

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
MARTIN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MARCH 21, 2017  
@ 4:00 P.M.

The regular meeting of the Martin County Board of Commissioners was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Chairman Dan Schmidtke. Commissioners present were Tom Mahoney, Kathy Smith, Dan Schmidtke, Elliot Belgard, and Steve Flohrs. Also present were Scott Higgins, Martin County Coordinator, Terry Viesselman, Martin County Attorney, Jeff Markquart, Martin County Sheriff, Kevin Peyman, County Engineer, Pam Flitter, Zoning Administrator, Dan Whitman, Martin County Assessor, Rod Halvorsen, KSUM/KFMC Radio, Jason Sorensen, Sentinel Newspaper, Julie Walters, Administrative Assistant, and members of staff and public.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by Commissioner Flohrs, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve the agenda for the March 21, 2017, regular Board of Commissioners meeting with the following additions: 7.1 Consider Renewal of Liquor, Wine, Club or 3.2% Licenses and Consumption & Display Permit for Fox Lake Golf Club, Inc.; 9.4 Consider Out of State Travel Request – Sheriff’s Office; 9.5 Highway Department Update – Kevin Peyman; and 9.6 Tax Court Update – Dan Whitman. Carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Mahoney, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve the minutes of the February 21, 2017, and March 7, 2017, regular Board of Commissioners meetings. Carried unanimously.

Terry Viesselman, Martin County Attorney, was present and had nothing new to report.

Teresa Tieman, Martin County Deputy Auditor/Treasurer-Payroll/HR, was present and reviewed an application that the Auditor/Treasurer’s Office has received from Fox Lake Golf Club, Inc., for renewal of its Liquor, Wine, Club, or 3.2% License (On-Sale and Off Sale); and Consumption & Display Permit (Set-up License). Tieman recommended approval contingent upon receipt of required insurance certificate(s).

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by Commissioner Flohrs, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve and authorize the renewal of Liquor, Wine, Club, or 3.2% License (On-Sale and Off-Sale) effective April 6, 2017 through April 5, 2018; and Consumption & Display Permit (Set-Up License) effective April 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018, for Fox Lake Golf Club, Inc.; and is contingent up receipt of required insurance certificate(s). Carried unanimously.

Chairman Schmidtke introduced Pam Flitter, Zoning Official, to review Martin County’s Zoning Ordinance addressing temporary/portable buildings. Schmidtke noted Richard Koons, representing Gerald Rosenberg, was present to inquire about Martin County’s ordinance pertaining to portable buildings.

Flitter noted our office (Planning and Zoning) received a number of aerial photographs comparing properties between the years of 2013 and 2016; many of which showed buildings that had not been permitted. We then reviewed our files and sent letters to the folks that needed to obtain building permits. The Martin County Zoning Ordinance does not administer the Minnesota State Building Code, but does require land use permits for a wide range of activities. We don't look at wind, we don't look at snow; we look to make sure they are in the proper district that they are supposed to be in and that they meet all of their set-backs. Permits are available for \$125. The Zoning Ordinance was put in place to protect the welfare and safety of all the people in the County; and set-backs are in place so people's views aren't blocked, to make sure it doesn't interfere with land surrounding it for having side yard set-backs, or even snow removal. Flitter went on to note of the seventy-four (74) letters that were sent we have really only had a handful that have been a problem. Most of them have come in and obtained their after the fact permits. We do have an Administrative Appeal process that is available to people that feel the permit process is not being administered correctly and includes completing paperwork for an Administrative Appeal that is then brought before the Board of Adjustment. The Board of Adjustment reviews the file, reviews the entire case, and makes their decision. Once their decision is made it is final unless the applicant files an appeal with thirty (30) days and then it goes to district court. These matters never come before the Board of Commissioners.

Flitter also noted the Ordinance does not address the term "portable" as "portable" is a retail term that retailers seem to be using and are saying that if you do portable...you don't need a permit. Martin County's Zoning Ordinance addresses "temporary" which mean they will be at a particular area for eighteen (18) months or less; otherwise it is considered a building and you need to obtain a building permit.

Flitter noted we are not looking for more work to do. This is a result of something that has come about and been spurred by the availability of aerial photos comparing years 2013 to 2016. When this was brought to our attention, we needed to follow up on it.

Chairman Schmidtke noted while we'll allow anybody to come here to our meeting but this is not the proper channel to discuss this issue (of portable buildings or after the fact variances). You need to take it to the Planning and Zoning Committee and that's where it gets addressed. With all that said I don't know how many people are here for all of this now. I'll let you talk for a few minutes but I think you all understand where you have to be to get anything done.

Richard Koons, Martin County Association of Townships, representing some of those township boards and representing Gerald Rosenberg, noted well it wasn't completely put on the agenda how I asked it to be. I'm not complaining about the ordinance. It is a very, very, very unknown fact and in fact in the last two days I've had two people that got these letters who had talked to Pam's office and were told that they did not need this permit for portable buildings. That being said...from a county association and many of its boards in the membership, the Planning and Zoning that we have here in Martin County, the way it is run, is on a thirty-year old diagram and it is broken. It's been broken for a long time. We've asked for some changes through the Planning and Zoning Office and we've not gotten them as township boards. It is no longer working. The agreement has to work. As county commissioners and as county employees, as township boards, our job is to represent the people and that is not happening in the rural districts.

I can almost assure you Mr. Flohrs...Mr. Schmidtke...Mr. Belgard...I would venture to guess you know 25% of your rural residents and ask them...most of them wouldn't know this was in practice. We as townships have made several suggestions to the Zoning Office to try and change some of the things that don't work and it has not been met with great reception. As broken as it is and in need of an update as this agreement and this policy and how it is run is, I would suggest to the commissioners today that any action that they take on the approximately fifty-eight (58) that I was informed of letters that have been sent out already be postponed for ninety (90) days. And furthermore...

Chairman Schmidtke noted Richard (Koons) I don't mean to interrupt you but you're wasting your time because we can't do that. It doesn't come to this Board.

Koons inquired this isn't a personnel issue?

Schmidtke answered not what you're asking to be done is not.

Koons noted okay well here is what I'm going to ask. I'll skip that part. I'm going to ask that the County Board agree to sometime in the very near future and the Zoning Board and the Township Board get together and discuss the remedies that need to be made in order to make this work. I mean we have...it's not been changed in thirty (30) years. Koons noted here is an example in our township where we had absolutely no say in it...ten (10) acres bought by father and son were split into two parcels, permitted two different sites, same driveway. Two and a half miles that way to the tar road that's a township road...from those two sites our tax base is \$163 inclusive both of them together. That doesn't buy a load of gravel...you know that. There's 800 loaded semi's going in and out of that site in a year.

Chairman Schmidtke noted every time there is a permit brought to us to apply for one of these buildings or any type of building...everybody within a mile (5,000 feet) is contacted and the township officials and the county officials are asked to come to a meeting...every time. If you're not getting your mail, don't blame us.

Koons noted a lot of times we don't get those until the day of the meeting.

Flitter noted we held several meetings during the feedlot process and times and we held them all over the county and we held them at all townships. According to the law, it says that a clerk is to receive the notice that a feedlot is going up and we heard that clerks weren't sharing this information and so during that process we had agreed that the chairman would sign the form and basically that form is just a communication tool letting them know that this feedlot is coming in and the clerk would receive a notice. Flitter noted that is up to the person who is applying for that permit...that they need to plan more accordingly. If you would like that to be at your township board meeting then they will need to plan that permitting more accordingly. But that was the purpose behind what we put into place was so that the clerk would receive notice and the chairman would sign so we knew that communications were being made and were clear.

Koons noted so the map shows it's not there in 2013 but shows it is there in 2016. You know I don't think they even qualify as buildings to be honest with you.

Flitter noted they are fastened to cement and those you'll want to fasten because they are going to blow away in Minnesota and a lot of those car ports we find get sides because we are in Minnesota so we get the winds and all of a sudden they get sides put on them and I know that the particular case that we're talking about...his site is in shoreland also which as a county we are required and delegated by the DNR to administer their rules and maybe on his particular site he fortunately meets all of the set-backs, doesn't block someone's view, but if there was a car port put on Fox Lake it would block someone's view.

Mike Gerken, landowner, was present and noted these portable buildings you made comment that they are on cement...there's all these portable buildings out there that some are not on cement...they're on wood, on dirt, so you can slide them around to get them around to wherever you want. That's what we're concerned about. And you move them to clean them out or move them to another spot and you'd like to move back here after a few months...okay...are they going to catch us during that time it was moved? No, they're not. That's the problem.

Brian Thate, landowner, was present and noted he met with Pam (Flitter) yesterday and we agreed on a few things. My problem with this rule is I paid her \$125 to move this portable building. Walking out of there I said to her I questioned her so two years from now and I want to move this building...I have to come in and get another permit for something that I already permitted once.

Flitter noted and I told him that if it is under eighteen (18) months it is considered temporary. If it is longer than that then yes you need to and like I said in most cases these buildings never move. They stay right where they are.

Commissioner Belgard inquired letting them know that they moved them in the eighteen (18) months... would that take care of the problem?

Flitter answered yes, all they have to do is let us know that they're moving them.

Thate noted then I have to pay \$125 again.

Flitter answered nope, not for a temporary structure. You just need to notify us that you're doing that.

Thate inquired what if I move it four years from now...I've got to get another permit. And this building I'm talking about is 30 some years old. My dad bought it. I moved it 100 yards across the yard and needed a building permit to move a building.

Commissioner Belgard inquired how big is it Brian (Thate)?

Thate answered 12 x 24.

Commissioner Mahoney inquired if it is permanently fixed.

Thate answered no. It's sitting on some skids.

Koons noted most of you know that I was in the construction business for a long time and there are those port-a-huts that you can mount on skids, set on the dirt, if you want you can mount them to the floor or a wall. But I have a particular case where about twenty years ago I was asked by a customer to pour a slab of cement, lay up some brick block wall and he was going to fasten these to it. I said no problem. Went out and looked at it and told him to get a permit and he come right up here same day and was told he didn't need a permit. He told them he was fastening it to a concrete wall and was told he didn't need one.

Commissioner Belgard noted it's got a foundation in it, it needed a permit 20 years ago and honestly it's kind of here say but I doubt that anybody in this office told them that if they had a foundation and a footing that they didn't need one for that.

Chairman Schmidtke again noted that's really where you need to be is a Planning and Zoning meeting.

Flitter noted you need to make an administrative appeal.

Koons inquired and how much time do we have to do that since it's not in your letter you sent out.

Flitter noted an administrative appeal you can do any time. It runs just like a regular board meeting so applications are due by the first Friday of the month to be heard on the fourth Tuesday of the month.

Koons noted there's such a thing as professional...I mean ignorance is no excuse we all know that. But, there's such a thing as professional courtesy. Had these guys gotten letters that said hey we've come across this...you should have had a building permit...could you come in and take care of that in the next 30 days; otherwise, we're going to have to do the fine. I mean we're talking \$1,000 on two buildings that didn't cost him \$2,500.

Commissioner Mahoney noted when this first started and became an issue that it would be just the Rosenberg's because I don't think you can lump all these 50-60 buildings all into the same thing but on the Rosenberg's I really don't feel that is a building...I don't think the attachment is there or anything. But, the other thing about Rosenberg's is that they got that letter, they had to pay \$500 by yesterday...I don't know what the fine was or anything...not everybody understands this stuff. I've been around the shoreland ordinance and the building permit...I did this stuff for 20 years and there were times where I had to make a decision does this make sense or whatever on the Rosenberg thing that's one issue...these other things are other issues and I know when I started in the early 1990's buildings on skids were a big deal. Now there really aren't many of them and that sort of thing.

Chairman Schmidtke noted actually they weren't a very big deal for a long time and then whoever like us grew up with them and had them for a long time and then they kind of went away but now everybody and their brother sells them...and they're coming back again. We could talk about this until midnight tonight and we wouldn't be done but I'm glad to hear...you guys can call me any time and that goes for anyone that's sitting here but we're not going to

change things no matter how long we talk about this. You really need to get your issues on an agenda for a Planning and Zoning meeting.

Gerken noted well what about these fines...there should be leeway on paying these fines.

Flitter noted that would need an ordinance amendment. We administer the ordinance according to the law and our county attorney is our legal representative...

Commissioner Mahoney inquired what happens if they don't pay the fines.

Flitter answered it goes over to the county attorney and the county attorney sends them a letter that lets them know that they are in violation.

Commissioner Mahoney inquired is this after the fact building permit always been \$500?

Flitter answered yes for many, many years.

Belgard noted that's the penalty for saying well maybe I won't get one. I'll see if they catch me...

Flitter noted all buildings (permits) are \$125 and after the fact is \$500. It's to help deter people from not getting the appropriate permits. Some people think that it's cheaper to do it and then ask for forgiveness later so you've got to have some sort of a penalty.

Thate inquired what would have been wrong with sending us a letter saying hey you're in violation can you come in and talk to us.

Flitter answered we did.

Thate noted but it said you owe \$500.

Flitter noted that is the policy.

Thate noted it is the policy but like my buildings were put in when there was no need for a building permit. And I didn't build it...I moved it.

Koons noted I know at least one person was given an extension and was advised to move their building and didn't get a permit

Flitter noted yes because of the weather they were saying that they needed to have some time to move the building and meet the set-backs.

Koons inquired and we can't offer that to some of these other people a month to get past the next Planning and Zoning thing.

Flitter answered the thing is, is that is not going to change the Ordinance. The Ordinance is as it reads. We're here to work with people and every situation is unique. It's not Pam's rules it's a county ordinance.

Mahoney inquired how long has this county ordinance been around.

Flitter answered since 1971. The Clean Water Act started in 1969 and when the Clean Water Act came into effect then they required counties to put in ordinances for land use and for shoreland in order to help protect people basically against themselves. We've had many cases over on Fox Lake where it's blocked someone's view and they've had to move their buildings.

Commissioner Smith inquired if there have been revisions to the ordinance.

Flitter answered yes. In 2002 we started doing the comprehensive plan and in 2004 we started putting all the changes into it and we worked on it until probably about 2007 and then there's been...because there were a lot of revisions that we needed to make...we've also done different types of things that you know there was a side-yard set-back I think that we had changed at one point and so there have been multiple...

Chairman Schmidtke thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and to be sure to go to the Planning and Zoning Office to get on an agenda.

Koons inquired if these portable buildings are taxed because they're considered permanent.

Dan Whitman, County Assessor, answered they've always been taxed as structures. And you know we would have picked these buildings up during our quintile but with the software that we are using we're just picking them up, up to four (4) or five (5) years sooner so it's a timing issue; but buildings on the farm we've always taxed them but a chicken shed you know it's worth about \$65 so that's \$.06 cents tax. But they are taxable structures.

Commissioner Mahoney inquired so are you going to talk about things (listed in the email). I see a bunch of these are \$159,000; \$206,000; \$271,000; \$273,000...are those like machine sheds or houses...

Whitman answered I didn't bring all of that data with. It's everything from bins to some machine sheds to small structures...there was a variety of different structures that were picked up...decks.

Flitter noted there weren't just portable buildings or temporary or sheds...there were a number of different types of things that included big machine sheds that weren't permitted, there were decks, there were grain bins, there were a multiple of things that were not permitted.

Whitman noted so with a house that is a wrong dimension that could have been an addition that wasn't permitted and we didn't know about it...I don't know without going and looking at each structure. We've done that review...we went out and reviewed these things but we were trying to demonstrate that the software was very beneficial...we picked up millions of dollars' worth of

value through that process. We've deleted several hundred thousand dollars of value of stuff that disappeared over the last three years that we didn't know about. So it went both ways. But we have found it to be a very valuable tool in having more accurate records and that's what we're striving for is to have the most accurate records we can.

Koons inquired so what about these portable outhouses...the ones that have sat in the same place for 4-5 years.

Flitter answered he will pick them up and move them.

Whitman noted for us it's not an issue because the minimum value is \$1,000. If it is not worth over \$1,000 we don't put it on as a taxable structure.

Commissioner Mahoney inquired do you know what you have for a value on the Rosenberg carport.

Flitter answered there is one carport and one building.

Chairman Schmidtke noted again this is really a Planning and Zoning issue. Thank you.

Ashley Brenke, Director Martin SWCD, presented and reviewed a resolution supporting an application to the Board of Water and Soil Resources for a planning grant to develop a comprehensive Watonwan Watershed management plan. Brenke noted I was here a couple of weeks ago talking about the Watonwan Watershed One Watershed, One Plan and that the Watonwan Watershed is located in the north central part of the Martin County. The application is to work with our neighboring counties and districts so it is actually six counties and six soil and water conservation districts that are part of this. This resolution is for the actual planning grant so you apply to get the planning grant.

Motion by Commissioner Flohrs, seconded by Commissioner Belgard,

R-#12/'17

RESOLUTION  
TO SUPPORT A WATONWAN WATERSHED  
ONE WATERSHED, ONE PLAN PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Minnesota Board of Soil and Water Resources has developed policies for coordination and development of comprehensive watershed management plans, also known as One Watershed, One Plan, consistent with Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 103B.801, Comprehensive Watershed Management Planning Program; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 103B.301, Comprehensive Local Water Management Act, authorizes Minnesota Counties to develop and implement a local water management plan; and

WHEREAS, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 103C.331, subdivision 11, Comprehensive Plan, authorizes Minnesota Soil and Water Conservation Districts to develop and implement a comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, the Counties, and Soil and Water Conservation Districts within the Watonwan Watershed #25, as delineated in the attached One Watershed, One Plan Suggested Boundary Map, have interest in developing a comprehensive watershed management plan for this area.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Martin County Board of Commissioners recognizes and supports watershed-scale planning efforts consistent with Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 103B.801, also known as One Watershed, One Plan; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Martin County, Minnesota, welcomes the opportunity to collaborate with the Counties, and Soil and Water Conservation Districts within the Watonwan Watershed for watershed-scale planning efforts in the future; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Martin County Board of Commissioners supports an application to the Board of Water and Soil Resources for a planning grant to develop a comprehensive watershed management plan and anticipates entering into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Counties, and Soil and Water Conservation Districts within the Watonwan Watershed, to collaborate on this effort, pending selection as a recipient of a planning grant.

Motion by Commissioner Flohrs, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, said resolution duly passed and adopted this 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2017.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MARTIN COUNTY, MN

---

Dan Schmidtke, Board Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Higgins, County Coordinator

Roll Call AYES: Commissioners Mahoney, Smith, Belgard, Flohrs, and Schmidtke. NAYS: None. Resolution duly passed and adopted this 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2017.

Tam Plumhoff, Wellness Committee Chair, along with Jenny Trushenski, Wellness Committee Co-chair, were present to review the Martin County CY2017 County Wellness Program Budget noting the South Central Service Cooperative (SCSC) Regional Wellness Program provides “wellness dollars” to improve the physical, mental, and social wellbeing of all individuals to its members. Plumhoff noted Martin County is expected to be eligible for approximately \$9,716.42 (\$80 per 121 contracts plus \$36.42 carryover from 2016) in wellness dollars from the SCSC to be used toward a variety of program goals to promote healthier/happier people with improved self-esteem, increased job performance, a decrease in sick leave days and lower health plan

utilization. Plumhoff also noted there was increased employee participation in the Wellness Program in 2016 and is hopeful for increased participation in 2017.

Motion by Commissioner Mahoney, seconded by Commissioner Flohrs, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, having already established the Martin County Wellness Program, and supports the programming of the Wellness Committee, hereby approve the CY2017 Wellness Budget and to approve and authorize Tam Plumhoff, Chair of the Martin County Wellness Committee, to sign the required agreements pertaining to the Wellness Program through the South Central Service Cooperative for 2017; and to authorize the County Coordinator to administer the overall Wellness/Fitness program and budget. Carried unanimously.

Jeff Markquart, Martin County Sheriff, presented an out of state travel request for Markus Murphy to attend TASER training in Madison, South Dakota, on March 21, 2017.

Motion by Commissioner Belgard, seconded by Commissioner Smith, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve and authorize the out of state travel request for Markus Murphy, Martin County Sheriff's Deputy, to attend TASER training to be held March 21, 2017, in Madison, South Dakota.

Markquart concluded with an update on the current Martin County Jail Population including twenty-four (24) in-house, ten (10) out of county, and seven (7) on Electronic Home Monitoring (EHM).

Kevin Peyman, County Engineer, presented a Highway Department Update including tentative early start to the upcoming Overlay Projects; direction from Board on moving forward with calculating labor and material costs for work at the Martin County Arena; current legislation on the state's Transportation Package; and no new information yet on our Hwy 15 funding schedule.

Dan Whitman, Martin County Assessor, was present to provide a tax court update including two petitions on one property – Shopko – and so we have a scheduling date that means we have to get ready to go to court coming up quite soon. Whitman noted the Department of Revenue has a specialist that they hired about five or six years ago and he's kind of given us a hint that things like Shopko, Dollar General, Walgreens, Kmart's...buildings where they build them and then they turn around and sell them back on a lease...this income producing property they call it and you're supposed to value them based on that lease...how much money they're making on that property. When you look at Walgreens, Shopko, Dollar General, we're quite a ways below that when we valued them so the Shopko petition we valued below where they would think that they might be worth...should maybe be worth quite a bit more money; and yet they're filing a petition saying that we are overvalue. There's a problem out there called "Dark Store Theory" it started in Indiana and Michigan where they want us to value a Shopko or a Walgreen based on what the empty Kmart store would sell for because that's all they think it is worth. And it is very troubling and they've had legislation passed in Michigan now and working on Indiana to prevent that kind of stuff. But the lawyer as I talked to him this week he suggested that's the theory he's using to come up with his suggested values and I was telling him in all honesty when we use

income approach well when we looked at what other Shopko's, what some of them are selling for, we're already undervalued...why would I go down.

Whitman went on to note I've also been working on a statewide tax court group put together so all counties can work together and this is kind of exactly why I would like to get an appraisal done on this building or a Shopko that we can all use as a baseline to tell us what really should we be valuing these properties and have them pay off of and that would be a negotiation tool. Right now the offer that we had from the attorney on our local one we'd end up paying back a little over \$6,000 in taxes if we accepted his offer. I think I've got four counties that are willing to kick in and go together and get an appraisal done and split the cost between the four of us using this new group. So our liability would maybe be between \$1,500 and \$2,500 if we could get some of those to get that done. To me that's not only a good thing for us but a good thing for the state in the long run to try and put this "Dark Store Theory" down again. So I just wanted to get your temperature if you agreed that may be a good idea or if you think I should do something different.

Commissioner Flohrs noted sounds like a good way to go about it...to get four counties to go in on it with you.

Chairman Schmidtke noted it is always better when you work together...

Whitman also noted there's two of us that have the same scheduling date almost – Lake County and us...he's got one up there in Two Harbors that he thinks is worth way more than ours but we've been talking and kind of agree on an appraiser. His estimate the first time was \$10,000 so I think he'll do it cheaper if I talk to him about using this group; but at the worst if we had four or five...that would be at the top end of our potential liability I think on this deal. Whitman noted the last one cost us...I think we approved it up to \$7,500 but he charged us \$5,050 and that's what we ended up using to settle that case. It came in a little less than we were; but it was quite a bit more than they were offering so it moved their offer up quite a bit when we got that appraisal.

Commissioner Mahoney inquired what farmland is valued at this year.

Whitman answered \$7,950...down about 3% this year.

The Board reviewed warrants to be paid March 21, 2017.

Motion by Commissioner Flohrs, seconded by Commissioner Belgard, Be It Resolved that the Martin County Board of Commissioners, hereby approve bills to be paid on March 21, 2017, as presented; and includes the Martin County Highway Department and Drainage bills as presented. Carried unanimously.

Warrants received and paid March 21, 2017, are registered on file in the Auditor/Treasurer's Office as follows:

Revenue Fund – Warrants Approved March 21, 2017	\$161,679.14
---	--------------

Enhanced 9-1-1 Fund	\$ 833.10
Martin County Economic Development Authority	\$ 1,836.77
Solid Waste Management Fund	\$ 28,583.98
Law Library Fund	\$ 1,922.13
Martin County Transit Fund	\$ 53,781.84
Building – CIP – Fund	\$ 420.00
Bank Building Fund	<u>\$ 4,728.10</u>
Total	\$253,785.06

Road and Bridge Funds Totaled	\$ 49,869.41
Martin County Ditch Funds Totaled	\$ 64,072.11

Commissioners reviewed their calendars of previous and upcoming meetings and activities: March 8, 2017 – Department Director meeting at 8:30 a.m., Human Services meeting, F-M Joint Transit Board meeting, Park Board meeting, and Bureau 14 meeting; March 9, 2017 – Soil and Water meeting; March 10, 2017 – GBERBA meeting; March 13, 2017 – Park Masters Golf (July) Committee meeting; March 14, 2017 – Building Committee meeting, Library Board meeting, Township meetings; March 16, 2017 – Traverse de Sioux Library meeting; Personnel Committee meeting at 4:00 p.m.; March 20, 2016 – Minnesota Valley Action Council meeting, and Martin County Substance Abuse Prevention meeting; March 21, 2017 – Building Committee meeting at 3:00 p.m.(we’ve received one bid for the water problems we had at the Human Resource Building and we should have another bid today and the third is coming tomorrow), AgriBusiness at Tami’s on the Ave at 6:00 p.m.; March 22, 2017 – Human Services meeting in Fairmont and Convention & Visitors Bureau meeting; March 23, 2017 – Emergency Communications Board meeting in Mankato, Minnesota, at 10:00 a.m., and South Central EMS meeting in Eagle Lake, Minnesota, at 1:00 p.m.; March 27, 2017 – Rural Minnesota Energy Board meeting; March 28, 2017 – Planning and Zoning meeting at 5:30 p.m., and Association of Minnesota Townships meeting at 6:30 p.m.; March 29, 2017 – South Central Minnesota Multi-County HRA meeting in North Mankato, Minnesota; March 30, 2017 – Water Plan meeting; April 3, 2017 – Martin County EDA meeting at 5:15 p.m., and Beyond the Yellow Ribbon meeting; April 4, 2017 – next regular Board of Commissioners meeting at 4:00 p.m. in the Commissioners Meeting Room – Courthouse (Chair Schmidtke will be absent – Vice Chair Mahoney will chair the meeting).

With no further business to wit, Board Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:37 p.m.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
MARTIN COUNTY, MN

---

Dan Schmidtke, Board Chair

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Scott Higgins, County Coordinator