A G E N D A

COOK COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

REGULAR MEETING COURT HOUSE, GRAND MARAIS, MN AUGUST 16, 2016

Please note that all times are estimated and changes of times could occur during the meeting.

8:30 a.m.		HUMAN SERVICES BOARD MEETING
10:30 a.m.		B R E A K
10:45 a.m.	1.	Call meeting to order Pledge of Allegiance Make adjustment to agenda
	2.	PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: Opportunity for citizens to appear before the County Board.
	3.	Consent Agenda items: Action as a whole. A. Claims B. 2016 PC Replacements
11:00 a.m.	4.	Rena Rogers, IS & Communication Director A. Tower Facilities Requests Policy. Information
11:20 a.m.	5.	Tim Nelson, Planning & Zoning Director A. Rename Planning & Zoning to Land Services. Action B. Out of State Travel Request for David Demmer. Action
11:40 a.m.	6.	Jeff Cadwell, Administrator A. One Watershed One Plan Comment Period. Action B. Resolution Opposing Moose Listing. Action
12:00 p.m.	7.	Employee Concerns Commissioner Concerns A. Commissioner Reports B. Meetings to note C. Meeting updates D. WTIP interview on 8/17/2016: Commissioner Storlie
12:15 p.m.	8.	Correspondence – Memos: A. Minnesota Housing Agenda. Information. B. Memo from Braidy Powers, Auditor-Treasurer. Information.

A D J O U R N

e-mail form

3.B.

Cook County
Request for Time
Before the Board of Commissioners

1.	a. Topic or Issue: (As should be listed on agenda) 2016 PC Replacements	b. Requested Date: 8/16/16	c. Amount of time with Board Consent Agenda ☑
2.	a. Person requesting/presenting Rena Rogers	b. Phone: 387-3662	c. Email: rena.rogers@co.cook.mn.us
3.	a. Departments affected: All	b.Department Head:	c. Dept been contacted?
4.	a. Has the Board addressed this before? No	b. If so, When?	c. What was the result?
5.	Are there other individuals or departments that will be affected by this matter and if so, who? Have they been notified? No		
6.	**BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**(detail what you seek from the board, including motion/vote): Request approval to spend $17,300 to replace 15 computer workstations. Cost per workstation is attached.		
7.	BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION (please be clear and concise; this information will be communicated to the public; and please attach ANY relevant supporting documentation you wish the Board to consider). Follows the regular replacement schedule for individual computer workstations. Pricing varies based on work requirements.		
8.	How will this request affect the County Budget? N/A		
9.	Have funds been budgeted/allocated for this request? Yes		
10.	If funds have been budget or allocated, please give details (i.e., levy, grants,general fund, department budget, or some combination; fully budgeted or partially budgeted; etc.): 01-060-6600 - Capital		

COUNTY STAFF INFORMATION

Meeting Date Set:	Agenda Item Number:
Auditor-Treasurer Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	County Attorney Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐

USER	COST	in stock
Dispatch 1	$	1,500.00
Dispatch 2	$	1,500.00
Arands, Nanette	$	800.00
Demmer, David	$	800.00
Espe, Rachel	$	800.00
Assessor	$	800.00
Smith, Todd	$	800.00
Sandstrom, Will	$	1,200.00
Assistant Engineer	$	1,600.00
Cooper, Neal	$	1,600.00
Judy Sivertson	$	900.00
PHHS USERS		
Jennifer Rue	$	1,400.00
Hadley, Sara	$	1,400.00
Wright, Lynn	$	1,400.00
Kimball, Janean	$	800.00
	$	**17,300.00**

e-mail form

4.A.

Cook County
Request for Time
Before the Board of Commissioners

1.	a. Topic or Issue: (As should be listed on agenda) Tower Facilities Requests Policy	b. Requested Date: 08/16/16	c. Amount of time with Board 20 minutes	Consent Agenda ☐
2.	a. Person requesting/presenting Rena Rogers/Rowan Watkins	b. Phone: 387-3662	c. Email: rena.rogers@co.cook.mn.us	
3.	a. Departments affected: MIS, Sheriff	b.Department Head: Pat Eliasen	c. Dept been contacted? yes	
4.	a. Has the Board addressed this before? no	b. If so, When?	c. What was the result?	
5.	Are there other individuals or departments that will be affected by this matter and if so, who? Have they been notified? no			
6.	**BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**(detail what you seek from the board, including motion/vote): Feedback on Radio/Communication Program Vision, Draft Tower Facilities Requests policy, and Tower Facilities Request Form (to manage initial inquiries related to County Tower infrastructure).			
7.	BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION (please be clear and concise; this information will be communicated to the public; and please attach ANY relevant supporting documentation you wish the Board to consider). Several months ago the County Board directed the County Administrator to set up a working group to develop a policy to manage Radio Tower Requests. That working group includes: Commissioner Moe, County Attorney Hicken, Administrator Jeff Cadwell, MIS Director Rena Rogers, and Radio Communication Analyst Rowan Watkins. This group has been meeting since early June and has developed a draft version of The Tower Facilities Request Policy. Also included is a first draft of a form to be used when an individual or entity is requesting to install equipment on towers or in an equipment shelter. Additionally a draft of a Vision for Tower Management that provides context for the policy is enclosed. The purpose of this request is to solicit input from the board. This input includes both specific comments or input about the general direction of this program.			
8.	How will this request affect the County Budget? N/A			
9.	Have funds been budgeted/allocated for this request? N/A			
10.	If funds have been budget or allocated, please give details (i.e., levy, grants,general fund, department budget, or some combination; fully budgeted or partially budgeted; etc.): N/A			

COUNTY STAFF INFORMATION

Meeting Date Set:	Agenda Item Number:
Auditor-Treasurer Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	County Attorney Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐

TOWER FACILITIES REQUESTS POLICY

PURPOSE. While towers allow for access to valuable services, they have negative aesthetic impacts. For this reason, the County prefers to use existing towers for services over building new facilities to limit the negative aesthetic impacts. Existing tower space is limited, so it must be efficiently used and in many cases must be reserved for the uses that best serve the public. The County must therefore prioritize certain services over others. The County discourages redundant services.

SCOPE. The scope of this policy includes towers we have an interest in by virtue of:

1. Those towers the County owns (the structure),
2. Those towers for which the County has a property interest in the land,
3. Those towers upon which County-owned equipment is placed, and
4. Tower facilities the County has supports or is being asked to support, financially or otherwise, the development of infrastructure supporting the tower.

Any towers outside this scope shall be managed exclusively by the Cook County Tower Facility Ordinance, Minnesota State Law and United States federal law.

DECISIONS GOVERNED BY THIS POLICY. Decisions related to changes or additions to communications tower-related infrastructure, tower-related development, tenancy, tower sites, tower-related structures

PRIORITY OF TOWER-RELATED SERVICES. Services towers provide, ordered by priority of support by the County:

1. Public Safety
2. Public Service (other government agencies which serve the public interest, assisting MNDOT, Hwy. Dept., PUC, etc.)
3. Public Utilities (electricity, cellular and other telephone, internet services)
4. Local Media
5. Commercial purposes
6. Other private parties and individuals.

Processing tower-related requests uses County resources such as staff time. Cook County has an interest in granting requests which allow for the administrative costs of the request to be recouped over time. For these reasons, the County reserves the right to deny the following requests:

1. Requests for services of a temporary nature; and
2. Requests in which the ultimate purpose for the request is in conflict with the Cook County Tower Facility Ordinance and/or Minnesota or Federal Law.

The County reserves the right to take action contrary to this policy on behalf of individuals or entities with a pre-existing legal relationship with the County or where the proposal is in the County's best interests as a whole.

The County ultimately has the discretion to act within its authority as owner, lessor, or lessee.

TOWER FACILITIES REQUEST FORM

Applicant Contact Information
Name:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
Mailing Address:

Represented Organization Information
Brief Description of the Organization:
Name:
Phone Number:
Email Address:
Mailing Address:

Select from The Following That Best Describes the Proposed Service:

- Commercial
- Local Media
- Private/Personal Use
- Public Safety
- Public Service
- Public Utilities

User Group(s)/Service Audience:

Desired Service Area Location(s):

Desired Start Date of Proposed Service:

Select the Time Frame That Best Describes Planed Duration of Proposed Service:

- Six (6) Months or Less
- One (1) Year
- Five (5) Years
- Ten (10) Years
- Twenty-Five (25) Years or Longer

Additional Relevant Information:

Radio Communication Towers

Program Vision

Management of communications systems, infrastructure, and equipment with emphasis on maintaining the balance between services, impacts, and costs. This vision will be realized by a program that:

- Continuously works to meet and prioritize the communication needs of the public safety community in Cook County
- Incorporates a level of consideration to visual impact that reflects the community's uniqueness and priorities in all decision making
- Continuously works to minimizes program costs by maximizing the earning potential of county owned infrastructure
- Maintains a level of flexibility that allows for the ongoing incorporation of current and competing technologies
- Facilitates the addition of services that provide benefits to the public

e-mail form

5.A.

Cook County
Request for Time
Before the Board of Commissioners

1.	a. Topic or Issue: (As should be listed on agenda) Rename Planning & Zoning to Land Services	b. Requested Date: August 16, 2016	c. Amount of time with Board 10 Minutes Consent Agenda ☐
2.	a. Person requesting/presenting Timothy Nelson	b. Phone: 387-3633	c. Email: tim.nelson@co.cook.mn.us
3.	a. Departments affected: Planning and Zoning	b.Department Head: Timothy Nelson	c. Dept been contacted? Yes
4.	a. Has the Board addressed this before? Yes	b. If so, When? August 9, 2016	c. What was the result? Direction from Board to return with proposal
5.	Are there other individuals or departments that will be affected by this matter and if so, who? Have they been notified? MIS, Auditor's, Personnel		
6.	**BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**(detail what you seek from the board, including motion/vote): To formally change the name of the current Planning and Zoning Department to Land Services, including the authorization of the administrative costs to implement the name change.		
7.	BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION (please be clear and concise; this information will be communicated to the public; and please attach ANY relevant supporting documentation you wish the Board to consider). For years it has been my observation that the Planning and Zoning Department actually functions more like that of an Environmental Services Department due to the variety of services and functional areas within the department, but the issue had never risen to a level of making any formalized proposal to the Board for a change. Now with the reorganization and creation of a new Land Commissioner/Parks & Trails Director position, the opportunity has presented itself for evaluating where that position is placed and what the department would be called. With the placement of the Land Commissioner/Parks & Trails Director into the current Planning and Zoning Department, the framework of the delivery of services of the department will reflect way more of a "Land Services" model than it does Planning and Zoning or Environmental Services. As such, I am requesting the Board consider changing the name of the current Planning and Zoning Department to Land Services. The cost of making this change will not be as extensive as changes like this have been in the past, and consists primarily of changing a couple signs in the courthouse and re-printing of items such as envelopes and business cards. As cost saving measures we already print our own business cards and we keep the letterhead as a template in each computer to print with each letter instead of having them printed professionally, so it is just the envelopes that we have printed. The full cost range estimate is listed on the attachment.		
8.	How will this request affect the County Budget? The direct expenditures could range from less than $100 up to $500 depending on the method of transition.		
9.	Have funds been budgeted/allocated for this request? No		
10.	If funds have been budget or allocated, please give details (i.e., levy, grants,general fund, department budget, or some combination; fully budgeted or partially budgeted; etc.): N/A		

COUNTY STAFF INFORMATION

Meeting Date Set:	Agenda Item Number:
Auditor-Treasurer Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	County Attorney Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐

COOK COUNTY
OFFICE OF
PLANNING & ZONING

411 W. 2ND ST.
COURT HOUSE, GRAND MARAIS, MN 55604
Phone 218-387-3630 FAX 218-387-3042

TIMOTHY NELSON
Planning Director
Solid Waste Officer

Bill Lane
Planning & Zoning
Administrator

MEMORANDUM

To: Cook County Commissioners

From: Timothy J. Nelson

Date: 8/11/2016

Subject: Costs Associated with Department Name Change

In review of the potential actions that would need to be taken should the Board determine to change the Planning and Zoning Department name to become a Land Services Department, it appears that most of the expense would actually be tied up in staff time to make the changes on the website and other areas where the Planning & Zoning name is referenced. The staff time for changes would be primarily in the Planning & Zoning and MIS Departments, but would also include some time from Personnel and the Auditors office. I would expect that we would simply run through our existing supply of envelopes, which are the only logistical items that we have professionally printed, and we print our own letterhead and business cards. As such, the direct transition costs would be somewhat minimal as listed below, and the biggest difference would be if we wanted to purchase all new envelopes, which would increase the cost by $300, otherwise the direct expenditures (not including staff time) would be as follows:

Transition Actions Direct Expenditures:

Physical signage changes at department door and front foyer	$130.90
Letterhead, Envelopes and other physical document changes *(Continue through existing stock and reorder new when needed)*	$0.00
Update Business Card	$20.00
Total	$150.90

e-mail form

5. B.

Cook County
Request for Time
Before the Board of Commissioners

1.	a. Topic or Issue: (As should be listed on agenda) Out of State Travel Request for David Demmer	b. Requested Date: August 16, 2016	c. Amount of time with Board 10 Minutes Consent Agenda ☐
2.	a. Person requesting/presenting Timothy Nelson	b. Phone: 387-3633	c. Email: tim.nelson@co.cook.mn.us
3.	a. Departments affected: Planning and Zoning	b.Department Head: Timothy Nelson	c. Dept been contacted? Yes
4.	a. Has the Board addressed this before? No	b. If so, When?	c. What was the result?
5.	Are there other individuals or departments that will be affected by this matter and if so, who? Have they been notified?		
6.	**BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**(detail what you seek from the board, including motion/vote): To Authorize out of state travel on County time for David Demmer to attend the 2016 Project for Public Spaces conference in Vancouver, BC called "Pro Walk/Pro Bike/Pro Place, which is scheduled for September 12 - 15, 2016.		
7.	BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION (please be clear and concise; this information will be communicated to the public; and please attach ANY relevant supporting documentation you wish the Board to consider). As you can see by the attached email, an invitation was extended to Mr. Demmer to attend the conference through the Active Living/Moving Matters groups, and the costs of the trip to include airfare, hotel, mileage, meals and conference registration would be covered through the BCBS-Center for Prevention/Moving Matters funding. The only cost that would be absorbed by the County would be David's wages. I fully support this travel request for Mr. Demmer as I believe the information that he would be learning at the conference would directly benefit Cook County in furthering the Cook County Land Use and Comprehensive Trails Plans. I will ensure that Mr. Demmer provides a presentation or a report on the conference to the Board of Commissioners upon his return.		
8.	How will this request affect the County Budget? This request will have no impact on the County Budget.		
9.	Have funds been budgeted/allocated for this request? N/A		
10.	If funds have been budget or allocated, please give details (i.e., levy, grants,general fund, department budget, or some combination; fully budgeted or partially budgeted; etc.): N/A		

COUNTY STAFF INFORMATION

Meeting Date Set:	Agenda Item Number:
Auditor-Treasurer Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	County Attorney Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐

Tim Nelson

From: Kristin DeArruda Wharton <kristin@sawtoothmountainclinic.org>
Sent: Monday, August 8, 2016 10:23 AM
To: Tim Nelson
Cc: David Demmer; Maren Webb; 'Hartley Acero'; Eric Weiss
Subject: RE: Project for Public Spaces Conference

Good morning, Tim.

I'd like to officially extend an invitation to David to attend the October 2016 Project for Public Spaces conference, called Pro Walk/Pro Bike/Pro Place. The conference will be held in Vancouver, BC. We are authorized to cover David's airfare, hotel, mileage, meals, and conference registration through our BCBS-Center for Prevention/ Moving Matters funding. We can reimburse for expenses that David incurs in these areas, or pay directly for those that we are able (ex. registration.) David would be attending the conference representing our community with the expectation that he'd attend a meeting of the Active Living Steering Committee and our Moving Matters staff to share his take aways after the conference.

http://walkbikeplaces.org/?mc_cid=3667216f39&mc_eid=147e6dfac6

This is reputed to be a great conference. I regret that I can't attend! We'd love it if David can stand in. And we do have funds for one other local community member on behalf of our project, if you or anyone else from the County is interested!

Registration is open, so as soon as things are a go on your end, we can start making arrangements.

Thanks, Tim and David.

Kristin

Kristin DeArruda Wharton, RN, PHN, IBCLC
Coordinator, Moving Matters
Coordinator, Statewide Health Improvement Program (SHIP)
WIC Program, Breastfeeding Support, Childbirth Education

Sawtooth Mountain Clinic, Inc.
Kristin@sawtoothmountainclinic.org
218-387-2330, ext. 150
www.becausemovingmatters.org
www.facebook.com/becausemovingmatters
www.sawtoothmountainclinic.org

e-mail form

6.A.

Cook County
Request for Time
Before the Board of Commissioners

1.	a. Topic or Issue: (As should be listed on agenda) One Watershed One Plan Comment Period	b. Requested Date: 8/16/2016	c. Amount of time with Board 10	Consent Agenda ☐
2.	a. Person requesting/presenting Jeff Cadwell	b. Phone: 387-3687	c. Email: jeff.cadwell@co.cook.mn.us	
3.	a. Departments affected: Commissioners	b.Department Head:	c. Dept been contacted?	
4.	a. Has the Board addressed this before? yes	b. If so, When?	c. What was the result?	
5.	Are there other individuals or departments that will be affected by this matter and if so, who? Have they been notified?			
6.	**BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**(detail what you seek from the board, including motion/vote): Recommend that the board support the summary comments regarding One Watershed One Plan as outlined in the attached letter.			
7.	BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION (please be clear and concise; this information will be communicated to the public; and please attach ANY relevant supporting documentation you wish the Board to consider).			
8.	How will this request affect the County Budget?			
9.	Have funds been budgeted/allocated for this request?			
10.	If funds have been budget or allocated, please give details (i.e., levy, grants,general fund, department budget, or some combination; fully budgeted or partially budgeted; etc.):			

COUNTY STAFF INFORMATION

Meeting Date Set:	Agenda Item Number:
Auditor-Treasurer Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	County Attorney Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐

August 12, 2016

Ms. Ilena Berg
District Manager/Water Plan Coordinator
Cook County SWCD
411 West 2nd Street
Grand Marais, MN 55604

RE: **Lake Superior North One Watershed, One Plan**

When entering this opportunity to partnership with Lake County as one of 5 pilot programs in the State of Minnesota, September 22, 2014, participates identified both their hoped for outcomes, related to this process, and their concerns in coming together as counties in the One Watershed, One Plan Pilot Program.

Among some of these hoped for outcomes were:

- Expanded awareness of the Lake Superior North Watershed beyond county borders.
- Better informed decisions, when implementing practices related to watershed management that will help to ensure the quality of the watershed.
- The ability to link resources; building positive, beneficial, cross-jurisdictional relationships.

We have come to understand the One Watershed, One Plan is not an effort to change local governance. One Watershed, One Plan is intended to utilize the existing structures of counties and soil and water conservation districts by increasing collaboration and cooperation across political boundaries.

The relationship between Lake and Cook County continues to be a good one. There is mutual respect and trust, given our history of working together on various levels. This has enabled open discussion and contributed to efficiencies in process. Trust between jurisdictional units is a decided factor in maintaining a healthy process.

Participants have consistently demonstrated their commitment to inform the content of the document.

The Water Plan Coordinators from each County, have done an excellent job mining out the information that defines the Plan; maintaining momentum; ensuring a welcoming, inclusive and professional environment for meetings; communicating and providing timely followup.

It is, therefore, with high regard that we, the Cook County Board of Commissioners, recognize the tremendous benefit this cooperative, deliberative process has provided in putting together the Lake Superior North Watershed One Watershed, One Plan document that will be invaluable in informing decision-makers in the area of watershed stewardship.

On behalf of the Cook County Board of Commissioners,

Heidi Doo-Kirk
Chair, Cook County Board of Commissioners
Board of Commissioners • Cook County Court House • 411 West 2nd Street, Grand Marais, MN 55604

e-mail form

6.B.

Cook County
Request for Time
Before the Board of Commissioners

1.	a. Topic or Issue: (As should be listed on agenda) Resolution Opposing Moose Listing	b. Requested Date: 8/16/2016	c. Amount of time with Board 10	Consent Agenda ☐
2.	a. Person requesting/presenting Jeff Cadwell	b. Phone: 218-387-3687	c. Email: jeff.cadwell@co.cook.mn.us	
3.	a. Departments affected: Commissioners	b.Department Head:	c. Dept been contacted?	
4.	a. Has the Board addressed this before? yes	b. If so, When? July 26, 2016	c. What was the result?	
5.	Are there other individuals or departments that will be affected by this matter and if so, who? Have they been notified?			
6.	**BOARD ACTION REQUESTED**(detail what you seek from the board, including motion/vote): See the attached Resolution submitted for consideration by Commissioners Moe and Gamble			
7.	BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION (please be clear and concise; this information will be communicated to the public; and please attach ANY relevant supporting documentation you wish the Board to consider). Documentation is attached			
8.	How will this request affect the County Budget?			
9.	Have funds been budgeted/allocated for this request?			
10.	If funds have been budget or allocated, please give details (i.e., levy, grants,general fund, department budget, or some combination; fully budgeted or partially budgeted; etc.):			

COUNTY STAFF INFORMATION

Meeting Date Set:	Agenda Item Number:
Auditor-Treasurer Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐	County Attorney Contacted: YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A ☐

Cook County, Minnesota
Board of Commissioners

Resolution–2016-

Resolution Opposing the Petition to List the U.S. Population of Northwestern Moose (Alces Alces Andersoni) under the Endangered Species Act

August 16, 2016

WHEREAS, we recognize the moose is an emblematic animal that has been woven into the longstanding social, economic, and cultural fabric of Cook County; and

WHEREAS, listing the moose as endangered or threatened may preclude the very activities, forest harvest management and controlled burning, that create the primary moose habitat; and

WHEREAS, on September 30,1854, the Grand Portage Nation entered into a treaty with the United States government establishing existing boundaries for the Grand Portage Nation, along with jurisdiction of tribal hunting and fishing rights within reservation boundaries; and

WHEREAS, one of the terms of a February 1988 out-of-court settlement, in response to a civil action filed in U.S. District Court in 1985 by the Grand Portage Band claiming the State of Minnesota had no jurisdiction over Band members exercising their treaty reserved rights to hunt and fish in lands ceded under the 1854 Treaty, marked the first time the Bands had any real say in how management of moose outside of reservation boundaries was to be handled; and

WHEREAS, with the development of the 1854 Authority's Biological Services Division in 1994, a new era of cooperation began as both funding and Tribal staff contributed to the annual moose survey with the stipulation that there be actual involvement of the Bands in the process; increasing levels of trust on both sides. The involvement of all parties in monitoring and managing the moose resource has led to a good working relationship; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Portage Nation has been a leader in researching the moose population and has shown that minimal tribal subsistence harvest of moose is not detrimental to the moose population; and

WHEREAS, listing the moose as endangered or threatened would affect the Grand Portage Nation's treaty rights to harvest moose for subsistence purposes; and

WHEREAS, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is determining whether or not to list the moose as an endangered or threatened species based on its analysis of research findings related to: habitat, disease, predation, hunting pressure, fluctuations in weather and other factors; and

WHEREAS, the Cook County Board of Commissioners is the duly elected governing body authorized to speak on behalf of Cook County;

NOW,THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Cook County Board of Commissioners respectfully requests the United States Fish and Wildlife Service not list the moose on either the threatened or endangered species list; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Cook County Board of Commissioners support the Grand Portage Nation's right to research the moose population and to take moose for subsistence purposes.

Adopted and Approved by the Cook County Board of Commissioners, August 16, 2016.

_____
Heidi Doo-Kirk
Chair, Cook County Board of Commissioners

_____
Braidy Powers
Cook County Auditor-Treasurer

This Resolution was moved by Commissioner _____,

seconded by Commissioner _____ and approved upon the following vote:

Ayes: _____Nays: _____ Date _____

Additional supporting comments for Northwestern Minnesota Moose Listing:

1. The Minnesota Division of Enforcement, Minnesota Division of Fish and Wildlife, Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, and the 1854 Treaty Authority, which includes the Grand Portage Nation, have partnered since 1995 to conduct aerial surveys on 436 total survey plots that cover the full extent of the moose range in northeastern Minnesota (almost 4 million acres) in an effort to:

1) best determine and understand the population's long-term trend (decreasing, stable, or increasing) and composition.
2) set the harvest quota for the subsequent hunting season (when applicable).
3) improve our understanding of moose ecology
4) otherwise contribute to sound future management strategies.

2. The primary strengths of this aerial moose survey partnership are the consistency and standardization of the methods since 2005 and the long-term affiliation of the survey team's personnel, survey biometrician, and GIS specialists.

3. The 2016 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources Moose Population Survey,which included 52 sample plots, reflected a notable difference in the 2015 survey with an increase of 29% in the number of moose counted; and while the year-to-year statistical comparisons of population estimates reflect short-term trends, the data is best suited in establishing long-term trends.

4. While the current population estimate is 55% less than the estimate in 2006 and the declining linear trend during the past decade is still significant, there appears to be a leveling since 2012; and the trend from 2012 to 2016 indicates the moose population is not declining. In fact, the January 2016 calf:cow ratio is 24% higher than the 11-year average since 2005 with 2016 reflecting the third highest ratio since 2005. Overall, survey results indicate calf survival to January 2016 is higher than in most years since the population decline began following the 2006 survey.

5. A 2013 Minnesota Forestry research publication concluded changes in forest habitat in northeastern Minnesota suggest reduced acreage in recently disturbed and young forest as a contributing factor in moose population decline, noting that new growth in young and regenerating forests is an important summer food source contributing to the success of moose over the winter months when available food sources are typically insufficient to maintain body mass.

6. Research findings indicate Minnesota's northeast moose habitat zone has lost 18.8% of its young growth forests (0-10 years) since 2005. Similarly, disturbed acres (forest fires, blowdown

areas) have declined 65% from a 2003 high of 352,299 acres. These numbers reflect the long-term statewide trend toward aging forests.

7. It is logical to conclude additional disturbance on the landscape would benefit the moose population. This includes increasing management of the forest age class distribution to foster more young forest and including the creation of food resources through planned disturbance. Additionally, examination of how moose use recently burned, harvested, or otherwise disturbed areas may help to establish the nature of the relationship between habitat and moose population.

8. While there is no evidence habitat alone limits the moose population in Minnesota, given the substantial loss in total area of summer feeding habitat between 2003 and 2011, it is possible that Minnesota's Moose population is experiencing pressure due to food resource limitations. Clearly, this type of reduction in available food resource will reduce the carrying capacity of a population. Hence, the situation we are observing with respect to loss of summer feeding habitat might be expected to result in a population decline. A precipitous reduction in food resources would likely exacerbate problems of disease, parasite, inclement weather, and other stressors.

8.A.

Minnesota Housing Finance Agency

GREATER MINNESOTA HOUSING FUND

USDA

September 19, 2016
Housing & Community Dialogue Agenda

Time	Session
10:00-10:05 a.m.	**Welcome**
10:05-10:35 a.m.	**Housing Trends and Q&A**
10:35-11:00 a.m.	**Introductions**
11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.	**Local Perspectives on Housing Needs and Q&A** (typically 4-5 people working in the community talking about the work that they are doing, the challenges and opportunities, what is working locally, and what they need in order to be successful – in the past this has included folks from social service agencies, lenders, realtors, major employers, developers, tribal entities, school districts, economic development entities, health care facilities, mayors, county commissioners, builders, advocates, and renters)
12:00-12:30 p.m.	**Lunch**
12:30-1:00 p.m.	**Agency Overviews and Q&A**
1:00-2:15 p.m.	**Breakout Session 1** (to be defined by community partners)
	Breakout Session 2
2:15-2:45 p.m.	**Next Steps**

8.B.

MEMO

TO: Cook County Board of Commissioners

FROM: Braidy Powers, Auditor-Treasurer

DATE: July 22, 2016

RE: State-in-Lieu Payment

Cook County received $370,008.48 for the State-in-lieu payment for 2016. We received $370,049.28 in 2015.

Other Natural Resources Lands 130,755.1 Acres @ 1.50 =	$196,132.65
Acquired Acres: 9,322.92 Acres @ 5.133 = $ 47,854.55 OR Appraised Value of Acquired Acres @ .75% =	163,421.10
County Administered Other Natural Resources 4,232.22 Acres @ 1.50 1.	6,348.33
Total Received	**$ 370,049.28**

Distribution of Funds M.S 477A:

Subd. 3 or 477A.17 (17, 22, 23): Wildlife Mgmt	$ 4,106.40
Subd. 1 & 2	$365,902.08
1. 40% Subd. 1 & 2 for levy reduction **01-822-5950**	$146,360.83
2. County Admin Other 4259.42 Acres @ .642/acre Resource Development Fund **01-523-5950**	2,717.09
3. 10% Subd. 1 & 2 for Town/Unorganized Apportionment: Towns 10%	6,530.69
Unorganized: county levy reduction **01-822-5950**	30,059.52
4.Remaining to General Fund levy reduction General Fund for any purpose **01-523-5950**	35,000.00
Excess of 35,000 for Levy Reduction **01-822-5950**	145,233.95
Total Subd. 1 & 2	$365,902.08

(Total Used for Levy Reduction $321,654.30 Resource Development $37,717.09)