

This Document can be made available in alternative formats upon request

State of Minnesota
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETIETH SESSION

H. F. No. 940

02/09/2017 Authored by Bliss and Grossell
The bill was read for the first time and referred to the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources Policy and Finance

1.1 A bill for an act
1.2 relating to state lands; authorizing public sale of certain tax-forfeited land that
1.3 borders public water.

1.4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

1.5 Section 1. PUBLIC SALE OF TAX-FORFEITED LANDS BORDERING PUBLIC
1.6 WATER; BELTRAMI COUNTY.

1.7 (a) Notwithstanding Minnesota Statutes, sections 92.45 and 282.018, subdivision 1,
1.8 Beltrami County may sell the tax-forfeited lands bordering public water that are described
1.9 in paragraph (c) under the remaining provisions of Minnesota Statutes, chapter 282.

1.10 (b) The conveyances must be in a form approved by the attorney general. The attorney
1.11 general may make changes to the land descriptions to correct errors and ensure accuracy.

1.12 (c) The lands to be sold are located in Beltrami County and are described as:

1.13 (1) the East 462 feet of Lot 2, Section 22, Township 146, Range 30 West (parcel number
1.14 08.00213.00);

1.15 (2) .20 acres of Lot 1, Section 21, Township 148 North, Range 32 West (parcel number
1.16 34.00212.00);

1.17 (3) that part of Lot 1 lying northerly of relocated County State-Aid Highway 22 and
1.18 easterly of the following described line: commencing at a point on the north line of Lot 1
1.19 200 feet West of meander corner 57, which is the point of beginning of said line; thence
1.20 running southerly at a right angle to the north line of said lot to the northerly boundary line
1.21 of relocated County State-Aid Highway 22, less the North 450 feet thereof, Section 33,
1.22 Township 148 North, Range 33 West (parcel number 47.00586.00); and

- 2.1 (4) Lot 3, Section 26, Township 152 North, Range 30 West (parcel number 83.00006.00).
- 2.2 (d) The county has determined that the county's land management interests would best
- 2.3 be served if the lands were returned to private ownership.