

## Meeting Notes: Municipal Delegations TAG

**Date:** 03/5/2026  
**Prepared by:** Makenzie Johnson  
**Location:** Minnesota Room/WebEx Event

### Attendance

- TAG members attending: Scott Wheeler, Scott McKown, Ryan Rehn, Bryan Kerby, Jerry Beckman, Lonnie Johnson, Jerry Norman, James Coyle, Scott Anderson, Randy King, Kyle Dimler, Travis Dunn, Nicole Kastern, Paul Swett, Greg Metz
- Guests attending: Randy King, Ryan Rehn, Scott Wheeler, Jerry Backlund, John Caldwell, Kyle Dimler, Amanda Spuckler, James Coyle, Gerald Norman, Nathan Bruhn, Kade Paulson, Paul Swett, Larry Farrar, Greg Metz, Adam Barthel, Britt McAdamis, Chad Payment, Dan Pederson, Dave Matthews, Jesse Soller, Jessica Kovarik, Jim Tiegs, Kostiantyn Korchak, Makenzie Johnson, Mike Bunnell, Richard Hauffe, Steve Shold, Steve Ubl, Time Manz, Todd Hoekstra, Wendy Rannenberg, Chris Rosival

### Current issues

- The group continued discussing the development of an objective and transparent system for assigning municipal delegation agreements and qualifying individuals.
- Members emphasized balancing clarity, consistency, and flexibility in how project complexity is categorized.
- Significant discussion centered on how the four-tier system should function for both projects and qualified persons.

### Qualified individuals

- TAG members revisited the February 19 consensus that qualifications should attach to individuals, not municipalities, and should be portable across jurisdictions.
- Continuing education and training remained a core expectation for all qualification levels.
- The group discussed how existing QPs would transition into the new level/tier framework, including whether prior “all-or-nothing” determinations should automatically place some individuals at a higher level.
- Members raised concerns about fairness, consistency, and optics when reassigning current QPs into new levels.
- The group agreed further work was needed to clearly define prerequisites, exam pathways, and methods for demonstrating past experience.

## Tiered system

- The TAG reaffirmed previous consensus to use a four-tier system for assigning state projects delegated to municipalities.
- A major portion of the meeting focused on what specific project types should fall into each tier.
- The TAG discussed a proposal to move certain occupancies (e.g., outpatient surgical centers, dementia care, schools with storm shelters) between tiers depending on the presence or absence of specific project complexities.
- Members emphasized the need to identify which components of a project would cause it to move up or down a tier—such as smoke compartments, storm shelters, locking systems, or special hoods.
- The group acknowledged that exact definitions of these components must be carefully developed to avoid recreating subjective decision-making.

## Discussion of alternative tiering approaches

- The group heard a public proposal to implement a point-based scoring system to determine project tier placement.
- Supporters argued a scoring model might reduce subjectivity and better account for variations in project scope, especially small remodels or limited-scope additions.
- Others expressed concern that a granular scoring system would over complicate intake review, increase workload, or unintentionally require DLI to conduct deeper project reviews before delegation.
- TAG members identified the need for additional examples, modeling, and scenario testing before determining whether the point system should be considered as a formal option.

## Delegation process

- The group discussed the need for flexibility in delegating specific projects to municipalities even if that municipality's general delegation agreement would not ordinarily cover the project's tier.
- This flexibility was seen as important for:
  - Allowing municipalities to build competence
  - Reducing delays for applicants
  - Efficiently distributing the workload across jurisdictions
- Members emphasized that although QP levels and project tiers were related, they served different purposes and should not be conflated.

## Next Meeting

**Date:** 04/02/2026  
**Time:** 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.  
**Location:** Minnesota Room/WebEx