

January 26, 2025

To Whom it May Concern:

In mid-2022, I was contacted by a MN DNR representative who told me that he had looked at my property online and that he thought that I was using state property as my own, as my property is directly adjacent to known state land.

I, then, received a letter (attached) that stated that I stood to face criminal charges for utilizing this property as my own, even though this land has been mine, with long established property lines for decades. I was accused of bulldozing this land and storing personal property on state land. This was proven to be untrue. This 'personal property' that was being stored was a deer stand that has been in that exact location for upwards of 30 years.

Upon further discussion, the state refused to pay for an assessor to look at and verify existing property lines. These lines have been long time established lines which was also stated by the forestry representative. I was told that if I agreed to pay for an assessor, I would be offered a 100-year easement lease. Due to economic issues, I did not pay for a full assessment, although I did pay for a land survey, which cost me roughly \$550. This survey was not the full assessment that the state expected me to pay for. The representative who assessed the state was equipped with a handheld device and no other equipment that one would expect to be used with a job of this size. I was told by the surveyor that had come to assess my property that to have a full assessment done would be "very expensive due to the lack of markers on the property." This cost was also not feasible due to the total land value of the property in question being less than the potential cost of the full assessment. By offering a 100-year easement if I paid for a full assessment, I feel that the state does not have much faith in their own, handheld equipment and assessment. They offered me a 10-year easement lease. I feel as though I was bullied into agreeing to their terms, as I was not offered the chance to argue my case.

This land has been in this condition, without the bulldozing that I was accused of, for as long as I can remember. I vividly recall being approximately 14 years old (around the mid-1960s), out hunting this land. The road was the same, it was well traveled and used heavily for the time. If memory serves me correctly, this road was the main road that went East and West in this area. I believe it was called the "old red lake" road. I've lived here, in this area for my entire life, barring the time that I spent serving overseas in the US Army.

The easement that we now have allows us to access the cabin that we built for our family. We wanted to spend the summers on the property and enjoy our retirement. Due to this easement issue, we were also cut off from vital life saving emergency services, including Fire and EMS. This made living in our newly built cabin impossible as we are aging and would possibly need these emergency services.

As this issue now sits, I am stuck paying taxes on land that was taken from me by the state. They offered to allow me to rent this property that has been mine for as long as I can remember. Although I declined the offer to rent my land back, I am still required to pay taxes on it. The state and their representatives, I feel, bullied me into agreeing to this easement and moving my property line.

As stated on the MN DOT surveying manual found online, "The location and restoration of public land and private boundary corners requires a thorough research of all the survey records, recorded and unrecorded for the particular area. The research of the public recorded survey data can be researched by starting with the original Public Land Surveys (PLS) of the United States Government, followed by state, county, township, city and private surveys. The research of private boundary corners will be more difficult as the survey data may not be of public record and is usually stored in private files of present and past property owners, private land surveyors, or by others."

I do not believe that the proper process was followed on this research, on the state's part. My family and children's families have to deal with the consequences of this action that the state took against us.

Thank you for your time.

Gene Scott

This image shows the part of land that was brought into question, due to my deer stand being on the property. The yellow area is the tillable land that has, since, been left to grow over due to this issue.



This image is a zoomed out photo of the property from County road 1 back to our cabin.

