

Partnership Business Meeting September 29, 2022 at 7:30 a.m.

- <u>www.RegionalPlanningPartnership.org</u>
- <u>RegionalPlanningPartnership@gmail.com</u>
- Partnership and Staff Roster
- In-person meeting will be held at Sherburne County Government Center County Board Room, 13880 Business Center Drive, Elk River 55330
- Join the meeting from a computer click <u>here</u>; join by phone: +1-510-338-9438, meeting number (access code): 2551 655 2595, meeting password: s7jHQjcSM83 (77547527 from phones)

		ΤΟΡΙϹ		ACTION	LEAD
outine Business					Lead
	 Welcome and call to order Introductions/roll call for both in-person and online (sign-in sheet as relevant) a. Members Present (in person or remotely): 			None	Chair
	Becker, City	_X_ Tracy Bertram (P) _X_ Rick Hendrickson (A)	_X_ Greg Lerud (Admin) _X_ Jacob Sanders (LT)		
	Becker Township	_X_ Brian Kolbinger (P) Brad Wilkening (A)			
	Big Lake, City	Paul Seefeld (P) Kim Noding (A)	_X_ Hanna Klimmek (Admin) Lucinda Spanier (LT)		
	Big Lake Township	_X_ Dean Brenteson (P) Larry Alfords (A)			
	Monticello, City	_X_ Lloyd Hilgart (P) Charlotte Gabler (A)	_X_ Rachel Leonard (Admin) Angela Schumann (LT)		
	Monticello Township	_X_ Bob ldziorek (P) Shannon Bye (A)			
	Sherburne County	_X_ Raeanne Danielowski (P) Tim Dolan (A)	_X_ Dan Weber (Admin) _X_ Marc Schneider (LT) _X_ Jessica Barthel (Sec'y)		
	Silver Creek Township	_X_ Barry Heikkinen (P) _X_ Chris Newman (A)			
	Wright County	_X_ Darek Vetsch (P) Mark Daleiden (A)	_X_ Clay Wilfahrt (Admin) Barry Rhineberger (LT)		
	b. <u>Others Presen</u> ■ Staff, o Wrigh Sherbu				
3. Agenda: Revise/approve otes: Motion by Lloyd Hilgart, seconded by Barry Heikkinen				Changes, Approve	Chair
4. Previous meeting <u>notes</u> otes: Motion made by Tracy Bertram, Seconded by Dean Brenteson				Changes, Approve	Chair
5.	Treasurer's <u>Report</u>			Acceptance	Treasurer

Action	Items: None	Action	Lead
Jiscus	sion or Information Items		
1.	Update on RFP process for Purpose and Need study and/or NEPA Document Chad is exploring the issues and risks involved with both processes and shared some of those with the partnership. Chad thinks the partnership could pursue the NEPA process, and needs a vote to develop an RFP. There needs to be discussion on who owns the RFP contract- Wright County, Sherburne County, CMRP, or a combination of entities. Andrew Witter said that regardless of who owns the RFP, we are anticipating a JPA. There are more than enough funds to get through the Purpose and Needs study to decide if this is a Go or a No Go. Chad said that he can draft an RFP for a full Pell Purpose and Needs, he has some templates to follow so we don't need to reinvent the wheel. Raeanne summarized that if this is the route the partnership wants to take, a JPA will need to be drafted between Sherburne and Wright Counties, CMRP can fund the Purpose and Needs study and that will happen second. From there we can decide if this is a Go or a No Go project.	None	Chair
Notes:	Lloyd Hilgart made a motion to direct staff to start working on a JPA between Wright and Sherburne Counties and draft document for a Purpose and Needs study RFP. Dean Brenteson seconded the motion. There were no nays. The motion carried. Discussion of the future organizational structure of the CMRP – memo attached Lloyd questioned that if a JPA happens, where does CMRP go from there? mmented that there are a number of ways the group could be structured. A JPA is a		
formal	branch of the government it is representing. A non-profit would be a 501c3 that is by businesses, private individuals, and other entities.		
to cons terms of subject dues to control powers manag	fit of JPA is that 100% control is retained by the members of the group. Other things sider with a JPA is that they are subject to Open Meeting laws and a JPA is inflexible in of raising funds as compared to a non-profit structure. A non-profit structure is not to Open Meeting laws and has the ability to fundraise and charge for membership o entities who want to be part of the group. However, a non-profit group is not 100% lled by the jurisdictions like CMRP is now. Also, a non-profit has a limited scope of a in terms of a transportation project, whereas a JPA is subject to more organizational ement such as Articles of Incorporation, filing with the Secretary of State, Bylaws and meetings		
	stated that he is leaning more towards CMRP transitioning to a non-profit after the e and Needs study.		
voting	endrickson stated that he wanted to make sure we had discussion only today and no on organizational structure to give a chance for everyone to take this information and the pros and cons within their entities.		

4. Adjourned: Motion made by Lloyd Hilgart, seconded by Dean Breanteson	None	Chair
workplan timeline which they are figuring that last piece out.		
Marc said that the separation from Anne Carroll is complete with the exception of the		
state.		
Notes: Info item from Darek is to take the Energy Transition Survey that is put out by the		
3. Other business/future agenda items:	None	Chair
transition process may look like.		
Clay offered to put together a Transition Strategy Sheet so the group could see what that		
look like for CMRP to review at a future meeting.		
Darek suggested that staff draft potential bylaws to see what a non-profit structure would		
input could go further than if they transitioned to a JPA structure.		
of the region and that CMRP is not folding. It is important that the members from cities and townships remain represented in a non-profit as they are in CMRP, but as a non-profit their		
Rachel stated that we need to be clear that it would be morphing CMRP to meet the needs		
lobbying group, and as a non-profit they would have more leverage to do this.		
Clearly stated the role of the non-profit would be to serve as a communication HUB and a		