. County Commissioners Association.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Property issues.</li> <li>2. Garbage/landfill regulations.</li> <li>3. Intergovernmental relations.</li> </ol>
<b>Idaho</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bankers, bond attorneys, counties, highway districts, school districts, public hospitals, municipal electrical utilities.</li> </ol>	Constitutional amendment on municipal debt.	No	

State	Coalitions	Issues	Opponents	Issues
<b>Illinois</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transportation for Illinois Coalition.</li> <li>2. Local Government Coalition.</li> <li>3. Municipal Government Coalition.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State and federal issues.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois.</li> <li>2. Illinois Press Association.</li> <li>3. National Rifle Association.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collective bargaining/benefit enhancements.</li> <li>2. Open meetings issues, making settlements public.</li> <li>3. Local ordinances vs. state-wide gun rights.</li> </ol>
<b>Indiana</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assoc. of Indiana Counties.</li> <li>2. Indiana Municipal Power Agency.</li> <li>3. Build Indiana Council.</li> <li>4. Fraternal Order of Police.</li> <li>5. Firefighters.</li> <li>6. Indiana Library Federation.</li> <li>7. Indiana Assoc. of Regional Councils.</li> <li>8. Indiana Planning Assoc.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Funding sources, economic development utility issues.</li> <li>2. Road and street funding.</li> <li>3. Most municipal finance issues.</li> <li>4. Most municipal finance issues.</li> <li>5. Most municipal finance issues.</li> <li>6. Most municipal finance issues.</li> <li>7. Most municipal finance issues.</li> <li>8. Planning/zoning issues.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School Associations.</li> <li>2. Restaurant and Hospitality Association.</li> <li>3. Indiana Cable Association/Telecommunications.</li> <li>4. Indiana Manufacturers Association.</li> <li>5. Indiana Chamber of Commerce.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Property tax/alternative financing.</li> <li>2. Food and beverage tax</li> <li>3. Cable franchising/municipal broadband.</li> <li>4. Property tax.</li> <li>5. Property Tax.</li> </ol>
<b>Iowa</b>	Yes		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Iowa Farm Bureau.</li> <li>2. Iowans for Tax Relief.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taxation and land use.</li> <li>2. Taxation.</li> </ol>

State	Coalitions	Issues	Opponents	Issues
<b>Kentucky</b>	Kentucky Chamber of Commerce; Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence.	To raise awareness of the threat posed by rising retirement and health costs to such vital services as education and public safety.	1. Retailers Association 2. Kentucky Assoc. of Counties 3. Realtors Association	1. Expanded Revenue 2. Annexation 3. Collection of occupational license taxes
<b>Louisiana</b>	1. Police Jury, Sheriffs, School Boards, District Attorneys, Fire Fighters, Police Chiefs. 2. Coalition to Save Louisiana Jobs.	1. Tax Issues. 2. Workers' Compensation Laws.	1. Trial Lawyers. 2. Business and Industry Association.	1. Tort reform/insurance issues. 2. Tax issues.
<b>Maine</b>	1. Maine Education Association. 2. Maine State Chamber of Commerce.	1. Require the state to pay at least 55% of the cost of public K-12 education. To fight for a reasonable school consolidation bill with both local and voter input, rather than a top-down consolidation mandate. 2. A coherent and reasonable alternative to TABOR.		
<b>Mass.</b>	Schools, businesses.		Firefighters Association.	Collective bargaining and other personnel issues.

State	Coalitions	Issues	Opponents	Issues
<b>Michigan</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. State Chamber of Commerce.</li> <li>2. Universities, non-profits.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Water withdrawal, binding</li> <li>2. General tax and state budget issues.</li> </ol>	County Association.	Economic development where it involves tax capture.
<b>Minnesota</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Other local government associations (counties, school districts).</li> <li>2. Other municipal subset groups, bankers, financial advisors, and develop. specialists.</li> <li>3. City Engineers Association, Public Works Assoc., city attorneys, and other professional associations for city employees.</li> <li>4. Minnesota Institute of Public Finance; and other develop. groups.</li> <li>5. Minnesota Foreclosure Partners Council.</li> <li>6. Municipal Beverage Assoc. and Licensed Beverage Association.</li> <li>7. Minnesota Chapter of the American Water Works Association.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multiple.</li> <li>2. Supporting public finance and tax increment financing legislation.</li> <li>3. As needed.</li> <li>4. Economic Development.</li> <li>5. Foreclosure issues.</li> <li>6. Liquor regulations.</li> <li>7. Drinking water.</li> <li>8. Sustainable development, green house gas.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taxpayers League of Minnesota.</li> <li>2. Minnesota Grocers Association.</li> <li>3. Auto Dealers.</li> <li>4. Realtors and Builders.</li> <li>5. Minnesota Chamber of Commerce.</li> <li>6. Retailers.</li> <li>7. Minnesota Business Partnership.</li> <li>8. Minnesota Newspapers Association.</li> <li>9. Minnesota Association for Justice (Trial Lawyers).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tax/spending issues.</li> <li>2. Wine in grocery stores.</li> <li>3. Zoning.</li> <li>4. Zoning and code issues.</li> <li>5. Numerous issues.</li> <li>6. General government, local control.</li> <li>7. Tax/spending issues, local control.</li> <li>8. Open meeting law/data practices.</li> <li>9. Tort caps, joint and several liabilities.</li> </ol>

State	Coalitions	Issues	Opponents	Issues
<b>Minnesota Continued</b>	8. Green Star Cities, state agencies and statewide energy and environmental organizations.			
<b>Missouri</b>	1. School associations. 2. County associations. 3. Municipal Utility Association.	Collective bargaining, labor negotiations.	Missouri Chamber of Commerce.	Taxation.
<b>Montana</b>	Yes		1. Chamber of Commerce. 2. Taxpayers Association. 3. Realtors Association. 4.	1. Local Tax Authority. 2. Local Tax Authority. 3. Land Use.
<b>Nebraska</b>	Yes			
<b>New Hampshire</b>	The league has many ad hoc coalitions, depending on issue, and does not depend on any particular org. as a consistent ally.			

<b>State</b>	<b>Coalitions</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Opponents</b>	<b>Issues</b>
<b>New Jersey</b>	No		1. Police Union. 2. Builders Association. 3. Housing Advocacy Organization. 4. Teachers Union.	1. Rights Issues. 2. Affordable Housing. 3. Affordable Housing. 4. Bargaining.
<b>New York</b>	1. Other municipal associations, schools. 2. Other municipal associations.	1. Labor issues. 2. State aid, mandates relief.		
<b>North Carolina</b>	Yes			
<b>North Dakota</b>	Counties Association.	Property tax reform.		
<b>Ohio</b>	Yes		Ohio Chamber of Commerce and the Ohio Society of CPAs.	Municipal income tax law.
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Yes	TRUST (Transportation Revenues Used Strictly for Transportation).	1. Fire, Police Unions. 2. Rural Water Association 3. Counties. 4. Farm Bureau Firefighters 5. Firefighters.	1. Personnel issues. 2. Water issues. 3. Funding issues. 4. Territorial issues (annexation, eminent domain).

<b>State</b>	<b>Coalitions</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Opponents</b>	<b>Issues</b>
<b>Oregon</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mayors Assoc.</li> <li>2. City/County Management Assoc.</li> <li>3. City Attorneys Assoc.</li> <li>4. Assoc. of Oregon Redevelopment Agencies.</li> <li>5. City Planning Directors Assoc.</li> <li>6. Assoc. of Municipal Recorders.</li> <li>7. Municipal Finance Officers Assoc.</li> <li>8. Assoc. of Chiefs of Police</li> <li>9. Fire Chiefs Assoc.</li> <li>10. Local Govt. Personnel Institute.</li> <li>11. City County Insurance.</li> <li>12. Special Districts Assoc. of Oregon.</li> </ol>			
<b>Penn.</b>	Other local government associations.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fraternal Order of Police.</li> <li>2. Newspapers.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pension/benefits.</li> <li>2. Advertising costs.</li> </ol>
<b>South Carolina</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chamber of Commerce.</li> <li>2. Firemen's Association, County Association.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comprehensive tax reform.</li> <li>2. Several public safety issues.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Realtors, homebuilders.</li> <li>2. Chamber of Commerce.</li> <li>3. County association, environmental groups.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Business license tax issues.</li> <li>2. Spending caps.</li> <li>3. Annexation.</li> </ol>

State	Coalitions	Issues	Opponents	Issues
<b>Texas</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Texas Association of Counties.</li> <li>2. Texas Association of School Boards.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local Government issues.</li> <li>2. Lobbying issues.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Anti-tax groups.</li> <li>2. Police/Fire associations</li> <li>2. Texas Association of Builders.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revenue and appraisal groups.</li> <li>2. Collective bargaining and meet and confer, sovereign immunity.</li> <li>3. Land use, regulation of development.</li> </ol>
<b>Virginia</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education Association.</li> <li>2. Association of Realtors.</li> <li>3. Local Government Managers Association.</li> <li>4. Association of Counties.</li> <li>5. Coalition of High Growth Localities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education funding.</li> <li>2. Blight remediation.</li> <li>3. Personnel Matters.</li> <li>4. Manifold issues.</li> <li>5. Land use matters.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Association of Homebuilders.</li> <li>2. Farm Bureau.</li> <li>3. School Board Association.</li> <li>4. Public Employee Unions.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Growth management, blight.</li> <li>2. Land use authority over agricultural uses.</li> <li>3. Education funding.</li> <li>4. Disability matters; overtime laws.</li> </ol>
<b>Washington</b>	<p>AWC has done so in the past, and anticipates will continue in the future; however, currently AWC is not a member of any formal, dues-paying coalitions.</p> <p>AWC works closely with and hosts meetings in conjunction with county and other local government associations as well as builder and realtor associations.</p>			

<b>State</b>	<b>Coalitions</b>	<b>Issues</b>	<b>Opponents</b>	<b>Issues</b>
<b>Wisconsin</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wisconsin Counties Association.</li> <li>2. Wisconsin Alliance of Cities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transportation Funding.</li> <li>2. Transportation Funding.</li> </ol>	Manufacturers and Commerce.	Property taxes and property tax exemptions.

## PART VI: STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCES IN 2009

<b>State</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Special Activities</b>
<b>Arkansas</b>	Jan. 14-16	Little Rock	Entire legislature invited to Opening Night Banquet
<b>Colorado</b>	February 25	Denver	Address by Governor Bill Ritter State of Cities and Towns presentation by CML executive board president, with unveiling of publication of the same name.
<b>Connecticut</b>	October 8	Hartford	
<b>Florida</b>	November 19-20	Orlando	
<b>Georgia</b>	January 24-26	Atlanta	Continue a legislative focus, with interaction with legislators, and possibly having speeches by the Governor, Lt. Governor, and Speaker. Capitol visits and a legislative reception at the Braves baseball stadium are planned.
<b>Idaho</b>	January 29	Boise	Luncheon with legislators, city officials to attend committee meetings, meeting with legislative leadership, Governor to address city officials.
<b>Illinois</b>	April 22	Springfield	A legislative briefing is provided for those attending from 10 a.m. to 11:15 a.m. at a local hotel. Some meetings will then be set up at the capital with key legislators. That evening a legislative reception is held for the members, legislators, and legislative staff at a local historic landmark. The following day the IML Board of Directors will meet in Springfield to review the activities of the previous day and to conduct the Board's quarterly meeting.
<b>Indiana</b>	February 18	Indianapolis	Reception for legislators, guest speaker for the luncheon, workshops on legislative issues, legislative committee meeting.
<b>Iowa</b>	January 27	Des Moines	A day of information presented by the lobbying team and discussion with key legislators, followed by a legislative reception.

<b>State</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Special Activities</b>
<b>Kansas</b>	January 24	Topeka	City Hall Day at the Capitol; Announce winners of the “If I Were A Mayor” Essay Contest.
<b>Kentucky</b>	N/A	N/A	City Night – annual evening of networking with legislators, city representatives, and state officials.
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Jan. 23-24	Boston	Annual League Convention
<b>Michigan</b>	March 3-4	Lansing	1) Setting aside time for members to lobby legislators; 2) Legislative reception at league’s capitol office.
<b>Minnesota</b>	April 8	St. Paul	The conference will be a joint event with the Minnesota School Boards Association, the Minnesota Association of Townships, and the Association of Minnesota Counties.
<b>Missouri</b>	Feb. 18-19	Jefferson City	Banquet with legislators and city officials.
<b>New Jersey</b>	January 14	Trenton	Elected officials Hall of Fame.
<b>North Carolina</b>	TBD	Greenville	Workshops, key speakers, etc.
<b>North Dakota</b>	Feb. 27	Bismarck	Governor presents award to elementary student winner of “mayor for a day” essay contest.
<b>Ohio</b>	April 1	Statehouse	
<b>Oklahoma</b>	March 2	Capitol	A day at the Capitol. Legislators will be meeting with the attendees.
<b>South Carolina</b>	Feb. 18	Columbia	
<b>Texas</b>	Oct. 21-23	Ft. Worth	
<b>Virginia</b>	February 5	Richmond	Focus is on priority bills in legislature to assist members as they meet with their delegations.
<b>Washington</b>	Feb. 18-19	Olympia	
<b>Wisconsin</b>			No legislative conference, but on May 21 there will be a legislative luncheon with the Wisconsin Alliance of Cities.

## PART VII: STATE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE SURVEY CONTACTS

<b>State</b>	<b>Survey Contacts</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Arkansas</b>	Don Zimmerman	<a href="mailto:daz@arml.org">daz@arml.org</a>
<b>Colorado</b>	Sam Mamet	<a href="mailto:smamet@cml.org">smamet@cml.org</a>
<b>Connecticut</b>	Ronald Thomas	<a href="mailto:rthomas@ccm-ct.org">rthomas@ccm-ct.org</a>
<b>Florida</b>	Allison Payne	<a href="mailto:apayne@flcities.com">apayne@flcities.com</a>
<b>Georgia</b>	Tom Gehl	<a href="mailto:tgehl@gmanet.com">tgehl@gmanet.com</a>
<b>Idaho</b>	Ken Harward	<a href="mailto:kharward@idahocities.org">kharward@idahocities.org</a>
<b>Illinois</b>	Matt Davidson	<a href="mailto:mdavidson@iml.org">mdavidson@iml.org</a>
<b>Indiana</b>	Matthew C. Greller	<a href="mailto:mgreller@citiesandtowns.org">mgreller@citiesandtowns.org</a>
<b>Iowa</b>	Jessica Harder	<a href="mailto:jessicaharder@iowaleague.org">jessicaharder@iowaleague.org</a>
<b>Kentucky</b>	JD Chaney	<a href="mailto:jchaney@klc.org">jchaney@klc.org</a>
<b>Maine</b>	Geoff Herman	<a href="mailto:gherman@memun.org">gherman@memun.org</a>
<b>Maryland</b>	Candace Donoho	<a href="mailto:cdonoho@mdmunicipal.org">cdonoho@mdmunicipal.org</a>
<b>Massachusetts</b>	John Robertson	<a href="mailto:jrobertson@mma.org">jrobertson@mma.org</a>
<b>Michigan</b>	Arnold Weinfeld	<a href="mailto:aweinfeld@mml.org">aweinfeld@mml.org</a>
<b>Minnesota</b>	Anne Finn	<a href="mailto:afinn@lmc.org">afinn@lmc.org</a>
<b>Missouri</b>	Patrick Bonnot	<a href="mailto:pbonnot@mocities.com">pbonnot@mocities.com</a>
<b>Montana</b>	Alec Hansen	<a href="mailto:mlct@mt.net">mlct@mt.net</a>
<b>Nebraska</b>	Gary Krumland	<a href="mailto:garyk@lonm.org">garyk@lonm.org</a>
<b>New Hampshire</b>	Cordell Johnston	<a href="mailto:cjohnston@nhlgc.org">cjohnston@nhlgc.org</a>
<b>New Jersey</b>	Bill Dressel	<a href="mailto:bdressel@njslom.com">bdressel@njslom.com</a>
<b>North Carolina</b>	Kelli H. Kukura	<a href="mailto:kkukura@nclm.org">kkukura@nclm.org</a>
<b>North Dakota</b>	Jerry Hjelmstad	<a href="mailto:hjelmstad@ndlc.org">hjelmstad@ndlc.org</a>
<b>Ohio</b>	John Mahoney	<a href="mailto:jmahoney@omlohio.org">jmahoney@omlohio.org</a>
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Missy Dean	<a href="mailto:missy@oml.org">missy@oml.org</a>
<b>Oregon</b>	Craig Honeyman	<a href="mailto:choneyman@orcities.org">choneyman@orcities.org</a>
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	Amy Sturges	<a href="mailto:sturges@plcm.org">sturges@plcm.org</a>
<b>South Carolina</b>	Reba Campbell	<a href="mailto:rcampbell@masc.sc">rcampbell@masc.sc</a>
<b>Texas</b>	Monty Wynn	<a href="mailto:monty@tml.org">monty@tml.org</a>
<b>Vermont</b>	Karen Horn	<a href="mailto:khorne@vlct.org">khorne@vlct.org</a>
<b>Virginia</b>	Mark Flynn	<a href="mailto:mflynn@vml.org">mflynn@vml.org</a>
<b>Washington</b>	Sheri Sawyer	<a href="mailto:sheris@awcnet.org">sheris@awcnet.org</a>
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Curt Witynski	<a href="mailto:witynski@lwm-info.org">witynski@lwm-info.org</a>

## State Legislative Links \*

Alabama Legislature ♦ <http://www.legislature.state.al.us/>  
Alaska Legislature ♦ <http://www.legis.state.ak.us/>  
Arizona Legislature ♦ <http://www.azleg.state.az.us/>  
Arkansas General Assembly ♦ <http://www.arkleg.state.ar.us/>  
California Legislature ♦ <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/yourleg.html>  
Colorado General Assembly ♦ <http://www.leg.state.co.us>  
Connecticut General Assembly ♦ <http://www.cga.ct.gov/>  
Delaware General Assembly ♦ <http://www.legis.state.de.us/>  
Florida Legislature ♦ <http://www.leg.state.fl.us/>  
Georgia General Assembly ♦ <http://www.state.ga.us/>  
Idaho Legislature ♦ <http://www.legisalture.idaho.gov/>  
Illinois General Assembly ♦ <http://www.ilga.gov/>  
Indiana General Assembly ♦ <http://www.in.gov/legislative/>  
Iowa Legislature ♦ <http://www.legis.state.ia.us/>  
Kansas Legislature ♦ <http://www.kslegislature.org/>  
Kentucky Legislature ♦ <http://www.lrc.state.ky.us/>  
Louisiana State Legislature ♦ <http://www.legis.state.la.us/>  
Maine Legislature ♦ <http://janus.state.me.us/legis/>  
Maryland General Assembly ♦ <http://mlis.state.md.us/>  
Massachusetts General Court ♦ <http://www.mass.gov/legis/>  
Michigan Legislature ♦ <http://michiganlegislature.org/>  
Minnesota State Legislature ♦ <http://www.leg.state.mn.us/>  
Mississippi State Legislature ♦ <http://www.ls.state.ms.us/>  
Missouri General Assembly ♦ <http://www.moga.state.mo.us/>  
Montana State Legislature ♦ <http://leg.state.mt.us/>  
Nebraska Legislature ♦ <http://www.unicam.state.ne.us/>  
Nevada Legislature ♦ <http://www.leg.state.nv.us/>  
New Hampshire General Court ♦ <http://gencourt.state.nh.us/>  
New Jersey State Legislature ♦ <http://www.njleg.state.nj.us/>  
New Mexico Legislature ♦ <http://legis.state.nm.us/>  
New York State Assembly ♦ <http://assembly.state.ny.us/>  
New York State Senate ♦ <http://senate.state.ny.us/>  
North Carolina General Assembly ♦ <http://www.ncleg.net/>  
North Dakota Legislative Assembly ♦ <http://www.legis.nd.gov/>  
Ohio General Assembly ♦ <http://www.legislature.state.oh.us/>  
Oklahoma Legislature ♦ <http://www.lsb.state.ok.us/>  
Oregon State Legislature ♦ <http://www.leg.state.or.us/>  
Pennsylvania General Assembly ♦ <http://www.legis.state.pa.us/>  
Rhode Island General Assembly ♦ <http://www.rilin.state.ri.us/>  
South Carolina Legislature ♦ <http://www.scstatehouse.net/>  
South Dakota Legislature ♦ <http://www.state.sd.us/>  
Tennessee General Assembly ♦ <http://www.legislature.state.tn.us/>  
Texas Legislature ♦ <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/>  
Utah State Legislature ♦ <http://www.le.state.ut.us/>  
Vermont Legislature ♦ <http://www.leg.state.vt.us/>  
Virginia General Assembly ♦ <http://legis.state.va.us/>  
Washington State Legislature ♦ <http://www.leg.wa.gov/>  
West Virginia Legislature ♦ <http://www.legis.state.wv.us/>  
Wisconsin State Legislature ♦ <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/>  
Wyoming State Legislature ♦ <http://legisweb.state.wy.us/>

\* From the National Conference of State Legislatures