

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARTIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
SEPTEMBER 15, 2015
@ 9:00 A.M.

The regular meeting of the Martin County Board of Commissioners was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Steve Flohrs.

Commissioners present were Steve Flohrs, Tom Mahoney, Elliot Belgard, and Dan Schmidtke. Commissioner District Three is vacant. Also present were Scott Higgins, Martin County Coordinator, James Forshee, Martin County Auditor/Treasurer, Kevin Peyman, Martin County Engineer, Terry Viesselman, Martin County Attorney, Rod Halvorsen, KSUM-KFMC Radio, Desiree Diaz, Fairmont Sentinel Reporter, Julie Walters, Administrative Assistant, and members of staff and public.

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by Commissioner Mahoney, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve the agenda for the September 15, 2015, regular Board of Commissioners meeting with the following: Delete 8.7 Consider I&S Group Proposal for Architect Services. Carried unanimously.

Vicki Paskey, Social Worker with the Minnesota Valley Action Council and Family Resource Coordinator for the internship program, along with Worksite supervisors including Ronnie Dauer, Lenny Tvedten, Jason Subbert, and Jeff Hagen, presented an update on the 2015 Summer Youth Work Experience Program, a joint venture of the South Central Work Force Center, Minnesota Valley Action Council, and Martin County Commissioners. Paskey noted this program recruited, assessed, and matched youth with profit and non-profit paid internships. Youth gained valuable skills, learned about potential career opportunities, and gained employment in Martin County. Paskey went on to note 16 youth participated coming from Welcome, Trimont, Truman, East Chain, Sherburn, and Fairmont; with worksite locations including Avery-Weigh-Tronix, 3M of Fairmont, Torgerson Properties (TPI), Lakeview Methodist Health Care, Fairmont Photo Press, Fairmont Community Education & Recreation, Ormsby State Bank, Martin County Historical Society, Fairmont Convention and Visitor's Bureau, Heaven's Table Food Shelf, Bank Midwest Operations Center, AdMfg., and Center for Specialty Care.

Commissioners thanked Paskey for her hard work and dedication in making the Summer Youth Work Experience Program a success.

Terry Viesselman, Martin County Attorney, was present to request approval for the Attorney General's Office to begin the sexual offender/sexual predator commitment process on a person that was sent to prison and is set to be released in October, 2016. Viesselman noted fees associated with this process include an initial cost of approximately \$1,600 for an evaluation from an independent expert. Viesselman went on to note due to the violent nature of the offender Viesselman recommends approval to start the commitment process.

Motion by Commissioner Schmidtke, seconded by Commissioner Mahoney, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve and authorize the Martin County Attorney's Office to proceed with the Attorney General's Office sexual offender commitment proceedings; and to approve and authorize anticipated expenses related to the commitment proceedings. Carried unanimously.

Kevin Peyman, County Engineer, reviewed the Highway Department's CY2016 Preliminary Budget Request summarizing the CY2016 proposed Revenue and Expenses and CY2016 Levy Request.

Jeff Markquart, Martin County Sheriff, noted the Martin County Sheriff's Office has accepted the resignation of one Part Time Corrections Officer and one Part Time Sheriff's Deputy and asks the Board to do the same.

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by Commissioner Schmidtke, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby accept the resignation of Cameron Abbey as Part Time Corrections Officer for the Martin County Sheriff's Office, effective August 27, 2015; and accept the resignation of Ethan Thate, Part Time Sheriff's Deputy for the Martin County Sheriff's Office, effective September 4, 2015. Carried unanimously.

Markquart presented his recommendation to hire two Part Time Deputies for the Martin County Sheriff's Office.

Motion by Commissioner Mahoney, seconded by Commissioner Schmidtke, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve and authorize the hire of Chase Davis, Part Time Deputy for the Martin County Sheriff's Office, effective September 15, 2015, at \$22.23/hour, not eligible for benefits, and contingent upon successful background check; and approve and authorize the hire of Jon Ellis, Part Time Deputy for the Martin County Sheriff's Office, effective September 15, 2015, at \$22.23/hour, not eligible for benefits, and contingent upon successful background check. Carried unanimously.

Markquart continued and recommended step increases based on satisfactory performance evaluation and according to Union Contract(s) for the following Martin County Sheriff's Office personnel: Beau Karge, Full Time Corrections Officer, and Chris Vasvick, Full Time Sheriff's Deputy.

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by Commissioner Schmidtke, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, upon the recommendation of Jeff Markquart, Martin County Sheriff, hereby approve and authorize step increase based on satisfactory performance evaluation and according to Union Contract(s) for the following Martin County Sheriff's Office personnel: Beau Karge, Corrections Officer (LELS #115), 1 Year Step at \$20.75/hour, effective September 7, 2015; and approve and authorize step increase based on performance evaluation and according to Union Contract(s) for Chris Vasvick, Deputy Sheriff (LELS #136), 6 Year Step at \$26.47/hour, effective September 11, 2015. Carried unanimously.

Markquart noted the Martin County Sheriff's Office has received an agreement for Off Highway Vehicle Enforcement Grant funds in the amount of \$10,014 for FY2016-2017. Grant funds will cover equipment and supply expenses incurred for ATV enforcement equipment and activities.

Motion by Commissioner Schmidtke, seconded by Commissioner Mahoney, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve and authorize execution of the Off Highway Vehicle Enforcement Grant agreement for FY2016-2017 in the amount of \$10,014.00 effective July 1, 2015, and expires June 30, 2017; and to authorize Board Chair and Martin County Sheriff, and/or the County Auditor/Treasurer, to sign the grant agreement and other required reporting on behalf of Martin County. Carried unanimously.

Markquart presented a Martin County Jail Population Update including twenty-three (23) in-house, ten (10) out of county, and two (2) on Electronic Home Monitoring.

Jeremy Monahan, Transit Director – Faribault-Martin County Transit Board, noted the Transit for our Future grant which is funding our transition to the Faribault-Martin County Transit Board the contract as you know took a longer time than we had expected and now the reimbursement request for funds has been delayed even further and as a result the initial deposits that each county has made has been exhausted and so we're asking for an additional \$15,000 from each county at this point to continue the transition operation and then we're also learning that you cannot submit just an invoice (to MnDOT) but that you actually have to spend the money before we can submit a request for funds. For now we're just requesting supplemental \$15,000 from each county. Dawn Fellows is doing the same thing over in Faribault County right now.

Motion by Commissioner Mahoney, seconded by Commissioner Schmidtke, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve and authorize a \$15,000 transfer of funds to the Faribault-Martin County Transit Board for supplemental joint transit expenses incurred to be reimbursed once the transitional Transit for our Future grant is executed through the Minnesota Department of Transportation – Office of Transit. Carried unanimously.

The Board recessed at 9:42 a.m.

Chairman Flohrs relinquished the public hearing duties for the proposed improvement to Judicial Ditch #20 to Commissioner Dan Schmidtke.

Commissioner Schmidtke, Martin County Drainage Authority, opened the public hearing in consideration of the Engineer's Preliminary Report for the Petition of Robert Neusch and others for the Improvement of Judicial Ditch #20 located in Sections 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34, 35, and 36 in Silver Lake Township. All county board members representing as the Martin County Drainage Authority were present, along with James Forshee, Martin County Auditor/Treasurer, Scott Higgins, Martin County Coordinator, Kurt Deter, Attorney for the Board, Chuck Brandel, Engineer for the project (I&S Group), Deb Mosloski, Martin County Drainage Administration, landowners, and other members of the public were present.

Deter reviewed with the Board there was a petition filed for the Improvement of JD #20. The petition was found to be valid under 103E the Drainage Statute. You then appointed an engineer

to do what is called a Preliminary Engineer's Report. You appointed Mr. Brandel to do the Preliminary Engineer's Report. The purpose of today's hearing is for him to report back on his Preliminary Engineer's Report. This is not the step that establishes the project...it's kind of a half way step to determine whether he believes the four items under Agenda No. VII are met. If those have been met then the next step will be to order him to do a Final Engineer's Report and to appoint three Viewers to determine the benefits and damages. So it is an opportunity for people that it affects to hear from the engineer what he is recommending, ask any questions, I'll read the DNR Advisory Report into the record, and then when we get to No. VII we'll see if those four items in the Board's opinion have been met. Again...it doesn't approve or establish the project. Then, the next step will be the Final Engineer's Report and Viewer's Report.

Deb Mosloski, Martin County Drainage Administration, noted the public hearing notice in consideration of the Preliminary Engineer's Report for the proposed Improvement of Judicial Ditch #20 was published; and notices were mailed to landowners.

Brandel noted JD #20 is a just under 2300 acre watershed. On the maps you have and shown on the screen, the watershed boundary that is proposed is shown in red; the system has an open ditch outlet with the rest of the system being all tile so the black dotted lines are the existing tiles. The system was originally established in 1911 as primarily an all tile system. There have been a couple of improvements. In 1959 there was an improvement to the outlet which increased the capacity and the depth of the open ditch at the outlet and replaced a portion of 22 inch tile with 26 inch tile. Also, there was an improvement in 1980 and 2003 to portions of Branch H which included some larger tile in Branch H and then in 2003 there was a reroute to allow some naturally low areas to be restored as a wetland. Another unique feature of this watershed is that there is approximately 190 acres that is in Board of Water and Soil Resources (BWSR) easements or permanent easements. Those areas are shown in purple on the map, so there are some low areas that have already been placed in easements in the watershed.

Brandel went on to note the proposed improvement looked at how the system can be upgraded to a half inch or better drainage coefficient. The reason we go to a half inch drainage coefficient is that's the minimum standard based on the NRCS's recommendation for tiles. Open ditches are sized from a one inch coefficient...tiles are a minimum of a half. So there were a few landowner meetings and a petition was put forward. Since then we've put together a complete survey of the project and the Engineer's Report on what size and what is the most cost effective way to put together the improvement based on a half inch drainage coefficient.

Brandel also noted one of the requirements of the statute is that your outlet is adequate by increasing the capacity of the system. It's our opinion that a small amount of storage is needed to offset the increase in flow. You've got another ditch system that drains into the outlet of the existing open ditch. So at this time we're proposing an option for a small pond near the existing outlet of the system where it outlets into the open ditch. And then the 26 and 22 inch pipe will be replaced with a 42 inch pipe. We would deepen this portion of the open ditch by approximately two or three feet and lower the outlet by five feet. What that does is it allows us to get as much grade as possible on the main. The goal is to keep it as small as possible but still give you your half inch drainage coefficient.

Brandel noted the main would be a 42 inch pipe and then it would downsize to a 36 inch pipe. That would get your half inch drainage coefficient. The existing capacity of the system ranges from .11 to .08 in places so we're upsizing by a factor of 5 or 6 depending on the location. The main would continue on to the west as a 36 inch and then would downsize to a 30 inch in Section 28; and then a 24 inch in portions of Section 29 and 20. Included in the improvement are multiple branches including a proposed Branch A which would be sized as a 15 inch; there's a proposed Branch B which would replace a 10 inch with a 15 inch; there's a proposed Branch E in Section 21 which would be a 12 inch upsized from an 8 inch; a proposed Branch C would be a 12 inch upsized from a 10 inch with some rerouting on that branch; Branch L would be a 15 inch up from a 10 inch; and then we'd reroute Branch L-1 around the BWSR easement in Section 27 and that would be an 8 inch line; Branch Q would be a 15 inch in Section 26 and that would pick up the eastern half of the land on the east side of this easement. There are some branches that were abandoned when the BWSR easement went in so I don't show those but there were branches for instance in this Mosloski piece in Section 26. Then there's a short Branch P which would be a proposed 8 inch. The pond would be constructed...here's the existing open ditch and the pond is just on the edge of the page there's a spot where the topography kind of narrows up and we'd use that area; excavate it out, and then construct a 24 inch pipe with a manhole on it that would allow the system to bump up 8-10 feet and then overflow into a 42 inch. So you'd have a 42 inch pipe coming into a 24 and have it reduce the outlet of the system and essentially make this system adequate from an outlet standpoint by reducing peak flows.

Brandel went on to note if the system were needed to be replaced today the repair cost for each branch (the entire area that is being proposed for an improvement) has a repair cost of \$1.7 million dollars. As shown the proposed improvement would be just over \$2.7 million dollars. You can see the breakdown for each branch with the main being the most expensive because you've got 42 and 36 inch pipe. As you get into the larger pipe sizes a 24 inch pipe in today's dollars is going to be in the low \$30 per foot. You go up to a 42 inch and you're up to \$70 a foot so you more than double when you get into the larger pipe sizes. So the goal is try and keep as much 30 inch and under; but based on your size of watershed and how flat it is, it's difficult to do.

Brandel also noted when you look at drainage systems if you can prove that the system is in need of repair you could subtract the repair costs from the improvement costs and that's how much benefit you need to have on the system. This system is in the process of being redetermined; but the viewers would have to find approximately \$965-986,000 of benefits for this project to be cost effective. That's approximately \$430 per acre of benefit. Another part of the project is road crossings with some pipes that need to be bored. Per statute the road authority whether that's the township, state, or the county, is responsible for the extra cost of boring those pipes because the system was put in prior to that requirement so there is a road authority cost of \$83,000. That brings the potential cost to landowners to \$2.6 million dollars.

Brandel noted recently there have been other improvements similar to this and portions of the Board will recall this, Judicial Ditch #2 which was Martin & Watonwan now Watonwan & Martin, the cost per acre based on the benefits was \$530 an acre, approximately, over the entire watershed. Looking at this project it would be cost effective if the benefits were similar to that project. We don't have a viewer's report yet, but one of the requirements of the statute is, is the

project cost effective when comparing to a recent project. There is some concern that because of the large amount of BWSR acres that the benefits might be lower. I did run a number that if the BWSR easements were taken out the benefits per acre that need to be found would be \$476 which is still less than JD #2, but it is pushing the limit of cost effectiveness.

Brandel noted the project was petitioned as a half inch or better drainage coefficient and a 42 inch outlet gets you to that. If because of land prices and crop prices going down and there weren't enough benefits to make this work, there is an option that I looked at and if we went to a slightly smaller drainage coefficient about .4 the project could save about \$300,000. That's not what was petitioned, but I did include that as an option. I know the landowners want to get as much drainage as they can out of it, but just to compare if we downsize the outlet pipes how much does that save and it would save a little over 10%.

Brandel also noted because we're at the preliminary hearings we can look at different options that could be presented to the Board. But either way there is a cost effective way to make this project work and improve the system. If we went with a smaller outlet pipe I would suggest downsizing the pond and I put a cost in for downsizing the pond also. So, this is a big project, there are a lot of pipes, it's a lot of detail. If there are particular questions on individual land and depth size I can answer those. On average the system is deepening from the existing system by over 5 feet and in some places it is 8 to 9 feet deeper. There are portions of the system that have very little cover. Based on our survey and the original profiles this dark line is the proposed pipe and the dashed line is the existing pipe and this line is ground. As you can see in the middle it has only 1 or 2 feet of cover which is why it's in rough shape and why it's not working right.

Brandel noted at this point the project is feasible, there is a necessity from the standpoint there are portions of the system that is failing, and it would be of public benefit, in my opinion. We are looking at some environmental concerns with having the proposed pond; we're also looking at a different type of inlet. So the environmental criteria could be met with having the proposed pond. And with the way the system is set up and designed the outlet would be adequate. This is a brief summary of a large system.

Deter read into the record the letter received from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Ecological and Water Resources, regarding the Preliminary Engineer's Report for the proposed improvement to JD #20.

Brandel addressed comments from the DNR letter.

Schmidtke asked for input from the public.

Mark Malo inquired when you lower the outlet what is that going to be in relation to the dam on East Chain Lake. Right now the water in Section 27 doesn't go down until the dam almost quits running.

Brandel noted I don't know what the elevation is at East Chain Lake, but when I look at...there's an existing culvert on County Road 49 now. The invert of that culvert if that helps at all is 1149 ½ approximately and the outlet of our system is proposed at 115376. So we're about 4 feet

higher than that culvert crossing on County Road 49 for the outlet. And that's the outlet of the pond. As we continue on, the main has a slope of .28 so by the time we get out of the pond we're 7 feet higher than that culvert. I can check what the elevation of the dam is on East Chain Lake; but, there is some fall in the system. We're going to try and take advantage of as much as we can, but also because it is a large system that drains into some flatter areas... If we ran the main at minimum grade it would have to be a lot larger pipe. We should have plenty of fall by the time you get to Section 27. Some portions of pipe in Section 27 are very shallow and some of the most undersized portions of the system. You can see it looks like it is almost coming out of the ground.

Lawrence Sukalski inquired about the project cost for example on Mosloski's large area; and will we have the full redetermination of benefits before the final decision is made so we know what it is going to cost each one of us?

Brandel noted I'm not a viewer, but I've seen reduced assessments for those areas. The per acre cost, that's a viewer question, but I've seen that they've been reduced by 75% compared to others. That does vary...the reason they still get a benefit according to the viewers are that they wouldn't have been able to go into the system and they wouldn't have been able to get that payment without the system being there. So there's a benefit to the system. And, they do still contribute water. But as we run pipe through those systems we have to match the existing capacity so they get very little improvement benefit. Where their assessments are, are based on repair costs of the system. That is a question that if this moves forward to a final engineering report it would be addressed at that time because there would be a value given at that time by the viewers. And, yes, landowners will be informed of individual costs before a final decision is made.

Bob Neusch noted if we don't do anything we're still going to have that \$1.7 million cost and we're still going to have an old shallow tile. And, go back to when you said the cost of a 28 inch tile compared to a 46 inch tile, and difference in volume.

Brandel noted yes. A repair has to go back in same size, same slope, and same depth. So you have a shallow undersized system. A 24 inch tile versus a 42 inch tile is estimated at \$67 or \$68 a foot and a 24 inch tile is \$32. The volume difference is 3 to 4 times as much.

Duane Petrowiak noted as I recall many years ago we went over this and you talk about (this system) being flat. There are a lot of falls. One time they were talking about putting in a ditch and we were talking about the problem of the cost of that and all the damming they'd have to do to slow the water down.

Brandel noted there is fall on the end of the system, but once you get into the middle of the system it is very flat. That's why the tile is so shallow. On the Mosloski piece you can see that the ground is actually falling away from the outlet. But it is very flat once you get up into that part of the system. And in this case we're proposing to do a pond at the end of the system to do that and that's where we are dropping some and at the same time using some elevation on that large pipe to keep it a 42. A lot of drainage systems would run at .1% and we're running at just under .3% here. But that's because we're maximizing the depth on the ditch in the pond for a

long stretch so we can come back up and then have the appropriate depth once we get into those flat areas and drain them. But yes, there are some very flat portions of the system.

Commissioner Schmidtke asked if there were any more questions or comments.

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by commissioner Flohrs, to close the oral portion of the public hearing. Carried unanimously.

Deter addressed the Board noting based on what you have heard today, you must determine if the proposed drainage project outlined in the Petition is feasible; there is a necessity for the proposed drainage project; the proposed drainage project will be of public benefit and promote the public health; and the outlet is adequate. This will not establish the project. If you determine these steps have been met, then we'll order Mr. Brandel to prepare a Final Engineer's Report and appoint Viewers.

Motion by Commissioner Flohrs, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, Be it Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, acting as the Drainage Authority for Martin County, after determining that the following criteria have been met for the proposed Improvement for JD #20 including: a. The proposed drainage project outlined in the Petition, or modified and recommended by the engineer, is feasible; b. There is a necessity for the proposed drainage project; c. The proposed drainage project will be of public benefit and promote the public health after considering the environmental and land use criteria in Section 103E.015, Subd. 1.; and d. The outlet is adequate; hereby approve the Preliminary Engineer's Report for the proposed Improvement for JD #20. Carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Mahoney, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, acting as the Drainage Authority for Martin County, hereby approve and authorize Chuck Brandel, Project Engineer with I&S Group, to move forward with compilation of the Final Engineer's Report for the Improvement for JD #20; and appoint Ron Ringquist, Charles Bowers, and Chris Christensen as Viewers for the Improvement Project. Carried unanimously.

The Board reconvened at 10:32 a.m.

James Forshee, Martin County Auditor/Treasurer, presented a resolution requesting approval from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources for the sale of said parcels of land that have been forfeited to the State of Minnesota for non-payment of property taxes.

Motion by Commissioner Schmidtke, seconded by Commissioner Belgard,

MARTIN COUNTY BOARD RESOLUTION #34 / '15

WHEREAS, The County Board of Commissioners of the County of Martin, State of Minnesota, desires to offer for sale certain parcels of land that have forfeited to the State of Minnesota for non-payment of taxes, and

WHEREAS, Said parcels of land have been viewed by the County Board of Commissioners and have been classified as non-conservation lands as provided for in Minnesota Statutes 282.01.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the Martin County Board of Commissioners hereby certify that all parcels of land on the attached list have been viewed and comply with the provisions of Minnesota Statutes 85.012, 92.461, 282.01, Subd. 8, and 282.018, and other statutes that require the withholding of tax-forfeited lands from sale.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED That the Martin County Board of Commissioners hereby request approval from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources for the sale of said lands.

MOTION WAS MADE by Commissioner Schmidtke, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, and carried to adopt said resolution.

Dated the 15th Day of September, 2015

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
MARTIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

Steven Flohrs, Chairperson

ATTEST: _____
Scott Higgins
Martin County Coordinator

Roll Call AYES: Commissioners Mahoney, Belgard, Schmidtke, and Flohrs. NAYS: None. Resolution duly passed and adopted this 15th day of September, 2015.

Forshee and Higgins reviewed the proposed 2016 levy noting that after reviewing each department, additional cuts and miscellaneous revenue expense reduction, the stated mandated maximum levy for 2016 is \$13,985,755 which equates to a 7.64% increase over CY2015. Higgins noted we can always go lower than the levy limit but we can't go any higher.

After much discussion,

Motion by Commissioner Schmidtke, seconded by Commissioner Belgard,

R-#35/'15

RESOLUTION

PROPOSING PRELIMINARY TAX LEVY FOR CY2016

WHEREAS, the Martin County Board of Commissioners met to review the recommended 2016 budget; and

WHEREAS, the 2016 recommended budget and levy was prepared with the participation of the Martin County Department Directors and Elected Officials.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that on September 15, 2015, following discussion by the Martin County Board of Commissioners, the Board set the 2016 proposed levy at \$13,985,755 which equates to a 7.64% increase over CY2015 levy; with proposed expenditures in the amount of \$22,943,375 and revenues in the amount of \$9,035,287.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT BEFORE ADOPTION OF THE FINAL 2016 BUDGET, the Board may reduce the proposed levy but cannot increase the levy from the amount set on this date; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Public Hearing for the CY2016 Budget will be held on Thursday, December 3, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Commissioners Board Room – Room No. 103 – First Floor of Courthouse – Fairmont, MN.

Upon Motion made by Commissioner Schmidtke, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, and unanimously carried, said resolution was duly passed and adopted this 15th day of September, 2015.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
MARTIN COUNTY, MN

Steve Flohrs, Board Chair

ATTEST: _____
Scott Higgins, County Coordinator

Roll Call AYES: Commissioners Mahoney, Belgard, Schmidtke, and Flohrs. NAYS: None. Resolution duly passed and adopted this 15th day of September, 2015.

The Board reviewed warrants to be paid September 15, 2015.

Motion by Commissioner Mahoney, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve bills to be paid on September 15, 2015, as presented; and includes the Martin County Highway Department and Drainage bills as presented. Carried unanimously.

Warrants received and paid September 15, 2015, are registered on file in the Auditor/Treasurer's Office as follows:

Revenue Fund – Warrants Approved September 15, 2015	\$162,090.56
Enhanced 9-1-1 Fund	\$ 4,915.50
Martin Co. Economic Development Authority	\$ 3,054.52
Solid Waste Management Fund	\$ 27,497.80
Law Library Fund	\$ 326.20
Martin County Transit Fund	\$ 70,891.50
Recorder's Technology	\$ 645.00

Recorder's Compliance	\$ 27,240.48
Martin County Area Redevelopment Fund	\$ 12,752.00
Bank Building Fund	<u>\$ 27,447.01</u>
Total	\$336,860.57

Road and Bridge Funds Totaled	\$ 48,065.87
Martin County Ditch Funds Totaled	\$ 39,067.31

The Board reviewed the 2015 Second Quarter Transit Budget Report; and 2014 Wind Energy Production for Taxes Payable in 2015.

Commissioners presented their Board member reports.

Commissioner Schmidtke noted he attended the Road and Forfeited Land Tour on September 8, 2015.

Commissioner Mahoney noted in addition to those already mentioned he attended Minnesota Valley Action Council Regional Planning Seminar on September 9, 2015; and Faribault-Martin Transit Executive Board meeting on September 10, 2015.

Commissioner Belgard noted in addition to those already mentioned he attended the Canvass Board meeting on September 4, 2015; and regular Martin County EDA meeting on September 14, 2015.

Commissioner Flohrs noted in addition to those already mentioned he attended the Martin County Library Board meeting and Beyond the Yellow Ribbon meeting on September 8, 2015; Department Directors meeting on September 9, 2015; Soil and Water meeting on September 10, 2015; Prairieland and GBERBA on September 11, 2015.

Commissioners reviewed their calendars of upcoming meetings and activities: September 15, 2015 – Employee Recognition Event beginning at 11:30 a.m.; September 16, 2015 – Human Services Full Board meeting and Faribault-Martin Transit Full Board meeting at 10:30 a.m., Martin County Insurance Committee meeting at 10:30 a.m., Land Use meeting in St. Cloud, MN, Blandin meeting at 3:00 p.m., leave for AMC Policy Committee meetings at Breezy Point; September 17, 2015 – South Central EMS Annual Meeting at 6:00 p.m. in Eagle Lake, MN; September 21, 2015 – Fairmont Area Substance Abuse Prevention Coalition meeting at noon and Minnesota Valley Action Council Workgroup meeting at 4:00 p.m., and Minnesota Valley Action Council at 6:30 p.m.; September 22, 2015 – Planning & Zoning meeting at 5:30 p.m.; September 23, 2015 – Flu Vaccination Clinic 7:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.; September 24, 2015 – South Central Emergency Communications Board meeting at 10:30 a.m. at the Blue Earth County Justice Center, Traverse de Sioux Library Board meeting at 9:00 a.m.; September 28, 2015 – Rural Minnesota Energy Board meeting in Slayton; September 29, 2015 – Human Services 40th Anniversary meeting at the Fairmont Armory from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m., Blandin Feasibility Study meeting at 10:00 a.m., Water Plan meeting at 7:00 p.m. (Commissioner Mahoney will attend for Commissioner Flohrs); October 5, 2015 – regular Martin County EDA meeting at 5:15 p.m., and Beyond the Yellow Ribbon meeting; October 6, 2015 – regular Board of Commissioners meeting at 9:00 a.m.; October 7, 2015 – tentative Martin County Wellness Golf

Outing at 3:00 p.m.; and October 8, 2015 – PC’s for People distribution event at the Fairmont Elementary School, 6-8 p.m.

With no further business to wit, Board Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:01 a.m.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
MARTIN COUNTY, MN

Steve Flohrs, Board Chair

ATTEST: _____
Scott Higgins, County Coordinator