



Board of Commissioners
606 5th Ave. SW, Room #131
Roseau, MN 56751
Phone: 218-463-4248
Fax: 218-463-3252

AGENDA
Tuesday, April 14, 2009, 8:30 a.m.

REVISED

Notice is hereby given that the Board of Commissioners of Roseau County will meet in session on April 14, 2009 at 8:30 am in the Roseau County Courthouse, Room 110, Roseau, MN, at which time the following matters will come before the Board:

8:30 Call to Order

1. Presentation of Colors
2. Approve Agenda

8:45 Consent Agenda

1. Approve Proceedings
2. Approve Revised Credit Card Policy
3. Approve Bills

9:00 Comments and Announcements

9:15 Committee Reports

9:30 Environmental Officer – Jeff Pelowski

1. Advertisement for Bids
2. Transfer Station/Demolition Landfill Re-permitting Process
3. SSTS Soil Verification Contract
4. Review SCORE Reports

10:00 Highway Department

1. Approve CSAH 5 Seal Coat and Fog Seal
2. Approve Call for Bids for Federal Project
3. Road Condition Update

10:30 Break

10:45 Discussion

1. Legislative Concerns
2. 2010 Budget Planning

11:00 Future Agenda Items

11:15 Adjourn

To schedule an appointment with the Board, please contact the County Coordinator at 218-463-4248
County Coordinator's e-mail address: trish.klein@co.roseau.mn.us
Roseau County Home Page Address: <http://co.roseau.mn.us/>

District 1, Alan Johnston, Vice Chair - District 2, Jack Swanson, Chairman -
District 3, Orris Rasmussen - District 4, Russell Walker - District 5, Mark Foldesi

An Equal Opportunity Employer

ITEM # _____
REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION
 * Required Fields



*Person Responsible for Request Pelowski, Jeff	*Department Environmental Services	*Board Meeting Date Apr 14 2009
--	--	---

***Subject Title (As it will appear on the agenda):**
 Environmental Office Operations

***Background (Provide sufficient detail of the subject):**
 Discuss "Advertisement for Bids" --- Transfer Station Truck / Hooklift; Discuss Transfer Station / Demolition Landfill Re-Permitting Process; Discuss SSTS Soil Verification Contract; Review 2008 SCORE Report; Overview of 2008 Transfer Station & Demolition Landfill Annual Reports.

***Financial Consideration:**
 Per 2009 Budget: Truck / Hooklift purchase; Re-permitting consultant costs; SSTS soil verification costs.

***Legal Consideration:**
 Review of Transfer Station Truck / Hooklift Bid Package; SSTS Contract Review; Review contract for consulting services (Demolition Landfill Construction Plans).

***Other Consideration:**
 None

***Resolution (Wording should reflect the intent of the Board vote):**
 None

Coordinator's Office Use (Do Not Write Below)

Date Received:	Comments:

Board Action:

Comm.	Motion (First)	Motion (Second)	Vote			Vote Result
			Yes	No	Abstain	
Swanson						Passed
Johnston						
Folds						Failed
Rasmussen						
Walker						Tabled

ATTEST: Teresa Klein, Board Clerk

ITEM # Consent 1

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

* Required Fields



*Person Responsible for Request Klein, Trish	*Department Coordinator	*Board Meeting Date Apr 14 2009
--	-----------------------------------	---

***Subject Title (As it will appear on the agenda):**
Proceedings for 4-07-09 Board Meeting

***Background (Provide sufficient detail of the subject):**
Please review carefully and advise of any changes.

***Financial Consideration:**

***Legal Consideration:**

***Other Consideration:**

***Resolution (Wording should reflect the intent of the Board vote):**

Coordinator's Office Use (Do Not Write Below)

Date Received:	Comments:
-----------------------	------------------

Board Action:

Comm.	Motion (First)	Motion (Second)	Vote			Vote Result	
			Yes	No	Abstain		
Swanson						Passed	
Johnston							
Foldesi						Failed	
Rasmussen							
Walker						Tabled	

ATTEST: Teresa Klein, Board Clerk

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROSEAU COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

April 7, 2009

The Board of Commissioners of Roseau County, Minnesota met in the Courthouse in the City of Roseau, Minnesota on Tuesday, April 7, 2009, at 8:30 a.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Board Chairman Jack Swanson. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Commissioners present were Mark Foldesi, Alan Johnston, Orris Rasmussen, and Jack Swanson. Russell Walker was excused.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Johnston seconded by Commissioner Rasmussen and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion to adopt the consent agenda was made by Commissioner Rasmussen, seconded by Commissioner Foldesi and carried unanimously.

The Board, by adoption of its consent agenda, approved a Minnesota Lawful Gambling Permit for North Star Lodge 22 Fraternal Order of Police.

The Board, by adoption of its consent agenda approved Amendment I to A'viands Foods Service Contract for the Detention Center.

The Board, by adoption of its consent agenda approved a Resolution in Opposition to Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).

COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Board acknowledged the April report from the Sheriff's office summarizing the month's activities.

The Board discussed the upcoming District III meeting and noted that it was important to be an active member. Policy Committee delegate and alternate positions were discussed as well as the possibility of a Roseau County Commissioner serving as an officer.

HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

Engineer Ketring met with the Board to request approval on a Culvert Replacement Project. A motion was made by Commissioner Foldesi, seconded by Commissioner Johnston and carried unanimously to adopt the following resolution:

2009-04-01

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does hereby approve a Culvert Replacement Project on CSAH 7 to low bidder R & Q Trucking, Inc. in the amount of \$52,680.50.

Emergency Manager Gracia Nelson met with the Board to request approval on a Presidential Resolution declaring Roseau County a disaster area due to rain, snow and flooding. This resolution would make Roseau County eligible for disaster recovery funding. A motion was made by Commissioner Rasmussen, seconded by Commissioner Foldesi and carried unanimously to adopt the following resolution:

2009-04-02

WHEREAS the County of Roseau has sustained severe losses of major proportion, caused by heavy rains and snow starting in November 2008 and continuing; and

WHEREAS Roseau County is a public entity within the State of Minnesota; and

WHEREAS substantial damage has been sustained to public property, as outlined in the attached damage assessment forms; and

WHEREAS the cost of recovery from this disaster is beyond the resources available within the county and state and federal resources are necessary;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of County Commissioners, for and on behalf of the citizens of Roseau County, request the Governor of the State of Minnesota to petition the President of the United States to declare the County of Roseau, Minnesota, to be a major disaster area, through appropriate channels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the request is for:

1. The Public Assistance (Infrastructure Support) Program only, as offered through P.L. 93-288 and 106.390.
2. The Hazard Mitigation Program, as offered through P. L. 93-288 and 106.390.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the County Emergency Management Director is authorized to coordinate the damage survey teams with local government, and assist in the administration of the disaster recovery process, as needed.

Upon motion carried, the Board adjourned the regular meeting at 9:00 a.m. The next regular meeting of the Board is scheduled for April 14, 2009 at 8:30 a.m.

Attest:

Date: _____

Teresa Klein, County Coordinator
Roseau County, Minnesota

Jack Swanson, Chairman
Board of County Commissioners
Roseau County, Minnesota

ITEM # Consent 2

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

* Required Fields



*Person Responsible for Request Klein, Trish	*Department Coordinator	*Board Meeting Date Apr 14 2009
--	-----------------------------------	---

***Subject Title (As it will appear on the agenda):**
Approve Revised Credit Card Policy

***Background (Provide sufficient detail of the subject):**
Attached you will find a marked up policy that shows the suggested policy revision. Note the change from department heads receiving statements and reconciling with Credit Card Purchase Claim Voucher to the Treasurer's Office doing the reconciling. The change is necessary because of the timing of the receipt of the statement and the date of the electronic payment. The policy revision requires that the credit card voucher form be turned into the Auditor's Office with the original receipts attached WITHIN 7 days of the incurred expense so that the statement may be reconciled with the claim voucher before the electronic payment is made.

***Financial Consideration:**

***Legal Consideration:**

***Other Consideration:**

***Resolution (Wording should reflect the intent of the Board vote):**

Coordinator's Office Use (Do Not Write Below)

Date Received:	Comments:

Board Action:

Comm.	Motion (First)	Motion (Second)	Vote			Vote Result
			Yes	No	Abstain	
Swanson						Passed
Johnston						
Foldesi						Failed
Rasmussen						
Walker						Tabled

ATTEST: Teresa Klein, Board Clerk

ROSEAU COUNTY CREDIT CARD POLICY

I. Purpose:

The purpose of this policy is to meet the State of Minnesota Office of the State Auditor recommendations regarding credit card use and policies which includes: the development of a comprehensive credit card policy that meets statutory requirements, good management practices, and includes internal control procedures.

It is further designed to provide Employees with clear information regarding the appropriate use of County issued credit cards.

II. Scope:

This policy applies to all County departments, officers, and employees.

III. Background

Per Minnesota Stat. 375.171 on December 27, 2006, the Roseau County Board approved the use of a county credit card by county officers and employees to make authorized purchases on behalf of the county.

IV. Authorization

The County Auditor and County Treasurer shall serve as Program Administrators of the county credit card.

A County credit card issued to an employee may be used by the employee for **approved** purchases and is **not transferable**. If a county officer or employee makes a purchase by credit card that is not approved by the County Board, the officer or employee is personally liable for the amount of the purchase. Unauthorized use of a County authorized credit card by any county employee or non-authorized individual may be subject to prosecution and disciplinary action as deemed appropriate up to and including termination.

V. Controls

The County Board, in consultation with Department Heads, sets the credit limit of each card. In general, cards issued to department heads are set with a \$1000 limit and cards issued to all other employees are set with a \$500 limit.

- Credit card users must complete a credit card agreement prior to use.
- Credit card users must submit a Credit Card Purchase Claim Voucher along with obtain original receipts for purchases for the purpose of reconciliation to the Auditor's Office within 7 days of the incurred expense.
- Department Heads are responsible for canceling lost or stolen credit cards issued to their department employees and immediately notifying the Program Administrators.
- Upon separation of employment, or employee transfer to a different department, the department head must return the employee credit card to the Program Administrators for cancellation

VI. Eligible Uses:

The credit card may be used to:

- Guarantee rooms for conferences and or meeting attendance
- Purchase lodging and while attending authorized **overnight** meetings or trainings
- Pay registration fees for approved meetings or conferences
- Purchase supplies and/or materials when purchase of the item by credit card is more timely and or cost effective than if purchased by a county warrant
- Purchase airline tickets to attend authorized meetings or trainings and for prosecution purposes

VII. Ineligible Uses:

The credit card MAY NOT be used for:

- Personal purchases
- Gasoline for a personal vehicle
- Cash advance
- Alcoholic beverages
- Meals without overnight lodging
- Personal Telephone calls

VIII. Monthly Reconciliation

Credit card receipts must be reconciled with the monthly billing statement prior to payment. The Treasurer's Office Department heads will receive a billing statement from the credit card company with a list of purchases made by the Department or its Employee(s). Department and will reconcile the statement to the submitted Credit Card Purchase Claim Voucher. Department heads are responsible for insuring that the credit card purchase claim voucher and all receipts have been submitted to the Auditor's Office within seven days receipt of the incurred expense billing so that the billing statement can be reconciled in a timely manner.~~the following:~~

- ~~• Original receipts~~
- ~~• Credit card billing statement~~
- ~~• Monthly Reconciliation Report~~
- ~~• Personal check(s) for the amount of interest and other fees charged~~

IX. Payment

Credit card bills will be paid as Commissioner Warrants and approved during regularly scheduled Board meetings. **The Board of Commissioners will not approve payment of credit card purchases that have not been verified and reconciled.** Employees are personally liable for all fees and service charges due to late processing of the credit card billing. The Auditor's office maintains a file of all original credit card statements.

ITEM # _____
REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION
 * Required Fields



*Person Responsible for Request Pelowski, Jeff	*Department Environmental Services	*Board Meeting Date Apr 14 2009
--	--	---

***Subject Title (As it will appear on the agenda):**
 Environmental Office Operations

***Background (Provide sufficient detail of the subject):**
 Discuss "Advertisement for Bids" --- Transfer Station Truck / Hooklift; Discuss Transfer Station / Demolition Landfill Re-Permitting Process; Discuss SSTS Soil Verification Contract; Review 2008 SCORE Report; Overview of 2008 Transfer Station & Demolition Landfill Annual Reports.

***Financial Consideration:**
 Per 2009 Budget: Truck / Hooklift purchase; Re-permitting consultant costs; SSTS soil verification costs.

***Legal Consideration:**
 Review of Transfer Station Truck / Hooklift Bid Package; SSTS Contract Review; Review contract for consulting services (Demolition Landfill Construction Plans).

***Other Consideration:**
 None

***Resolution (Wording should reflect the intent of the Board vote):**
 None

Coordinator's Office Use (Do Not Write Below)

Date Received:	Comments:

Board Action:

Comm.	Motion (First)	Motion (Second)	Vote			Vote Result
			Yes	No	Abstain	
Swanson						Passed
Johnston						
Folds						Failed
Rasmussen						
Walker						Tabled

ATTEST: Teresa Klein, Board Clerk

ITEM # Discussion 1

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

* Required Fields



*Person Responsible for Request Klein, Trish	*Department Coordinator	*Board Meeting Date Apr 14 2009
--	-----------------------------------	---

***Subject Title (As it will appear on the agenda):**
Legislative Concerns

***Background (Provide sufficient detail of the subject):**
Please review the attached AMC Legislative Update. It is very lengthy but very critical that we discuss the legislative impasses on a multitude of bills that could have unprecedented financial impact and service delivery to Roseau County and develop a short term and long term strategy to address these concerns. Most notably is the Governor's unwillingness to agree to the AMC version of the Human Service Authority Act and the possibility that counties will be required to spend down there reserves before receiving ANY county program aid.

***Financial Consideration:**

***Legal Consideration:**

***Other Consideration:**

***Resolution (Wording should reflect the intent of the Board vote):**

Coordinator's Office Use (Do Not Write Below)

Date Received:	Comments:
-----------------------	------------------

Board Action:

Comm.	Motion (First)	Motion (Second)	Vote			Vote Result	
			Yes	No	Abstain		
Swanson						Passed	
Johnston							
Foldesi						Failed	
Rasmussen							
Walker						Tabled	

ATTEST: Teresa Klein, Board Clerk



Intergovernmental Services Weekly Legislative Update

Session Update: Recess

This comprehensive Update is coming to you mid-week to capture events that occurred through yesterday's committee meetings. House and Senate committees had until Midnight last night to complete work on policy bills. The Legislature is nearing its third committee deadline next week as the House and Senate finance committee divisions must complete work on their respective budget bills no later than Thursday, April 16. Starting today, the Legislature is taking its Easter/Passover break and has no meetings scheduled until Noon on Tuesday, April 14.

To supplement the information on the Human Services consolidation proposals (see separate email), this Update contains helpful information about the status of many important county initiatives pending before the Legislature. The material should be useful in any conversations AMC members have with legislators during the Easter/Passover break.

Many decisions unfavorable to counties have already been made. For example, note the specific information below on the mandate relief initiatives that describes items counties asked for and shows what has been rejected by the House or Senate. In conversations with legislators, members should continue to ask for significant relief. We are *underwhelmed* by the size and scope of the Legislature's commitment to local mandate relief.

The legislative session has now passed the 14-week mark and only five weeks remain. However, most of the decisions have yet to be made. There is no clear legislative solution to the budget impasse and won't be until mid-May. Most policy bills of concern to counties have not been passed off the floor of either the Senate or House. It is therefore vitally important that county officials attend the [Joint Legislative Conference](#) at the end of April. **We have to be there in force and remind legislators about their promises.** We will focus our attention and advocacy on challenges such as:

- **Human Services Delivery Redesign.** Negotiations with the administration regarding Human Service authorities are at an impasse. The governor believes that the AMC proposal is not bold enough and will likely demand his one-size-fits-all approach during session-ending negotiations. As an alternative to the governor's plan, we must focus our collective efforts on awareness and support for the AMC alternative in the House and Senate. Because the governor's plan has not been laid to rest, we ask all to get involved and talk to legislators about the existence of the AMC proposal and contrast it with the governor's limited structural proposal. (Again, please refer to the separate email for targeted information on this issue.)
- **Mandate Relief.** One-by-one, mandate relief items requested by AMC have been stricken from the various relief bills. Although the session started with great recognition and support for maintenance of effort (MOE) flexibility and relief, there is little or no significant MOE relief still pending. Overall, legislators need to hear that much more needs to be done this year.
- **County Budget Reserves.** It is increasingly likely that the governor and the House majority will propose a plan to draw on local government budget reserves as part of one-time solutions to "solve" the state budget problem. The plan would force all local government units (city, county and schools) to spend down reserve balances before being eligible for whatever aid might be available.

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact:
[Scott Simmons, AMC Intergovernmental Services Manager](#)

General Government & Taxes

Tax Bills Expected Shortly After Easter

The House Property and Local Sales Tax division has already finished its work on a division report and the full House Tax Committee is likely to begin crafting their legislation when policy makers return from the Easter break. The most notable piece of the division report, in addition to mandate relief proposals, is the inclusion of a ½ cent sales tax which can be imposed at the discretion of the county board. The sales tax revenues would partially offset county program aid. The sales tax is expected to raise \$230 million, but would also result in a \$125 million reduction in County Program Aid.

The Senate Property Tax Division had initially announced the rollout of its division report as early as this week but has since decided to wait until after the break as well. Tax bills will carry revenue increases to cover the budget plans proposed by the House and Senate and likely won't be put in final form until the specifics of the House and Senate budget proposals are completed.

Legislative Mandate Relief Efforts

The 2009 legislative session began with significant interest in pursuing mandate relief for local governments as a way to provide some additional flexibility to deal with reduced revenues on the local level. The House Property Tax Division and Local Government Division both initiated legislation to provide mandate relief to counties and other local governments. In the Senate each policy area was tasked with creating a mandate relief bill. Mandate relief bills from the Tax Committee, State and Local Government Operations and Oversight Committee, Human Services Policy Committee and K-12 Education Policy Committees were moved through the political process and ultimately packaged into one piece of legislation [SF 3](#). The House has moved one bill through the Property and Local Sales Tax Division ([HF 2020](#)) and another through the State and Local Government Operations Reform, Technology and Elections Committee ([HF 1849](#)). It is currently unclear procedurally whether these bills will continue to travel as stand-alone legislation or if the House will roll their two mandate relief bills into one omnibus piece of legislation and sends it to conference committee with SF 3.

In its current form the legislation does provide a modest amount of mandate relief, although the legislature has continued to jettison pieces of mandate relief at every step in the process in an attempt to find non-controversial mandate relief proposals. Several state agencies also put up roadblocks to mandate relief, opposing delays in the implementation of new rules that significantly increase costs to counties and testifying against efforts to reduce reporting requirements. It is unclear whether or not state policy makers have the appetite to revisit the mandate relief issue in 2010, although they have clearly identified the need to make this a more regular part of the legislative process. Rep. Morrie Lanning (R-Morehead) has been the chief supporter of a new legislative commission to bring more legislators into the process of mandate review and relief. That commission is currently part of HF 2020, although it faces an uncertain future in the omnibus tax bill. It is also worth noting that the House mandate relief bill HF1849 included provisions to allow county boards to reduce their salary at any time.

Mandate Relief Requests from AMC (in no particular order) is attached.

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Joe Mathews, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

Health and Human Services

Tuesday, April 7 was the final deadline for bills to clear the policy committees. Thus, there was a plethora of bills moving through the various policy committees. The following is a status report on key HHS bills of interest to counties.

The State-County Results, Accountability and Service Delivery Redesign Act (SF 1923/HF 2145): This bill was amended a week ago into the AMC Mental Health Maintenance of Effort Bill (HF 986) in the House Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight Committee. The amended version of HF 986 was heard in the House Local Government Committee on Monday (3/30). The committee heard testimony on the AMC Redesign proposal. The bill

was passed with the AMC language and referred to the House State and Local Government Operations Committee. It was heard and passed in that Committee on Tuesday and thus makes the Policy Committee deadline. Kelly Harder, Steele County Social Services, testified on behalf of counties.

Talking Points:

- **Bills to better manage, not eliminate the mental health maintenance of effort are moving forward in both the House and Senate (Berglin SF1504 and Thissen HF986).**
- **We want to be sure to include ways to look at performance rather than just a fiscal MOE.**
- **The Thissen bill does this, the Berglin bill does not.**

County Human Services Mandates: The House HHS Policy Committee heard [HF 1276](#) (Norton) which modifies several county human services mandates. The bill includes language allowing for counties to receive Rule 5 MA reimbursement for children placed in border state facilities (This provision is not in the Senate version). The bill was passed and referred to the Health Care and Human Services Finance Division. The Senate Companion was amended into SF 3 (Berglin) which passed the Senate floor on Monday, April 6.

Talking Points:

- **The legislature has been quite sensitive this year to adding additional human services mandates.**
- **Thanks to legislators for their awareness of the need for additional flexibility as county resources are reduced;**
- **Urge that they keep this in mind as you prepare the omnibus budget bills.**

Children and Community Services Act (CCSA) Changes: In an extended Thursday evening hearing, several bills related to county children's services were heard in the HHS Policy Committee. An author's delete-everything amendment was offered to [HF 577](#) (Hosch MFIP bill), to incorporate the **Protecting Children's Act** language contained in [HF 1571](#) (the governor's HHS budget bill). The proposal would have carved out a portion of CCSA into a separate grant program, required counties to expend 55% of CCSA on children's services, legislated performance standards, and reallocated the funding formula over a period of years to move toward a performance-based allocation. Representative Loeffler offered an amendment, drafted by Hennepin County that would have made the 55% spending for children's services a minimum rather than a maximum and deleted the funding formula but specified that formula is to be developed in consultation with counties. AMC staff testified on the history and intent of CSSA and CCSA, the 2003 reductions to this block grant, and the need for maximum flexibility with these dollars. Both Representatives Loeffler and Abeler commented about the poor policy direction of creating less flexibility for counties with reduced revenue. The DE amendment was not adopted; thus, the Protecting Children's Act is not likely to move forward in the House this year. Other provisions related to CCSA (e.g. Protecting Adults Act) remain in HF 1571.

Talking Points:

- **We want as much flexibility as possible in human services programs.**
- **The CCSA block grant provides this and allows us to focus on children's services as well as other local needs.**
- **CCSA was reduced by 30% in 2003**
- **Keep CCSA intact and protect it from further reductions.**

Northstar: [HF 1577](#) (Hayden) was amended to include the portions of the DHS budget proposal (in 1571) related to Northstar, which would have consolidated rates for foster care and created better incentives for adoption. MACSSA did not take a position on this bill, but individual county representatives testified both for and against the DHS proposal. Many foster parents and children's advocates also testified both for and against. The bill was further amended to allow for exceptions to the foster care rates for hard-to-place high risk children. This bill now goes to HHS Finance, but without other changes, this will likely generate a state fiscal note.

Youth aging out of foster care: The Senate HHS Finance Committee [SF 666](#) (Marty) which extends foster care benefits to youths aged 18-21. County representatives worked with Senator Marty on an amendment that would make the county's responsibility to extend of housing, vocational, and other benefits contingent upon available resources. A similar provision passed the House HHS Policy Committee on Monday evening.

Non-Emergency Medical Transportation: The Senate HHS Budget Division heard two bills Wednesday related to non-

emergency medical transportation ([SF 224](#) Sheran and [SF 723](#) Lynch) and extensive testimony about the need to reform the current system to improve access. SF224 would provide for higher reimbursement rates in the rural areas (thru the "RUCA" system) but fund this by eliminating the broker to manage Access Transportation in the metro area. SF 723 contains the same provision, but in addition would add county staff to the list of personnel who must perform level of need determination for special transportation service (STS). There is an unspecified appropriation for counties to perform this function. AMC testified about the potential cost to metro counties if the broker model were eliminated, and stressed the need for funding for the level of need assessment. Both bills were held over for possible inclusion in the Omnibus HHS budget bill. There are substantial state fiscal notes on both bills. A local fiscal note has also been requested in the Senate. HF 374 (Thissen), the companion to Sen. Sheran's SF 224, was heard, amended and passed the House Health Care and Human Services Policy Committee on Wednesday. Other non-emergency transportation provisions have been amended onto SF 230, a physician assistant bill authored by Rep. Norton. This bill was referred to the Budget Division.

Chemical Health Pilot Projects: [HF 2069](#) Liebling/[SF 1766](#) Rosen, which allows counties to participate in chemical health care pilots, was heard in the Senate Health and Human Services Budget Division on Wednesday (4/1). The Bill was also heard in the House Health Care and Human Services Policy and Oversight Committee on Thursday (4/2) and was referred to Health Care and Human Services Finance Division. Kelly Harder, Steele County, testified on behalf of MACSSA in both committees. The bill has met the policy deadline in both the House and Senate.

Personal Care Assistant Modifications: SF 1229 (Prettner Solon)/HF 1329 (Hosch) contains some proposed changes based on the Office of Legislative Auditors report, including certification and training of assessors and training for PCAs. This bill does not include the changes in eligibility proposed by the governor, and so it does not save the state any money. The bill was heard in the Senate Health and Human Services Finance Committee this week and was laid over for possible inclusion in the omnibus HHS finance bill. The bill is awaiting action in the House HHS Finance Division.

Health Information Technology: HF1322 (Thissen)/ SF 1890 (Lourey) Health information technology incentive requirements created for the use of federal funding have been modified to better position the state to receive federal stimulus funding for health information technology. The changes include new definitions, expanded definition of the existing revolving loan fund for implementing electronic medical records, and other changes. Local public health departments (counties) have been added to the list of health care providers who are eligible for the revolving loan fund. The bill has had its second reading on the House floor, and awaits final action. In the Senate, the bill passed the Health, Housing, and Family Security Committee on Wednesday and was re-referred to the Judiciary Committee.

Vacation Rental Homes

[SF 894](#) (Skogen)/ [HF 1072](#) (Howes) clarifies the definition of vacation home rental as it pertains to regulation and licensing of the home. The bill has been amended to change the definition of vacation rental home to remove the authority of counties that conduct food, beverage, and lodging inspections' ability to regulate these facilities.

First Omnibus Finance Bills Out

The House Housing & Public Health Omnibus Appropriations Bill was released Monday, HF 2150 (Clark). Key provisions of the bill of interest to counties:

- All MDH General Fund grants are reduced by 2.55% in FY 2010 and FY 2011 and then by 5.5% in FY 2012 and FY 2013. The grants that most directly impact local public health departments (counties) include the local public health grant, family planning special projects, tobacco prevention, and eliminating health disparities;
- There were no reductions to TANF funded grant programs – MCH block, family home visiting, and eliminating health disparities);
- MDH administrative budget reduction is \$2 million per year (slightly more than the Governor's proposal);
- Environmental health fee changes proposed in the Governor's budget are included;
- Includes a \$50 fee for monitoring of wells that are unsealed and owned by federal, state, or local governments (line 6.17). This is a new fee to local governments, but has a relatively small impact, as most counties/cities own very few wells. It is also a reduced rate, as private entities pay \$175 per well.

Government entities would now also be charged the fees for drilling new wells (\$215) and sealing wells (\$50);

- Includes a new accreditation process and fees for environmental labs, which a few local public health departments operate).

Talking Points:

- **HF2150 (Clark) includes 2.5% and 5.5% reductions to public health grants**
- **Counties recognize that everyone has to take cuts, but are concerned about eroding the public health infrastructure**
- **It is extremely important to maintain funding for the Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP); this will help reduce health care costs for everyone. The governor's budget cuts SHIP in half. We do not have the House or Senate language on this yet.**

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Patricia Coldwell, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

Environment & Natural Resources

Comprehensive planning

HF 898 (Hornstein), the bill regarding comprehensive planning and setting vehicle miles traveled in the metropolitan counties was heard in the House Transportation Committee. During the hearing a portion of the bill that would require the regulating government unit (RGU) and environmental assessment worksheet (EAW) to analyze the greenhouse gas emissions of a project was removed from the bill. This provision, which AMC opposed, was removed early in the Senate process. This bill was heard in the Senate transportation committee on April 7. An attempt was made to amend a portion of the bill to another, but the motion failed and the original bill was tabled in committee.

SCORE streamlining work group

SF 1773 (Saxhaug) is in relation to the AMC Redesign, contains suggestions that would allow for abbreviated SCORE reporting in 2010; and would require forming a group of county representatives for the purpose of discussing how to streamline the SCORE report and how to standardize estimation methods. The bill was heard in the House as well. It is laid over for possible inclusion in the environment finance omnibus bill in the House and passed to the Senate floor.

One-time payments for acquisition of public land (payment in lieu of PILT)

The bill, SF 1773 (Wagenius), which regards payments for conservation easements was heard last week. An amendment by Rep. Dill is of particular interest to counties, because it proposes for any new public land purchased, the State would also be required to make a one-time payment to the county in which the public land is located. This one-time payment would be 25 percent of the appraised value of the acquired natural resources land. This money would be managed by the county and would be given one time only in lieu of PILT payments. The legislators are trying to address concerns regarding the current PILT funding budget cut proposals, as well as additional problems with funding PILT in future purchases of additional public land with the conservation funds from the constitutionally dedicated dollars.

House and Senate Agriculture and Veterans Finance Omnibus Bills – Waste Pesticide Disposal program

SF 1779 and HF 1122 are in the Senate and House Ag Finance Omnibus bills. They were both heard last week. AMC staff has been paying special attention to the Waste Pesticide Disposal program language in this bill. The House has taken the governors recommendation to increase funding for the program and set up a separate account that would be available on to counties to draw from. AMC has been in support of the House language, as the author has made great effort to accommodate county concerns about the language. The Senate bill, however, is a large step back from the program that we currently have. The Senate bill does not have a funding increase provision and removes the departments' obligation to host pesticide collection events from 'every year' to 'periodically.' In addition, the amount of funds the department would have for cooperative agreements would likely decimate the program. Commissioner Reinhardt, Ramsey County, has testified before both the House and the Senate on these proposals.

House Clean Water Omnibus Bill

HF 1973 (Wagenius) put forward the Environment Committee's recommendations for spending the Clean Water dollars brought in through the constitutionally dedicated funds. The bill does not have any of the recommendations

from the Clean Water Council. AMC is supportive of Rep. Eken's bill, which contains recommendations for long-term consistent funding that was put together by the Clean Water Council. The Environment Finance Omnibus bill, which will be heard in the Senate next week, will be of interest to see what is allocated to existing programs through the general and environment funds.

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Annalee Garletz, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

Transportation

Bills with no further action during the 2009 Session

Truck weight limit exemption

The House and Senate heard [SF 453](#) (Murphy) & [HF 912](#) (Eken) in early March. The bill provides a weight restriction exemption for cargo tank vehicles during spring road weight restrictions, and even though an amendment limited the times of day in which the cargo tanks would be exempt from the spring road weight restrictions, county stakeholders objected to adding another weight limit exemption due to the stress it would add to county roads in Greater MN. While the Senate file passed the Transportation committee and was sent to the Finance committee, the House companion file was tabled by the House Transportation Policy Division when Chair Hornstein expressed his intent to leave the issue until the 2010 session. It is therefore expected that both the House and Senate will do a comprehensive review of all weight limit exemptions—including for propane haulers—in 2010, and counties will surely want to be actively engaged in the discussion.

Ongoing bills

Statewide Design-Build Pilot Program

The House and Senate heard [SF 1300](#) (Lynch) and [SF 1547](#) (Hortman) in mid-March. The bill creates a three-year pilot program that would allow for up to ten counties to utilize the design-build procurement method for a selected transportation project. Fiscal notes were requested by Transportation committee chairs in both the House and Senate thereby causing the bill to miss the first policy deadline in both chambers. However, both the Senate and House are expected to add the design-build pilot program to their transportation omnibus bills in the next week, thereby allowing the pilot program to continue along the path to becoming law in 2009. **AMC will continue to monitor the situation and provide updates once the pilot program is officially added to the House and Senate omnibus bills.**

Solving the Met Council Transit Deficit

The Met Council faces an estimated \$62 million operating deficit during the 2010-11 biennium, and the Council and legislature have begun crafting proposals to address the issue. The Council proposed solving the operating deficit through a variety of actions including money shifts from capital to operating accounts, possible fare increases, a drawdown of budget reserves, the use of federal stimulus funds, and reductions in funding for suburban transit systems. The House and Senate, weary of further service cuts in suburban areas, additional fare increases and unsustainable solutions, are each crafting counterproposals. The Senate omnibus transportation finance bill proposes a permanent elimination of the low income gas tax rebate and subsequent transfer to the Met Council operating account that would cover approximately \$57 million over the 2010-2011 biennium. This would not only provide funding to account for a large majority of the operating shortfall, it would also offer a structural funding solution that will carry past 2011. While the House proposal will not be unveiled until next week, all indications point to an attempt at shifting constitutionally dedicated funds within the Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST) account away from trunk highway construction to cover the Council's operating deficit. To address the decrease in funding available for road construction projects, the House would then provide MnDOT with additional bonding authority. In comparison with the Senate proposal, the House plan would not provide a structural fix and requires a shift in constitutionally dedicated revenues. **AMC members will therefore be asked in the coming weeks to contact their legislators and voice support for the Senate plan to repeal the low income gas tax refund as it is the only structural solution to the operating deficit problem.**

Small business construction mitigation efforts

The House and Senate recently heard [HF 2006](#) (Champion) and [SF 1513](#) (Torres Ray), a bill that requires road

authorities to designate a business liaison that would work with affected small businesses to mitigate construction impacts from projects planned to last at least one month. The bill requires funds to come from federal (first priority) or state general fund (second priority) sources, but there is a question of what entity would be required to fund the program if federal or state general fund sources are not available. The proposal arose in response to a MnDOT stakeholder task force that examined the effects of construction on small businesses, but task force members (which included county representatives) did not conclude that mandating road authorities to conduct a small business mitigation program was the appropriate course of action. **AMC members will therefore be asked to engage their legislators in the coming weeks to address this funding concern and ensure that any small business construction mitigation program would not add an additional mandate to counties and/or reduce the funds available for local transportation construction projects.**

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Ryan O'Connor, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

Energy

Ongoing Bills

Directing Energy Stimulus Funds

The House and Senate Energy Finance Committees both recently sent bills to their respective full finance committees that would direct the use of incoming federal energy stimulus funds. [HF 680](#) (Kalin) and [SF 657](#) (Anderson) both require the MN Department of Commerce's Office of Energy Security (OES) to be the primary recipient—and subsequent allocator—of energy stimulus funds. Under the House proposal, counties would be eligible for approximately \$6.3 million in state-managed competitive grants under the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) program. These funds must be used in conjunction with the state's Public Building Enhanced Energy Efficiency Program (PBEEP). Additionally, counties and school districts would be eligible to receive approximately \$22.5 million in total through State Energy Program funds for public building retrofits. The Senate version of the bill provides the same sources of available funding to counties from OES, but the amounts available are reduced due to the inclusion of earmarked projects. In the Senate bill, counties that did not receive a direct EECBG appropriation would be eligible to compete for \$6.3 million in state-managed competitive EECBG funds. Those funds would again have to be used in conjunction with PBEEP. However, counties and school districts would only be eligible to receive approximately \$13 million total for public building retrofits and wind projects. **AMC members will therefore be asked to engage their legislators in the weeks ahead and advocate for the earmark-free House funding that would create a higher number of energy funding opportunities for counties.**

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Ryan O'Connor, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

Ag

Ongoing Bills

Changes to the Noxious weed Law

The House and Senate both included revisions to the Noxious Weed Law in their Agricultural omnibus bills. The language contained within the two bills is virtually identical and will create additional flexibility for counties in the control of noxious weeds. Under current law, all counties are required to appoint a noxious weed inspector that shall carry out a long list of duties associated with the education, outreach and enforcement of noxious weeds. Under the compromise language contained within the bills, counties will now have an option of appointing either a 'county designated employee' or 'county agricultural inspector'. Under either scenario, the county is required to provide a point of contact within the county to address noxious weed compliance issues if the township/municipal weed inspectors are unable to garner compliance from an offender (this only occurs in rare instances). The county designated employee or agricultural inspector would then have the option of working with the MN Department of Agriculture to provide enforcement assistance to the township/municipal inspector. For counties that wish to provide more than a point of contact for the limited number of noxious weed enforcement issues that arise, a county board may appoint a county agricultural inspector to also perform outreach and education to the extent that the board deems appropriate. Any duties that go beyond enforcement of the county agricultural inspector would need to be recorded during a county board meeting. In summary, the benefits of the modified noxious weed law language

are as follows:

- 1) Added transparency. If a county board names a designated county employee for noxious weed issues, it sends a signal to residents that it only wants to be involved in enforcing the few noxious weed issues that require the county's legal institutions to get involved. All other weed issues will be dealt with at the township/municipal level. However, county boards that appoint a county agricultural inspector signal to residents that the county thinks that the issue is a priority and will therefore be involved in the enforcement provisions AS WELL AS whatever outreach and education duties associated with noxious weeds the county board deems appropriate.
- 2) Removal of a mandated county agricultural inspector position. Counties no longer must employ a county agricultural inspector unless the board believes it is a worthwhile position to have within the county. Naming an existing county employee as the designee therefore provides additional flexibility.
- 3) Increased accountability. Under the new language, counties, townships, cities and the MN Department of Agriculture all must play a role in administering the section of the noxious weed law that is appropriate for their governance structure. Townships and municipalities must hire inspectors to perform the day-to-day noxious weed education, outreach and the first line of enforcement, counties must support the townships and municipalities when rare enforcement issues do arise, and the state must provide materials to local weed inspectors to ensure that education associated with noxious weeds occurs throughout the state. Of course, all entities also have the option of providing additional noxious weed services should they so choose.

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Ryan O'Connor, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

Public Safety

On Tuesday of this week the House released its Omnibus Public Safety Finance Bill (HF 1657). This bill includes cuts to the judiciary, the Department of Public Safety (DPS), and the Department of Corrections (DOC). The bulk of the county pass-through dollars are in the DOC budget and the House proposal is a cut of roughly 1%. However, the bill does include a full repeal of the Short Term Offender (STO) program and a phased take back of all STOs by the end of calendar year 2009 (during the first six months of the State's FY 2010). This is a significant positive development, in that the governor and the House now agree that ending the STO program is the best course of action. With regard to the courts, there are still significant recommended cuts, but they are substantially less than those proposed by the governor. The cuts are partially mitigated by a substantial increase in court fees.

We expect action on the Senate's budget proposal on Wednesday of next week. Given the way the Senate has set targets, we do not expect their budget proposal to be as favorable to counties as the House or governor, but during their hearings thus far the committee has shown an understanding of what the impact of their cuts will be. The Senate has also expressed a desire to end the STO program, but it is not clear if their tougher budget target will allow them to include it in their proposal. Now would be an excellent time to reinforce with your Senators that the STO issue is a major problem for counties from both a budgetary and policy perspective.

The policy committees in both the House and the Senate have wrapped up their omnibus public safety policy bills (HF 1301/SF 993). Both bills contain a large number of provisions, though relatively few have a significant positive or negative impact on counties.

For more information regarding any of the above topics, please contact: [Ryan Erdmann, AMC Policy Analyst](#)

*ADMINISTRATORS /AUDITORS: Please share a hard copy of all AMC UPDATE emails with any county board members who do not have email.

**If you do not wish to receive these emails in the future, please reply to this message with the word 'REMOVE' in the subject line.

ITEM # Discussion 2

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

* Required Fields



*Person Responsible for Request Klein, Trish	*Department Coordinator	*Board Meeting Date Apr 14 2009
--	-----------------------------------	---

***Subject Title (As it will appear on the agenda):**
2010 Budget Planning

***Background (Provide sufficient detail of the subject):**
Attached you will find the 2010 estimated wage/benefit budgets by department based on the previously approved contract negotiations that included a 3.5% COLA increase. The budget amounts also include all scheduled step increases and other benefit and payroll costs. Note that the 2009 budgeted amount for Human Services (Welfare) did not include the two new positions that were added to be able to capture services and revenue. Also note that the 2010 highway wage/benefits budgets do not include any seasonal overtime wages.

***Financial Consideration:**

***Legal Consideration:**

***Other Consideration:**

***Resolution (Wording should reflect the intent of the Board vote):**

Coordinator's Office Use (Do Not Write Below)

Date Received:	Comments:
-----------------------	------------------

Board Action:

Comm.	Motion (First)	Motion (Second)	Vote			Vote Result	
			Yes	No	Abstain		
Swanson						Passed	
Johnston							
Foldesi						Failed	
Rasmussen							
Walker						Tabled	

ATTEST: Teresa Klein, Board Clerk

			2010	2009	DIFFERENCE
Commissioners	1	5	239,617.91	228,542.00	11,075.91
Auditor	1	41	321,200.52	309,664.00	11,536.52
Treasurer	1	53	145,688.04	139,893.00	5,795.04
Assessor	1	55	264,196.73	256,357.26	7,839.48
IT	1	63	116,105.74	103,372.03	12,733.71
Attorney	1	91	340,204.73	317,273.00	22,931.73
Victim Services	1	93	64,018.61	60,722.22	3,296.39
Recorder	1	101	169,413.72	163,768.00	5,645.72
Vets Officer	1	121	46,996.87	45,309.76	1,687.12
Lenny	1	191	57,657.49	55,887.44	1,770.05
Sheriff	1	201	1,023,639.08	1,006,421.18	17,217.91
Bailiff	1	203	25,608.00	25,608.00	
Jail	1	204	628,242.40	590,042.47	38,199.93
Cops Grant	1	213	51,485.92	53,875.42	-2,389.50
Emergency Management	1	281	64,332.02	57,541.06	6,790.96
Extension	1	603	13,295.65	12,818.02	477.62
Highway-Maint	2	310	1,122,460.09	1,088,578.91	33,881.18
Highway-Construction	2	320	306,080.12	296,708.63	9,371.49
Highway-Adm	2	330	387,733.15	374,788.68	12,944.48
Highway-Equipment	2	340	129,833.06	125,597.48	4,235.57
Welfare	11	850	1,799,931.02	1,608,045.79	191,885.23
Environmental	25	609	25,520.72	24,694.29	826.43
Transfer Station	25	870	238,585.26	230,435.83	8,149.42
Kamar	25	871	210,184.43	203,409.92	6,774.52
REVENUE	1		3,571,703.45	3,427,094.85	144,608.59
HIGHWAY	2		1,946,106.42	1,885,673.70	60,432.72
WELFARE	11		1,799,931.02	1,608,045.79	191,885.23
ENVIRONMENTAL	25		474,290.41	458,540.04	15,750.37
			7,792,031.30	7,379,354.39	412,676.91
Note					
The 2010 figures include the negotiated 3.5 % cola increase and scheduled step increases. The 2010					
figures include the following: salaries, pera, fica ,medicare and health insurance premium.					
I used the 2009 premiums for health insurance costs in the 2010 figures.					
The 2010 figures for the Highway department don't include any overtime hours while the 2009					
amounts do.					
The 2009 amount for the Welfare Department doesn't include the 2 new positions that were					
opened in 2009					
Prepared by John Huss			4/9/09		