

**SAUK CENTRE CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2015 – 6:30 P.M.**

AGENDA

1. Call to Order/Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
 - a. October 21, 2015 Regular Meeting **(P. 1-7)**
4. Public Open Forum (Comments Limited to 3 Minutes)
5. Public Hearings
6. Reports/Presentations
 - a. Annual Citywide Insurance Renewal – Mark Mahoney, MN National Agency **(P. 8-16)**
 - b. Ambulance 3rd Quarter Report, Tim Deschene, Ambulance Assistant Director **(P. 17-19)**
 - c. Park Board Report, City Administrator **(P. 20)**
 - d. EDA Report, City Administrator **(P. 21)**
7. Action Items
 - a. Approve Insurance Renewal and Action on Excess Liability Waiver **(P. 22-23)**
 - b. Approve Amendment to Lease Agreement – CentraCare Health Systems/Sauk Centre **(P. 24-26)**
 - c. Approve 2015 TIF Pay As You Go and Abatement Payments **(P. 27)**
 - d. Approve Accountant/Payroll Specialist Step **(P. 28)**
 - e. Approve Advertisement for Arena Seasonal Staff **(P. 29)**
 - f. Approve Pay Voucher #4 – Stearns County **(P. 30-31)**
8. Unfinished Business
9. New Business
10. Consent Agenda **(P. 32-34)**
 - a. Schedule of Claims
 - b. Resolution No. 2015-81 Accepting Contribution
11. Informational Items
 - a. Safety Committee Meeting Minutes **(P. 35)**
12. Adjournment

**SAUK CENTRE CITY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2015**

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Sauk Centre City Council met in a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, October 21, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers pursuant to due notice being given thereof. Present were Council Members Keith Johnson, Heidi Leach, Diane Kelly and Mayor Warren Stone. Also present were City Administrator Vicki Willer, City Planner Sarah Morton, Public Works Director Matt Zinniel and Administrative Assistant Nicki Vogt. Mayor Stone presided thereat. Council Member Dave Thomas was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Council Member Leach and was seconded by Council Member Kelly to approve the agenda with the addition of 7h, Resolution No. 2015-80 Authorizing Execution of Grant Agreement. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Leach, Kelly, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Council Member Kelly and was seconded by Council Member Leach to approve the October 7, 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes as presented. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Kelly, Leach, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

4. PUBLIC OPEN FORUM (Comments Limited to 3 Minutes)

None.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mayor Stone opened the Public Hearing and read the Public Hearing Procedure.

a. **3.2 Off-Sale Liquor License Application – Isaac’s North Star, Inc.**

Isaac’s North Star Inc. located at 925 Sinclair Lewis Avenue has requested a 3.2 Off-Sale License at this location. Granting of this license would authorize the owner of the establishment to sell 3.2 off-sale liquor. New liquor locations within the City require that a Public Hearing be held by the City Council to hear comments regarding the proposal before the license can be granted.

A legal advertisement was published notifying the public that a Hearing is scheduled on October 21, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. or shortly thereafter. The license to be effective November 1, 2015.

The following has been received:

- City Application

- \$100.00 public hearing fee
- \$100.00 Liquor License Fee
- A Completed Background Check
- Form 9011- Certificate for a 3.2 Liquor License (State)
- Workers Compensation documents

Mayor Stone called for persons to speak in favor.

Isaac Winters, 925 Sinclair Lewis Avenue, Sauk Centre, MN 56378. Mr. Winters is asking for Council approval of his request for the following reasons:

1. Approval will generate more traffic which will increase sales.
2. To provide ease and accessibility for customers and travelers.
3. It is a high demand/profitable item.

Mayor Stone called three additional times for persons to speak in favor or opposition. None additional spoke.

See 7a.

6. REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS

- a. At the September 16, 2015 meeting the Council approved moving forward with a proposal to refund (refinance) two of the City's outstanding bonds. The bonds to be refunded are the Ash Street Bond (2008A) and the City Hall Bond (2007A)

George Eilertson of Northland Securities reviewed the Summary of Recommended Terms and Related Considerations. Eilertson also noted that the City's Rating is AA-

See 7b.

- b. Police Chief Friedrichs reported that in September there were 347 ICRs and 273 Verbal Warnings for a monthly total of 620.
- c. City Planner Morton reported on the October 13, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting as follows:
 - August and September building permit reports
 - Development of Business Registration Program
 - Fee Schedule Review, specifically regarding multiple variance requests
 - GTS Educational events
- d. The Personnel/Finance Committee (Mayor Stone and Council Member Thomas) met on Monday, October 12, 2015 to review various items on behalf of the City Council as follows:
 - Reviewed Stormwater Utility Rates. See 7e.

- Reviewed Franchise Fees including Gas and Electric. Recommend revisit the Electric Fee. See 8a.
- Reviewed Cleaning Contract and recommend update of duties and review with contractor.
- Recommend Contract with Building Official. Action to be taken at a future meeting.

7. ACTION ITEMS

- a. See 5a.

Council Member Johnson introduced Resolution No. 2015-75, Resolution Approving the Application of Isaac's North Star, Inc. for a new 3.2 Off-Sale Liquor License to be Located at 925 Sinclair Lewis Avenue. The motion was seconded by Council Member Leach. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Johnson, Leach, Kelly and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

- b. See 6a.

Council Member Johnson introduced Resolution No. 2015-76, Providing for the Issuance and Sale of \$2,230,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2015B and Levying a Tax for the Payment Thereof. The motion was seconded by Council Member Leach. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Johnson, Leach, Kelly and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

- c. At the EDA's regular meeting on October 7, 2015, they met with Heidi Pepper, of SEH on a proposal to provide grant writing assistance to the City to obtain funding for the redevelopment of the racetrack property.

The proposal by SEH is that grant writing services will be done at no fee provided that if a grant is successful and is funded that the City will enlist the services of SEH to conduct the next phase of planning/engineering for the project.

The project is envisioned to take several steps involving a variety of funding opportunities. The first is to apply for a grant to conduct a Phase I Environmental Study. This will be done in conjunction with Felling Trailers as the owner of the other half of the property.

Once the Phase I study (and potentially Phase II) the EDA would then proceed with other redevelopment grant applications. This grant writing will also be done at no cost, providing the City contract with SEH to do the planning/engineering on the project.

The City Council will be the actual entity that enters into the Agreement with SEH to provide the services if they agree.

A motion was made by Council Member Kelly and was seconded by Council Member Leach to approve an Agreement with SEH to provide grant writing/planning/engineering for the Racetrack Redevelopment Project. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council

members Kelly, Leach, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

d. See 7c.

The first grant application to be submitted for Redevelopment of the racetrack property is for a Contamination Cleanup Grant to conduct a Phase I (and possibly Phase II) Environmental Study.

This is a 75% (State)/25% (City/FellingTrailers) grant, if funded.

The application deadline is November 2, 2015.

Council Member Kelly introduced Resolution No. 2015-77, Approving the Application to Contamination Cleanup Grant Program, Committing Local Match and Authorizing Contract Signature. The motion was seconded by Council Member Leach. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Kelly, Leach, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

e. After review of the Storm Water Utility Fee and various other revenue sources the Finance Committee recommends that the City Council consider revising the fee structure.

The recommended changes are to increase the base rate by \$1.00 and the secondary rate by 25 cents.

This rate increase will result in a projected increase in revenue to be used for maintaining the storm water system by approximately \$3,100 per month. The projected date for enactment is January 1, 2016.

It was noted that this revenue would be allocated for stormwater uses only.

City Code 53.04 Rates and Charges

(D) Each developed single-family residential parcel shall pay one REU at \$4 ~~\$5~~. Each multi-family or commercially developed property shall pay a rate of \$4 ~~\$5~~ per REU for the first ten REUs and then \$4 ~~\$1.25~~ for each subsequent REU on a parcel of land. This rate may be amended from time to time by the City Council.

Council Member Kelly introduced Ordinance No. 761, An Ordinance Amending City Code Section 53.04 Stormwater Utility Rate Structure. The motion was seconded by Council Member Leach. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Kelly, Leach, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

- f. The City currently has an outstanding Hospital Revenue Bond Series 2005C, which is tied to the lease agreement with CentraCare.

Bond Counsel recently ran scenarios for refunding the bonds at a lower interest rate. Those scenarios were presented to CentraCare who has indicated they would like to pursue the refunding. Because the bonds will be issued as tax-exempt bonds and due to CentraCare's involvement in the operation of the facility, the City will need to hold a public hearing before refunding can occur.

George Eilertson noted that the approximate amount of savings, if approved, is 1.8 million dollars over the remaining term of the bonds.

Council Member Johnson introduced Resolution No. 2015-78, Resolution Calling for a Public Hearing on the Issuance of General Obligation Hospital Refunding Bonds Authorizing the Publication of a Notice of Hearing and authorization to allow staff to continue working with Northland Securities as it relates to the Hospital Refunding Bonds. The motion was seconded by Council Member Leach. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Johnson, Leach, Kelly and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

The Public Hearing is set for November 18, 2015.

- g. Removed from agenda.
- h. Earlier this year the City Council approved moving forward with the Grant Agreement with the FAA for the Environmental Assessment for future Airport Improvements. This grant is expected to pay 90 percent of the cost.

In addition, MnDot Aeronautics will pay five percent of the costs which are laid out in the Grant Agreement.

Staff is recommending that the City Council must approve the grant and authorize its execution to move forward. It was noted that the total project cost is \$89,000.

Council Member Leach introduced Resolution No. 2015-80, Authorizing Execution of Grant Agreement. The motion was seconded by Council Member Kelly. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Leach, Kelly, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- a. The Finance Committee reviewed the Gas Franchise Agreement which calls for a three percent franchise fee on retail sale of gas. At the time this rate was set it was comparable to the electric franchise fee paid to the City by the Public Utility.

The Electric Franchise is not set as a percentage, it is set as a mil rate. It is based on kilowatts sold so as the price increases per kilowatt the fee does not increase. The rate is

currently set at 2 mils (2/10th of a penny) per kilowatt. Consequently, as the rate per kilowatt increases the percent that is paid for the franchise decreases, thus creating a disparity from the Gas Franchise which is set at a flat three percent. The Committee recommends that the City work with the Public Utility to develop a percentage based system for future continuity.

<u>Cost per Kilowatt</u>	<u>Percent</u>
5 cents	4%
6.7 cents	3%
8 cents	2.5%
10 cents	2%

It was the general consent of the Council to authorize staff to proceed with development of a percentage based system for future continuity.

9. NEW BUSINESS

None.

10. CONSENT AGENDA

The Council considered the following Consent Agenda Items:

- a. Schedule of Claims - Unpaid Claims \$60,672.11
 Paid Claims \$26,915.00
 Total \$87,587.11
- b. September Checks #02742E-#02766E \$510,844.09
 #36682-#36752
 3 Payroll ACH Transfers
- c. Gambling Application for Exempt Permit request from the Sauk Centre Lions Club for a raffle on February 24, 2016 at Jitters Java Café.
- d. Resolution No. 2015-78, Resolution Accepting Contributions. The contributions were as follows:

Bolton & Menk, Inc.	\$200.00	Airport
S.C. Youth Hockey Assn	\$10,000.00	Arena

A motion was made by Council Member Leach and was seconded by Council Member Johnson to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Leach, Johnson, Kelly and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

The Council thanked Bolton & Menk, Inc. and S.C. Youth Hockey Assn for their contributions.

11. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

None.

12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Council Member Leach and was seconded by Council Member Kelly to adjourn the meeting. A vote being recorded as follows: For: Council Members Leach, Kelly, Johnson and Mayor Stone. Against: None. Absent: Council Member Thomas. The motion passed.

With no further business to come before the Council, Mayor Stone adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor Warren Stone

City Administrator Vicki Willer

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Insurance Renewal
Agenda Item: 6a

Description/Summary

Mark Mahoney of MN National Agency will be present to discuss the 2016 Insurance Renewal for the City. This renewal is for property and liability insurance.

The League of MN Cities is recommending the City allow for a possible increase of 3 to 5 percent for property insurance and 2 percent for auto physical damage while municipal and auto liability are predicted to remain constant.

In addition, Mr. Mahoney will be requesting action from the Council on whether they wish to waive the statutory tort liability limit and if it wishes to purchase excess liability coverage.

The cost to the City to waive the limit is \$945.

The cost to purchase the excess liability insurance was \$8,126 for 2015.

Waiving the limit and purchasing excess liability insurance increases the City's coverage to \$3,000,000 per incident in event of a claim.

Absent the waiver and extra coverage, the limit for tort liability purposes is \$500,000 for a single claimant and \$1,500,000 per incident. (See attached chart).

Action Requested:

Receive Information (Action Under 7a)

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:



INFORMATION MEMO

Budget Guide

RELEVANT LINKS:

[LMC information memo, Reducing LMCIT Premium Costs](#)

[LMC information memo, Experience Rating in LMCIT's Liability and Work Comp Premiums](#)

I. Insurance

Most cities are members of the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust (LMCIT) for property, liability, auto, and workers' compensation coverage. If your city purchases insurance from a private company, you should ask your provider about insurance coverage options, claim trends, and costs. For cities looking for possible ways to reduce their premiums, the LMCIT risk management memo, *Reducing LMCIT Premium Costs*, suggests some options.

In budgeting for premiums, it is important to also take into account two other factors, in addition to the rates themselves: any changes in your exposures (e.g., payrolls, city expenditures, property values, etc.), and any changes in your city's experience rating. (Workers' comp, municipal liability, and auto liability premiums are experience rated.) Your city's actual premium costs will be a function of all three—rates, exposures, and experience.

The following are LMCIT's best estimates for what premium rates might look like for 2016. We would stress that these are very early preliminary estimates and are absolutely not guarantees. We need to complete the annual actuarial reviews and other rate development work, and also get a firm indication of reinsurance costs before giving any definite answers on premium rates for 2016. Cities may wish to check back with LMCIT in the fall for an updated outlook on premiums.

Workers' compensation. Rising medical costs will likely once again continue to put pressure on work comp premium rates for 2016. Medical costs are the single biggest component of workers' compensation loss costs, and they continue to increase at a faster rate than payrolls. LMCIT's actual work comp medical loss costs have turned out to be higher than projected in each of the past few years. At this point we'd suggest that for budgeting purposes cities allow for a workers' compensation premium rate increase that could be in the 3 to 6 percent range. It is important to note, however, that as is the practice every three years, we'll be reviewing and adjusting the relative levels of each payroll class rate. As a result, the particular mix of each member's payroll class exposures could affect members in different ways.

This material is provided as general information and is not a substitute for legal advice. Consult your attorney for advice concerning specific situations.

RELEVANT LINKS:

Property: Property losses in 2014 were quite a bit higher than the two prior years and higher than projections, which could put some pressure property rates. Also, if we were to see significant changes in LMCIT's reinsurance costs, that could affect premium rates since reinsurance costs are a significant part of LMCIT's expense for property coverage, but at this point we think that's unlikely. For budgeting purposes, we'd suggest that cities allow for a possible rate increase in the range of 3 to 5 percent or so.

Auto physical damage: Auto physical damage loss costs have been in line with projections in recent years, so we don't expect major premium changes for 2016. For budgeting purposes, we'd suggest cities allow for an inflation-type increase in the 2 percent range.

Municipal liability and auto liability. While the very large number of claims against LMCIT member cities relating to driver's license data continues to represent a potentially significant and highly uncertain cost, the LMCIT Board's approach has been to cover those costs from existing funds, and since we view this as a unique situation it won't affect future premium levels. Aside from the driver's license data claims, loss costs in recent years for municipal liability and auto liability haven't been too out of line, so we don't anticipate major changes in the overall level of rates for municipal liability or auto liability

But while we don't expect overall rate levels to change significantly, the transition to the new rating system which we began in 2013 is not yet fully complete – there's still a small portion of membership that has not fully transitioned to the new system - so there will still be differences in how some individual cities are affected for 2016. (Some cities' premiums increase and others decrease under the new system.) Further, there may be some room for fine-tuning and adjusting individual rating components of the liability rating system. (per police officer rate, per employee rate, per household rate, per sewer connection rate, and average expenditure rate) If it's determined we need to make those sorts of adjustments, as with the workers' compensation rates, the particular mix of each member's liability exposures could affect members in different ways.

Since each city's situation is unique there's no way to provide meaningful general guidance. We'd suggest that cities or agents contact their LMCIT underwriter for an indication of how the city's premiums will likely be affected for 2016. If your city's coverage has already renewed for 2015, the underwriters can provide that guidance right now. If you haven't yet renewed for 2015, the underwriters would be able to provide that guidance for 2016 when your 2015 renewal is processed.



RISK MANAGEMENT INFORMATION
LMCIT LIABILITY COVERAGE OPTIONS
Liability Limits, Coverage Limits, and Waivers

LMCIT gives cities several options for structuring their liability coverage. The city can choose either to waive or not to waive the monetary limits the statutes provide; and the city can select from among several liability coverage limits. This memo discusses these options and identifies some issues to consider in deciding which of the options best meets the city's needs.

What are the statutory limits on municipal tort liability?

The statutes limit a city's tort liability to a maximum of \$500,000 per claimant and \$1,500,000 per occurrence. These limits apply whether the claim is against the city, against the individual officer or employee, or against both.

What are the coverage limits for LMCIT's basic primary liability coverage?

For coverage written or renewed on or after November 15, 2014, LMCIT's liability coverage will provide a limit of \$2,000,000 per occurrence. Besides the overall coverage limit of \$2,000,000 per occurrence, there are also annual aggregate limits (that is, limits on the total amount of coverage for the year regardless of the number of claims), for certain specific risks. Aggregate limits apply to the following:

Products	\$3,000,000 annually
Failure to supply utilities	\$3,000,000 annually
Data security breaches	\$3,000,000 annually
EMF	\$3,000,000 annually
Limited pollution*	\$3,000,000 annually
Mold	\$3,000,000 annually
Employers liability (work comp)	\$1,500,000 annually
Land use/special risk litigation**	\$1,000,000 annually
Activities in outside organizations	\$100,000 annually

* Includes sudden and accidental releases of pollutants; herbicide and pesticide application; sewer ruptures, overflows and backups; and lead and asbestos claims. Dredging or excavation claims are subject to a \$250,000 sublimit. These limits apply to both damages and defense costs.

** Coverage is provided on a sliding scale percentage basis, which is based on participation in LMCIT's online land use training. Coverage applies to both damages and litigation costs.

Why does LMCIT provide higher coverage limits than the statutory limit?

The reason is to give member cities better protection. The statutory liability limit caps the city's liability for many types of claims. But some liability claims, which are listed in the next section, aren't covered by the statutory limit, so the city's potential liability is unlimited. The higher limit also protects against a major incident in which many people might be injured. The \$2,000,000 per occurrence coverage limit gives the city better protection for these types of claims, and makes it less likely the city could end up with liability exceeding its coverage limit.

Another reason to provide higher limits is because it's increasingly more common to see contracts require more than the statutory limit of \$1,500,000; a more common figure is a \$2,000,000 limit. LMCIT's higher limits will now meet this requirement, but if even higher limits are required, there is the option to carry LMCIT's excess coverage to meet the additional requirements. LMCIT can also issue an endorsement to increase the city's coverage limit only for claims relating to a particular contract.

If the statute limits our liability and LMCIT is already providing higher limits than required, why purchase even more limits?

There are four good reasons why cities should strongly consider carrying LMCIT's excess coverage, which provides higher limits of liability coverage. Excess coverage is available in \$1,000,000 increments, up to a maximum of \$5,000,000.

1. The statutory tort limits either do not or may not apply to several types of claims

The following are the types of claims the statutory limits do not apply to. LMCIT's higher limit of \$2,000,000 will definitely provide better protection against these types of claims, but there could be cases where even that limit might not be enough.

- *Claims under federal civil rights laws.* These include Section 1983, the Americans with Disabilities Act, etc.
- *Claims for tort liability that the city has assumed by contract.* This occurs when a city agrees in a contract to defend and indemnify a private party.
- *Claims for actions in another state.* This might occur in border cities that have mutual aid agreements with adjoining states, or when a city official attends a national conference or goes to Washington to lobby, etc.
- *Claims based on liquor sales.* This mostly affects cities with municipal liquor stores, but it could also arise in connection with beer sales at a fire relief association fund-raiser, for example.
- *Claims based on a "taking" theory.* Suits challenging land use regulations frequently include an "inverse condemnation" claim, alleging that the regulation amounts to a "taking" of the property.

2. LMCIT's primary liability coverage has annual limits on coverage for a few specific risks

The table on page 1 lists the liability risks to which aggregate coverage limits apply. If the city has a loss or claim in one of these areas, there might not be enough limits remaining to cover the city's full exposure if there is a second loss of the same sort during the year.

Excess liability coverage gives the city additional protection against this risk as well.

There are, though, a couple important restrictions on how the excess coverage applies to risks that are subject to aggregate limits:

- The excess coverage does not apply to the following types of risks:
 - Failure to supply utilities.
 - Mold.
 - “Limited pollution” claims if either the pollutant release or the damage is below ground or in a body of water.
 - Auto no-fault claims.
 - Uninsured/underinsured motorist claims.
 - Workers’ compensation, disability, or unemployment claims.
 - Claims under the medical payments coverage.
- The excess coverage does not automatically apply to liquor liability unless the city specifically requests it.

3. The city may be required by contract to carry higher coverage limits

LMCIT’s limit of \$2,000,000 will meet most contract requirements, but if even higher limits are required, LMCIT’s excess coverage is an option. LMCIT can also issue an endorsement to increase the city’s coverage limit only for claims relating to a particular contract.

4. There may be more than one political subdivision covered under the city’s coverage

An HRA, EDA, or port authority is itself a separate political subdivision. If the city EDA, for example, is named as a covered party on the city’s coverage and a claim were made that involved both the city and the EDA, theoretically the claimant might be able to recover up to \$1,500,000 from both the city and the EDA, since there are two political subdivisions involved. Excess coverage is one way to provide enough coverage limits to address this situation. Another solution is for the HRA, EDA, or port authority to carry separate liability coverage in its own name.

This issue of multiple covered parties can also arise if the city has agreed by contract to name another entity as a covered party, or to defend and indemnify another entity.

Who needs excess liability coverage?

If anything, excess liability coverage is even more important to a small city rather than to a large city. If a city ends up with more liability than it has coverage, the city will have to either draw on existing funds or go to its taxpayers to pay that judgment. A large city faced with, say, \$1,000,000 of liability over and above what its LMCIT coverage pays might be able to spread that cost over several thousand taxpayers. The small city by contrast might be dividing that same \$1,000,000 among only a couple hundred taxpayers. \$1,000,000 divided among 5,000 taxpayers is \$200 apiece – annoying but probably at least manageable for most taxpayers. \$1,000,000 divided among 200 taxpayers is \$5,000 apiece – enough to be a real problem for many.

What’s the effect of waiving the “per claimant” statutory liability limit?

For cities that choose to waive the statutory limits, the city is choosing to waive the protection of the statutory limits, up to the amount of coverage the city has. Someone with a claim against a

city that has waived the statutory limits would be able to recover up to \$2,000,000 (of course the individual would have to prove to the court or jury that he or she really does have that amount of damages), rather than the statutory limit of \$500,000 per claimant. Because the waiver increases the exposure, the premium is roughly 3% higher for coverage under the waiver option.

For cities that choose not to waive the statutory limits, the city's liability is limited by the statute to no more than \$500,000 per claimant and \$1,500,000 per occurrence. LMCIT's higher coverage limits would only come into play on those types of claims that aren't covered by the statutory liability limit.

Why would the city choose to pay more for the waiver-option coverage?

The statutory liability limit only comes into play in a case where:

- The city is in fact liable.
- The injured party's actual proven damages are greater than the statutory limit.

Very literally, applying the statutory liability limit means an injured party won't be fully compensated for his or her actual, proven damages that were caused by city negligence. Some cities, as a matter of public policy, may want to have more assets available to compensate their citizens for injuries caused by the city's negligence. Waiving the statutory liability limits is a way to do that.

Other cities may feel that the appropriate policy is to minimize the expenditure of the taxpayers' funds by taking full advantage of every protection the legislature has decided to provide. There's no right or wrong answer on this point. It's a discretionary question of city policy that each city council needs to decide for itself.

What's the effect of waiving the statutory limits if the city has excess coverage?

If the city has \$1,000,000 of excess coverage and chooses to waive the statutory tort limits, the claimants (whether it's one claimant or several) could then potentially recover up to \$3,000,000 in damages in a single occurrence. If the city carries higher excess coverage limits, the potential maximum recovery per occurrence is correspondingly higher.

Carrying excess coverage under the waiver option is a way to address an issue that some cities find troubling: the case where many people are injured in a single occurrence caused by city negligence. Suppose, for example, that a city vehicle negligently runs into a school bus full of children, causing multiple serious injuries. \$1,500,000 divided 50 ways may not go far toward compensating for those injuries. Excess coverage under the waiver option makes more funds available to compensate the victims in that kind of situation.

The cost of the excess liability coverage is about 25% greater if the city waives the statutory tort limits. The cost difference is proportionally greater than the cost difference at the primary level because for a city that carries excess coverage, waiving the statutory tort limits increases both the per-claimant exposure and the per-occurrence exposure.

Is there an increase in risk if the city waives the statutory tort liability limits?

There is no increase in risk for the city to end up with liability if LMCIT doesn't cover it. The waiver form specifically says the city is waiving the statutory tort liability limits only to the extent of the city's coverage.

Of course, that's not to say there is no risk the city's liability could exceed its coverage limits. Listed earlier in this memo are a number of ways that could happen to any city, but the waiver doesn't increase that risk.

Can the city waive the statutory tort limits for the primary coverage but not for the excess coverage?

No. If the city decides to waive the statutory tort limits, that waiver applies to the full extent of the coverage limits the city has. The city cannot partially waive the statutory limits.

Is there a simple way to summarize the options?

It's not necessarily simple, but the table on the following page is a shorthand summary of what the effect would be of the various coverage structure options in different circumstances.

Your League Resource
Call the Underwriting
Department at 651.281.1200
or 800.925.1122 with any
questions.

LMCIT Liability Coverage Options

Coverage structure If the city:	On a liability claim to which the statutory limits apply		On a liability claim to which the statutory limits do not apply
	This is the maximum amount a single claimant could recover on an occurrence.	This is the maximum total amount that all claimants could recover on a single occurrence.	
Does not have excess coverage & Does not waive the statutory limits	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000
Does not have excess coverage & Waives the statutory limits	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Has \$1,000,000 of excess coverage & Does not waive the statutory limits	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000
Has \$1,000,000 of excess coverage & Waives the statutory limits	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November, 4 2015
Subject: Ambulance 3rd Qtr Report
Agenda Item: 6b

Description/Summary

Tim Deschene to present the Ambulance Department's 3rd Quarter Report.

Action Requested:

Receive Information

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

2015 January 1st - June 30th

	no loads/special detail/cancelled	ALS transfers	BLS transfers	Billed calls	Total calls	2014 calls	2013 calls	2012 calls
January	5	8	13	36	41	68	45	41
February	7	5	4	30	37	52	52	45
March	8	6	11	40	48	57	55	45
April	8	10	15	45	53	61	59	42
May	13	15	17	59	72	55	52	46
June	14	10	17	60	74	55	39	61
July	17	11	17	47	64	62	76	69
August	16	9	17	57	73	76	71	49
September	20	12	6	50	70	39	70	60
Totals:	108	86	28	424	532	525	519	458
1st quarter billed:		2nd quarter billed:		3rd quarter billed:		4th quarter billed:		
January:	\$37,778.80	April:	\$52,234.00	July:	\$53,067.90	October:		
February:	\$30,265.10	May:	\$65,853.90	August:	\$60,093.10	November:		
March:	\$41,189.00	June:	\$62,787.10	September:	\$46,928.90	December:		
TOTAL	\$109,232.90		\$180,875.00		\$160,089.90			
Cancel / No Load.								

lift assist 2
 fall 9
 standby 12
 cancelled transfer 3
 crash 29
 DOA 2
 Medical alarm 10
 polar plunge 1
 stabbing 1
 seizure 4
 suicidal 1
 laceration 2
 chest pain 1
 diabetic 3
 unknown 4
 MCI Drill 1
 can. Mutual aid 1
 special details 11
 kicked by animal 1
 assault 3
 choking 1
 psych 1
 cardiac 1
 sick 4

163 ST. CLOUD HOSPITAL
 1 AIRPORT
 3 ST. CLOUD DETOX
 1 GLACIAL RIDGE, GLENWOOD
 1 HENNEPIN COUNTY MEDICAL CENTER
 1 NURSING HOME
 1 OTHER MINNESOTA HOSPITAL
 14 PRAIRIE ST JOHNS
 2 BRAINERD
 2 PRIVATE RESIDENCE
 1 SAINT MARY'S HOSPITAL - ROCHESTER
 2 UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
 1 DOUGLAS COUNTY
 1 RICE COUNTY, WILLMAR
 1 HUTCHINSON HOSPITAL
 4 ST CLOUD V.A.
 2 SAUK CENTRE CENTRA CARE
 1 PRAIRIE CARE MAPLE GROVE

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Park Board Report
Agenda Item: 6c

Description/Summary

The Park Board to meet on Tuesday, November 3, 2015.

- Received Campground Financial Report
- Recommend Appointment of Seasonal Arena Employee
- Discussed Naming Rights for Splash Pad
- Discussed Campsite Reconfiguration to fit Larger Units

Action Requested:

Receive Information

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015

Subject: EDA Report

Agenda Item: 6d

Description/Summary

The EDA met in regular session on Wednesday, November 4, 2015.

- Received Update on Consumer Survey
- Approved Tax Increment and Abatement Payments
- Received Information on Informational Center Site Development
- Discussed Preliminary Plat of Information Center Site
- Received Update on Racetrack Timeline
- Discussed Development of Railroad Property

Action Requested:

Receive Information

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 04, 2015

Subject: Excess Liability

Agenda Item: 7a

Description/Summary

Each year when the City renews Liability Insurance Coverage, a determination needs to be made whether the City purchases Excess Liability Insurance Coverage and also whether the City wishes to waive the per person limit for liability put in place by MN State Statute.

Currently the City purchases excess coverage (umbrella) and waives the limit.

Action Requested:

Purchase Excess Liability Insurance and Waive the Statutory Limit.

Action Taken: _____

Motion: _____ **Second:** _____



LIABILITY COVERAGE – WAIVER FORM

LMCIT members purchasing coverage must complete and return this form to LMCIT before the effective date of the coverage. Please return the completed form to your underwriter or email to pstech@lmc.org

This decision must be made by the member's governing body every year. You may also wish to discuss these issues with your attorney.

League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust (LMCIT) members that obtain liability coverage from LMCIT must decide whether to waive the statutory tort liability limits to the extent of the coverage purchased. The decision has the following effects:

If the member does not waive the statutory tort limits, an individual claimant would be able to recover no more than \$500,000 on any claim to which the statutory tort limits apply. The total all claimants would be able to recover for a single occurrence to which the statutory tort limits apply would be limited to \$1,500,000. These statutory tort limits apply regardless of whether the city purchases the optional excess liability coverage.

If the member waives the statutory tort limits and does not purchase excess liability coverage, a single claimant could potentially recover up to \$2,000,000 for a single occurrence. (Under this option, the tort cap liability limits are waived to the extent of the member's liability coverage limits, and the LMCIT per occurrence limit is \$2 million.) The total all claimants would be able to recover for a single occurrence to which the statutory tort limits apply would also be limited to \$2,000,000, regardless of the number of claimants.

If the member waives the statutory tort limits and purchases excess liability coverage, a single claimant could potentially recover an amount up to the limit of the coverage purchased. The total all claimants would be able to recover for a single occurrence to which the statutory tort limits apply would also be limited to the amount of coverage purchased, regardless of the number of claimants.

Claims to which the statutory municipal tort limits do not apply are not affected by this decision.

_____ selects liability coverage limits of \$_____ from the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust (LMCIT).

Check one:

- The member **DOES NOT WAIVE** the monetary limits on municipal tort liability established by Minnesota Statutes, Section 466.04.
- The member **WAIVES** the monetary limits on municipal tort liability established by Minnesota Statutes, Section 466.04 to the extent of the limits of the liability coverage obtained from LMCIT.

Date of city council/governing body meeting _____

Signature _____ Position _____

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Amendment to Lease Agreement - CentraCare
Agenda Item: 7b

Description/Summary

Prior to the refunding (refinancing) of the 2005C Hospital Bonds in conjunction with CentraCare the lease was reviewed for potential amendments that would be required prior to issuance of the new 2015C bonds.

CentraCare provided and the City's Bond Counsel reviewed the proposed Lease Amendment. The Amendment ties the new lease to the new bond along with any future refunding and removes the language relating to the old bond (2005C) that is being refunded.

Action Requested:

Approve Lease Agreement with CentraCare removing language referring to Bond Series 2005C and inserting language referring to the new and/or future refunding bond.

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

**SECOND AMENDMENT TO
LEASE BY AND BETWEEN
CITY OF SAUK CENTRE, MINNEOSTA, AS LESSOR
AND
CENTRACARE HEALTH SYSTEM-SAUK CENTRE, AS LESSEE
FOR
ST. MICHAEL'S HOSPITAL AND NURSING HOME
AND LAKESHORE ESTATES**

That certain Lease, by and between the City of Sauk Centre, as Lessor, and CentraCare Health System-Sauk Centre, as Lessee, with an Effective Date of December 1, 2012, is amended as follows:

1. Section 1.03 is amended in its entirety and replaced with the following:
 - 1.03 Rent. Lessee shall, as rent for the Leased Property during the term of this Lease, make the following payments:
 - (a) The annual payment as specified in Exhibit 1.03(a).
 - (b) Lessee shall pay to Lessor, when and as due, amounts as set forth on attached Exhibit 1.03(b), being the principal and interest on the General Obligation Crossover Refunding Bonds, Series 2005C Bonds (the "Series 2005C Bonds") that are the outstanding as of the Effective Date, were issued by the Lessor, and the proceeds were utilized in connection with the Health Facilities. In the event that the City refinances the Series 2005C Bonds, Lessee shall pay to Lessor, when and as due, the principal and interest payments on the bonds that were used to refinance the Series 2005C Bonds (the "Refunding Bonds"). Upon the issuance of Refunding Bonds, Exhibit 1.03(b) shall be replaced with a new payment schedule for the Refunding Bonds. For the purpose of this Lease, the Series 2005C Bonds and the Refunding Bonds shall be collectively referred to as the "Bonds". Lessor shall use such payments to pay principal and interest on the Bonds.
2. Except as herein provided, all the terms and provisions of the Lease shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Lessor and Lessee have executed and delivered this Lease on the dates set forth below.

Dated: _____

CITY OF SAUK CENTRE, MINNESOTA

By _____

Warren Stone

Its: Mayor

By _____

Vicki M. Willer

Its: City Administrator

Dated: _____

CENTRACARE HEALTH SYSTEM-SAUK CENTRE

By _____

Craig J. Broman

Its: President

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Approval of 2015 Tax Increment and Abatement Payments
Agenda Item: 7c

Description/Summary

TIF Pay As You Go Payments (PAYGO)

PAYGO Developer Payments

a. Mississippi Flats	\$16,650.00
b. Sauk Centre Opportunities (TALK Inc.)	\$6,425.92

The 2015 Dunham Express (8310 Commerce Drive) semi-annual Payment is due December 15, 2015.

The semi-annual payment due is \$2,277.19

TOTAL PAYMENTS \$25,353.11

Action Requested:

Approve the 2015 PAYGO and Abatement Payments in the Amount of \$25,353.11

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Approve Step Increase
Agenda Item: 7d

Description/Summary

Jacquelyn Kirckof has been employed by the City for one year on November 10, 2015.

The City was fortunate to find such a talented and dedicated individual to fill the Accounting position last year when it became open following a retirement. Jacquelyn is a quick study and very knowledgeable in her field. She has transitioned into the governmental accounting environment and has applied her background knowledge in accounting and auditing to help streamline and modernize the system.

In addition to her knowledge in the field, she is professional, works well with other staff, consistently meets deadlines, and brings new ideas and processes to the table while helping to eliminate redundancy.

It is for these reasons that I recommend Jacquelyn be advanced to Step 5 of pay system effective November 10, 2015.

Action Requested:

Approve Step Advancement for Jacquelyn Kirckof to Step 5. Effective November 10, 2015.

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Advertise for Seasonal Employee
Agenda Item: 7e

Description/Summary

The Park Board, at the recommendation of Public Works Supervisor, Matt Zinniel, is recommending that the City hire one additional seasonal employee at the arena to share hours with the existing seasonal employee.

The total hours worked or budget is not expected to increase as a result.

Action Requested:

Approve Advertisement for Seasonal Employee for Arena

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Payment #4 Beltline/Centre Project
Agenda Item: 7f

Description/Summary

The fourth payment request has been received from Stearn's County for the 2015 Beltline/Centre Street Project.

The total work completed for the City share of the project is:

Local Participation - City Share of County Project	\$96,342.22
Local Participation - City Share of County Storm	\$50,457.75
City Storm - I94 Drainage/Beltline	\$540,822.68
Centre Street	<u>\$332,739.91</u>
Total Completed to Date	<u>\$1,020,362.56</u>
Paid to Date including this Voucher	\$969,344.43
5% Retaining	<u>\$51,018.13</u>
Total to Date	<u>\$1,020,362.56</u>
Amount of this Voucher	\$101,268.20

Action Requested:

Approve Pay Voucher #4 for \$101,268.20 to Stearns County.

Action Taken:

Motion:

Second:

STEARNS COUNTY HIGHWAY

P.O. Box 246
 St. Cloud, MN 56302
 320-255-6180 Fax 320-255-6186

INVOICE

INVOICE NO: 197-2015
 DATE: 10/30/2015

To: City of Sauk Centre
 Attn.: Vicki Willer
 320 Oak St South
 Sauk Centre, MN 56378
 Vicki.willer@ci.sauk-centre.mn.us

SAUK CENTRE SHARE OF SAP 073-672-005 w/I-94 DRAINAGE AND CENTRE STREET IMPROVEMENTS

QUANTITY	DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	AMOUNT
	SAP 073-672-005 WORK CERTIFIED TO DATE		
	LOCAL PARTICIPATION		\$96,342.22
	CITY SHARE OF STORM SEWER (75% of 67,277)		\$50,457.75
	 I-94 DRAINAGE WORK CERTIFIED TO DATE		 \$540,822.68
	 CENTRE STREET IMPROVEMENTS WORK CERTIFIED TO DATE		 \$332,739.91
	TOTAL		\$1,020,362.56
	LESS 5% RETAINAGE		(\$51,018.13)
	LESS PAID TO DATE		(\$868,076.23)
	 A copy of Pay Voucher #4 is attached.		
	SUBTOTAL		\$101,268.20
	TOTAL DUE		\$101,268.20

Make all checks payable to: Stearns County Highway.
 If you have any questions concerning this invoice, contact Tracey Worzala, Office Manager 320-255-6180.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR BUSINESS!

City of Sauk Centre
Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 4, 2015
Subject: Consent Agenda
Agenda Item: 10a-b

Description/Summary

The Council to consider the following Consent Agenda Items:

- a. Schedule of Claims -
- | | | |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
| Unpaid Claims | \$259,522.10 | |
| Paid Claims | \$1,098.13 | |
| Total | <u>\$260,620.23</u> | |
- b. See attachment 10b - Resolution No. 2015-81, Resolution Accepting Contributions.
- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------|-----------------|
| The Men's Card Playing Group | \$209.00 | Senior Center |
| Dr. Jim Wachlarowicz | \$50.00 | Ambulance Dept. |
| Rosa Rodriguez | 15.00 | Senior Center |

It is recommended that the City acknowledge the contributions received and thank the Men's Card Playing Group, Dr. Jim Wachlarowicz and Rosa Rodriguez.

Action Requested:

Approve Consent Calendar as Presented.

Action Taken: _____

Motion: _____

Second: _____

Schedule of Claims

City of Sauk Centre

1st Meeting — November 2015

Date of Meeting: 11.4.15

Vendor	Dept.	Purpose	Amount
American Welding & Gas	Ambulance	Oxygen	\$ 167.76
Applied Concepts, Inc.	Police	Radar Unit	2,505.80
Arvig (IT Support)	Various	Monthly IT support	\$ 2,664.49
Arvig (Monthly service)	Various	Monthly phone and internet service	\$ 1,243.34
Auto Value	Street	Hitch Pin	\$ 25.98
BCA CJTE Unit	Police	Training	150.00
Bolton & Menk, Inc.	Airport	Airport Environmental Assessment for Runway Rehad and Widening	\$ 66,000.00
Bound Tree	Ambulance	Medical Supplies	\$ 404.01
Centre Electric, Inc.	CityHall/Amb/Arena	Water Heater, Switches for lights over ice, wall	\$ 2,210.09
Centre Rental, Inc.	Park	Air Compressor Rental	\$ 245.00
Chase Card Services	Various	workshops, GIS charges, cameras for PD, blower and vacuum for Splash Pad	\$ 948.95
Cuyuna Medical Center	Ambulance	CPR classes	\$ 36.00
D.E.S. of St. Cloud	Arena	Test, Tune and Repair Titan Air handler	\$ 548.70
East Side Oil	Waste Oil	1 barrel of filters and 30 gal antifreeze	\$ 80.00
Egan, John	Fire	Expense Reimbursement	\$ 577.77
Fleet Services	Police	Monthly Squad lease - September 2015	\$ 1,801.50
Friedrichs Tire & Oil	Police	Tire repair	\$ 15.00
Gieske, Kenneth	P&Z	Mileage Reimb for Planning Commission Training	\$ 52.90
Jim's Wholesale	Cmpgrnd/Arena	Toilet paper, towels and soap	\$ 716.15
Johnson, Terry & Bobbi Jo	Fire	Reimbursement for repairs and Tow	\$ 392.38
Kirkkof, Jacquelyn	Adm	Mileage Reimbursement	192.05
Konica Minolta	Various	Monthly Copier maintenance	\$ 485.00
Main Street Press	Ambulance	ABN Forms	\$ 29.35
MN Dept of Human Services	HospFd	ECPN pymt November 2015	\$ 44,858.64
Moritz, Ron	Fire	Expense Reimbursement	\$ 566.07
NCPERS Minnesota	GnGvt	Life Insurance	112.00
Rahn's Oil & Propane	Arena	LP and the pickup of tank and heaters	\$ 129.00
Rihm Kenworth	Street	Bracket Kit	267.20
Sauk Centre CVB	Gn/Cmpg	Lodging Tax	\$ 4,964.99
Sauk Centre PUC	Various	Utility charges: September 1, 2015 to October 1, 2015	\$ 14,365.31
Stantec	Beltline/Centre Street	Beltline/Centre Street Reconstruct	\$ 8,297.92
Star Claims	Ambulance	September 2015 billing fees	1,176.00
Stearns County Highway	Beltline/Centre Street	Centre Street Improvements - drainage work	\$ 101,268.20
Steiner Lumber	SplashPad, Cmpgrnd/Arena	Floor Door Holder, white facia, soffit nails, joint tape, lock protector	\$ 195.45
Summit Companies	Various	Annual Fire Extinguisher Maintenance	127.50
Truckers Inn	Police	Antifreeze for Squad	18.16
Ultimate Auto Care	Street	Annual DOT Inspections	\$ 341.79
United Laboratories	Arena	Disinfect Plus Pine	\$ 249.30
Vogt, Nicole	Adm	Mileage Reimbursement	\$ 41.40
Vogt, Sally	Various	October 1 - 31 ~ cleaning	\$ 1,029.00
Zep Sales and Service	Arena	Cleaning supplies	\$ 21.95
Total			\$ 259,522.10
Paid Prior to Meeting			
Bueckers City Sanitation	Various	Monthly refuse hauling - September	\$ 1,098.13
			1,098.13
Claims Appr by Council			\$259,522.10
Additions			1,098.13
Totals Claims This Batch			\$260,620.23

X _____ Date: _____
 CtyAdmr/Clk

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-81

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING CONTRIBUTION

WHEREAS, a contribution of \$209.00 was received by the City from the Men's Card Playing Group, and

WHEREAS, the Men's Card Playing Group has requested that the City allocate the contribution to the Sauk Centre Senior Center.

WHEREAS, a contribution of \$50.00 was received by the City from Dr. Jim Wachlarowicz, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Jim Wachlarowicz has requested that the City allocate the contribution to the Sauk Centre Ambulance Department.

WHEREAS, a contribution of \$15.00 was received by the City from Rosa Rodriguez, and

WHEREAS, Rosa Rodriguez has requested that the City allocate the contribution to the Sauk Centre Senior Center.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF SAUK CENTRE, MINNESOTA that the City accept the contribution received and commend Men's Card Playing Group, Dr. Jim Wachlarowicz and Rosa Rodriguez for their generosity.

Adopted by the Sauk Centre City Council this 4th day of November, 2015.

Mayor Warren Stone

ATTEST: _____
City Administrator Vicki M. Willer

**TO BE POSTED AT ALL WORK SITES
10/14/15**

Sauk Centre Safety Committee Meeting was called to order on Wednesday, October 14, 2015 @ 9:32 a.m. by Andrew Rousslange.

Members present: Wendy Drobny, Andrew Rousslange, Paul Froseth, Quint Swedenberg and Justin Hinnenkamp. Guest Present: Robin Klug.

Members absent: Paul Hoeschen, John Egan, Matt Zinniel & Dewey Sunderman.

The October 14, 2015 Agenda was approved by General Consent.

The July 15, 2015 minutes were approved with a motion by General Consent

ACCIDENTS: None.

OLD BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

Coordinators Report:

- July 15 & August 12 – Field Observations
- October 14 – Safety Committee Meeting & Defensive Driving/Backing Training
- Reviewed the 2016 Annual Training Calendar
- Date change for the November training from November 10 to November 16 due to hunting and Veteran's Day.

Meeting adjourned at 9:56 a.m. with a motion by Paul Froseth and seconded by Justin Hinnenkamp. All were in favor.

Respectfully,

**WENDY DROBNY
SECRETARY**