



BOARD MINUTES

BOARD OF WRIGHT COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

JUNE 21, 2022

DATE APPROVED: JUNE 28, 2022

Christine Husom	District 1
Darek Vetsch	District 2
Mark Daleiden	District 3
Mary Wetter	District 4
Michael Kaczmarek	District 5

The Wright County Board met in regular session at 9:01 A.M. with Husom, Vetsch, Daleiden, Wetter, and Kaczmarek present.

COUNTY BOARD MINUTES 06-07-2022

Commissioner Mike Kaczmarek requested an edit on page 4 to say “I deferred to Commissioner Vetsch due to concerns stemming from his district.”

Kaczmarek moved to approve the County Board minutes from Tuesday, June 7, 2022, with the suggested corrections. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mark Daleiden. The motion carried 5-0.

AGENDA

Daleiden moved to approve the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mary Wetter. The motion carried 5-0.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Darek Vetsch moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item B4 to be moved to a timed agenda item for further discussion. The motion was seconded by Kaczmarek. The motion carried 5-0.

*Items removed for further discussion and placed in the timed agenda.

A. ADMINISTRATION

1. Authorize Signatures On Contract Extension With Crossroads Animal Shelter, To Continue The Administrative Functions And Record The Keeping Of Dangerous Dogs.

B. ADMINISTRATION – FINANCE

1. Acknowledge Warrants Issued Between June 1, 2022 And June 10, 2022.
2. Motion To Approve The Reimbursement Of The American Rescue Plan Act (ARP) Funds As Follows:
 - i. County ARP Funds:
 - ii. Approval Of County Reimbursement Of \$445.91 From 01-099- 493.6910 Transfer Out Into 01-100-493.5910 Transfer In As Follows:
 1. \$445.91 For Administrative Expenses-Staff Costs
 - iii. Approval Of Use Of ARP Funds From 01-099-493-8433-6020.
 1. \$4,529.44
 - 2.2 Household Assistance
3. Motion To Approve A Reimbursement For Money Spent In Connection With UCARE Dental Clinic. A Journal Entry Will Be Processed In The Amount Of \$19,142.50 From 11-450-000-0000- 6910 Transfer Out Into 34-150-000-8216-5910 Transfer In.
4. *Approval Of Performance Management Resolution, And Acceptance Of The Performance Management Grant Application.
5. Approve Renewal Of Annual Club On-Sale, Off-Sale And Sunday Liquor License For CHD Ventures LLC - Trails End Pub For The License Period July 1, 2022 To June 30, 2023.
6. Approve Precious Metal Dealer License For Shaphan Kirkpatrick DBA National Gold Consultants (City Of Buffalo) For A One-Year Period.
7. Approve Renewal Of Annual Club Off-Sale Liquor License For David Olson DBA Olson's Truck Stop For The License Period July 1, 2022 To June 30, 2023.
8. Approve Renewal Of Annual Club On-Sale And Sunday Liquor License For Fountain Hill Winery & Vineyard For The License Period July 1, 2022 To June 30, 2023.
9. Approve Renewal Of Temporary 1-Day On-Sale Liquor License For Church Of St Mary Of Czestochowa For Its Event On July 16th.

C. AGRICULTURE & DRAINAGE

1. Approval Of The Contract Proposal For Phase 1 Diagnostic/Feasibility Study For 12-Mile Creek Water For ARP Project #8409.

D. PLANNING & ZONING

1. Accept The Findings And Recommendation Of The Planning Commission For The Following Request To Rezone:
 - i. KYLE ASHWILL - (Cokato Twp.) Commission Unanimously Recommends Approval Of The Request To Rezone From AG General Agricultural To I-1 General Industry District.

TIMED AGENDA ITEMS**BARRY RHINEBERGER - PLANNING & ZONING****Determination Of Need For An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) For Knife River Naaktgeboren Gravel Pit Expansion, Wright County, Minnesota.**

Environmental Health Supervisor Edward Pettit said the resolution had to do with the expansion of the Knife River Naaktgeboren pit in Silver Creek Township and the determination of need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Commissioner Christine Husom asked what his recommendation was. Pettit said the pit had been in operation since 1984 and it was expanded in 2017, which triggered the need for an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW). That document was prepared and the board determined in 2017 no further review was warranted, so an EIS was not prepared. The current proposal would be to expand the pit again, staying within the permitted boundary. Rather than mining 10 acres that was previously permitted, the county would increase the mining to around 14 acres. Planning and Zoning Director Barry Rhineberger recommended proceeding with no EIS. Husom said it appears that another EIS is not needed.

Assistant County Attorney Greg Kryzer said staff went through the proper channels and everything was satisfactory. All comments that were received have been given a response and Kryzer agreed that no EIS was needed at this time. This determination was an expansion of another EIS that had been done in 2017. Those completing the review of the expansion simply went outside the boundaries that were studied previously. Kryzer said he did not see any need at the staff level, but the final determination would be up the board. Rhineberger said he had made a few typographical corrections to resolutions so the new printouts the board was viewing was modestly different. Kaczmarek wanted to know if someone could address why this expansion would not be affected by the moratorium. Kryzer said this was a process that went under the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) rules, meaning this was the state agency rule under the EAW. This had nothing to do with the conditional use permit. It was a separate process. Rhineberger explained that this was the first stage and said the amendment would be coming forward with the conditional use permit application. Rhineberger explained that if there were any existing approved uses under the old language, any change would require an updated permit. Vetsch asked if there was an EAW or an EIS prior. Rhineberger said there was not. Pettit explained that this was a very involved process that could take years. The first step would be getting an EAW to see if there was potential for environmental effects.

Vetsch moved to approve the resolution for the findings of fact, conclusions and order for no warranted need for EIS determination for Knife River Naaktgeboren Gravel Pit expansion. The motion was seconded by Daleiden. The motion carried 5-0.

VIRGIL HAWKINS - HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT**Award Contract For The Otsego Truck Station Building Expansion. We Recommend Award Of The Base Bid To Rochon Corporation Of Osseo, MN In The Amount Of \$1,441,000.**

County Highway Engineer Virgil Hawkins said the first recommendation was an award contract for the Otsego Truck Station building expansion. He had received bids on Tuesday, June 7 and there was a letter of recommendation from the architect in each board member's packet with a bid summary. Hawkins recommended that the award of the base bid go to Rochon Corporation of Osseo, MN in the amount of \$1,441,000. Daleiden asked what the addition would be. Hawkins said the Otsego Truck Station would be adding three bays to the shop. Originally part of it was going to be an enclosed salt brine storage area, but it was decided afterwards that the salt brine storage area be part of the Buffalo shop which was still part of the project but not part of this particular bid. Hawkins thought this would be completed before Winter 2022.

Daleiden moved to approve the Award Contract for the Otsego Truck Station building expansion to be awarded to Rochon Corporation of Osseo, MN in the amount of \$1,441,000. The motion was seconded by Wetter. The motion carried 5-0.

Award Contract No. 2205, CSAH 19 Federal One-Way Pair Project (Subject To Authorization Of Award By The MnDOT Civil Rights Office). We Recommend Award Of Contract No. 2205 To be awarded to Thomas & Sons Construction, Inc. Of Rogers, MN In The Amount OF \$3,712,060.38.

Hawkins said he received bids on Tuesday June 14, for contract No. 2205, CSAH 19 Federal One-Way Pair Project. Three bids with summaries were attached. He recommended to award Contract No. 2205 to Thomas & Sons Construction, Inc. of Rogers. Daleiden noted that the county was very fortunate to get these bids as the bid amounts were incredibly low. Daleiden moved to approve the Award Contract No. 2205, CSAH 19 Federal One-Way Pair Project. The motion was seconded by Wetter. The motion carried 5-0.

Acceptance Of The 2021 Highway Department Annual Report. The 2021 Highway Department Annual Report Was Distributed To The County Board On Tuesday, May 31, 2022 To Allow For Review By The County Board Members.

Hawkins requested acceptance of the 2021 Highway Department Annual Report. The 2021 Highway Department Annual Report was distributed to the county board on Tuesday, May 31 to allow for review by the board members. He did not receive any comments, so he asked for acceptance. Kaczmarek said he sent an email regarding the difference in costs. There was a roundabout that was in the millions of dollars on page 11, but also a roundabout that was in the \$400,000 range. Kaczmarek asked what was driving the price. Hawkins explained that when building roundabouts there were a lot of moving parts. In general, the cost has gone up for projects. He said the mini-roundabout in Delano was \$600,000 and that the others were all in the \$1 million range. The roundabout that was \$400,000 was part of a federal grant and the total cost was not listed in that report. The 2021 report would however have a total amount. Some of the federal funding was put towards building these roundabouts. Hawkins said there was a lot of information in the packet.

Daleiden asked about the construction on Highway 35 and Bison Blvd. Hawkins said there was a pre-construction meeting scheduled on Friday, June 24. Construction was scheduled to start the week of July 5 or July 11 depending on when the concrete pipe structures can be delivered. He hoped to open the road back up before school starts. Daleiden asked if there would be a detour in the interim. Hawkins said there would be signs out for the detour about a week before the construction starts. Wetter asked about the roundabouts that had a cement or flat middle. Hawkins said the flat ones are mini-roundabouts. They were created this way so that buses and trucks could drive over the top. The larger ones have the mounds that you do physically have to go around. They too have a larger shoulder a semi can use to make the turns. Kaczmarek made the comment that it would be beneficial to put out information explaining the design of the roundabouts so the public understood the cement piece through the middle was not an error. Hawkins explained that he preferred roundabouts because there is such great intersection control. Roundabouts greatly reduce and eliminate serious injuries and fatalities. Daleiden said this would be posted on the Highway Department's website so the community could follow along with the construction.

Daleiden moved to approve the acceptance of the 2021 Highway Department Annual Report. The motion was seconded by Vetsch. The motion carried 5-0.

COMMISSIONERS

Approval Of Performance Management Resolution, And Acceptance Of The Performance Management Grant Application.

Assistant Finance Director Heather Lemieux said last year the county received \$19,000 back in reimbursements. Daleiden and Husom thanked the Finance Department and recognized their efforts noting it won this award the last five years in a row.

Daleiden moved to approve Performance Management Resolution and acceptance of the Performance Management Grant Application. The motion was seconded by Vetsch. The motion carried 5-0.

ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

ADMINISTRATION

Approve Addition To Committee Listing

Husom said that with the addition of the Department of Employment Economic Development Energy Transition Advisory Committee, the board now had to appoint the members of the committee. There was a lot of time involved with this committee in particular, which was why it was being added to the list of per diems. Husom asked if the board would like to add the gravel work group to that per diem list as well. County Administrator Lee Kelly said the Energy Transition Advisory Committee can be added to the per diems list. He said that typically this is a housekeeping item, but expanded this to an

Item for Consideration in case there were other committees the board would like to add to that list.

Kaczmarek said the Employee Retention Work Group, otherwise known as R.A.I.S.E. was also a meeting and asked if the board wanted to keep that. Vetsch explained that R.A.I.S.E. was staff group not a formalized group with minutes so it would not meet the criteria. Wetter brought up Environmental Health Work Group that she and Daleiden were on most of the work was done by Planning and Zoning. Daleiden said this would go through the end of the year. The next step would be to talk to restaurants and hotels to see if they were happy with the funding they are getting from the State or if they would prefer local representation and inspections. Vetsch mentioned timing can be crucial with getting inspections completed and that there were a lot of pieces involved with that. This next step would determine whether the board continues with this group. Vetsch asked that the board review the next set of minutes from the Environmental Health Work Group to be brought up to date on its status.

Vetsch moved to approve the addition to the committee listing. The motion was seconded by Wetter. The motion carried 5-0.

Daleiden wanted to note that the board needed to set a date for next week or the week after for citizen placement in each township for the Gravel Work Group. Vetsch, knowing there are a lot of people wanting to apply, wanted to get this scheduled as well. Board members discussed how they would like to move that meeting forward. Applications are due by noon Thursday, June 30, 2022 for anyone interested in being on the Gravel Work Group. Assistant County Administrator Marc Mattice said so far there were five people from townships and three operators on the list. Wetter and Kaczmarek would be looking at applicant recommendations and letters from the township board at 1:00 p.m. Thursday, June 30. Mattice requested Wetter and Kaczmarek include someone from Planning and Zoning to help answer questions about logistics when deciding. The board is looking for two or three ideal candidates.

COMMITTEE MINUTES

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING MINUTES (06/07/2022)

Husom referenced the section about the redetermination of benefits for Ditches 23 and 31. She asked that a change be made on Page 3, from the word "title" to "tile". Top of Page four Vetsch would like "Vetsch saw we are devaluing it" to be "Vetsch said that the board was devaluing it".

Vetsch moved to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes from Tuesday, June 7. The motion was seconded by Kaczmarek. The motion carried 5-0.

I. Public Hearing for the Redetermination of Benefits on County Ditch #23 and County Ditch #31

Board Chair Christine Husom called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and stated from a written document: This is a public hearing on the redetermination of benefits and damages on Wright County Ditch 10 under statutes section 103E.351. I would like to welcome everyone who has come today. Under consideration at this hearing is the redetermination of benefits and damages for Wright County Ditch 10 which includes the acquisition and valuation of buffer seeding areas. The purpose of this hearing is to review the viewer's report and receive comment from those affected by or interested in the proposed redetermination of benefits and damages report. This is an evidentiary proceeding. The proceedings are being recorded in order to preserve the record. The presentation for each drainage system will be taken in numerical order. The order of business for the hearings will be as follows. First, the Drainage Authority's legal will present the procedural and legal requirements. Following the staff presentation one of the viewers will make his presentation. After the viewer has made his presentation, I will open the hearing for public comment. The Board would like to hear your comments on the proposed redetermination of benefits and damages of the drainage system and any information relevant to that purpose.

Specifically, the Board is interested in:

- Whether it is missing information used to define the public benefit, damage, or valuation.*
- The extent and basis of any benefits or damages.*
- Whether and how your land drains to the public system*
- Whether you have concerns with the soil classifications as presented by the viewers.*
- Whether the seeding and right of way acquisition area and valuation is correct or missing information.*
- Whether you have concerns or issues associated with any portion of the benefits of damages assessed to your property*
- Whether the recommended benefits and damages creates other material concerns the Board should consider prior to adopting the*

viewers report

Though information may be presented regarding the current condition of the drainage system, this hearing is not an appropriate time to discuss issues related to possible, future actions such as a repair unless the repair or lack of an ability to make a repair will alter the benefits or damages of the system. If repairs are warranted, the Drainage Authority will initiate separate proceedings to discuss those issues. However, if you have an immediate concern, we invite you to contact our drainage coordinator Matt Detjen. The purpose of this hearing is to review the viewer's report. During the public hearing, commissioners may ask questions of staff or the viewers making presentations and of commenters, to clarify any testimony. In addition, if a member of the public asks a question and a commissioner believes that a response from the Drainage Authority staff or a viewer can readily resolve the question or enrich the testimony, the commissioner may ask me to have the appropriate staff member or viewer speak to the question. I will exercise my judgment as to whether to allow such discussion. However, commissioners' expression of their positions and general discussion concerning the subject of the public hearing should be avoided during the public comment portion of the public hearing. Board discussion will occur after all members of the public have had a chance to speak and the public comment period has been closed. Board discussion may occur and be concluded at this or a subsequent meeting, as the Board decides. If a member of the public would like to make a comment, please stand and address the Board when I recognize you. Speak clearly and state your name and address for the record. If you have a specific question concerning the proposed viewers report, we may ask our drainage coordinator, one of the viewers or legal counsel to respond. If you have anything in writing you wish to submit, you can provide it to me before the close of the public comments and I will note its receipt in the record. To ensure that all wishing to comment on the proposed viewers report concerning the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system may have time to speak, I may limit the time any single speaker may comment to three minutes. Please limit redundant or repetitive comments. Would any of the board members wish to offer any further remarks before we begin?

Assistant County Attorney John A. Bowen spoke on behalf of the ditches located in Woodland Township stating:
(DRAINAGE SUPERVISOR COMMENTS FOR HEARING REESTABLISHMENT OF BENEFITS AND DAMAGES Wright County Ditches 23 and 31 (103E.351)

- 1. This is a public hearing on the redetermination of benefits and damages of Wright County Ditches 23 and 31. These drainage systems are located Woodland Township, Wright County. The drainage area is mainly developed and guided for agricultural use .*
- 2. As part of his analysis of the drainage system, the viewers have provided the Drainage Authority with a report showing the following: A description of the lot or tract, under separate ownership, that is benefited or damaged; The names of the owners as they appear on the current tax records of the county and their addresses; The number of acres in each tract or lot; The number and value of acres added to a tract or lot by the proposed drainage of public water; The damage, if any, to riparian rights; The damages paid for the permanent strip of perennial vegetation under MN ST section 103E.021; The total number and value of acres added to a tract or lot by the proposed drainage of public waters, wetlands, and other areas not currently being cultivated. The number of acres and amount of benefits being assessed for drainage of areas that would be considered conversion of a wetland under United States Code, title 16, section 3821, if the area was placed in agricultural production; The amount of right-of-way acreage required; and The amount that each tract or lot will be benefited or damaged.*
- 3. In order to properly manage the drainage system in a way that recognizes its intended, beneficial public functions, the Drainage Authority initiated proceedings to redetermine the benefits and damages over the system. The Board initiated the redetermination of benefits and damages process by resolutions adopting findings and orders dated July 26, 2016.*
- 4. The Drainage Authority adopted the Resolution because the original benefits or damages do not reasonably reflect current land values or because the benefited or damaged areas have changed.*
- 5. Pursuant to the requirements of 103E.351 sub, 2, the Board mailed notice of this final hearing to all property owners benefited or damaged by the drainage systems. The viewers report was mailed to the property owners. Other interested parties were provided notice by publication in the Howard Lake Herald Journal. Evidence of all notices are on file with the Drainage Authority.*
- 6. Substantive comments received during today's hearing, if any, may be incorporated into the final findings for the Board.*
- 7. Evidence of all actions in this matter, including the viewers report, preliminary orders, appointments, oaths, affidavits of mailing, publication or posting as well as hearing agendas and presentation materials shall be considered the record of proceedings in this matter.*
- 8. At this hearing, the viewers will present their report. The viewers will also provide an explanation of the process and information used to determine the benefits and damages and valuation and acquisition of the right-of-way of the drainage systems.*
- 9. The intent of this proceeding is to confirm the benefits and damages and the benefited and damaged areas and to also acquire any*

permanent strips of perennial vegetation under Minn. Stat. § 103E.02

10. The redetermined benefits and damages will be used in all subsequent proceedings relating to the drainage systems.

11. Based on your comments and testimony today, the Drainage Authority may make one or more of the following decisions:

- a. Rise and report to the full board an order accepting the redetermination the benefits and damages as described in the viewer's report.*
- b. Direct the viewers to further review the area or portions of the drainage systems and determine if adjustments should be made to the proposed benefits and damages and perennial strips of vegetation.*
- c. Rise and report to the full board that it adopt an order rejecting the viewers report and directing a new report be conducted.*
- d. Direct the viewers to make adjustments and submit a revised report.*

12. As requested by the Drainage Authority, please limit your comments to the Redetermination of benefits and damages. Comments related to repair of the drainage system are not germane to this public hearing unless the repair or lack of ability to make the repair will alter the benefit or damages of the system.

13. The decision standard for the Board is whether, based on the proceedings herein, the evidence presented at this hearing and the testimony of the viewers and the public, the Board finds that the viewers report accurately reflects the benefits and damages of the watershed for Wright County Ditches 23 and 31.

Minnesota Drainage Viewers Stearns County Director, John Cunningham took the stand. His assistants Vernon Ruschmeyer and Richard Kvols were present. Cunningham started this project in Spring 2020. He was told not to do any work on 23 initially. At the beginning of this year Cunningham met with the President of the Viewers Association, Ron Ringquist, and reevaluated the numbers in the agricultural business. Cunningham stated he would need the board to consider how much would be needed for the buffer payments.

Cunningham went on to discuss Ditch 23, referencing print out "Wright County Drainage Authority" which was attached for viewing. Ditch 23 is located east of Lauzers Lake and drains into this lake. He explained that 516 acres were assigned benefits. Cunningham went said this ditch was established in 1915. The viewing process includes using a cell survey, maps of Wright County, Geographic Information System (GIS), aerial photos and data, light detection and ranging (LiDAR), United States College of Farm Management records, sales from county auditors, the Center for Farm Financial Management at the U of MN in St. Paul that keeps track of farm sales in each county, Cunningham did his best to view these ditches himself without damaging any crops in the process. There was an engineer hired to look at Ditch 31 because there were no records available. Each parcel was looked at to see if it was an A, B, C or D soil which shows the value of the land before there was a ditch. Then consideration is made for what ditch receives benefits.

"A" Standing water or cattails, wetland classification with a market value for agricultural purposes of \$0.00 per acre, economic productivity of \$0.00.

"B" Seasonally flooded/pasture ground. Pasture classification with a market value of \$1,000.00 to \$1,500.00 per acre, economic productivity of \$60.00 based on grazing days and/or hay values.

"C" Wet subsoil -- Marginal crop land, low to medium crop land classification with a market value of \$4,000.00 to \$5,000.00 per acre, annual economic productivity of \$170.24 based upon average annual yield of 82 percent of optimum with \$261.76 production costs.

"D" Upland areas not needing artificial drainage but irregular in shape and intermixed with wetter soils. Medium to high cropland classification with a market value of \$4,500.00 to \$7,000.00 per acre, annual economic productivity of \$251.24 based upon average annual yield of 95 percent of optimum with \$261.76 production costs.

Cunningham showed an image of Ditch 23. When ditch 23 was originally built, the farmers wanted the 40 acres to be a tile situation. But there was an open ditch through the low land. There was a portion of the land Cunningham referenced on his maps, saying there would be no repairs in that section so that was considered, and benefits were lowered. The ditch inspector said he opted Option 4 from the engineer's report. The A ground was only going to get 25 percent of the potential benefits because the water was not going to move well out of that ditch, 35 percent on B acres, 50 percent on C, and 50 percent on D acres. This calculation is done using a proximity rating, normally if you are right on a ditch, you are 100 percent, meaning you don't have to spend any more money to get the water to the ditch because you are right on it. If a landowner was located farther away, the viewer measures 85 percent for the first 40 acres, and then 70 percent, 65 percent, 50 percent, 40 percent, etc. Some ditches we went as low as 5 percent.

Commissioner Mark Daleiden asked that we open to the public about Ditch 23 before discussion about Ditch 31. Bowen agreed that working on Ditch 23 hearing was the best plan of action. Husom opened the floor for discussion. There was no one who asked to speak. Husom closed the floor to public comments at 1:26 p.m. Husom invited Agriculture and Drainage Coordinator Matthew Detjen to comment. Detjen said that with the informational meetings with landowners there were a lot of questions raised on proximity rate. Detjen asked if Cunningham could explain this more in depth so that those present could have a better understanding. Commissioner Darek Vetsch asked about Option 3 or 4, seeing that it has adjusted values because of the portion that will not see repair because of circumstances with the culverts and things of that nature and Dretjen confirmed this.

Husom asked Cunningham for an explanation about the adjustments that were made. Vetsch asked how Cunningham had come to that conclusion. Vetsch liked the methodology of it but wanted more of an explanation because this was a new methodology versus what was used in the past. Vetsch saw that the board was devaluing rather than paying damages. Cunningham said there would be no damages unless a landowner's property was touching the edges. Landowners will not be farming the land with their crops anymore. The land will still stay an A,B,C, or D, the percentage of what the homeowner pays is what was changing. In Cunningham's opinion, the water will not go out of Lauzers Lake. He said it would not do the owner much good, so this was why the amount of benefits landowners will get was reduced to make this area any different there would need be an improvement project which would need to be addressed at another time. Reestablishing the benefits and looking at what it was, not what it could be. Cunningham said if an engineer put the ditch back to its original condition it wouldn't be adequate to drain the amount of water that its being asked of at this time.

RECOMMENDATION: Direct staff to prepare findings and an order consistent with the proceedings, including responses to all comments received through the public comment process; that the draft findings and order be written to affect the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system consistent with the viewer's report and recommendation; direct recording of the order to reflect the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system record; and that we rise and report this matter to the Board's regular meeting, at which meeting we will consider findings and an order for the proposed viewer's report on the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system records.

Motion made by Vetsch, seconded by Commissioner Mike Kaczmarek. Husom clarified that the board is acting as the drainage authority and findings would be sent to the county board for review.

Detjen wanted to clarify if the board was taking the viewers recommendation for acquisitions for the buffer strip and the amount they presented or if it wanted to set a different amount. Vetsch recommended adopting the viewer's buffer. Daleiden wanted to know what the recommendation of the buffer was. Cunningham read on Ditch 23 there was one parcel that was valued at \$3,000, one at \$2,500, another at \$700, and another as low as \$500.

Daleiden wanted to know for the highest value, how many acres that was. He wanted to make sure what the assessors had was accurate and similar, to avoid issues down the road. Cunningham said there had been times where one ditch remained the same price all the way through. Vetsch wanted to know about areas that can be used to explain other uses, where a land assessor may not see this same value. Husom agreed that higher valued land would cost more. Detjen said a buffer strip for wetland would be different than prime farmland in regard to price. From what he had seen of what the viewers proposed, this was an accurate evaluation. Husom wanted to confirm that Vetsch and Kaczmarek were still in favor knowing that the motion did not include the buffers. Both agree that the motion should include this.

Cunningham said there was a total of 4,500 acres, of which 2,690 were assigned benefits on Ditch 31. Both ditches went through the same process to find value. There were some small areas specifically at the end of a ditch 31 where there was disagreement regarding where the ditch actually ended because of the water running two directions. Cunningham drew a line to divide the two ditches. Some of the water ran east and the rest ending in the ditch. This would be shown when Cunningham had the official outline drawn. Cunningham illustrated this with the maps he brought for his report. There is a five to eight acre change on both sides of the line he had drawn. Both owners on either side were happy with what was done. Cunningham referred to the handout that explained the established estimate of County Ditch 31.

"A" Seasonally ponded agricultural ground. Low cropland classification with a market value of range of \$ 4,000.00 to \$5,000.00 per acre, annual economic productivity of \$252.34 based upon average annual yield of 80 percent of optimum with \$293.45 production costs.

"B" Occasionally flooded agricultural ground. Medium cropland classification with a market value range of \$5,500.00 to \$6,500.00 per acre, economic productivity of \$306.95 based upon three average annual yield of 88 percent of optimum with \$293.46 production costs.

"C" Wet subsoil. Medium high cropland classification with a market value range of \$6000.00 to \$7500.00 per acre, annual economic productivity of \$361.50 based upon average annual yield of 96 % of optimum with \$293.46 production costs.

“D” Upland areas not needing artificial drainage, but irregular in shape and intermixed with wetter soils. Medium to high cropland classification with a market range value of \$6,500.00 to \$8,000 per acre, annual economic productivity of \$381.97 based upon average yield of 99 percent optimum with \$293.46 production costs.

The benefits for 80 acres are 50 percent, 75 percent on B, 90 percent on C, and 95 percent on D because the ditch would work adequately when fixed to its original state. Cunningham used a map to show the ditch on west side of the lake has to channel water. Cunningham said the proximity had been changed by 5 percent because the benefit value is reduced because the water will not run the way it should. The water ran into the two lakes. There was a discrepancy with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR.) Older photos do not show this ever-holding water. There is standing water and Cunningham wanted more confirmation from the DNR that it was officially a lake. Cunningham said that the way he understood it, if no repairs had been made on a ditch in 25 years then it may be hard to make a change with the DNR. He added that he was grateful to have the help of an engineer on this project. The numbers had been changed since the January 2022 meeting buffer on Ditch 31. The increase was about 3.75 percent per acre which made sense at the beginning of this process. The value was now \$3,670 per acre. Daleiden said it was necessary to keep homeowners. Evaluations were much higher than \$3,670 as the Assessor’s Office was valued consistent for around \$6,000 per tillable acre. Larry Broll spoke to Waverly Bank about land evaluation and was told per acre it was \$7,500 with room for value fluctuation. Daleiden wanted to keep it fair and go with what the Assessor’s Office said is the valuation standard. Husom opened the public hearing for Ditch 31 at 1:50 p.m.

Doris Schendel of Waverly asked if the viewer report was updated as of Thursday, June 2 after the Woodland Town Hall meeting. Cunningham said this was updated as of June 3. She asked if the buffers that were already in place were correct for every parcel located on Ditch 31. Cunningham said the payments were the same. She wondered who did the work on the buffers that are non-compliant. Daleiden answered Wright County’s ditch inspectors took care of this. Detjen explained that the Wright County Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Office does the inspection portion of Minnesota Statute 103F Buffer Law and he himself did the enforcement actions through Wright County. Schendel asked what the current account was on Ditch 31. Agriculture and Drainage Specialist Janice Edmonson said on Ditch 31 there was some engineering work done through Huston engineering and the county was at about \$85,000 into this project, which included the redetermination. Daleiden confirmed that this included the engineering that was done because there were no current records and it needed to be reestablished.

Vetsch said some of the cost may have Viewer’s work, costs, assessment of ditches based on linear miles and the cost of drainage. Vetsch asked Detjen if there had been any major projects done on Ditch 31 and if so what the incurred costs were. Detjen said before doing any new work, he would have to assess the benefits with the new landowners not the original ones. Husom added that was why it was prudent to wait until repairs were due so it was more fair.

Larry Broll of Waverly said he had lost two years of payments on his repairs. He wanted to understand how it could be partially owned by the county even though the county did not make payments. He said there was five feet where Ditch 31 crossed County Road 30 and he wondered if the county would utilize that space to drain more water. He felt that he was paying too much money for what he was getting. He suggested culverts as there were a lot of ditches that cleaned themselves but culverts on County Road 8 and County Road 30 is a sediment trap. He wanted the culverts taken care of on the main roads. He explained that his last bill was high and he cleans all his trees out. Broll thought that the job could have been done during the dry summer in 2021. Also there was a homemade bridge that his grandfather built that was eroding underneath, so he had to put in a new six-foot culvert and he was wondering what the county would do when they clean the ditch out. He wanted to know if the county would replace the culvert. Husom reminded Broll that repairs would have to be discussed at another meeting specific to repairs. The state had determined that the county had to have buffers on the drainage systems. Husom described reasons that change, and why there is a need to redetermine. Once the redetermination was adopted there would be another meeting about repairs, topography, culverts and drainage.

Vetsch reiterated that once the public hearing and committee meeting was completed there would another board meeting for repairs. Waverly resident Robert Bakeberg said information that had been presented earlier in which ditches were now being used to drain more water than they were ever intended to. Bakeberg wanted to know if he would receive paperwork saying he would retain ownership of the land after multiple payments. He wanted to make sure his land would not turn into public property. Daleiden asked Detjen about ownership laws. Detjen responded saying it was an easement. Bakeberg mentioned Ditch 31 already had \$85,000 put into it and wanted to know if there would be another engineering study. Bakeberg said he had no say in whether there would be another study done.

Husom said there would have to be another public hearing to discuss repairs. Bakeberg wanted to know what the next steps would be after this hearing. Daleiden said it depended on the benefitted landowners. He said the board would not do anything unless there was a request for repairs. Vetsch explained that there were repair requests on the system. That was why there was a cost estimate of \$200,000. This proposal was a high level proposal. As long as the proposal was adopted and as long as the repair request were still valid, the engineer showed an estimate and a hearing would take place.

Waverly resident Tracy spoke on behalf of County Road 30 residents as well. Her farm is south of this large area of water which did not drain. She expressed her frustration that only part of the ditch was being benefitted. She wanted to know where the missing land was. Cunningham explained he was working with the DNR to see if trees can be taken out.

Bakeberg asked, If Ditch 23 asked for a cleaning would the cleaning also include Ditch 31 because they were connected. Detjen said only the landowner could request a cleanup unless there was a cleanup initiated by the board. Vetsch said the county would not be doing further engineering as there was already a full report that had been adopted. Doris Schendel asked if there was a cost on buffers that were already there on 31. Cunningham confirmed that there was buffer included in the \$85,000.

Husom closed public comments at 2:15 p.m.

Kaczmarek explained that Ditch 23 and Ditch 31 were not considered the same ditch because both ditches were established on different dates and different years which was why they are separate. If the ditches were one in the same, then a decision on one would affect the other. Edmonson stood to clarify that the \$85,000 mentioned earlier was for expenditures that had already occurred. The buffer damages were not included in that total and had not been paid out yet. Vetsch asked what the buffer per acreage would be. Cunningham answered that the \$85,167 total damages at \$ 3,670, which was about 23 acres. He told Husom that by changing for \$6,000 per acre that would add \$53,000 to the existing \$85,167. Vetsch thought for the equality factor there should be a tier one and tier two system in place. Daleiden agrees adding that the assessors would need to involve. He asked Assistant County Attorney Greg Kryzer if it would be possible to make a tier benefit system. Kryzer said the board is able to accept the report as written or has the option to amend it for specific reasons. Daleiden and Kryzer said Viewers should do this work along with the assessors.

Kaczmarek, thanked the members of the public who showed up. He said the viewer report was very confusing and the board should be able to easily look and see a percentage of the cost. There was also a maintenance cost to consider. It would be helpful for residents to see percentages for repairs that each resident will be responsible for. The public should have been given a map when they left so that they could go home and evaluate what was discussed at the meeting. Cunningham noted that the board may have to amend the contract to obtain such a map. Kaczmarek thought the board should amend to have a map for the contract.

RECOMMENDATION: Direct staff to prepare findings and an order consistent with the proceedings, including responses to all comments received through the public comment process; that the draft findings and order be written to affect the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system consistent with the viewer's report and recommendation; direct recording of the order to reflect the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system record; and that we rise and report this matter to the Board's regular meeting, at which meeting the board will consider findings and an order for the proposed viewer's report on the redetermination of benefits and damages of the public drainage system records. Motion made by Vetsch, the motion was seconded by Daleiden and carried 5-0.

COUNTY BOARD WORKSHOP (06/14/2022)

Kaczmarek wanted to make a change to the minutes on Page 4. Before the recommendation it noted that Kaczmarek wanted to follow up with department heads about the recommendation on Page 4. Kaczmarek wanted to confirm that his recommendation was to have the agenda posting deadline be 12 p.m. Thursdays. In the interim, Vetsch suggested the deadline for agenda posting be moved to end of day Thursdays. Husom agreed with this recommendation. Kelly said he discussed these items with his team and holiday deadlines were not a problem. He explained that having recently hired new staff, administration was working on getting staff trained and proficient. Kelly said he had ideas he would like to share at the next Leadership Meeting and discuss processes to make things run more smoothly. Kelly said he was working on the back side to create a new agenda posting program. There were a lot of variables in place to make the deadline work for 12:00 p.m. Thursdays.

Husom said there are a lot of things that need to get done in order to get minutes out and it takes a lot of time. Kelly said his staff would strive to have minutes done by end of day Thursdays. Daleiden suggested this deadline be reevaluated at the Workshop in September. Kelly mentioned the board adjusting the amount of meetings to two a month and Vetsch said now would be a good time to bring that idea forward. He wanted to make the best use of the board and staff's time by possibly minimizing the amount of meetings per month. Vetsch understood that by pushing up the deadline for minutes the board was asking minute takers to cut out eight hours of work to meet this deadline. He added that having the agenda in front of the board members in a timely fashion would be helpful when reviewing notes. Husom agreed that this was a big ask of minute takers.

Kaczmarek moved to approve the recommendations made in County Board Workshop from Tuesday, June 14. The motion was seconded by Daleiden. The motion carried 5-0.

Vetsch moved to approve the County Board Workshop minutes from Tuesday, June 14. The motion was seconded by

Daleiden. The motion carried 5-0.

The Wright County Board met for a workshop session at 9:00 A.M. with Husom, Vetsch, Daleiden, Kaczmarek and Wetter present.

I. Schedule Meetings as Needed

County Administrator Lee Kelly asked to follow up on the items that were removed from the County Board Workshop agenda at the prior County Board Meeting. He wanted to schedule a Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss American Rescue Plan (ARP) Program updates as well as to review the results from the Community Health assessment survey. Staff recommendations for a meeting date included Monday, June 20 or Wednesday, June 22 in the afternoon or Thursday, June 30 in the morning. Commissioner Christine Husom suggested adding these conversations to the Committee of the Whole meeting at 10 a.m. Monday, June 20. The remaining board members agreed this would be a good time for these discussions.

Kelly said the next meeting that needed to be scheduled was the Broadband Committee meeting. There was a Request for Information (RFI) that would be coming back to the committee on Friday, July 15 and recommended scheduling the meeting for the following week. Commissioner Darek Vetsch agreed and suggested scheduling a meeting the following week based on how much time staff needed to digest the information received from the RFI. Commissioner Mark Daleiden suggested 9 a.m. Monday, July 25. The remaining board members agreed on this date and time.

Kelly wanted to address the Gravel Subcommittee that was presented at the June 7 County Board meeting. Vetsch did not want to schedule a meeting for this subcommittee until there were solidified members named. He added that there would most likely not be a meeting until the third week of July. Kelly said he would keep this topic as a reminder item to be addressed at a later date. Daleiden asked about the Compost Facility discussion and where the board was at with this process. Kelly said the report had been delayed and followed up by saying there should be a discussion scheduled in July regarding this topic. Daleiden suggested adding this conversation to the County Board Workshop agenda in July. Commissioner Mike Kaczmarek said he had met with Inspector Tony Kuhn who had done a mock Occupational Safety and Health (OSHA) inspection the week prior and thought he would have his report prepared by the following week. He suggested they combine the results of this inspection with the other inspection in order to review these findings at one time. The members of the board agreed that this would be added as an agenda item at the next County Board Workshop meeting at 9 a.m. Tuesday, July 12.

RECOMMENDATION: Add the Community Health assessment survey results and ARP program update discussion topics to the Committee of the Whole Meeting agenda scheduled for 10 a.m. Monday, June 20. Schedule the next Broadband Committee Meeting for 9 a.m. Monday, July 25. Add the Compost Facility discussion topic to the County Board Workshop agenda at 9 a.m. Tuesday, July 12.

II. Fair Board Bathroom Building Discussion

Wright County Fair Board Vice President Jerry Quaal thanked the board for its time and introduced himself and his colleagues attending the meeting, Fair Board President Ward Westphal and Fair Board Treasurer Jeff Wheeler. Quaal explained that the Fair Board knew there were a few issues with the restrooms that had come up over the past few years that now needed to be addressed. The discussion regarding the restroom issues started November 2021. The following fix-it items were approved at the most recent Fair Board meeting. The first item discussed was the need to install vents in one restroom. There was a ventilation system installed that was pushing air into the attic without a way to properly ventilate it out of the space. The Fair Board received an estimate of \$2,400 but wanted to seek out one more estimate to compare before making the decision to move forward with the project. The Fair Board agreed that it needed to be fixed before the 2022 Wright County Fair July 20-24. The second point of discussion was the issue of the fans that had been placed on the floor to dry the moisture collected on the floor caused by people drying their hands with the hand dryers. It was decided that it would be safer to have fans on the ceiling instead of on the floor of the restroom. The cost of this project was around \$800, and the Fair Board planned to mount the fans itself. The third point of discussion had to do with a water drainage issue in the lower restrooms. These specific restrooms were used by several hundred campers, 4-H members, and Future Farmers of America (FFA) members who would visit the fair each year. This is where the kids in these organizations would get ready as well as where the campers would hook up and use the shower rooms and restrooms. The sheer volume was causing a major issue. The Fair Board had already broke concrete, received the correct permits for this project, and had the drains installed. That specific project had already been addressed and completed. The fourth item was to replace the women's sanitary containers in the restrooms. This project cost was \$500, and it was already being taken care of by the Fair Board. The fifth item was the need to replace showerheads, which Quaal explained was an easy fix and would be around \$100 per showerhead to replace. The sixth item was the replacement of several toilet seats and other small maintenance items which the Fair Board maintenance staff had taken care of on its own.

The Fair Board wanted assistance from the county to replace the hand dryers in the restrooms because the current ones did not work properly. The quote received estimated the hand dryers to be \$800 per unit, so the Fair Board budgeted \$1,000 per unit. There was also the cost consideration of bringing an electrician in to install the hand dryers. The Fair Board thought that was too much to spend on its own. Quaal explained that since the last Fair Board meeting, the distributor had informed the Fair Board that if the county was involved, his company would be able to drop the price per unit to around \$600. The significant price reduction and the want to complete this purchase and installation before the 2022 County Fair in July were what spurred the assistance request to the county

board. Husom asked if the hand dryers would be the model that one can stick their hands into to dry them or if they were the traditional dryer that blew air downward causing water to drop on the floor. Quaal did not specify which type of hand dryer they were but said that the reason they wanted to look into hand dryers was to cut down on waste at the fair. He added that there were some paper towel rolls left to use and the Fair Board wanted to keep a few paper towel dispensers to use up the remaining supply. Quaal explained that the end goal was to move away from the paper towels completely. The paper towel dispensers they had at the restrooms were old and needing to be frequently replaced. It was an expensive and inefficient option when considering the alternative of new hand dryers. Husom suggested having paper towels available for fairgoers who preferred towels over hand dryers, as well as for those who had a need to use them as napkins or for other cleanup purposes.

Vetsch asked Quaal what the expectation for funding from the county would be. Quaal said the Fair Board had originally wanted to install 14 hand dryers, one in each restroom. When the Fair Board looked into how many new dryers were actually needed, it concluded that 10 were needed which would be one hand dryer per sink. Assistant County Administrator Clay Wilfahrt explained that part of the reason that this was being brought up was due to the change in practice of how the County Board works with the Fair Board. When Wilfahrt spoke with the county legal team, he learned that since the county owned the buildings at the fairgrounds, the county would be exempt of sales tax if the county bought and installed the hand dryers. He explained that the change was that the county did not typically purchase or install anything at the fairgrounds, and this was why they were coming forward with this request. Wilfahrt said that the Fair Board would like these funds to come out of next year's allocation rather than come out of its current allocation.

Husom asked if the funds would be subtracted from next year's allocation. Wilfahrt confirmed it would and added that he had spoke with the county finance team and it had said it was a feasible request. Husom said she would be comfortable approving this request. Kaczmarek asked how much the county would save in sales taxes if the county took on this project and what the dollar amount would be for installation. Wilfahrt said he did not have an exact dollar amount but that it would be around \$600 per unit with the additional shipping costs. In regard to the electrician and installation cost, he explained that Facilities Director Alan Wilczek would need access to the building in person in order to come up with a concrete estimate for the board. Kaczmarek asked Quaal if he was comfortable taking this on and moving the projected completion date to before the 2023 County Fair. Quaal confirmed he was okay with this. He added that the rest of the projects he had presented in the beginning of the meeting were already approved at the last Fair Board meeting. The total cost for those approved projects was around \$6,700, adding that \$1,000 of that cost would be the cost to replace the paper towel dispensers. If the board approved the new hand dryers the Fair Board may not have to spend the \$1,000 on replacing the paper towel dispensers. Kaczmarek asked if the \$6,700 would come out of the 2022 allocation and Quaal confirmed this was correct.

Kaczmarek asked if the Fair Board had a preference of whether it purchase the paper towel dispensers or try to move forward with the hand dryers before the 2022 County Fair. Wilfahrt said the dryers would take about two weeks to receive once they had been ordered and asked Wilczek to speak on the timeframe for installation. Wilczek said he could not give the board an estimated timeframe until he saw the buildings himself as he had to take into consideration circuits, power sources, conduits, and other details that would affect the project timeline. He also explained that the supplier's discount to the county was simply in regard to the sales tax exemption. Wilczek said there were no other suppliers to compare the cost to. He wanted to know if the county board's intention was to have staff do installs and be more hands on with the fairground buildings and projects going forward.

Husom was not sure if staff should log their hours and that be subtracted from the cost of the project or if there was a better way to account for this work in order to be fair to the taxpayers. Kaczmarek pointed out it was the county's building and property. He said that what needed to be decided was whether the Fair Board wanted to get this hand dryer project done before the 2022 County Fair. Vetsch said that he did not want this project to set a precedent that the board would take on projects and installations going forward pointing out that it was ultimately the Fair Board's fair, revenue, expenses, and responsibility to handle on its own with the allocation the county provided. He clarified that he supported this project for the cost savings but emphasized that it was the fair's revenue and cost and responsibility going forward.

Daleiden asked if Quaal had received an estimate from a local electrician for installation. Quaal said he had not had an electrician look at the project since he thought the Fair Board would not have been able to afford the project in 2022. Daleiden was curious to find out what a local electrician would charge for installation. In addition, he wanted to have Wilczek visit to the location to see what the amperes and other electrical and technical specifications were. Daleiden thought there were too many unknown pieces of the project to have it completed before the 2022 fair. Daleiden asked if the wiring was underground at the fair. Quaal did not know if there was enough power at the location now to accommodate for the hand dryers that were in the restrooms currently. Daleiden reiterated that he wanted this project done after the 2022 fair so that the project was not rushed.

Westphal said the power in the restrooms would be sufficient for the project since there were already hand dryers installed at those locations. He also noted that there was a power source close that would be able to be tapped into if necessary. Westphal said his intention was to meet with an electrician to get a better idea of the cost. Husom thought it would be good to have the electrician and Wilczek out to the property at the same time to coordinate. Wilfahrt summarized that the board's intention was to receive cost estimates for installation by a private electrician and one for installation by county staff. While the estimates were getting collected, Wilfahrt said he would get the hand dryers ordered. Finally, he confirmed with the board that this project did not need to be completed before the upcoming 2022 fair. Husom confirmed this was the board's intention.

RECOMMENDATION: Obtain estimates for hand dryer installation from a local private electrician and from county staff. Order 10 hand dryers for the fairground restrooms and wait until after the 2022 County Fair for installation.

III. 2023 Budget Forecast

Auditor-Treasurer Bob Hiivala presented the financial forecast with the assistance of a handout he provided. Hiivala explained that the goal of the forecast was to avoid the spike in the tax rate that the county had experienced a few years prior. He said there was no projected inflation in the 2023 debt service as it was a fixed amount. 2023 would be a union negotiation year and several factors were built into the forecast to include general range movements, insurance, and new staff. Personnel and personnel-related expenses accounted for 50 percent of the overall operating expenses. Hiivala said there were also other factors to consider to include software and software update costs, fuel and utility costs, and the impact of inflation on operating supplies. This brought him to the projected Consumer Price Index (CPI) of 8.3 percent. He anticipated that the tax rate would actually go down and the tax capacity was projected to increase by 20 percent. Hiivala explained that this forecast was a consideration without seeing the departments' individual budgets for the coming year.

Vetsch did not think the tax rate projection was correct because he thought that only new construction would increase the tax rate. Finance Director Lindsey Meyer distributed a handout to the board that showed the real impact on specific parcels. She started by comparing historical data that assessors had submitted to the state. She had found a correlation between the estimated market value compared to tax capacity and found that on trends over the last few years. She was comfortable saying that there would be a 20.64 percent tax capacity increase.

County Assessor Tony Rasmuson's team looked at what the estimated market value of the new construction would be and in conjunction with the 20.64 percent tax capacity increase, the increase came out to be 2.13 percent. Vetsch pointed out that this was the number that he wanted to capture for a more accurate projection. He added that everyone would see an increase in their taxes in 2023. Meyer added that this was why the tax rate was proposed to decrease down to 38 percent. Meyer showed a comparison that was done between the 2022 tax statement and the projection for the 2023 tax year. Vetsch pointed out that this was the shift from the residential to commercial. Meyer explained that there would be an increase in the residential tax rate and a decrease in the commercial tax rate. She also showed that there would be a projected decrease in the residential agriculture tax rate and the commercial agriculture tax rate. Vetsch asked if this was based on the levy of 6.27 percent and Meyer confirmed this was correct. Meyer provided three pages of tax impact comparisons that showed if values would have remained stagnant, there would have been a 12 percent tax decrease. She clarified that the numbers presented were all estimates. Vetsch added that if housing prices level off this would also have an impact on the projection. These projections provided the ability for the market to right itself and did not want to have a negative effect on the residents in the short term.

Daleiden noted that there would be a closed session coming up regarding union negotiations, where the board would get a better idea of the specific projections. He added that the current presentation had theoretical numbers provided to assist with the preparation for the closed session. Husom clarified that nothing would be approved at the meeting that day and that the 2023 Budget Forecast was simply an informational presentation.

Kaczmarek asked how Hiivala came to the number of \$8,870,000 for the Local Option Sales Tax (LOST) for the 2022 Amended Budget. Hiivala explained that this number was based off the projects that were approved. He added that there was a direct correlation between project costs and revenue. If the project costs were higher, the revenue would be as well. Vetsch explained that the county would always take in more than it would spend. He explained that they only wanted to budget into the forecasting the money coming in versus money going out. Daleiden added that some of the money would be set aside for the 2023 budget and that number would vary each year.

IV. Hybrid & Flex-Work Discussion

Assistant County Administrator Marc Mattice presented the Hybrid and Flex-Work proposal to the board. He explained that he had started to work on this concept with the Human Resources Department. Mattice explained that this topic was discussed at the Leadership Team meeting Thursday, June 2 and he had gathered a lot of good feedback from department heads. What he wanted to know from the board was whether it was interested in approving this topic to be explored further by staff. He added that he wanted some guidance from the board in regard to the scope of this alternative working model for the county. Mattice understood that there was a lot that went into this policy and reiterated that he simply wanted to know if the board was interested in pursuing this option for employees.

Husom thought that it was important to look at all the different options. She referenced when the county first sent 12 employees from the Health and Human Services Department to work from home. After a designated period of time the department reassessed and found that those 12 employees were more efficient when able to work from home. Husom wanted to consider what was best for both the county residents and the employees. Daleiden thought that the county had a flex-policy in place already that enabled employees to work between the hours of 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. He thought it was imperative to look further into this hybrid working model for the employees' sake. Vetsch thought that in the current labor market, the county had to be more progressive in regard to a workplace

structure. He thought this topic was especially important when it came to recruitment and retention. He wanted to add the conversation of changing the hours of operation for the county building itself. Husom and Daleiden agreed that the building hours of operation was an important topic to revisit as well. Vetsch wanted to hear recommendations from staff at a future meeting. Husom thought it was important to work with department heads and consider the needs within their specific departments when it came to in-person work schedules. Vetsch requested that the board and Mattice work together to take on one issue at a time in order to facilitate changes in small increments, rather than make numerous big changes all at one time. Daleiden suggested these discussions be heard at the Personnel and Employee Relations Committee meetings in regular occurrence. Mattice agreed and explained that he would recommend changes and updates to policy in small increments while working with Human Resources and the board. He explained how each department would have different requirements for its employees in regard to any policy changes regarding hybrid and flex working schedules. He added that he was working closely with Human Resources Director Schawn Johnson to be sure that changes being discussed were fair and realistic across the board for all departments. Commissioner Mary Wetter thought the hybrid and flex working model was important to consider as many private sector jobs had flexible opportunities. She thought that in order to be competitive with the private job market, this change had to be considered.

Kaczmarek wanted to help mitigate in-person working issues and thought that the parking lot for employees could be reconfigured because he thought that the public did not use as many spaces as were allotted to public parking. He asked if Mattice knew if the Information Technology (IT) Department had been able to configure the correct security protocols to enable employees to work from home. Kaczmarek wanted the flex working option to be considered because of the congestion at the traffic light at the beginning and end of the day. He thought that staggering in-person working hours would have a positive effect on this issue. Kaczmarek wanted to follow up on a request from the October 2021 Quarterly Leadership Team Meeting in regard to department heads reporting staff accountability and how each department accounted for this. He thought that the in-person employee accountability needed to be ironed out before working from home could be considered. Mattice confirmed that IT Director Matthew Fomby confirmed that the security protocol for employees working from home was ready for use.

RECOMMENDATION: To allow staff to pursue potential changes to policy regarding hybrid and flex-work schedules, county building hours of operation, and expansion of designated employee parking. Staff should plan to have discussions regarding updates and changes to this policy at the monthly Personnel and Employee-Relations Committee meetings. To have staff follow up on collecting a information in regard to how staff accountability is handled in each department.

V. Board Meeting Schedule & Agenda Process and Timeline – Kaczmarek

Kaczmarek had previously asked Kelly to look into gathering information from other counties in regard to their frequency of board meetings as well as how their county board meetings were run. Kelly had provided this information to the board via email. Kaczmarek's first question was whether the county board workshop meeting details and agenda should be posted in the same location on the website as the regular county board meetings. Kelly clarified that there were two locations on the website that agendas could be found. The workshop details and agendas were always posted on the website calendar, but not in the secondary location where the longer agenda list was located. He explained that this was simply what had been done in the past. The remaining members of the board agreed that the agenda and meeting details should also be available on the agenda list section of the website in addition to the calendar location.

Kaczmarek's second topic of discussion was the adjustment to the timeline for when agendas are to be posted. He explained that it was difficult to familiarize himself with the agenda, especially on a holiday weekend, when the agenda was posted at 12 p.m. on Friday. He proposed that the agenda be posted by 12 p.m. on Thursday for holiday weekends, potentially setting the precedent going forward for all county board agendas. Daleiden thought that it was past practice to have the agenda posted by 12 p.m. on Thursday for a holiday weekend. Kelly confirmed that this was the correct timeline in past practices for holiday weekends. Vetsch pointed out that with the addition of new staff members to take on administrative roles this should give the department more bandwidth to accommodate this proposed timeline. Kaczmarek reiterated that he would like to see the agenda posting deadline be move indefinitely to 12 p.m. on Thursday and pointed out that this should not be an issue with additional staff that had been hired for this role.

Daleiden noticed that the counties that only had two county board meetings per month only had meetings that lasted an hour and a half at most. He wondered how their meetings were shorter in length than Wright County's meetings when meeting half as frequently. Vetsch thought that the advisory updates were not done during these county board meetings as well as counties having a different decision-making delegation processes. Kaczmarek thought this discussion of meeting twice a month went hand in hand with moving the agenda timeline up by 24 hours. This change would allow the commissioners to have committee meetings on the off-week and give staff more time to compile an agenda for the following week. He wanted to know if there was interest among board members to look into this change starting January 2023. He asked Assistant County Attorney Greg Kryzer if this was a change the board would be able to make on its own. Kryzer said the board would just need to continue to announce its regular meeting times and pass a resolution to change the frequency of the meetings in order to stay aligned with Minnesota Statutes. Kaczmarek asked if the members of the board had any concerns with his recommendation to reduce the number of board meetings per month to two and have committee meetings on the alternating Tuesdays. Husom said she would still like some flexibility to schedule meetings as they come up on different days.

Husom thought it would be difficult to reduce the frequency down to two meetings per month considering the length of each meeting

and the frequency with which the board was currently meeting. She proposed that this should be a discussion to have with the new county commissioners once they were elected. She pointed out that staff might be more likely to miss timelines with less frequent meeting dates. Kaczmarek thought that staff creating the agenda should be firmer with other county staff when receiving agenda submissions after the designated deadline. Husom explained that her concern was with grant deadlines and other deadlines in the outside community that may be missed due to lack of opportunity to have commissioners approve requests. Vetsch thought this was the way the county needed to go but understood that this change from four to two meetings per month would take time for the employees to adjust to the new timeline. Vetsch thought the changes to having two meetings per month and the shortened agenda posting timeline could go hand-in-hand.

Husom thought the committee minutes could be summarized, or potentially not discussed at all, during the county board meeting in order to increase the efficiency. Kelly agreed. Wetter asked how many of the counties that Kelly referenced as examples were seven member boards. Kelly explained his reasoning behind selecting the counties he did. It was because these counties were comparable to Wright County in size. He added that only two of the counties he had referenced were seven member boards. Kelly reiterated Kryzer's statement that the Minnesota Statute allowed for the commissioners to adjust the frequency of meetings. He thought that process modifications could be made, but there would have to be adjustments on the staff side to make the board's requests happen.

Kaczmarek offered the possibility that the minute taker stay late on Wednesday, in order to adjust to the new deadline of 12 p.m. Thursday for agenda posting, being compensated in a flex-work style and have the ability to leave early on Fridays. Kaczmarek thought this was an opportunity for the board to see the positive result of providing additional staffing by increasing efficiency. Daleiden argued that it had not been that long since those positions were filled. Daleiden thought it would be reasonable to start by asking that the agenda was posted Thursday evening or Friday morning. He thought it would be fair to allow Administration staff to see if this request would be feasible, consider moving up the agenda posting deadline, and utilizing a flex-work schedule. Kaczmarek recommended the board set the new deadline as 12 p.m. on Thursday. Daleiden and Husom said they wanted to leave the decision up to staff to review and come up with a solution to present to the board. Wetter suggested trying the 12 p.m. Thursday deadline for a trial period so it would not overwhelm staff and potentially cause staffing turnover to happen. Daleiden reiterated his recommendation that staff take a look at procedures to see if it was possible to move the agenda posting deadline up. Kelly restated the board's recommendation that it would ideally like to see the agenda posting deadline moved to 12 p.m. Thursdays.

Vetsch thought the layout and practices of the county board meetings could be made more efficient as well. Daleiden said when he first became a commissioner, he had to come into the Government Center on Fridays to pick up his agenda packet and that committee minutes were read out loud at each county board meeting. He wanted to emphasize the strides the board had already taken to streamline meeting efficiency. Vetsch thought there was still room for cleaning up the board meeting processes and shorten the meetings' length. Kelly agreed with Vetsch when he said he wanted to maximize the value the board was getting from its time. He thought it would be good to hear from Administration Office Manager Laine Stephan to get her take on the changes proposed as well as discuss the potential to shorten committee minutes. Vetsch thought that the committee minutes' recommendations should be moved to the consent agenda on the county board agenda if it was non-controversial. He added that if a recommendation needed to be discussed in more detail, it be moved to a timed agenda item. Husom thought it would be most efficient to move the committee recommendations to a timed agenda item going forward. She also wanted the board to consider moving committee meetings from Wednesdays if the agenda posting timeline were to be moved up to Thursday.

Vetsch suggested piloting the new agenda timeline in July 2022, the new committee minute practices in September 2022 and reevaluating the changes in October 2022. Kaczmarek agreed with Vetsch's recommendation with the adjustment of moving the agenda posting deadline up to 2 p.m. Thursdays prior to July in order to account for the Fourth of July holiday weekend. Vetsch agreed with Kaczmarek's change. Husom thought this was a reasonable request, especially considering the addition of new staff in Administration and the coming holiday weekend. Kaczmarek confirmed that the official recommendation was to pilot the new agenda posting deadline of 12 p.m. on Thursdays starting Thursday, June 30, pilot a new committee minute practice moving the committee recommendations to timed agenda items starting in September 2022, and reevaluating the instituted changes in October 2022. Vetsch thought that if the number of county board meetings was reduced to two a month, the board should also make a change to only address the recommendations from committee minutes instead of summarizing the meeting itself. Kaczmarek also requested that staff reach out to other counties that had made the transition to two meetings a month in order to glean information about best practices and how to make this transition.

RECOMMENDATION: To post County Board Workshop meeting details and agendas on both the website calendar and the website Agenda and Minutes list location. To look into reducing the frequency of County Board meetings to meet twice a month and moving committee meetings to alternating Tuesdays. To have staff reach out to counties that had made the switch to two County Board meetings per month in order to assist Wright County make a smooth transition. To move committee meeting minutes to a timed agenda item in September, to allow for discussion regarding recommendations if deemed necessary. To post County Board Agendas by 12 p.m. Thursdays for holiday weekends. To start posting County Board Agendas by 4:30 p.m. Thursdays starting June 23. To have a reevaluation of the instituted changes at the County Board Workshop in September.

VI. Central MN Council on Aging/Health and Human Services (HHS) Senior Services (10:00 a.m.)

Social Services Manager Jill Pooler introduced Central Minnesota Council on Aging (CMCOA) Executive Director Lori Vrolson. Pooler said since the county had been providing funds to the CMCOA, Vrolson wanted to be available to give an update on where the funding was being used. Vrolson said that one of the main roles of the CMCOA was to allocate funds coming from the federal Older Americans Act (OAA) at the local level. In a typical year, that was around \$2.5 million. Vrolson said the additional COVID-19 Pandemic funding, CMCOA had allocated around \$5 million each year for the past two years. However, CMCOA would be going back to the base level of flat funding in the next few years. She was requesting an administrative match from the county, which the county had been providing for the previous 35 years. In Wright County, the request was always \$6,587.

Vrolson said that in Wright County the main providers were Catholic Charities for meal delivery, Mid-Minnesota Senior Law for the Senior Law Project, Wright County Community Action (WCCA), and Senior Community Services. Vrolson shared that based on 2021 data, the number of individuals served in Wright County through OAA funding from the CMCOA included 4,452 sessions provided by Senior LinkAge Line, 1,073 rides were given, 1,601.25 hours of chores and 1,259.25 hours of homemaking were provided, 1,647 congregate meals were served, 43,237 home delivered meals were provided, 545 hours of caregiver consultation was given, 91 hours of respite provided, 481 hours of legal assistance, and 3,461 calls were answered. Vrolson said that while there was a 36 percent increase since 2019 in delivered meals provided, it is still less than what was seen in other Minnesota counties. She thought this was in part due to funding from the state and WCCA, which had a large supply of frozen meals.

Vetsch asked if Catholic Charities not being a long-term provider of meal services would be a detriment to the county down the line. Once a quarter, Vrolson said she would host a meeting to discuss where WCCA was at in regard to meal delivery needs and Catholic Charities would supplement as needed. Catholic Charities worked with WCCA to send out letters in December 2021 to let the community know to contact Catholic Charities for meal service going forward as WCCA was stopping this service. Catholic Charities has congregate sites in Maple Lake, Annandale, and Cokato, in addition to its meal delivery service throughout the county. Vrolson asked that the board let her know where the meals were most needed within the county in order to set up a site where individuals could come once a month for frozen meal pick up.

Vrolson said that CMCOA had a contract with a Parkview Care Center for their Director of Nursing to do outreach on the COVID-19 vaccine and the Influenza vaccine. Catholic Charities would be doing a Request for Proposal (RFP) with additional American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding to supply providers with community funding to assist in developing community health care workers. Those health care workers will then be able to serve the underserved members of the community.

Vetsch asked what her plan was for marketing the services to the community and wanted to know what she was doing to assist in navigating people to these services. Vrolson said the Senior LinkAge Program would get seniors connected to providers. If an individual went to CMCOA, it had staff able to assist the senior or family member navigate the many resources. She said that the outreach that was done was given through the providers that CMCOA promotes, CMCOA did not have a marketing budget specifically. Pooler explained that CMCOA is the funnel for funding sources rather than a navigation tool. She added that this was what Senior LinkAge Line was used for. Vetsch was concerned that the Senior LinkAge Line was too large to easily navigate. He wanted to have a better source of knowledge for county seniors, and he thought the county funds could be better utilized in another way. Pooler said the funding was well utilized but agreed that there could be a better system of pushing out the information. Vrolson said that via Senior LinkAge Line, the CMCOA has social workers available to answer questions and direct individuals to services. Senior LinkAge Line also has staff that would go out and meet with seniors who needed that extra attention. Vrolson said Senior LinkAge Line also has advocates to help answer questions specifically about Medicare.

Wetter said that at the last CMCOA meeting, the state demographer was present to explain how the population of seniors was going up and how there would be more of a need financially in the future. Wetter wanted to know what the CMCOA was doing to prepare for this uptick in need in the community. Vrolson noted that there were currently more seniors than school-aged children. The CMCOA's goal was to make sure there was an array of services available at the community level for adults who stay in their own homes and adults who are aging. She said CMCOA had flat funding for the past 15 years and did not see any increases coming up in the future from OAA funding. The CMCOA knows that it does not have the capacity to service all seniors over age 60, but its goal was to service individuals who are just above the poverty line. Vrolson wanted to extend an invitation to a virtual session with ARP's national expert on broadband that would be streamed from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. Wednesday, August 24 to discuss the broadband needs of seniors. Vetsch thanked Vrolson for her time and the work she had done within the county.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING MINUTES (06/14/2022)

Daleiden moved to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes from Tuesday, June 14 as informational only. The motion was seconded by Vetsch. The motion carried 5-0.

I. Discussion with BKV Regarding Government Center Extra Services

Commissioner Christine Husom called the meeting to order at 11:13 a.m. County Administrator Lee Kelly said the subject of the meeting was first brought up in a letter from Bruce Schwartzman, Partner and Architect at the Boarman

Kroos Vogel Group, Inc (BKV) regarding a request for payment of additional services for Construction Administration (CA) of the Government Center. Kelly said he had forwarded an email to the Board prior to the meeting with information from Schwartzman on additional hours tracking he had put together.

Schwartzman said if the timeline of the project had gone two months or six months past the contract time, he would not be making this request. Schwartzman said the company did not believe in nickel and diming its clients. The work being discussed had a large financial impact on BKV. Schwartzman wanted to go back to the contract to justify the request for additional payment. He referenced the contract between Wright County and BKV, Page 11, §4.3.3, where the project was specified as taking a period of 76 weeks or 18 months. The project went well past the time frame for various reasons. In a letter dated December 20, 2021, Schwartzman referenced a number of ways to calculate the additional cost. Schwartzman said one way would be to take the hours planned for the time period under contract and figuring the percentage BKV went over in hours determine the cost incurred by going over. Schwartzman said the cost of the overage would total a few hundred thousand dollars which he did not think equated the effort BKV had put forth. The second way to calculate the cost, Schwartzman said, was to look at the weekly hours involved. Typically, BKV would go through 12 to 16 hours per week for all the coordination efforts the project required. These additional CA meetings occurred when the project was extended from 18 months to 30 months for various reasons. The cost of this additional CA came out to \$109,000 using a blended rate of about \$155 per hour. Schwartzman said BKV wanted to be fair about the cost and came up with \$85,000 dollars. Schwartzman said because the construction took place in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic with both the pandemic and the resulting supply chain issues, the contractors and construction managers faced unforeseen delays. Schwartzman said this request was a result of those delays and BKV believed the contract allowed for that change. Schwartzman said a question had come up regarding the amount of time BKV had been spending on site. Schwartzman had BKV's accounting group look at the hours being worked by the two primary BKV construction managers who were helping with the majority of the CA from the architectural side. For the duration of the project, one individual had 3,959.25 hours worked and the other had 2,860.25 hours. Combined the hours came out to about 6,800 hours of CA coordination during the project. The dollar amount came from dividing the number of hours by 30 months and then dividing by four weeks. This number came out to 56 hours on average per week BKV spent on the project, not the 14 hours BKV requested. Schwartzman said he was not looking to retrieve all expenses from this additional work, but a fair adjustment based on the time extension. Schwartzman said the contract was very specific on the timeline.

Commissioner Darek Vetsch asked Schwartzman what work had changed in the scope of the project. Vetsch acknowledged that there were pauses in construction from COVID and supply issues. Vetsch believed the construction cost was a flat rate. Schwartzman said that every two weeks or so there were CA meetings and occasionally coordination meetings. No matter what would be going on at the time there were a litany of things that were coordinated during construction that needed to be addressed from paint color to carpeting. There were thousands of items that needed to be addressed. Assistant County Attorney Greg Kryzer asked how many site visits were done by BKV. Schwartzman said theoretically every two weeks, but with COVID some things were done remotely. Vetsch asked if there was a record that could be produced to determine the number of visits. Schwartzman acknowledged there was a log and it could easily be produced to answer this question. Commissioner Mike Kaczmarek asked if both mileage and drive time to the worksite were being billed. Schwartzman said per the contract the company did bill for mileage but not for time spent traveling. He said it was approximately \$40 per one-way trip for gas.

Vetsch confirmed with Husom the amount being requested was \$85,000. Vetsch said that with the millions of dollars the county had spent with BKV he did not think the total due was \$85,000, rather a much smaller amount. Schwartzman said he did not want to have a bad relationship with Wright County. He added that his team did an excellent job and he was proud of them. He said he thought this request was fair and appropriate. Husom asked for clarification on what the extra amount without the discount would have been. Schwartzman said the contract has the fees broken down by percentage of phase. On Page 17 §11.5, 20 percent of the fee was CA. Based on that percentage there was a 67 percent increase of scheduled calendar time for the additional 12 months. According to his calculations one way to calculate that is the fee was \$337,000 for that phase. He said the fee could have been \$224,779, however he said he was not asking for that.

Kryzer asked who had drafted the contract. Schwartzman said his firm created the contract. Kryzer asked if it was BKV's firm that put all the strike throughs and additions in. Schwartzman said yes. Kryzer added that this was a copyrighted document, and the county did not have a license to produce such a document. Kryzer asked if there were any contract negotiations between Wright County and BKV. Schwartzman said there should have been. Kryzer asked if the contract

was accepted as it had been presented. Schwartzman said he did not know but was certain there had been some discussion. He said that he could not recall a client who had not had some back and forth on the contract. Kryzer said the contract was signed by former Assistant Wright County Attorney Brian Asleson. Kryzer asked Schwartzman what the back and forth was like between Asleson and himself. Schwartzman said he could do research to find out, but he did not recall the specifics. Kaczmarek asked if Kryzer had reviewed the contract and Kryzer said he had asked County Attorney Sarah Erickson, who had experience with this specific American Institute of Architects (AIA) type of contract, to review it. Erickson stated she was familiar with the request for additional services to be paid and noted these requests were not uncommon with these types of contracts. Erickson identified two separate issues. The first issue was in the Additional Services section of the AIA contract signed by BKV and Wright County, Page 11, §4.3.3. This section specified caps to the number of shop drawings, site visits, product data, work inspections, and final inspections covered in the contract. Erickson said if BKV was to do any additional work beyond the stated caps, those overages must be paid by the client. Erickson identified the second issue being the additional CA time due to the extension of the project. She said this issue was addressed on Page 11, §4.3.4 and was intentionally stricken from the contract. Erickson said Wright County does not owe any money for CA. Erickson said the contract which was written and signed by BKV did not allow for additional services to be paid out if completion was not within the specified amount of time. Erickson said that the writers of the contract had not put in a number into §4.3.4 indicating how much time past the planned completion before additional services were compensated for. Erickson said if they had put "18 months" in the section where, indicated by parenthesis, had not been stricken then the additional expenses would have been owed to BKV. She said that BKV did not have a contract provision to turn to for the additional services caused by the extensions. Erickson said the county does owe BKV for any additional site visits as indicated in §4.3.3 in the contract as they had occurred.

Kaczmarek asked Schwartzman if he had a response to this. Schwartzman said he deferred to the board he had brought forward what he thought was fair compensation. Husom and Commissioner Mark Daleiden asked how many site visits were additional and what the cost per visit was. Schwartzman indicated each visit was approximately two to four hours in length, but he would need to refer to his records for the specifics. Daleiden presented the option that the county pay \$50,000 for the additional work as it had been done by BKV. Vetsch said he was more inclined to pay only what was extra according to the signed contract. Vetsch said he believed the total amount due was significantly less than \$50,000. He said that he had looked at the additional work done and did not believe it cost as much as was being stated by BKV, but rather around \$6,000 to \$10,000. Daleiden repeated his suggestion of \$50,000 to acknowledge the additional work done. Schwartzman said that at this point that the money had been spent by BKV and it had already covered the costs. He said he thought the charges were fair and appropriate but deferred to the board again. Schwartzman said this issue should have been brought up and resolved more than a year ago when the letter was presented, and the additional work was happening. Daleiden said BKV did provide extra time and he thought it fair to pay at least \$50,000. Vetsch wanted it articulated whether BKV had made any profits on this work. He did not believe that BKV took a loss as an organization. Daleiden stated that regardless of profits, BKV did spend extra time on site. Schwartzman offered to sit down with Vetsch and open up the project's financial books showing all the costs and charges. Kaczmarek said the county was not trying to hide anything with the contract and he was disappointed that Schwartzman had not come to the board with a number indicating how many site visits over 36 the county owed. Schwartzman said he thought the language in the contract was just and fair. He said he valued the relationship with Wright County more than collecting the requested funds. Husom said the bids had come in under projection and if the building was to be built that day, the cost would have been significantly more expensive. Husom agreed with Daleiden that \$50,000 would be appropriate. Daleiden asked Facilities Services Director Alan Wilczek if he had any idea how many meetings over the designated 36 there were. Wilczek said in order to know this, he would have to go back to the minutes of the construction meetings. Wilczek said one of the two individuals Schwartzman mentioned as construction managers were on site most of the time, but that there were a handful of meetings where no representative from BKV was available. Wilczek said ground was broken in September, 2019 and completed in February, 2022. Construction took 29 months to 30 months instead of the original estimate of 24 months. Wilczek said the changes to the project were what extended the time. He said the contract originally ranged from 130,000 square feet to 165,000 square feet before changing to 202,000 square feet when the project was released for bid. In addition, he said the site and the duration changed from the original 24 months to a timeframe of 29 months to 30 months. This extension was partly because of the expansion of the third floor and reconfiguration of floor zero and an additional 20,000 square feet, which the county paid additional services for. Vetsch agreed with Kaczmarek that, while the county should pay what it was contractually obliged to pay, nothing more should have been paid. Daleiden asked if the contract was amended or increased at all with the size changes. Schwartzman said there were additional services added to the contract. Schwartzman asked that his request be dropped. While Schwartzman acknowledged the amount he had requested was not a small amount, it was more important that the project went well and BKV would absorb the

amount disputed.

Kryzer thought a recommendation for information only was in order and the matter at hand could be closed out.

RECOMMENDATION: Information only.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE / ADVISORY BOARD UPDATES

County Administrator Lee Kelly

Kelly said the board was fortunate enough to host the AMC District 5 meeting on Monday, June 6. The timing worked out great as the commissioners had attended the Wright Soil and Water Conservation District Annual Tour which was nice to see some of those sites and projects the county has been working on for a while. He also mentioned that at 12:00 p.m., Wednesday, June 29, the county is hosting an open house for employees for Well at Work Clinics ribbon cutting.

Commissioner Michael Kaczmarek

Kaczmarek had an Emergency Services Board (ESB) meeting. There was an audit conducted and the books were good. Kaczmarek said the ESB would lowering regional operating boards expenses next year by using some of the fund balance. The Wright County Fair Board met and advised Kaczmarek that the mud racing event has been cancelled because there was a lack of entries. He said he had a few copies of a limited-edition fair book available if anyone wanted one.

Commissioner Mark Daleiden

Daleiden said the Wellness Group met Tuesday, June 14, and wanted to remind everyone that the Spring Wellness walk would be on Wednesday, June 22, and asked employees to complete the survey about what you would like to see for a possible café or vending options. Daleiden would like pop bottle recycling containers in our facility. All five board members attended the Wright County Mayors Association meeting and had a great time.

Commissioner Darek Vetsch

Vetsch attended the Wright County Economic Development Partnership meeting. One of the presenters was Nick Tietz from ILT Studios, which is a startup studio for entrepreneurship training. It has a 10-week Academy that trains local innovators and entrepreneurs the skillsets needed to develop successful ventures. Tietz said ILT Studios were looking for potential entrepreneurs in our area that a scholarship could be given to. Vetsch had three different meetings with the Energy Transitioning Group about trying to create a matrix that illustrated taxes that our power plants paid to personal property tax, to production tax, and state accessed tax.

Commissioner Mary Wetter

Wetter wanted to commend the Sheriff's Office for a wonderful open house on Friday, June 10. She thought the robotics were very impressive. Wetter said she met the new Horticulture Specialist Emily Hanson who lives in Buffalo. Wetter said she met with the City of Rockford. She also participated in the Environmental Health Group. She hoped this group would continue. She also met with the Historical Society to discuss replacements for Archivist Betty Dircks who will be retiring in August. Wetter also mentioned that she had a great time at the Mayors Association meeting.

Commissioner Christine Husom:

Husom thought the Economic Development Authority (EDA) workshop brought up great discussion with the different townships. The Mentorship, Education, and Drug Awareness (MEADA) Coalition met and were thinking of doing site visits. Husom made an appearance at the MEADA booth at the Sheriffs open house which was very busy. She said Public Works, Labor Management, and the Highway Department would be at the fair and are very busy with signs and culverts. State Community Health and Central Minnesota Jobs in Training brought up that the state legislature did not finish its session so many groups are in a holding pattern not knowing what funding will be going through.

The meeting adjourned at 10:11 a.m.

County Board Minutes submitted by Delia Scepaniak, Administrative Specialist.