

Oronoco Town Board
Monthly Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2026

Minutes of the regularly scheduled meeting of the Oronoco Town Board held on **Monday, September 14, 2026**, at 5:30pm at the Oronoco Community Center, located at 115 Second Street SW, Oronoco, Minnesota.

Supervisor Ken Mergen called the meeting to order at 5:30pm.

Pledge of Allegiance

The agenda was accepted with a change to remove item number eight rent stabilization.

OTVAR-26-01, Scattered Acres, Inc., Public Hearing

Request: An application for a variance to waive the requirement for a Non-Farm parcel/lot to contain a minimum of 1 acre of non-prime soils in an A-2 zoning district.

Analysis:

Analysis of the 6 criteria for granting a variance is as follows:
(Staff comments are in italics)

Criteria for Granting a Variance: A variance may be granted only when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the official control. Economic considerations do not constitute practical difficulties. The Oronoco Board of Adjustment must find evidence that all of the following facts and conditions exist:

1. There are extraordinary conditions or circumstances, such as irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of the lot or exceptional topographical or physical conditions which are peculiar to the property and do not apply to other lands within the neighborhood or the same class of zoning district;

There are no extraordinary conditions or circumstances such irregularity, narrowness, shallowness, exceptional topography or physical conditions unique to this property. This property shares general characteristics of the surrounding properties, and this criterion is not met.

2. The extraordinary conditions or circumstances are due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner;

The conditions or circumstances of this request are solely created by the landowner as they are seeking to create a non-farm parcel without the requisite non-prime soils. This criterion is not met.

3. The variance is necessary to overcome practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance so that the property can be used in a reasonable manner not permitted by the ordinance;

By reconfiguring the proposed non-farm parcel, the required non-prime soils could be incorporated into the lot. Per the attached exhibit, there are multiple options that could be utilized to incorporate the required non-prime soils. This criterion is not met.

4. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to other property in the area, and will not alter the essential character of the locality;

The variance would not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to other property, but it would alter the essential character of the locality by creating a non-farm parcel that does not meet criteria for non-prime soils. This criterion is not met.

5. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance;

By creating a non-farm parcel that does not meet the requirements of the ordinance the variance would not be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the A-2 district – which is to "maintain, conserve and enhance agricultural lands which are historically valuable for crop production, pasture land, and natural habitat for plant and animal life. This district is intended to encourage long term agricultural uses and preserve prime agricultural farmland by restricting the location and density of non-farm dwellings...". This criterion is not met.

6. The terms of the variance are consistent with the comprehensive plan;

This property is located within Olmsted County's Resource Protection district. Waiving the requirements for non-prime soils would not meet the intent of this district. This criterion is not met.

Conclusion:

The variance to waive the requirement to include a minimum of 1 acre of non-prime soils in a Non-Farm parcel does not meet the established criteria for granting the variance. There are areas of non-prime soils adjacent to the proposed lot/parcel so there are no practical difficulties to including the requisite non-prime soils; there are no extraordinary conditions or circumstances that are unique to this property; the conditions of the request are owner-created; the variance would alter the character of non-farm parcels by not including the non-prime soils; and the variance is not in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the ordinance.

Recommendation:

Staff finds that none of the required criteria for a variance are met by this request and recommends denial of this variance application.

This information was taken from the TCPA packet and is only a portion of the document. The entire document can be found at TCPA or the Oronoco Township Clerk, Jody Schroeder.

Supervisor Mergen opened the public hearing for OTVAR-26-01, Scattered Acres, Inc.

Applicant Angela Palm addressed the Board and provided an explanation of how the variance request meets each of the applicable criteria. She reviewed each criterion and described the circumstances and conditions of the property supporting the requested variance.

Land owner Mike Thompson told the board that there was an existing building site where the applicant is trying to build. The ground in this area is not farmable. The applicant has rented the land for years to pasture horses. The proposed parcel is not feasible as it would close access to an additional 40 acres of farm land.

Supervisor Mergen asked three times for additional comments for or against ORVAR-26-01, Scattered Acres. Hearing not additional comments, Supervisor Mergen closed the public hearing.

Supervisor Johanningmeier stated that the goal is to preserve good, prime agricultural land and that each property must be evaluated based on its individual circumstances. He noted that, in this particular situation, it would not make sense to require the applicant to purchase additional land and remove that land from agricultural production.

After consideration of the application, testimony, and information presented, the Oronoco Board of Adjustment makes the following findings regarding the variance request:

1. **Extraordinary Conditions or Circumstances**
Extraordinary conditions or circumstances exist that are peculiar to the property and do not generally apply to other lands within the neighborhood or the same zoning district. A previous homestead existed on the site, and the property is not suitable for use as conventional farmland. These existing conditions contribute to the unique circumstances of the property.
2. **Conditions Not Created by the Landowner**
The extraordinary conditions affecting the property were not created by the current landowner. The conditions are associated with the historical use and development of the property, including the previous homestead established on the site in approximately 1900.
3. **Practical Difficulties and Reasonable Use**
The variance is necessary to overcome practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance and to allow the property to be used in a reasonable manner. Reconfiguring the property without the variance would restrict access to an additional approximately 40 acres of property owned by Mr. Thompson.
4. **Public Welfare and Character of the Locality**
Granting the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare, materially injurious to other property in the area, or alter the essential character of the locality. The property is currently utilized as pastureland for horses, and the existing driveway and access will continue to be utilized.
5. **Purpose and Intent of the Ordinance**

The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. Granting the variance will facilitate the continued use and protection of the surrounding farmland and pastureland.

6. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

The variance is consistent with the goals and intent of the comprehensive plan because it supports the protection and continued use of surrounding agricultural and pastureland. The proposed home will be located on the existing farmstead site, thereby utilizing an established developed area rather than requiring development of additional farmland.

There was a motion by Supervisor Johanningmeier to approve OTVAR-26-01, Scattered Acred, Inc. with the Oronoco Board of Adjustment finding all criteria of the variance to be met, second by Supervisor Matzke. The motion passed unanimously.

OTVAR-26-02, Hottle, Public Hearing

Request: An application for a variance to allow a dwelling in a non-buildable portion of a non-farm parcel.

Background: Existing Parcel C was recently created (OTMB-25-06). Parcel C is 28.87 +/- acres with roughly 20 acres of buildable area on the south in Section 8 and 10 acres of designated non-buildable area in the north in Section 5. Due to proposed improvements to the transmission lines along the south portion of the property, the prospective buyers would prefer to build in the non-buildable area of the property to minimize the view of the transmission lines. The transmission lines will affect numerous properties in this area and in other townships and counties as well. There are 20 +/- buildable acres in this parcel with options for various placement locations, building orientations and landscape improvements (buffers and/or berms) that can mitigate the view-shed of the transmission lines.

Analysis: Analysis of the 6 criteria for granting a variance is as follows: (Staff comments are in italics)

Criteria for Granting a Variance: A variance may be granted only when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the official control. Economic considerations do not constitute practical difficulties. The Oronoco Board of Adjustment must find evidence that all of the following facts and conditions exist:

1. There are extraordinary conditions or circumstances, such as irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of the lot or exceptional topographical or physical conditions which are peculiar to the property and do not apply to other lands within the neighborhood or the same class of zoning district;

There are variations in topography for this parcel that are generally typical for this area. There are no extraordinary conditions or circumstances that are unique to this property.

The overhead transmission line improvements will affect multiple parcels in Oronoco Township and throughout the County and are not unique to this property. This criterion is not met.

2. The extraordinary conditions or circumstances are due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner;

No extraordinary conditions or circumstances exist and there are 20 +/- buildable acres in this parcel. The request to build in the non-buildable area is created by the applicant. This criterion is not met.

2. The extraordinary conditions or circumstances are due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner;

There are 20 +/- buildable acres in this parcel. There is no practical difficulty in complying with the zoning ordinance and there are options for placement location, orientation of the structure and landscaping improvements that can mitigate the view-shed of the lines. This criterion is not met.

3. The variance is necessary to overcome practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance so that the property can be used in a reasonable manner not permitted by the ordinance;

There are 20 +/- buildable acres in this parcel. There is no practical difficulty in complying with the zoning ordinance and there are options for placement location, orientation of the structure and landscaping improvements that can mitigate the view-shed of the lines. This criterion is not met.

4. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to other property in the area, and will not alter the essential character of the locality;

The variance would not be materially detrimental to the public or materially injurious to other property, but it would alter the essential character of the locality by allowing an additional dwelling in a designated non-buildable area of an A-2 zoning district – the purpose of which is to preserve agricultural lands and use. This criterion is not met.

5. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance; and

The variance is not in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance. The purpose of the A-2 zoning district is to "maintain, conserve and enhance agricultural lands" and "restrict the location and density of non-farm dwellings". This criterion is not met.

6. The terms of the variance are consistent with the comprehensive plan.

This property is located within Olmsted County's Resource Protection district. Allowing a dwelling in a designated non-buildable portion of a parcel where the density of non-farm parcels is already met in the ¼ ¼ section would not be consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Conclusion: The variance to allow construction of a dwelling within the designated “non-buildable” portion of this parcel does not meet the established criteria for granting the variance. There are no practical difficulties that prevent building within the buildable 20 +/- acres; the transmission lines will affect numerous properties and there are no extraordinary conditions or circumstances that are unique to this property; the conditions of the request are owner-created; the density of non-farm parcels in the subject ¼ ¼ section has already been met; there are options to mitigate the view-shed of the transmission lines and there are no practical difficulties in complying with the requirements of the ordinance; the variance could increase the number of permitted dwellings in the ¼ ¼ section; and the variance is not in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the ordinance.

Recommendation: Staff finds that none of the required criteria for a variance are met by this request and recommends denial of the variance application.

This information was taken from the TCPA packet and is only a portion of the document. The entire document can be found at TCPA or the Oronoco Township Clerk, Jody Schroeder.

Supervisor Mergen opened the public hearing for OTVAR-26-02, Hottle.

A letter was submitted by Linda Sparby in support of granting the variance, citing the location of the Xcel Energy transmission lines.

Applicants Blake and Lexi Hottle addressed the Board and stated that their goal is to protect productive farmland. They explained that the proposed homesite is located on hilly ground that is not suitable for farming. They stated that locating the home on this site would help preserve the productive farmland and provide greater separation from the transmission lines.

Contractor Jason Halverson stated that locating the home at the site identified by TCPA would remove several acres of agricultural land from production. He stated that the site proposed by Mr. and Mrs. Hottle is more suitable given the existing characteristics of the property.

Courtney and Caleb Willey, landowners to the north of the property, stated that they are in favor of moving the homesite, provided that the change does not affect their ability to build on their property in the future.

Adam Rucker stated that his primary concern is the potential for three non-farm dwellings in the section if the variance is granted without restrictions. He requested that the Board consider adding a deed restriction to the south of the farm dwelling.

Neil Stolp, a neighbor to the east, stated that he was neither in favor of nor opposed to the variance. He advised the applicants of additional transmission lines in the area, the possibility of a future substation, and the property's proximity to the Prairie Island Community Land.

Contractor Jason Halverson asked whether the section line could be moved. Supervisor Johanningmeier stated that the section line could not be moved.

Supervisor Mergen asked three times for additional comments for or against ORVAR-26-02, Hottle. Hearing not additional comments, Supervisor Mergen closed the public hearing.

Supervisor Johanningmeier stated that this is not the first time the variance request has been discussed. He noted that the Board needs to consider the density of dwellings in the area while also considering the preservation of agricultural land. He stated that the intent is to allow only one additional dwelling in this section while preserving the productive agricultural land.

Ethan Kaske, TCPA, stated that by putting a deed restriction on the property, the parcel could not be split in the future.

After consideration of the application, testimony, and information presented, the Oronoco Board of Adjustment makes the following findings regarding the variance request:

1. **Extraordinary Conditions or Circumstances**
Extraordinary physical conditions exist on the property that are peculiar to the property and support the continued use of the surrounding farmland. The physical characteristics and configuration of the property allow the farmland to remain together and in agricultural production.
2. **Conditions Not Created by the Landowner**
The extraordinary conditions or circumstances are unique to the property and were not created by the current landowner. The existing physical characteristics and conditions of the property are pre-existing conditions.
3. **Practical Difficulties and Reasonable Use**
The variance is necessary to overcome practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance and to allow the property to be used in a reasonable manner. The topography of the land presents physical limitations that make strict compliance with the zoning requirements impractical while maintaining the existing agricultural use of the property.
4. **Public Welfare and Character of the Locality**
Granting the variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare, materially injurious to other property in the area, or alter the essential character of the locality. The variance will allow the farmable land to remain together and in agricultural production while permitting the construction of only one additional dwelling.
5. **Purpose and Intent of the Ordinance**
The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance because it supports the preservation and continued agricultural use of the land. Granting the variance will help preserve agricultural land while allowing reasonable use of the property.
6. **Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan**
The terms of the variance are consistent with the comprehensive plan. The variance supports the plan's objective of preserving agricultural land and maintaining land in agricultural production.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Matzke to approve OTVAR-26-02, Hottle, with the Oronoco Board of Adjustment finding that all applicable criteria for the

variance have been met, subject to a deed restriction allowing only one additional dwelling on the parcel, seconded by Supervisor Mergen. The motion was carried unanimously.

OTVAR-26-03, Pegram

Request:

An application for a Variance to allow an existing single-family dwelling to remain at a front yard setback of twenty-one point three (21.3) feet where thirty (30) feet is required, and at an interior side yard setback of six point seven (6.7) feet where eight (8) feet is required, in an R-1 Low Density Residential District.

Analysis:

Analysis of the 6 criteria for granting a variance is as follows:
(Staff comments are in italics)

Criteria for Granting a Variance: A variance may be granted only when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the official control. Economic considerations do not constitute practical difficulties. The Oronoco Board of Adjustment must find evidence that all of the following facts and conditions exist:

1. There are extraordinary conditions or circumstances, such as irregularity, narrowness, or shallowness of the lot or exceptional topographical or physical conditions which are peculiar to the property and do not apply to other lands within the neighborhood or the same class of zoning district;

The rear part of the property has steep slopes at times over 30% grade. The applicant stated in the application that their licensed soil tester could identify only one area capable of supporting a septic system, which is in the rear of the house.

During construction, the applicant revised the plan to remove a portion of the rear of the house to meet all setback requirements. It appears the applicant was trying to make a good-faith attempt to meet setbacks. This criterion is met.

2. The extraordinary conditions or circumstances are due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner;

Staff acknowledges that the construction of the house in its current location reflects an error in measurement. The setbacks were measured from the edge of the road of Sunset Bay Road NE rather than from the platted right-of-way line. It appears the mistake was unintentional and was not made to obtain additional buildable area. Staff will defer to the Board of Adjustment to determine if this criterion is met.

3. The variance is necessary to overcome practical difficulties in complying with the zoning ordinance so that the property can be used in a reasonable manner not permitted by the ordinance;

Looking back at the historical aerial imagery, there was a dwelling on that property in 2024 that

met all the setback requirements. The house that was built is bigger, but it did fit on the approved site plan within the buildable area. A single-family dwelling is a permitted use in the R-1 Low Density Residential District and is the reasonable and expected use of a platted residential lot in this subdivision. The applicants seek no expansion of use, no additional density, and no use not contemplated by the district.

The dwelling is complete. Compliance would require removal of the covered porch and approximately one foot of the southeasterly wall of the dwelling, which is a load-bearing wall of the finished residence. Relocation of the dwelling at this point is not available as an alternative. This criterion is met.

4. The variance will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to other property in the area, and will not alter the essential character of the locality;

Development in the Sunset Bay Ridge Subdivision consists of single-family dwellings on similarly configured lots, and the dwelling is consistent with that pattern in scale, use, and siting. Granting the variance would not alter the essential character of the locality. This criterion is met.

5. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance; and
The purpose of the R-1 District is to accommodate single-family residential development. The use of a single-family home is permitted. The variance is dimensional only and does not allow the property to be used in any other manner than what is permitted by ordinance or within the surrounding area. This criterion is met.

6. The terms of the variance are consistent with the comprehensive plan.

The Olmsted County Land Use plan describes the land as "Suburban Development Areas consist of very low-density residential areas, relying for the indefinite future on private well and septic systems." This is consistent with the comprehensive plan. This criterion is met.

Conclusion:

The builder is responsible for following the approved site plan, knowing the local ordinances, and meeting the required setbacks of the Oronoco Township Zoning Ordinance. The variance request is for a front yard setback of twenty-one point three (21.3) feet and an interior side yard setback of six point seven (6.7) feet to allow for a completed dwelling to exist within the required yard setbacks of the Oronoco Zoning Ordinance as a result of the builder's error in measurement.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the variance request of a one point three (1.3) foot variance to the side yard setback and an eight-point seven (8.7) foot variance to the front yard setback. The dwelling is complete, and compliance would require removal of load-bearing walls. However, the Oronoco Board of Adjustment should take into consideration all staff findings, public comment, and reviewers' comments when making a determination.

This information was taken from the TCPA packet and is only a portion of the document. The entire document can be found at TCPA or the Oronoco Township Clerk, Jody Schroeder.

Supervisor Mergen opened the public hearing for OTVAR-26-03, Pegram.

Brett Jenkinson addressed the Board and stated that, in his opinion, some of the variance criteria have been met while others have not. He stated that applicants Nicholas and Desirae Pegram were aware of the applicable requirements and are responsible for the construction of the home. Because the home has already been constructed, he stated that the Board should focus on what the property owner can do to address the situation, including fire safety, stormwater and drainage, privacy, and whether the owner should purchase additional property. Mr. Jenkinson stated that he believes the situation resulted from a failure by Olmsted County Planning and that the matter should not have occurred. He expressed his strong opposition to granting the variance.

John Kingsley, a neighboring property owner, addressed the Board and stated that he believes there are inaccurate or incorrectly stated items in the application packet. He questioned who was responsible for reviewing the application and why the situation was allowed to occur. Mr. Kingsley stated that when he built his home, he was told that the proposed plans were not permitted, and he made adjustments to his plans in order to comply with the requirements. He expressed concerns regarding the actions of Kristi Gross and Rob Mathias and stated that, in his opinion, the situation resulted from poor planning and the use of inexpensive labor.

Desirae Pegram, applicant, addressed the Board and stated that the applicants had intended to locate the home farther back on the property. However, she explained that the soil conditions in that area were unsuitable and that the septic system needed to be located in its current position. She stated that the situation was an honest mistake.

Supervisor Mergen asked three times for additional comments for or against ORVAR-26-03, Pegram. Hearing not additional comments, Supervisor Mergen closed the public hearing.

Supervisor Matzke asked how the Board should proceed with the matter. She asked Ethan Kaske, TCPA, whether a survey could be completed to verify the property boundaries and building location. Mr. Kaske stated that a builder would typically have a survey completed as part of the construction process.

Mr. Jenkinson stated that the survey lines had been clearly marked and characterized the situation as an unmistakable error.

Supervisor Mergen noted that the detached garage is not part of the variance request and stated that the separate garage had been approved by Olmsted County. Supervisor Mergen recommended that mitigation measures be identified and addressed before approval of the variance.

Ethan Kaske, TCPA, suggested contacting Construction Management Systems (CMS) regarding questions related to building code requirements.

Supervisor Johanningmeier stated that, because the structure is outside of the approved distances, the Board needs to determine what mitigation measures may be necessary. He stated that additional research is needed before the Board makes a decision.

Mr. Kaske, TCPA, recommended extending the variance consideration for 60 days to allow time for the necessary research to be completed.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to extend the 60-day variance, by another 60 days, to obtain more information, seconded by Supervisor Johanningmeier. The motion was carried unanimously.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Johanningmeier to table OTVAR-26-03, Pegram until the October 12, 2026 meeting, seconded by Supervisor Mergen. The motion was carried unanimously.

Supervisor Matzke will contact CMS to determine the next steps and discuss the matter with OTPAC Commissioner Collins to obtain their input on how to proceed.

Dietel Development

Supervisor Matzke recommended that Oronoco Township support the proposed land-use designation change because the development is consistent with the surrounding land-use pattern. She stated that engineering, septic, drainage, roads, grading, and other related matters, as well as the preliminary and final plat, will be reviewed when the respective applications come before the Township.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to approve the letter of support for the Dietel Development, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion was carried unanimously.

Lake Zumbro Forever Lease Agreement

Attorney Ruppe worked with the Roger Behrens, Minnesota Management and Budget to complete the Lake Zumbro Forever Lease Agreement. The agreement was sent to Lake Zumbro Forever for review. As of the meeting date, no response had been received.

Road Report

Blakely Court Signs/Parking Ordinance

Supervisor Matzke stated that she has been working with Attorney Ruppe regarding signage options for Blakely Court. Attorney Ruppe recommended posting "No Parking" signs sooner rather than later. He suggested that the signs prohibit parking from April 1 through December 1 and include a \$100 fine. He also recommended listing a towing company on the signs to expedite the removal of illegally parked vehicles.

Supervisor Johanningmeier asked whether the restriction could instead be made permanent.

Supervisor Mergen asked whether the signs would be required to be posted at specific intervals or a certain distance apart.

Scott Schumacher suggested that a towing company not be listed on the signs, noting that the signs would need to be updated if the designated towing company changed.

Supervisor Mergen will contact Olmsted County Sheriff Rinn to obtain additional information regarding towing companies and the applicable requirements. The matter will be discussed further at the October 12, 2026, Township Board meeting.

Lake Zumbro Park Driveway Permit

Township Engineer Logan Tjossam, Widseth Engineering, reviewed the driveway permit application for Lake Zumbro Park. The current concept plan depicts access from the northwest corner of Blakely Court serving the proposed parking area.

After reviewing the application and site layout, Mr. Tjossam confirmed that it does not support a driveway connection from Blakely Court. The Township's position is based on the requirements of Oronoco Township Ordinance No. 2023-01. Specifically, the proposed access does not meet the ordinance's driveway separation requirements and would result in more than one access serving the parcel. The ordinance requires a minimum separation distance of 300 feet between driveways on the same side of the roadway and limits parcels to one driveway unless an exception is granted.

Mr. Tjossam indicated that if access can instead be provided from Fisherman Drive, the access review and permitting authority would be Olmsted County, as Fisherman Drive is under County jurisdiction rather than Township jurisdiction.

It was recommended that the access configuration be revised to evaluate a connection from Fisherman Drive and that the applicant coordinate with Olmsted County Public Works regarding applicable access requirements and permitting.

Residents on Tennis Lane

Residents Don and Darla McKenzie were at the meeting to gather information regarding the river corridor overlay district. They would like to build on their property and want to ensure that proper setback requirements are met.

Undeveloped Land within the River Corridor Overlay District

Supervisor Matzke stated that she worked with Attorney Ruppe to develop a letter to ensure that property owners and real estate professionals are accurately informed of the development limitations within the River Corridor Overlay District.

The letter would be provided to TCPA for distribution to property owners and real estate agents before lots are sold, as well as to owners of lots that have previously been sold where no building permit has been applied for. The intent is to ensure that prospective and current property owners understand the applicable development requirements and limitations before making decisions regarding the property.

Supervisor Matzke emphasized that a property being zoned residential does not automatically mean that a dwelling can be constructed on the property, as other applicable regulations and site-specific requirements may limit development.

Supervisor Johanningmeier would like the letter changed to have it read the change is needed due to Oronoco Township zoning ordinances.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to approve the letter within the Oronoco Township Ordinances, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion was carried unanimously.

Resolution 2026-07, Appointing Election Judges for the General Election, November 3, 2026

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to approve Resolution 2026-07, Appointing Election Judges for the General Election on November 2, 2026, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion was carried unanimously.

Eminent Domain, Mississippi-Mankato Transmission Line Project

Clerk Schroeder was contacted by Barbara J. MacInnis, Principal Paralegal for Fredrikson & Byron, P.A. regarding an eminent domain proceeding in which Oronoco Township is named as a respondent due to its interest in roads. Most documents that are served, can be served by mail, but the initial documents, including the Petition, Notice of Hearing, and Notice of Motion must be served personally. Clerk Schroeder will set up a time at Oronoco City Hall to be served with these documents.

Minutes Approval

There was a motion made by Supervisor Johanningmeier to approve the August 10, 2026 meeting minutes, seconded by Supervisor Mergen. The motion was carried unanimously.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Johanningmeier to approve the Special Meeting Minutes for August 18, 2026, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion was carried unanimously.

Treasurer's Report-Brandi Lind

Discussion will be held at the October 12, 2026, meeting regarding the CDs scheduled to mature on that date. Treasurer Lind noted that there is a 20-day grace period following the maturity date before any action is required.

The YTD Statement of Receipts, Disbursements and Balances as of September 14, 2026, shows: receipts \$1,020,242.14, disbursements \$605,101.99, and an ending balance of \$1,068,629.68.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to approve the treasurers report for September 14, 2026, in written form, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion was carried unanimously.

Approval to pay payroll and claims including electronic transfer

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to approve the payroll and claims, including electronic transfers for September 14, 2026, seconded by Supervisor Johanningmeier. The motion was carried unanimously.

OTPAC

River Ridge Fifth Preliminary Plat Approval

A special meeting of the Oronoco Township Planning Advisory Committee (OTPAC) was held on August 17, 2026, regarding the River Ridge Fifth Preliminary Plat. Attorney Ruppe was present and recommended approval of the application subject to numerous conditions intended to preserve Outlot B and restrict structures within the development. OTPAC approved the preliminary plat subject to 25 conditions.

Rent Stabilization

Rent stabilization is being proposed only for Manufactured Home Communities (MHC) and Tiny Home Communities (THC) where a landlord owns the underlying real estate and the homes are owned by individual tenants.

The purpose of rent stabilization is to address the fact that manufactured homes and tiny homes can be difficult, and in some circumstances impossible, to relocate once they have been installed. The proposed ordinance would establish a limit on the percentage by which land rent could be increased each year.

Under Minnesota law, a rent control ordinance must be approved by voters through a ballot question at a general election. The deadline for placing the question on this year's ballot has passed. The matter may be presented as a ballot question at a future general election.

Oronoco Township Board Members Attending OTPAC meetings

There was discussion regarding the significant amount of time, work, and preparation required for Township Board members to attend and participate in Oronoco Township Planning Advisory Committee (OTPAC) meetings.

Clerk Schroeder recommended that all Oronoco Township Board members who attend and participate in OTPAC meetings be compensated at the same rate as OTPAC Commissioners, which is currently \$150 per meeting.

A motion was made by Supervisor Mergen that any Oronoco Township Board member attending an OTPAC meeting receive a \$150 meeting fee, retroactive to the beginning of 2026, seconded by Supervisor Johanningmeier. The motion carried unanimously.

Clerk Notes

Oronoco First Responders/EMS Contract

Clerk Schroeder was contacted by Melissa Griggs of the City of Oronoco. The Oronoco First Responders would like to submit a service provider proposal for the Board's review.

The Township would like to thank the City of Oronoco for reaching out and for its interest in providing first response services to Oronoco Township. While the Township continually evaluates its service providers throughout the year, the Board is not considering any changes to its current emergency service arrangements at this time.

OCTOA Meeting

The next OCTOA meeting will be on September 24, 2026 at Olmsted County Public Works Service Center.

General Election

The General Election will be November 3, 2026. Polls are open from 7am-8pm.

Board Member Comments

Noxious Weeds

Supervisor Johanningmeier received a citizen complaint regarding noxious weed on a property on Zumbro Pine Lane. A letter was drafted to address the noxious weeds within 30 days. The letter will be sent certified mail.

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to approve sending the drafted noxious weed letters to the residents on Zumbro Pine Lane by certified mail, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion carried unanimously.

State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds Program (SLFRF)

Treasurer Lind noted that she received confirmation from the U.S. Department of the Treasury that, on September 10, 2026, the Township's participation in the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) program was officially closed. The Treasury issued a "Final Closeout Award Notice" regarding Oronoco Township's SLFRF award. The Treasury completed its review of the Township's closeout submission and determined that the SLFRF award was successfully closed.

Cravath Addition Meeting

Special Projects Administrator Lynn Koenig will attend the Cravath Addition annual meeting on Thursday, Sept. 17th at 6:00pm.

Road and Weight Restrictions on Minnesota Avenue

Supervisor Matzke was contacted by City of Oronoco Mayor Eichhorst regarding a proposed weight limit on Minnesota Avenue. Mayor Eichhorst suggested rerouting truck traffic onto

Oronoco Township Board Meeting Minutes
September 14, 2026

Township roads. Supervisor Matzke stated that the City should coordinate with Olmsted County to verify the legal authority for such a change. She also recommended conducting a traffic study to determine the volume of truck traffic in the area.

Adjourn

There was a motion made by Supervisor Mergen to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Supervisor Matzke. The motion was carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:40pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

Clerk Jody Schroeder

Tammy Matzke

Ken Mergen

Joel Johanningmeier