

TOTAL RECEIVED = 35

Goal: A statement that broadly describes a desired future condition for Eureka Township

Policy: The position of the Township or course of action the Township will take to implement the goals

Below is a list of the **Draft Goals and Policies** for the Plan chapter that deals with **natural resources**. Please note if you are in favor, not in favor, or are neutral on the goal/policy statement, or find that the statement is unclear.

| Draft Comprehensive Plan Goal/Policy Statement | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Natural Resources GOALS | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
| 1. Protect priority water resources, natural areas and natural resource corridors for future generations to enjoy. | 20 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 2. Preserve open space for the benefits of public health, property values, and rural community character. | 17 | 12 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 3. Protect surface waters and wetland areas to promote recreation opportunities, aesthetic qualities, natural habitat areas, surface water quality, and ground water recharge. | 18 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 4. Protect the habitat and biodiversity of the area. | 13 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 3 |
| 5. Provide for the economic availability, removal, and processing of sand, gravel, rock, soil, and other aggregate materials, while protecting against adverse impacts. | 20 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Natural Resources POLICIES | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
| 1. Strive to minimize tree loss to home sites and roads, and to protect high quality woodlands through the development review process. | 18 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| 2. Require that land use permit requests identify the natural resource corridors and priority natural areas on preliminary plans and submittals. Plans must identify the methods that will be used to protect or manage these resources. | 12 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 3. Utilize Township Ordinances to protect natural resources. Explore performance standards to control the impacts of development (such as landscaping for screening, stormwater infiltration features, or maximum areas of impervious surface), and incentives to encourage conservation. | 14 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 4. Recognize land stewardship practices by private property owners that protect natural areas. | 20 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| 5. Encourage enrollment of priority natural areas in preservation programs. | 16 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Shift land uses that could have adverse impacts on groundwater quality away from groundwater sensitive areas and encourage them in other better protected parts of the Township. | 14 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 7. Encourage minimal use of salts, fertilizers and herbicides in groundwater sensitive areas. | 17 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 8. Consider opportunities for the extraction of aggregate prior to approving requests for nonagricultural land uses. | 12 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 3 |

| Natural Resources POLICIES (Cont.) | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
|--|----------|--------------|---------|----------------------|------------|
| 9. Provide safeguards and controls to minimize environmental and aesthetic impacts of aggregate mining on adjacent properties and the Township as a whole. | 19 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Require that after aggregate mining, land is restored to a usable, attractive condition. | 23 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

| COMMENTS |
|--|
| G1,2, 3. Depends on how. |
| G1 through 5. This is already being done. We don't need more Gov. involvement-or more ordinances and phoney policies |
| G1. We already have this |
| G2. No – not your LAND |
| G3. Not your Land!! |
| G5 through P7. ? |
| P1. Not your LAND! |
| P1. This should be land owners decisions |
| P2 through 10. There are plenty of County, DNR, State Ordinances and Policies – Get out of Private Property Owners way |
| P4. What do you mean recognize? |
| P5. Each his own. Encourage but don't REQUIRE. Any consideration (\$) for |
| P6. Depends on how |
| P7. Where is that? The aquafor is huge! |
| P9. Depends on how |
| P10. Depends on how. Define usable – for what? |
| P10. Already doing! |
| P10. The DNR has this area covered. |
| P10. Up to landowner what they want to do |
| General |
| I want the township out of my property! |
| We already have multitudes of laws and regulations at every level of government designed to protect these resources |
| Why do we need more? |
| I am not aware of any imminent environmental threat facing the township. Are you? |
| Government officials should not abdicate their responsibilities by bringing in ecologists or other people who are not accountable to the citizens for their acts and who have no priorities other than protecting nature from township citizens. If the township does not have the expertise to make environmental determinations then it has no business enacting ordinances or plans that call for those determinations. |
| No more government control! |
| Protect high quality woodlands? The Best! - \$\$ |
| Protect, Preserve, Provide, Encourage, Utilize, Strive = control another persons property rights |
| The goals and policy statements are full of words that suggest your “wishes” to control someone elses property. |
| There is no reason or logic to suggest that you should pass restrictions on some peoples land. |
| The ideas that “incentives”, undefined will exist to encourage “your wishes” do not seem to approach the value of the high quality resources. |

| COMMENTS (Cont.) |
|--|
| There must be plenty of ways (programs) already to contribute to the public good. |
| I suggest anyone in favor of such goals and policies enroll their property in some public good program but leave that decision to individuals not commeties(sp?) or experts. J. Robert Davison |
| I like the "carrot" approach. Leaves option to landowners but does not require it. |
| We need to protect our water and natural resources. This is <u>not</u> a partisan issue! All people can agree on that. Lets use that as a starting point to figure out <u>how</u> we do that. |
| Not a big fan of aggregate. For the most part, aggregate in this area is of limited quality. Protect/extraction should not be a priority and should not be encouraged or incentivized. |
| Good work – <u>thank you!</u> |
| I would prefer natural resource protection to be <u>stronger</u> than the plan is currently is written. |

TOTAL RECEIVED = 35

Goal: A statement that broadly describes a desired future condition for Eureka Township

Policy: The position of the Township or course of action the Township will take to implement the goals

Below is a list of the **Draft Goals and Policies** for the Plan chapter that deals with **agriculture**. Please note if you are in favor, not in favor, or are neutral on the goal/policy statement, or find that the statement is unclear.

| Draft Comprehensive Plan Goal/Policy Statement | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Agriculture GOALS | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
| 1. Protect the Township's rural and agricultural character. | 22 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Promote the economic viability of farming operations. | 20 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 1 |
| 3. Protect agriculture and farm operators from development that may contribute to the loss of farmland, land use conflicts and/or nuisance complaints. | 17 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| 4. Promote agricultural operations that grow products for local consumption. | 19 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| Agriculture POLICIES | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
| 1. Maintain Eureka Township's agricultural zoning of one dwelling unit per quarter-quarter section. | 11 | 18 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2. Continue to support the Right To Farm when using generally accepted agricultural practices. The Township recognizes that with farming come smell, noise, dust, and slow moving vehicles. | 28 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 3. Limit the subdivision of the Township's farmland for housing and other non-farm land uses. Allow limited non-farm development provided that the impact on farming is minimized. | 16 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| 4. Educate residents of the potential conflicts or incompatibilities that can arise between development and agricultural uses. | 19 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| 5. Provide for adequate separation of new non-farm houses from existing confined animal feedlots or manure storage facilities. | 14 | 8 | 11 | 2 | 0 |
| 6. Use local ordinances to support the commercial viability of farming. | 15 | 9 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| 7. Allow farm-related land uses that are directly supportive of commercial agriculture, and develop performance standards for farm-related uses to protect public health, safety and welfare. | 18 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 8. Work with County and State officials to help develop a program that will assess farmland at a lower tax rate. | 22 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 9. Encourage enrollment in farmland preservation programs. | 16 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| 10. Encourage units of government, institutions, or other entities doing business in Eureka Township to consider local agricultural products when making purchasing decisions. | 14 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 0 |
| 11. Be receptive to adjusting local ordinances so that local farms can adapt to new trends in farming. | 20 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 2 |

| Agriculture POLICIES (Cont.) | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
|--|----------|--------------|---------|----------------------|------------|
| 12. Avoid fragmentation of farmland in order to support a "critical mass" of farms, making farming activity more viable in the Township. | 13 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 0 |

| COMMENTS |
|---|
| G1. Sounds like a control statement |
| G2. Why “promote” anything? |
| G4. It’s a free market. |
| P1. Add additional units per strategic vision. Rural. |
| P1. 1 in 20? |
| P1. What is the alternative? |
| P4. Are we stupid? |
| P4. Do you really think we’re ignorant or stupid? |
| P4. Not until high density proposed. |
| P5. Depends on how |
| P5. Review |
| P6. What? |
| P6. How? |
| P7. Stay out of the farmers way! |
| P7. Why do you lump these together in one policy? |
| P8. Already in existence. Stay out of farmers way |
| P8. Don’t we already have that |
| P9. As long as they really do that |
| P9. Let the market work |
| P9. How |
| P10. Let the market alone! |
| P10. Let the market work. |
| P11. Enough with ordinances! |
| P11. Receptive? Just listening? |
| P11. What are you talking about? |
| P11. Depends but generally yes (new trends) |
| P12. Who would be the determiners of policy? No <u>thanks</u> |
| P12. Zoning? |
| P12. You can’t control economic viability |
| P12. on best farmland-preserve it |

| COMMENTS (Cont.) |
|---|
| General |
| I want the township out of my property! |
| This township is trying to control to make this township all about agriculture. There are under 6 farmers who make their total living from farming in this township. The majority of residents are not farmers. Farmers already get huge subsidies from the government to help them that other businesses do not get. Now this board wants to protect them more. We feel our livelihood is just as important. As far as environmental issues you already have many ordinances that protect them. Please keep in mind that the land is owned, by the people who make the payments and taxes and not the board. Older residents reaching retirement should have the chance to sell their land for their retirement and given more building rights. The Board does not own the land-if you want to preserve it – Buy it and you can do what you want!! |
| Forms – only 3 real farming operations in this township. The rest are <u>small</u> acreage-hay, corn, etc. for “part-time” farms! |
| I would prefer a more simplistic solution-2 per quarters/quarter <u>challenge</u> the metro council – whose running this Township? There is really only 3 real farms in the township. The rest – even though a lot of land – are weekend, 2 month of the year – farmers, if you want to call them that. |
| Anything in any way, shape, or form of mandating anything of anyone’s land is not allowing freedom of ownership. If I own a large piece of property I should be able to farm it, preserve it, or develop it however and whenever I want to. My neighbor should have the same right. Do I want my neighbor putting up 100 houses in a development right next to me? Not exactly, but it should be his right to do so. I also have the right to buy his land if I can meet his price. There comes a point where government is just making ordinances for something to do and to look like they’ve accomplished something. More and more control is not what is needed. |
| These questions imply that you have specific ideas of how to achieve these goals and implement these policies but you don’t tell us what those ideas are. By asking for support/non support you may want to use these results to maintain that support exists for these undisclosed ideas. That would be manipulative. Why don’t you give examples so we know what you are asking? I highly recommend that you read “Basic Economics” by Thomas Sowell. It is an easy to understand explanation of why so many well-intentioned laws lead to unintended consequences that nobody wanted. |
| Protect, promote, Maintain, Limit, provide, Encourage, Be receptive, avoid = control another persons property rights |
| Yes, all good. This is a community with some very high-quality farmland. The township should inventory farmland based on quality and comparative yield (Natural Resources Conservation Service has this information). |
| I would <u>not</u> like to see more feedlots! Environmental disasters and the odor is a real problem. Flies too. |
| I support measures that would promote sustainable, organic agriculture! |

TOTAL RECEIVED = 34

Goal: A statement that broadly describes a desired future condition for Eureka Township

Policy: The position of the Township or course of action the Township will take to implement the goals

Below is a list of the **Draft Goals and Policies** for the Plan chapter that deals with **land use**. Please note if you are in favor, not in favor, or are neutral on the goal/policy statement, or find that the statement is unclear.

| Draft Comprehensive Plan Goal/Policy Statement | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Land Use GOALS | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
| 1. Allow land uses that will maintain Eureka Township's rural character. | 21 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 2. Encourage protection of priority natural areas and natural resource corridors through local land use decisions. | 15 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Promote the continuation of agriculture as the primary land use. | 18 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 4. Allow limited non-farm development provided that the negative impact on farming is minimized. | 23 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Land Use POLICIES | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
| 1. Maintain Eureka Township's agricultural zoning of one unit per quarter-quarter section. | 10 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 2. Create a transfer of housing rights program that achieves the specific goals of such a program, stated in the Land Use Plan. The goals are: | 14 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 9 |
| 1) The program will be useful in achieving the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. | 15 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 2) The program will help relieve development pressure on large blocks of agricultural property. | 16 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 3) The program will allow property owners to gain revenue by selling housing rights. | 15 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| 4) The program will be compatible with the Metropolitan Ag Preserves Program. Property owners will continue to have choices to use their land in ways that maintain eligibility in Ag Preserves. | 18 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 5) The program will encourage protection of priority natural areas and natural resource corridors. | 12 | 11 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 6) The program will protect opportunities for efficient and cost-effective land development for a time when public sewer and water services may become available. Such opportunities include the creation of a suitable commercial/industrial area in the Township. | 14 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 7) The program will be understandable by citizens. | 24 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 8) The program will respect landowners' rights to use their land in a way that does not significantly harm others' property nor the community's health, safety, welfare and morals. | 20 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9) Administration of the program will not create an undue burden on Township government. | 23 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 5 |

| Land Use POLICIES (Cont.) | In Favor | Not in Favor | Neutral | Statement is unclear | Left Blank |
|--|----------|--------------|---------|----------------------|------------|
| 3. Use Township Ordinances to minimize the visual and environmental impacts of development. | 17 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Continue to allow agricultural/horticultural businesses and home occupations in a manner consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. | 23 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 |
| 5. Conduct thorough study before guiding land for commercial-industrial use. | 23 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 6. Consider opportunities for aggregate extraction as part of orderly and staged land use planning when considering land use changes that would preclude future access to those resources. | 15 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| COMMENTS | | | | | |
| G1. "Allow" is control. | | | | | |
| G2. Depends on how | | | | | |
| G2. If landowner <u>wants</u> | | | | | |
| G3. "Promote" | | | | | |
| P1. In favor of 2 per quarter-quarter section | | | | | |
| P1. 1 on 20. | | | | | |
| P2. I would prefer more | | | | | |
| P2-2. Housing density and less | | | | | |
| P2-3. Including additional reserve rights | | | | | |
| P2-4. (Government) (townboard) involvement | | | | | |
| P2-5. How? | | | | | |
| P2-5. Too vague | | | | | |
| P2-6. ! | | | | | |
| P2-7. Probably not. | | | | | |
| P2-7. Yeah, right, they rarely are. | | | | | |
| P2-8. Who says what's harmful to the community's health etc | | | | | |
| P2-8. Land owner full control | | | | | |
| P2-8. nor the community's health, safety, welfare and morals – delete words | | | | | |
| P3. What? | | | | | |
| P3. Too vague | | | | | |
| P3. No – I don't trust the township to act in my best interests | | | | | |
| P4. Which plan? | | | | | |
| P4. What does this mean | | | | | |
| P4. Expand? | | | | | |

| COMMENTS (Cont.) |
|--|
| P5. Yes – Lets just do this already to end this debate. Should only do commercial if it increases tax base – and pay for itself |
| P5. Who would do the study? |
| P6. Depends what you mean. |
| P6. More pits or restrict pits? |
| |
| General |
| Stick with Strategic Vision of adding additional building rights for large land owners. |
| I want the township out of my property! |
| Totally against the primary and secondary conservation areas. Government (MAC) has way too much control over things and they don't need more. Let landowners do what they want. They paid for it, they're paying the taxes on it, let them use it however they want. People need to stop trying to control every action that the next person makes. Let the landowners decide what they want to do with their own land and when they want to do it. One should not be punished for owning desirable land. |
| It appears that once again the town board has wasted taxpayer's dollar. This Comp Plan could have been accomplished and compiled by township. If the "great and glorious" Met Council vetoes it – we can go forward with zoning changes and present standards. The board acts as though they're afraid of this big brother. Leadership anybody??? |
| TDR should be a privilege – you get to do it if you agree to protect high quality farmland and natural resources. If not, you don't get to do it. So require protection. |
| TDR-I agree market should set price. Township should <u>not</u> cap price for lots. That would pervert the market and encourage development. |
| Do not add "development rights" to make their total number greater than the one-per-quarter-quarter will allow. |
| Saying that other communities have adopted similar plans does not say anything about whether these are good ideas. There are many places in this world that have terrible laws that oppress people. We need to look at whether what is being proposed is a good idea, not act like lemmings and adopt what others have adopted for that reason alone. We have 1 per qtr qtr zoning. This is a rural township. Why do we need all these restrictions and regulations Why not address some real problems in the township For example, why are many people afraid to run for office after hearing stories about people trying to run others off the road, board members being threatened with harm if they don't vote the right way, unidentified arsonists burning down a garage. These are REAL threats to the Community's health, safety, welfare and morals. |
| Not in favor of restrictions that inhibit land use by the owner, if of a <u>reasonable</u> nature. I favor 2 per quarter/quarter section. Give everyone equal rights/opportunities Keep your proposal for transferring "simple" and easy to execute and understand |
| Thanks for all you're doing. |