

EUREKA PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
SEPTEMBER 2, 2008

Chair Sharon Buckley called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Commissioners in attendance were Sharon Buckley, Vince Mako, Kenny Miller, Ken Olstad, and Nancy Sauber. Audience members included Supervisor Jeff Otto, Virginia Windschitl, Wayne Windschitl, Supervisor Dan Rogers, Mike Greco, Mike Giles, Don Pavek, Steve Wilmot, Bruce Schweich, Lee Dilley, Carol Cooper, Supervisor Carrie Jennings, Caroline Jones, Spencer Jones, Kelly Brosseth, Ray Kaufenberg, Jerry Zimmer, Betsy Zimmer, Pat Mason, Thomas Conroy, Andre' Stouvenel, Gary Gunderson, and Supervisor Cory Behrendt.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Buckley had a few additions to the agenda. Ken Olstad moved to approve the agenda as amended. Nancy Sauber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

A. Permit Requests

1. Jerry and Betsy Zimmer, 5716 225th St. W., New House

Jerry and Betsy Zimmer represented the application for a 1,400 square foot rambler with a partially finished basement and an attached 944 square foot garage. The total project square footage is 2,344. The existing driveway will be utilized. (The distance from the driveway to the nearest intersection is given on the application, but is not needed as the driveway is already there and a new one is not being applied for.) A letter dated May 22, 2008, from the Dakota County Water Resources Department granting a shoreland building permit for the construction of a house and listing procedures and practices that must be followed was attached. A similar letter from the same agency, dated August 14, 2008, permitting the septic system and listing the procedures and practices that must be followed was included. A document from the Dakota County Treasurer-Auditor, dated August 13, 2008, regarding the lot split of the parcel was attached to the application as well. Further, there was a letter, dated May 22, 2008, attached from the County assigning an address to the property in question. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Area Hydrologist, Janell Miersch, sent a letter dated August 26, 2008, which gives particulars about the Zimmers' low-water ford crossing of the Vermillion River. It states that, in its present form, the crossing has been grandfathered in, and no permit is necessary for the current crossing. In this same letter, Ms. Miersch further states that any reconstruction of the crossing *would* require a permit, which could be denied under current Minnesota Rules. The Zimmers' access must be no more than 2 feet below the Regulatory Flood Protection Elevation. Mr. Zimmer showed a cross-sectional survey that indicates their access elevation is at a proper elevation. Other information from the DNR regarding the crossing and the River is to be found in this communication.

Nancy Sauber pointed out that the document from the Dakota County Treasurer-Auditor has a different Property Identification Number (PIN) from that given on the application form submitted by the Zimmers. After some discussion, it was clarified that the PIN on the application form was incorrect. It was corrected (13-00200-011-75) and then initialed and dated by Jerry Zimmer.

The square footage was clarified with Mr. and Mrs. Zimmer. Jerry initialed and dated the corrected square footage information on the application.

The distance to the nearest neighbor's farm building is noted on the Certificate of Boundary Survey as 800'.

Sharon Buckley asked Jerry whether there were to be any changes to the existing driveway. Jerry showed a copy of the new Rules for non-permitted crossings that he received from Ms. Miersch that tells what can be done to their crossing without requiring a new permit. For example, Jerry stated, they could install permanent steel plates at the base. Mr. Zimmer said that he does not intend to change the crossing, and that it is fine the way it is. Sharon stated that it would be desirable for the Commission to make contact with the DNR before Monday's Board meeting to be sure that the understanding of what is communicated in the letter is correct. Sharon said that she would personally make the phone call to the DNR and ascertain whether there are any other concerns that Eureka Township should be aware of concerning this issue.

Kenny Miller moved to forward the application to the Board with the recommendation for approval as presented with any restrictions by the DNR and Dakota County Soil and Water, as presented in the documents. Ken Olstad seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmer also showed a new FEMA floodplain map and said that the floodplain has been made much smaller. He also had a new river map and said that the portion of the Vermillion River that goes through his property is no longer designated as trout stream, but instead is designated as "conservation corridor." These new maps are now available, Jerry commented.

The motion was then voted on and was passed unanimously.

2. Thomas and Deborah Conroy, 23145 Denmark Avenue, new farm building

Thomas Conroy represented the application. It is for an 18,736 square foot pole shed with 16' walls. A site plan was submitted as well as an agricultural building exemption application. The building's intended use is for machinery and hay storage. The distance to the nearest residence is 800'. The setbacks are ample. Thomas stated that it is possible that the building might be smaller than applied for.

Chair Buckley asked that the minutes reflect that Mr. Conroy gave the incorrect date with his signature on the application form. He gave the date as September 18, 2008, but Town Clerk Nanett Sandstrom received the application on August 18, 2008. Mr. Conroy would have signed it on *August* 18, 2008; the date of this meeting was September 2, 2008. The application was clearly on time, Sharon commented.

Ken Olstad move to forward the application to the Board with the recommendation to approve. Nancy Sauber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Kenny Miller will verify the setbacks for this agricultural building.

3. Mike Giles, 23777 Cedar Avenue, farm building

Mike Giles was present to represent the application, which is for a farm building of 1536 square feet. The application was amended to show that the walls are to be 12' high, as this information was not given. Mr. Giles initialed and dated the change. The application form gave the start date as November 1, 2007, and the completion date as January 1, 2008, Sharon pointed out. Mike explained that he actually had re-used an old application form which he had started to fill out in the past and but had not completed. The dates were changed to give the start year as 2008 and the completion year as 2009. Mike initialed and dated these changes. The application includes a letter from Dee Jarvis of Dakota County Water Resources department, dated August 18, 2008, which states that there is no permit needed from the County if the building is located outside the green shaded area shown on the accompanying map.

Sharon mentioned that the site plan shows the proposed building next to the more western of two buildings already on Mr. Giles' property. It was clarified that it is north of the middle of the three smaller outbuildings that exist on Mr. Giles' property, as shown by the aerial view. The existing building that the proposed building is north of is the one that is sized 32' X 80'. (There are also two much larger buildings shown further to the west.) Mike had not drawn all the buildings on his property on the site plan, he said. Sharon asked Mike how long these buildings had been there. He replied six, seven, ten, twelve (years); he didn't know; he just likes building sheds, he said. Sharon asked if the buildings were all for agricultural uses. He replied all except the one that is used for his son's excavating.

Mike submitted an agricultural building exemption form. The building's intended use is for raising chickens and pheasants and also for plants. Mr. Giles stated that it is for personal use only. Nancy Sauber asked whether the date of the signature on the ag exempt form was clear on the original as it was not clear on her copy. Sharon answered that it looked like 8-10-08. Nancy noted that on the number four item on the ag exempt form that Mike has circled the word "owner." Nancy stated that she believes he needs to check "yes" or "no." Mike then checked "yes" and initialed and dated the addition. Nancy also pointed out that on item number three of the form "livestock" should be checked if Mr. Giles is going to use the building for chickens and pheasants. Mike checked "livestock" and initialed and dated the change, as requested by Chair Buckley.

Kenny Miller moved to forward the application to the Board with the recommendation for approval of the farm building. Vince Mako seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ken Olstad will verify the setbacks when the stakes are in.

4. Wayne and Virginia Windschitl, 5294 235th St. W., addition to house

Wayne and Virginia and Bruce Schweich, contractor contact person, were present to represent the application. The addition's foundation will consist of 400 square feet. The Windschitls propose to add a second story over the existing structure and to add a porch to the house as well.

The 1800 square feet noted on the application form is the number for the existing house. The dimensions of the porch addition are given on the site plan.

Sharon Buckley asked about the location of the well and septic system. Virginia added the locations of the well and of the septic tanks and drain field and an estimation of the distances to the house and other buildings.

Kenny Miller moved forward the application to the Board with the recommendation for approval as presented. Vince Mako seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5. Gary and Eunice Estrem, 10270 250th St. W., porch and deck

Don Pavek of College City Remodeling was present to represent the application. It was clarified that there is a deck of 240 square feet and, alongside it, a screened porch of 240 square feet. The porch will have a foundation; the deck will not. The setbacks were clarified. Any additions were initialed and dated by Mr. Pavek. There are two septic tanks shown on the site plan. The location of the well was in question. Mr. Pavek was asked to attempt to talk to the Estrems to obtain this information. While he did so, the Commission moved to the next permit request.

6. Gary Gunderson, 25361 Ipava Avenue S., new garage

Mr. Gunderson was present to represent the application, which is for a 1536 square foot unattached garage with 9'10" walls. (The height of the walls was added to the form, as the blank after "walls" had been misinterpreted by Gary to mean the square footage of the walls.) Sharon asked Gary to add the location of the well and the septic system and an estimation of the distances to the garage to the site plan. He did so and initialed and dated the additions. The setbacks were adequate.

Kenny Miller raised the question of whether a demolition permit were not required as Mr. Gunderson proposes to remove the existing garage and the existing milk house, as noted on his site plan. It was discussed whether such a demolition permit was required for the removal of any structure or only for the removal of a dwelling. Gary said that he had not seen a demolition permit on the list of permits required (on the website.) It was stated that the demolition permit was required only for the teardown of a house. Gary Gunderson said he wanted to be sure that there would not be a problem concerning this. He did not want to slow down his project.

Kenny Miller moved forward the application to the Board with the recommendation for approval with the well and septic distances as noted. Vince Mako seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Gunderson again asked about whether he needs demolition permits and again noted that he had not seen "demolition permit" on the permits required list. Sharon said that the question would be looked into. Kenny Miller said that it is the Township's responsibility and it is "not on" Mr. Gunderson. Kenny repeated that he believes that the demolition permit is for any structure on a site and that this needs to be clarified for Mr. Gunderson. He also said that the Township should be sure that the demolition permit is added to the list of permits required, whether it is for any structure or only for a house. It should have been on the list. Sharon

resolved the question by asking audience member Mike Greco, Planning Commission Chair at the time that the Building Official gave input on demolition permits. Mike reminded the Commission that a demolition permit is required for the teardown of any structure. This is to be part of the building permit application, Mike added, not a separate application. Sharon commented that the building application form has not been modified to reflect that. Gary said that he wanted to be sure that he did not need a special permit. It is noted on his site plan that he intends to teardown the two structures.

Ken Olstad moved to interpret Mr. Gunderson's application to include application for the demolition of the two buildings on the site plan. (Existing garage and existing milk house) Kenny Miller seconded the motion. The Planning Commission unanimously passed the motion.

Don Pavek (Estrem application) returned with the information requested earlier. Mr. Pavek said that the well was 40 feet to the south of the house. Sharon noted that it is on the opposite side of the house from the septic system. Mr. Pavek initialed and dated the additional information.

Kenny Miller moved to forward the application to the Board with the recommendation to approve the plans as presented and amended. Nancy Sauber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

B. Land Use and Zoning Issues

1. John and Mariann Storlie, 23449 Dodd Blvd., Lot split

John Storlie was present to represent the application. The split is for PIN 13-00700-010-02, Parcel A, which consists of 80.205 acres. Parcel B, to be split from Parcel A, consists of 6.322 acres. Nancy Sauber noted that some information was missing on the second page of the application form. In reply, Sharon stated that the Town Clerk would give the date the application was received and would sign the application as Zoning Administrator. It was also clarified that there is a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for gravel mining existing on the property. Sharon noted it on the form and dated the notation. Sharon noted that a copy of the CUP is to be attached to the application. (It is not an Interim Use Permit (IUP) as is given under the newer Mining Ordinance, because this use pre-existed that Ordinance and was grandfathered in.) Kenny Miller asked with which parcel the CUP would remain. Mr. Storlie replied that the CUP would remain with the larger parcel. Kenny Miller pointed out for the record that the piece being split, Parcel B, would lose its CUP. The remainder parcel would retain the CUP. Kenny said that, while he believes it is correct to specify with a split involving a CUP with which parcel the CUP is to remain, the Township should check with the attorney about this. Sharon asserted that Mr. Storlie does need to declare with which property the CUP would stay. John repeated that it should remain with the larger, remainder or parent parcel, the one he still owns, not with the one he is splitting off. Sharon stated that the minutes would reflect this. John was also asked whether a non-conforming use registration exists for the property. He said that he did not register for such a use; it was noted that he did not need to do so, as he has a CUP for that use. Sharon noted on the form that no NCU registration exists for the property.

Kenny Miller moved to forward the lot split application to the Board with the recommendation to approve as presented. Ken Olstad seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2. Kelly Brosseth, 9235 235th St. W., Level 3 Mining Interim Use Permit (IUP)

Kelly Brosseth and Pat Mason, of Ames Construction, represented the application. The application is for a Level 3 Extraction Permit for the extraction of sand and gravel. The extraction area will be on 79.85 acres, which is part of a larger parcel of approximately 155 acres. It is proposed to include stripping of topsoil, mineral extraction, material processing, including crushing, screening and washing activities, and loading and transporting materials to and from the site. Currently, five acres of the proposed site is being operated under a Level 1 Extraction Permit.

Sharon asked Pat Mason to sign as Operator on the application form.

Under Ms. Buckley's guidance, the Commission and the applicants went through the list of application information and the list of supporting documentation required in Ordinance 6, Chapter 5, Sections 1 and 2. The only piece of information missing was about the construction fencing. Mr. Mason said that they would have that information in to the Town Clerk by the next day. This was acceptable to the Commission.

Sharon Buckley stated that the Commission reserves the right to ask for any additional information it deems necessary throughout the procedure. Pat Mason offered that, if the Commission should have any questions, the binder presented includes a list of consultants who would be happy to answer any such questions. Pat said that the Commission is welcome to call any of the consultants.

Sharon stated that the Land Alteration Plan has been completed.

Kenny Miller moved that, when the application is complete, that it be forwarded with the supporting information to the Township's designated engineer, TKDA, to review the application and for the preparation of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet. Sharon Buckley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Supervisor Cory Behrendt asked that a Commissioner be designated as a contact person for the Board for any questions on this application. Sharon Buckley agreed to be that contact person.

3. Lee Dilley, 714 Highland Avenue W., Northfield, lot split

Lee Dilley was present to represent the application. The property to be split is along Denmark Avenue, near the Prairie Creek Community School. The PIN is 13-03600-010-75; the property, Parcel A, is 130.98 acres. Parcel B, to be split from Parcel A, consists of 5.26 acres. Mr. Dilley explained the site maps, pointing out the property to be split and how it relates to the present school property.

Kenny Miller moved to accept the lot split application. Ken Olstad seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Prairie Creek Community School, 27695 Denmark Avenue, Conditional Use Permit

Spencer Jones, landscape architect, Caroline Jones, Director of Prairie Creek Community School, and Steve Wilmot, architect, represented the application.

Spencer Jones presented and explained a color layout of the school building and site. The plan is to expand the school to accommodate sixty more students, bringing the maximum enrollment to 180 students. There are two existing access points to Denmark Avenue. These will be retained, while there would also be a new entrance on Denmark on the south end of the property. The parking lot will be reconfigured for visitor and volunteer parking, while the faculty parking would be off to the side to the south. There would be a bus drop-off, which would allow for the stacking of two buses. The playgrounds will be relocated. Plantings are shown for screening the parking lot.

Steve Wilmot said that they plan to work with the look of the existing buildings, which are stucco, with large banks of windows. Drawings have been submitted for the building elevations.

Ken Olstad asked whether the parking area would be permeable gravel as the current parking area is. Spencer said that the budget would probably allow for the area to be paved, and that there are two retention areas proposed. One will accommodate the run-off from the new building; the other is for the run-off from the pavements. Kenny Miller asked about the water drainage to the creek to the north. Spencer replied that there is a ridgeline and that half of the water goes to one ditch and the other half to another. (He pointed out these ditches on the plan.) Kenny asked about rain gardens to filter the run-off. Spencer said that was what he had just been speaking about with the retention areas. The soil is fairly porous, Kenny and Spencer agreed.

There was a question by Nancy about the information to be checked off on the second page about the existence of a CUP, an IUP, or a Non-conforming Use (NCU) registration on the property. The concern was that the form be complete. Not all the Commissioner's copies showed that information, but Chair Buckley's did show that there is none of the above for the School property. It is recognized that the School was in existence before CUP's for schools were required.

Nancy Sauber pointed out that the letter from Steve Wilmot, dated August 21, 2008, although titled "Conditional Use Permit Request," mentions the use as a non-conforming use in two places. This is not a NCU, but a Conditional Use, a permitted use in the Township.

Sharon read the seven points addressed under "general information" in Mr. Wilmot's letter. These are in response to the criteria for a CUP, listed on p. 72 of the Ordinances. Nancy Sauber asked if the increase in enrollment, while not a large number of students, would result in extra buses, or would the increase be absorbable by the number of buses already in use. Caroline Jones replied that the school currently has one bus and that it would probably need to add a bus.

Nancy said, so, when Spencer said that there was room to stack two buses, that would, in fact, accommodate all the buses required. Caroline agreed that this is so.

A public hearing date was set and will be published for September 15, 2008. All landowners within 1000' of the School will be notified of the application per the Ordinances.

Steve Wilmot asked whether they should follow up with the Board at their meeting on the upcoming Monday. Sharon said that it might be helpful for a representative to be in attendance in case the Board had any questions. The Commission's recommendation to the Board would be made at its October meeting.

6. Harry Swantek, building permit issue

Mr. Swantek had a question; Nanett Sandstrom had directed him to the Building Inspector. Sharon stated that apparently the Building Official had satisfactorily addressed Mr. Swantek's questions, as he was not present.

7. Other Land Use and Zoning Issues

There were none presented.

The Commission recessed at 9:15 p.m. The Commission reconvened at 9:22 p.m.

C. Approval of Minutes

1. August 4, 2008, Planning Commission Regular Meeting

There was one change suggested. Sharon Buckley moved to approve the minutes as changed. Kenny Miller seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2. August 19, 2008, Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing Minutes

A number of corrections were offered. Sharon asked that the minutes of this meeting acknowledge that, although the minutes of the public hearing were correct on her point, she was incorrect when she had stated that there would be a transcription of the public hearing. There are summary minutes of the public hearing, but not a transcription of it. Vince Mako moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Sharon Buckley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

D. Other Business

1. Second soils verification inspector for septic system installations

Kenny Miller said that he had discussed this with Supervisor Cory Behrendt, and that Cory thought that the Township could at least temporarily hire a gentleman to whom Kenny had spoken about this, a Mr. Darryl Gilmer. Mr. Gilmer could handle the responsibility until it could be determined whether this had to be put on a contract basis or not. It is imperative that the Township has someone designated to do this work, Kenny said. It will be on the Town Board agenda for their next meeting. Mr. Gilmer is certified throughout Minnesota. There is not someone certified at the state level at Waldron Associates, Kenny stated.

2. Letter to CapX 2020 on Behalf of the Township

Ken Olstad said that, at the last open house that CapX had in Lakeville about the routing, there was a lot of discussion about the two alternative routes that go through Eureka Township, one being along County Road 86, and the other being along 240th Street. There was a question about County Road 70, which runs north of the Township. The Citizens Energy Task Force asked CapX if it would not include that route in their application so that it can get a hearing in front of the judge and be properly examined as an alternative. There were many reasons given as to why that might be a good alternative route. Craig Poorker is one of the project managers from CapX, and it was discussed with him about getting a letter requesting that on behalf of the Township.

Ken is suggesting that the Township do that. Ken has written something in the form of a resolution that might be used for that purpose. The basic reasons for this request are: 1) County Road 70 corridor is not in a residential zone, unlike the Eureka routes; 2) the County Road 70 corridor already has power lines, and thus would not suffer as much of an adverse impact as Eureka would; 3) by going along County Road 70, future land use options would not be eliminated because all the land there is already industrial with power lines; 4) power lines do not fit well with Eureka's tradition of planning for preservation and maintaining the quality of the agricultural, natural, and residential characteristics of its land; 5) going through the Township would not be as consistent with the Metropolitan Council's designation of Eureka as an ag preserve; 6) most of the power demand mentioned in the attempt to justify this power line is in the metro area, and thus it makes sense from a standpoint of fairness that the power line not go through Eureka Township. Ken said that he would like the Commission to recommend to the Board that it send such a letter on behalf of the Township to CapX 2020, requesting that the route be included in the application as one of the alternatives. Sharon asked whether the CapX2020 people seemed receptive to the letter. Ken replied that he had not shown them any proposed text, but talked about that the Township might send them a letter. Ken said that the CapX2020 people seemed a little uncomfortable with it.

Vince Mako asked whether there had been any discussion of using the new aluminum/ceramic 3M wires that allow for more than twice the capacity. The sag associated with these wires is significantly less.

Nancy Sauber said that she is not against sending such a letter, but just wanted to comment on what she and Jeff Otto had talked about with the CapX2020 people at the open house held in the afternoon. They had spoken to the routing staff about the possibility of putting something along County Road 70, but lower because of the airport. Those people referred Jeff and Nancy to another staff person with whom they spoke about pole heights. That person then referred them further to Kevin Lemmons, who is an engineer with CapX2020. His reaction was that he does not see County Road 70 as a viable route at all. He said that the 115kv and the 345kv lines cannot be put on the same pole, as it would be too tall because of airport restrictions. If they were to be placed side by side, a 300' easement would be required, Kevin had stated. There are "pinch points," as he called them, along the route, which would pose problems with that.

Kenny Miller said that what he thought that the Township should ask CapX2020 to do is to ask them to explore all technological advances to minimize impact, no matter which route they choose, and that may have some bearing on the route.

Ken said that this is particularly a request about the routing application to the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). CapX2020 is required to present *at least* two routes; they can submit more than two routes. The Township would be asking that they include an additional route for consideration. It is not saying that it is necessarily the best route because all the engineering reasons are known, but are asking them to consider it, because there are some reasons that it might be a better route. It might be a good idea to include something about the ceramic technology, but the point is, the Township wants them to consider that route. Maybe it is not feasible; maybe it is. When Ken had spoken to Mr. Lemmons, he said, Kevin did not say it could not be done. He said it was not viable, and, when pressed, said that, philosophically, they do not like to do that, Ken said.

Kenny commented that his point is that the Township needs CapX2020 to consider all technological advances for every route. If the advances are not applicable, tell the Township why not, in language that can be understood. Do not say we can't afford it, or we do not like that idea. Tell us why it can't be in this place, and why it must be in that place instead. Tell us why you have to burden the Township with this route.

Sharon commented that it is within the Commission's responsibility to the community to provide input wherever it can. This is a well-written start. The Board may have more to add to it. The Commission can recommend that they look into this.

Ken said that the important thing is that the Township is on record as having specifically requested that the route be included as one of the alternatives to be considered.

Vince Mako suggested that the Township also request a response from CapX2020.

Ken suggested that he could add something to his submission to request a response and could add something about the new technologies that might make this a feasible route. The Board can add what they want, but this would give them something to start with.

Ken Olstad moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board that a letter be sent to CapX requesting that the County Road 70 corridor north of the Township be included in the route permit application as one of the route alternatives. Nancy Sauber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. 2030 Comprehensive Plan

The Commission needs to consider the input from the public hearing and to make any further modifications to the Plan before it is forwarded to the Board. Sharon has had communication with Berry Farrington, TKDA planner, regarding the mechanism of so doing. There is about \$500 left in the budget. The remaining work can be done within budget if the number of revisions that TKDA has to do for the Township is limited. The Commission can achieve this by

generating a list of edits to be done and forwarding that to the Board. The Board can make edits beyond that, or it can object to some of the Commission's. They can add to or modify that list, and TKDA can do one editing of the draft document.

After some discussion, a special meeting of the Planning Commission for the consideration of the Comprehensive Plan was set for September 10, 2008, at 7:00 p.m.

4. Local Water Management Plan

The Comprehensive Plan update can have language saying that the Water Chapter will include the community water plan, Sharon stated. The Council may require that the water plan be added before it will say the Plan meets their system statements, but the Township can go ahead with the Comprehensive Plan process in the meantime, Sharon said.

Kenny said that he would rather get the Plan out of the way and then have time later to address the water plan and some of the issues that have been raised.

Sharon said that the Dakota Association of Township Officers Meeting is to be held on September 30, 2008. One of the agenda items is the Rural Collaborative Water Plan. The first chapters are adopted in their entirety directly from the Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization's (VRWJPO) Plan.

Nancy Sauber asked what it would cost to scan the document and have it available online. She said that she thinks it is a legitimate point that the access to the document was somewhat limited. The public could always have come in and had a copy made, but it would have been rather expensive.

Jeff Otto said that the North Cannon Watershed Management Organization would not be discussing it until a later meeting. The Township has something in place already and that can certainly be referred to in the Comprehensive Plan. Eureka is not alone. Jeff also commented that Carol Cooper said she could scan the document.

Carol Cooper said that she had already scanned the document. It was agreed that she would communicate with Ken Olstad, who would then make the document available through the Township website. Sharon thanked Ms. Cooper for her efforts.

Nancy Sauber asked whether, once the plan is available online, could the Commission have people submit written questions that could be forwarded to the people who could answer them.

Jeff Otto commented that there are budget constraints that the VRWJPO has as well as far as having Dean Johnson do further work.

Mike Greco said that when the water plan was first talked about, part of the discussion was about that part of the money that was available would go to communities to help them understand the plan and to understand how to implement it. If the Township is being asked to adopt this plan, it is reasonable to say it needs someone to explain this and walk us through this document; it is too

technical for us. If that does not happen, then the Township could say that we are not going to adopt it. It is ridiculous, Mike said, that all this time and all this money has been spent preparing the plan, but there has been no outreach to the Planning Commission, the Board, or to anybody to help explain the process that they went through. That commitment to do so should be followed.

Carrie Jennings commented that she had been at a meeting where a checklist was distributed so that it could be figured out which part of the plan would apply to Eureka Township, but there was not an explanation of the plan itself.

Carol Cooper said she wanted to point out that the copy given and scanned has maps that are in black and white and that makes it harder to read.

There were comments made regarding the lack of an electronic copy and the technical aspects of that.

There was a discussion about the aspect of what other townships might modify about the plan and where that would leave Eureka. Do all the townships have to agree? The Metropolitan Council's requirements for Comprehensive Plans have to be considered. The Township could move ahead on the Comprehensive Plan update for now. The VRWJPO is the group that the Township has to go before when it has a Land Alteration Plan for an application. They have made their stand clear.

Sharon Buckley and Nancy Sauber said that they were planning to attend the meeting on the 30th.

5. Ordinance Updates

Nancy Sauber, Jeff Otto, and Ken Olstad scheduled another work group meeting to work on the suggested buildable lots ordinance language. After that group has finished its work, the language would go to the attorney. It would then come to the entire Planning Commission. Once all the ordinance language is available, the Commission also needs another special meeting to complete its work on the Ordinances before going to a public hearing. The goal is to have the buildable lots issue included along with the other Ordinance matters in this process.

6. Board Report and Miscellaneous Updates

a. Consultant engagement policy

This writing of this policy is still pending.

b. Public hearing

The Board agreed the Township did not have to have a public hearing about the Dakota County Rural Collaborative Comprehensive Plan.

c. Hoeft inspection

The Board felt no further action was needed.

d. MAT question about additional housing rights

Jeff Otto said that he would ask the question requested.

e. Permit Application Revisions

Waldron Associates is doing the updates. Ken Olstad will follow up with them to be sure that the updates are completed.

7. Permit Application Form Revisions

Taken care of above.

8. Street Naming and House Numbers

The County has communicated that it does not have the statutory authority to do this; the Township does. The question was asked whether the Township has the option of asking the County to do it for us. Kenny Miller said that he would talk to Randy Knippel, the County GIS Manager, and then let Sharon know the answer for the Board Report.

The County has given the townships its manual about how it does this, as well as a model ordinance for their use. This topic is also on the agenda for the Dakota County Association of Township Officers meeting on September 30th.

9. Training

No training sessions were attended recently.

ssNancy Sauber moved to adjourn. Kenny Miller seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:54 p.m.

Submitted by,

Nancy Sauber, Recorder