



## REDWOOD COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICE

*Planning & Zoning • Parks & Trails • GIS  
Aquatic Invasive Species • Septic Inspector  
Drainage Inspector • Agricultural Inspector*

PO BOX 130  
REDWOOD FALLS  
MINNESOTA 56283  
PH: 507-637-4023

### REDWOOD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

#### *MINUTES*

**Meeting Date: January 25, 2016**

A meeting of the Redwood County Planning Commission convened on Monday, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2016, at the Redwood County Government Center.

The following members of the Redwood County Planning Commission were present: Mark Madsen, John Rohlik, Jr., Kent Runkel, Dave Mattison and Commissioner Lon Walling. Mike Scheffler was absent. Also present were the following individuals: Redwood County Environmental Director Scott Wold, Redwood County Land Use & Zoning Supervisor Nick Brozek, Greg Green, Chuck Beisner, Jason VerSteeg, Bill Helget, Tom Green, Lynn Green, Joseph R. Plaetz, and County Commissioner Dennis Groebner.

At approximately 1:00 p.m., Chair Madsen called the meeting to order.

The first item of business was to elect new officers for 2016. On a motion by Runkel, seconded by Mattison, Scheffler was nominated for Planning Commission Chair and John Rohlik, Jr. was nominated for Planning Commission Vice-Chair. There were no additional nominations. The motion was passed unanimously by voice vote.

Madsen read aloud the rules of the meeting and handed the meeting over to Vice-Chair John Rohlik, Jr.

At approximately 1:05 p.m., Vice-Chair Rohlik opened discussion and review of Conditional Use Permit #3-15, previously obtained by the City of Morgan for the construction of a wastewater treatment facility.

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission members were provided an informational packet, which included the following information regarding CUP #3-15:

1. The City of Morgan, through its agent Bolton & Menk, applied for and received CUP #3-15 last year. The application was reviewed by the Planning Commission at the regularly scheduled February meeting (2-23-15). The Planning Commission recommended the application for approval by the Board of Commissioners, which approved it on 3-3-15.
2. CUP #3-15 is to construct new wastewater treatment lagoons in Section 9 of Morgan Township, on the northeast side of State Hwy 67 at the intersection of that road and Ranch Avenue. Morgan currently utilizes a mechanical wastewater treatment plant on the west side of town that is nearing the end of its useful life. The mechanical plant will be demolished and replaced with a pump station, which will pump the wastewater through a

main placed in the State Hwy 67 right-of-way, to the proposed new lagoon facility. The lagoons will outlet into County Ditch 109.

3. The City had planned to begin construction of the wastewater treatment facility this past construction season. However, after receiving the CUP, the City was informed by the MPCA that an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) would have to be completed prior to beginning construction. This process is still ongoing, and it is clear that construction of the project will not begin until summer of 2016.
4. The delayed start means that the City will not be able to meet the requirements of the Redwood County Zoning Ordinance, Section 25, Subd. 10 of which states that “[a] conditional Use Permit shall become void one year after being granted by the Board unless used.” This means that the City’s CUP #3-15 will expire on March 3, 2016 – one year after it was approved by the Board of Commissioners.
5. The City is requesting a time extension of the one-year deadline. They anticipate that the EAW process will take two months and that construction of the project will begin during the coming construction season. The Environmental Office supports granting a time extension.
6. The purpose of the “one-year rule,” which requires permit holders to “use” their CUPs within one year of approval is to avoid situations in which long-dormant CUPs are suddenly put into use in neighborhoods that may have changed greatly since the CUP was originally issued. CUPs are recorded in the property record on the property or properties on which they will occur, but they are not recorded against neighboring properties. Consequently, the only way for a new prospective owner of a property to know that a particular Conditional Use is present in the area is for them to see it in action. Thus, if an applicant obtains a CUP, then does nothing for many years, any new landowners in the area would not have any way to know about it, and may take actions with their properties in reliance on the assumption that they would receive notice before that use could be performed near them. Alternatively stated, the Ordinance judges that it is more important to protect the rights and expectations of people who are making use of their property than it is to protect people who sit on their rights without using them for long periods of time.
7. However, in the present case, the City will exceed the time-limit by only a small amount of time – several months. Additionally, a review of the area where the project is proposed to be built shows that the nature thereof has not changed. The only Zoning Permit (building permit) issued in Section 9 in 2015 was for the City’s project. Only three additional permits were issued in the 8 adjacent sections around Section 9. The closest of these to the proposed wastewater treatment facility was a permit issued to Dale Hanson in Section 8, to move an existing garage structure onto his property, ¼ of a mile west of the project site. Mr. Hanson was notified of the City of Morgan’s CUP hearing, and attended the hearing. The other two permits were issued in Section 17, one for a new farm shop one mile southwest of the project site, and the other for a home addition (converting an existing residential deck into year-round living space) ½ of a mile west of the project site. These three projects all are permitted uses in the Agricultural District, all took place on

existing building sites, and do not alter the character of the area or substantially increase the scope of the existing uses.

8. Additionally, extension of the City of Morgan CUP time limit is supported by the fact that the wastewater treatment project is still in the public eye, via the publication and public comment period required under the EAW process. In other words, this is not a situation in which a CUP has sat unused for a long period of time and has faded from public consciousness. Furthermore, State-required waiting periods generally toll local permitting timing deadlines. Though there is no specific statute tolling this particular deadline, it is arguably within the spirit of the law to do so.

Bill Helget was present at the meeting, on behalf of the City of Morgan, to explain the status of the project and the request for a time extension. Helget made the following statements:

- The City wanted to start its project last fall, but got held up with its state permitting, due to the MPCA determination that an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is required. The MPCA informed the City it would need the EAW during the state permit process.
- They are now hoping to start the project in April or May.
- The EAW should be a two-month process, including notice and public comment period.
- Rural Development has approved the project and has given a deadline for receiving bids.

Land Use & Zoning Supervisor Brozek presented the following information to the Commissioners:

- When the City obtained its CUP, the one-year deadline for beginning the project was discussed. It was decided that if the City could not meet the deadline, they would come back in and ask for an extension.
- The purpose of the one-year deadline is to prevent CUP holders from sitting on their rights, and holding onto a permit for a long period of time without using it. This could create situations where the neighborhood changes in a way that renders the conditional use incompatible with the area. New neighboring owners could come in and would have no notice of the proposed conditional use, since it would not be observable on the ground (not built) and would be recorded only on the subject parcel record, not on the neighboring parcels.
- In this case, there has not been a long passage of time (barely over the year deadline), the nature of the area has not changed (Brozek reviewed the few building permits issued in the surrounding area), and the project has remained in the public eye through the EAW process.

Runkel asked how long of an extension is needed in order for the project to move forward. Helget stated that Rural Development has given them 120 days to complete the bidding process, and they will start construction a month or two after that.

Walling asked if the time of the extension would be counted from February 2<sup>nd</sup>, which would be the date that the Board of Commissioners would approve it. Brozek replied that the

Commissioners could set the end date whenever they want, either counting from the date of approval or from the anniversary of the original permit approval. Helget said either method will work for the City.

Brozek asked Helget if changes have been made to the plan since the permit was approved last year. Helget stated that they have made minor engineering changes in response to suggestions and concerns of the MPCA and RD. The MPCA is particularly concerned about the effectiveness of the aeration of the ponds. Helget explained that the ponds will be aerated naturally by wind movement, aided by the fact that the ponds will usually be below capacity. The aeration system to be installed will only be needed to supplement the natural process. The City has responded to the MPCA concerns and is waiting to hear back. MPCA will not issue its permits until the EAW is complete.

No one was present in support or in opposition to the project.

On a motion by Madsen, seconded by Mattison, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend a one-year extension of CUP #3-15 for approval by the County Board of Commissioners.

Vice-Chair Rohlik called to order a public hearing on Application for Extraction Conditional Use Permit #1-16 submitted by Duininck, Inc.

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission members were provided an informational packet, which included the following information regarding the Duininck, Inc. permit application:

1. Duininck, Inc. is seeking to repermit its existing gravel and hard rock mine site in Section 17 of Swedes Forest Twp, known as the Grannes/Gryting Gravel Pit. The site has an existing Conditional Use Permit (#5-06) which was approved by the County Board of Commissioners and issued on April 4, 2006. According to its terms, CUP #5-06 expires on January 30, 2016. Duininck intends to continue using the site and so was notified that a new permit is needed.
2. Approximately 65 acres of the site will be mined and/or used for mining processes and stockpiling. Duininck proposes to mine and process gravel and granular materials. This will include blasting, crushing, washing, stockpiling, and hauling. The materials are used primarily for road construction and maintenance. See the CUP application materials for a detailed description of the project provided by Duinincks, including information on dust control, noise control, erosion prevention, hours of operation, mining and crushing, and reclamation. Duininck is requesting a 10 year permit beginning on January 30, 2016 and ending on January 30, 2026.
3. The site is located in both the Agriculture District and the Shoreland District. Mining is a Conditional Use in both Districts. Section 5.6.C(2.) of the Shoreland Ordinance states that “[p]rocessing machinery must be located consistent with setback standards for

structures from ordinary high water levels and from bluffs.” This means that all the machinery on site must be located at least 150’ from the ordinary high water level.

4. Duininck has an MNG49 NPDES permit from the MPCA, which is a general stormwater permit applicable to all of Duininck’s sand and gravel operations, including the Grannes/Gryting pit. Duinincks also has a Non-Metallic Aid Emissions Permit for its crusher.
5. Wetlands have been delineated on the northeast part of the site. This delineation is shown on the maps provided with the CUP application. No mining or other activity will occur in the wetland areas. Other wetlands are present on the Grannes property west of the site, but these will not be impacted and thus were not delineated.
6. On site dust should be kept to a minimum because the material coming out of the ground is generally wet. Furthermore, the MPCA Non-Metallic permit requires that the moisture level of the material be kept above 1.5% in order to control dust.
7. Best management practices used on the site to prevent erosion and manage stormwater will include using berms and the topography of the site to direct runoff to the low areas of the site, so the water will not be discharged off-site. Once areas start to be reclaimed, mulch will be used to stabilize the topsoil which will be spread and seeded.
8. Duininck proposes to reclaim the hard rock portion of the site (northwest) by terracing the rock faces. Each terrace would be no higher than 25’.
9. An EAW is not needed for this project because it is an existing site.
10. The closest residential dwelling to the site is a dwelling owned by the Lowell E. Gryting Trust No. One, one of the landowners of the site. It is located approximately 2050’ south of the site. The next three closest dwellings to the site are as follows: Ben & Diedre Lecy, 43512 CSAH 7, about 2190’ west of the site; Molly Lecy, 44555 CSAH 7, about 2480’ northwest of the site; and a dwelling owned by Jimmie & Joyce Lecy about 2680’ west of the site. However, Jimmie and Joyce Lecy live off site, in Echo.
11. The soils present on the site are as follows:
  - a. Dickman sandy loam
  - b. Estherville sandy loam
  - c. Millington loam
  - d. Wadena loam
  - e. Rock outcrop-Copaston complex
12. A copy of the Conditional Use Permit application, maps, plans, and proposed permit conditions are enclosed.

Jason VerSteeg was present to explain the project on behalf of Duininck, Inc. VerSteeg made the following statements:

- Duininck is requesting renewal of permitting for the existing Grannes gravel pit
- The site was permitted by Duininck in 2006. It was permitted by other operators prior to that.
- The pit yields various different types of aggregate material.
- The pit is located on land owned by two different owners: Melvin Grannes and the Lowell Gryting Trust.
- The Gryting property has been mostly reclaimed.
- As locations within the pit cease to be used, they will be reclaimed.
- Top soil is and will be preserved to be spread and seeded in some parts of the pit. Other parts of the pit will be reclaimed as pond and topsoil will not be spread there.
- To the extent that mining occurs below the water table, those areas will be turned into ponds.
- The site is accessed from CSAH 7, which is paved. There is a wide access road through the woods that opens up to the pit, shielding the pit from view from the roadway.

The Planning Commission discussed the weight restriction on CSAH 7. Walling stated that all Redwood County Highways are 10 ton roads. Madsen stated that there should be no problem with hauling on a 10 ton road.

Runkel asked how often blasting will occur. VerSteeg said that blasting is done as needed, but usually only one or two times per year. After blasting, the material is crushed.

Madsen asked if there are bald eagles on the site. VerSteeg said there are not.

Brozek provided information that he had received from the DNR in connection with Duininck's project.

- The state is concerned about the neighboring wetland (to the west of the site). They want to monitor the water level to ensure that there is no impact on the wetland from the mining activity.
- The state is also concerned about the hard rock mining area on the north end of the site and they recommend that a Natural Heritage Review be done to determine if there are any protected species there.
- DNR recommends that the permit not be issued until these determinations are made.
- They want to see a staff gauge installed for ongoing monitoring of the wetland water level and want to have the water levels surveyed on the entire site and the wetland.
- A review of the Natural Heritage Inventory was completed in 2006 as part of a wetland delineation that was required under the exiting CUP. The state would like it done again because the inventory has been updated in the last 10 years. The review will take 3 or 4 weeks to complete in the spring.



Rohlik asked how long the current 2006 permit is valid for. Brozek stated that it expires at the end of January, 2016.

Mattison asked if the pit has to be operational to do the water level study. Brozek said the ice has to be off the water so the DNR can perform pump and flow tests.

Brozek stated that the Planning Commission could choose from several courses of action on the permit:

- Allow removal of existing stockpiles only
- Allow new excavation except in the hard rock/blasting area
- Allow excavation throughout the site immediately

VerSteeg responded to the DNR concerns:

- Normally Natural Heritage Review is done as part of an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW). It was done in 2006 as part of the wetland delineation, to address concerns that were identified at that time.
- This project does not require an EAW because the expansions did not meet the acreage threshold.
- Wetlands were delineated in 2006 and those areas are off limits and will not be mined.
- Historical photos and usage of the site show there has been no discernable impact of the mining on the wetlands since 1992.
- There is no way for Duininck to lower the water levels unless approved by the DNR.

Brozek suggested that if Duininck excavated through a limiting soil layer, that water could be drained out of the pit downward into a lower aquifer, and that lateral movement from the wetland into the pit could drain water from the wetland. VerSteeg agreed that this was theoretically possible, but it will never occur because Duinincks will stop excavating if they hit a limiting layer, such as bedrock or clay, because those are not materials they are interested in.

Walling stated that the proposed permit conditions require Duininck to follow all laws and regulations, which would include the wetland laws. He asked VerSteeg about the excavation depth of elevation 880. VerSteeg responded that in some areas they will excavate deeper than that depending on where they find material and whether they obtain a permit to dewater. The 880 foot elevation is from a nationwide elevation database, based on sea level elevation.

Madsen asked Brozek if the county is required to follow the DNR recommendations. Brozek responded that the recommendations are not a requirement. However, the wetland laws still apply, prohibiting Duininck from impacting the wetlands. Brozek recommended that the maximum excavation depth be set at 10 feet below the ordinary high water level of the wetland, to avoid confusion as to the database elevation.

Walling expressed concern that following the DNR recommendations would require the county to do the DNR's job.

Wold recommended long term tracking of the wetland water levels via staff gauge as an easy and inexpensive requirement to ensure the mine does not impact the wetland.

Brozek recommended the additional condition that the footprint of the excavation site not be moved any closer to the wetland than it already is. Walling suggested that the pit be allowed to move toward the wetland in the event that the owners go through the state-approved wetland mitigation process.

Wold inquired whether the wetland in question is on the same property as the mine. VerSteege responded that it is on the same property and a gauge could be placed without causing trespassing concerns.

Madsen recommended that Duininck be required to check the staff gauge monthly.

Runkel asked if Duininck notifies the neighbors prior to blasting. VerSteege said they do, though they are not required to do so.

VerSteege stated he is ok with the additional conditions of: 1) maximum depth no greater than 10' below ordinary high water level of the wetland; 2) move site no closer to the wetland than it is currently; and 3) install a staff gauge and check it once per month, or as required by the DNR.

Madsen made a motion to recommend approval of Conditional Use Permit application #1-16, subject to the proposed conditions and the three additional conditions as stated above. Runkel seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair Rohlik called to order a public hearing on Application for Conditional Use Permit #2-16 submitted by Chuck Beisner of SunShare, LLC.

Prior to the Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission members were provided an informational packet, which included the following information regarding the SunShare permit application:

1. SunShare, via RWSun, LLC, is requesting to construct a community solar garden on County Hwy 2, about one half of a mile north of the City of Morgan. The property is owned by Richard & Lynn Green, who have signed off on the Conditional Use Permit application. The proposed site is located in the South Half of the Southeast Quarter (S1/2 SE1/4) of Section 9, Morgan Township, parcel number 59-009-4060. The site is in the Agricultural District.
2. The facility will consist of a perimeter fence and a four megawatt (AC) solar array, covering approximately 40 acres. The panels and panel structures will be about 9 feet high.



3. The location of the proposed solar garden is currently a tilled field. The existing surface water drainage pattern is that water on the east side of the property drains to the northeast, while water on the west side of the property drains to the west.
4. The proposed project will include solar modules on metal racking, a 15' wide access road from CSAH 2, four 500 KW inverters on concrete pads, a 6' tall chain link perimeter fence, and an on-site solar feeder power line (buried).
5. The site will be connected to the power grid via an existing Xcel distribution feeder line located in the CSAH 2 right-of-way, on the east side of CSAH 2.
6. The applicant has submitted a decommissioning plan addressing the disposition of the facility should it cease to be used for twelve months or reach the end of its useful life. At that time, the system will be shut down and the panels, racking, poles, wire, conduit, boxes, inverters, concrete pads, fence, electronic components and other components will be removed and properly disposed of. The site will then be restored to its pre-installation status as an agricultural field.
7. A copy of the Conditional Use Permit application, maps, plans, and proposed permit conditions are enclosed.

Chuck Beisner was present to explain the project and made the following statements to the Planning Commission:

- SunShare is a solar developer working with Xcel Energy to meet the state required 1.5% renewable energy standard by 2020.
- SunShare's primary market for solar was Colorado, where they developed five gardens over the course of six years. They moved into the Minnesota market due to the 1.5% requirement.
- The proposed solar garden will be 4 MW covering 40 acres of land. The panels will be fixed tilt, facing south at a 30 degree angle. The panels and racking will be 8.5 feet tall.
- The site will cause no noise or odor.
- There is an Xcel feeder line across CSAH 2 from the proposed site. Overhead line will be strung across the road and 50 feet onto the solar garden site property. From there, all lines will be underground.
- Perennial grasses will be planted on the site to prevent erosion and provide habitat for bees and birds. The intent is for the site to be low maintenance.
- Traffic in and out of the site will be approximately one technician once per month to do routine checks.
- Snow will be plowed from the access driveway in winter.
- The site will be mowed once or twice each summer.
- SunShare is fine with the proposed conditions.
- The site will have the capacity for up to 800 subscribers.

Rohlik inquired as to why these projects are called "gardens." Beisner explained that it is simply a term, like a solar farm. There are three different size levels of solar installations: 1)

single/individual installations; 2) utility-sized installations (over 100 acres in area); and 3) solar gardens, of middle size, and providing opportunity for subscribers to buy into the project.

Madsen inquired about liability insurance for the site. Beisner replied that a policy is carried by SunShare.

Runkel asked if the posts for the racking will be set in concrete. Beisner responded that concrete will only be used for the four inverter pads, so the use of concrete will be minimal.

Lynn Green spoke in favor of the project, stating the following:

- She is one of the owners of the proposed site.
- She speaks for Dick Green also.
- They “did their homework” and determined that this project will not cause any issues for the surrounding land uses in the area. Otherwise they would not be moving forward with the project.
- She has a 25.4 kW solar installation on her home property and has experienced no problems with it.

Dennis Groebner, County Commissioner, spoke in favor of the project, saying that solar gardens are a good idea.

Greg Green spoke in opposition to the project, stating the following:

- He is concerned about safety regarding environmental impacts of the site and possible radiation.
- He is concerns about the impact of the site on radio and TV transmissions.
- He concerned about the impact on the value of resale of the adjacent building site, which he owns (Gro Inc.).
- He is concerned about the impact on GPS in farm equipment, and said that farmers experienced GPS problems with the nearby CAPX2020 transmission line.
- Will the project have a fixed-term lifespan and what is the decommissioning time frame?
- Are there any outside studies showing that there are no issues with solar gardens?

Beisner responded to Greg Green’s questions and concerns, stating the following:

- Solar gardens are new to the area, but not new to the country
- There have been five major solar gardens operating in Colorado for 4 or 5 years, two are completely surrounded by residential properties and three are in agricultural areas. No impact has been shown on property values in either the residential or ag areas.
- There has been no effect shown on radio, TV, or tractor GPS.
- This project will not involve installation of new transmission lines, since it will hook directly into the existing lines.
- The term of the project will be about 25 to 30 years.

Lynn Green stated that Dick Green is a part owner of the neighboring building site (Gro Inc.).

Walling asked Beisner if there has been any issues with satellite reception in connection with the existing solar gardens. Beisner said no.

Brozek asked how the power line proposed to be installed on the property in order to hook the solar garden to the existing Xcel feeder line compares to the CAPX2020 transmission line. Beisner stated that the connection line is just like any other 3-phase power line connecting a building site to the power grid. It is not comparable to a power transmission line. Beisner stated that there may be a small increase in power going through the substation.

Rohlik asked Greg Green if his questions and concerns had been answered. Greg said yes.

Madsen asked if the substation has the capacity to safely accept the additional energy. Beisner said yes. Wold stated that Xcel will be liable if it turns out the capacity was not there. Beisner said this may be the last garden built here due to the 10 MW limit on the substation.

On a motion by Madsen, seconded by Mattison, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend Conditional Use Permit application #2-16 for approval by the County Board of Commissioners, subject to the proposed conditions.

Vice-Chair Rohlik called to order a public hearing on a draft sign ordinance.

Brozek presented the draft to the Commissioners, who had previously received a copy in their meeting packets:

- Staff looked at the sign ordinances of surrounding counties. They also conferred with people in the sign industry, particularly Daktronics in Redwood Falls, and also professionals in real estate, crop and seed sales, church groups, and other interested parties in the county.
- The maximum size of permitted signs in each zoning district was based on the nature of the land uses, safety concerns, and general aesthetic in each district. Thirty-two square feet, the surface area of one sheet of plywood, was used as the basic building block for the different allowable sizes.
- Signs may be displayed above the maximum size with a Conditional Use Permit
- The maximum allowed sign size in surrounding counties varies greatly, but overall the new proposed standards in the draft ordinance are either in line with or are less restrictive than the regulations of the surrounding counties.
- The max size in the B-1 and I-1 zones (business and industry) will stay the same.
- The major change will be in the Agricultural District and the right-of-way setbacks, the max size being 64 square feet and the right-of-way setback starting at 0 for small signs and extending to greater distances for larger signs.

Mattison asked about crop signs. Brozek stated they would be exempt from permitting unless they were over 6 square feet in area.

Brozek relayed some feedback and suggestions received from Gary Laughlin from Quicksigns of Willmar. The Commissioners decided to eliminate language prohibiting red, amber, and green

electronic signs and cautionary language, since signs mimicking traffic control signs are prohibited elsewhere in the draft.

Wold stated that the proposed draft is much more liberal regarding the types and sizes of signs that can be displayed and also allows enforcement to be predictable and clear, in comparison to the former sign ordinance.

Brian Kletscher, CEO of Highwater Ethanol, spoke in favor of the draft ordinance, stating that the ordinance is good overall and well written, particularly regarding the allowable sign sizes and setbacks. Kletscher asked the Board to consider the recommendations from Gary Laughlin.

Madsen asked if the new ordinance will affect any existing signs. Brozek responded that all existing signs that were in conformity with the ordinance when they were erected will be grandfathered in and any more restrictive rule in the new ordinance will not affect them.

Mattison asked about how sign borders are treated in the ordinance, and whether the border is part of the sign surface area. Brozek explained that the border is part of the area of the sign only if it is designed to draw attention to the sign or if it is more than 10" wide.

The Commissioners discussed Laughlin's recommendations and decided to make the following changes to the draft:

- Subp 8.2 (page 11): Requirement that dynamic display images change no more frequently than every 8 seconds, changed to every 2 seconds.
- Subp. 8 (page 11): Removed prohibition of red, amber, and green illuminated signs and "caution" language.

On a motion by Mattison, seconded by Madsen, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend the draft ordinance to the County Board of Commissioners for approval, including the above described changes, and subject to staff seeking out additional feedback from Daktronics.

The Commissioners reviewed and discussed the minutes from the December 28<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. On a motion made by Madsen and seconded by Runkel, the December 28<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Planning Commission meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Vice-Chair Rohlik asked if there was any additional business to discuss. Brozek informed the Commissioners that he had received another Conditional Use Permit application from SunShare for an additional solar garden outside of the City of Morgan, to be reviewed at the February 29<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

The Commissioners discussed the possibility of charging an extra permit fee in cases where an applicant brings back an application that was previously denied by the Board.

The Commissioners discussed placing a setback on mining operations from public waters.

Wold updated the Commission on the state buffer legislation and its relation to the County Shoreland Ordinance.

On a motion by Mattison, seconded by Madsen, and passed unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.



---

Nick Brozek  
Land Use & Zoning Supervisor  
Redwood County Environmental Office



---

John Rohlik, Vice-Chair  
Redwood County Planning Commission