

EUREKA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 5, 2009

Chair Sharon Buckley called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. Commissioners present were Sharon Buckley, Vince Mako, Kenny Miller, Ken Olstad, and Nancy Sauber. Audience members included Supervisor Dan Rogers, Dave Tonsager, Amy Tonsager, Supervisor Jeff Otto, Kelly Brosseth, Pat Mason, Richard Pennings, Kate Kleiter, Shawn Dahl, Terry Swor, Randy Allen, Supervisor Cory Behrendt, and Ron Quanbeck.

Approval of Agenda

Two items were added to the agenda. Sharon Buckley moved to approve the agenda as amended. Nancy Sauber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

A. Permit Requests

There were no permit requests.

B. Land Use and Zoning Items

1. Agricultural Preserve request, Dave and Amy Tonsager, 25700 Granite Path, Farmington

Dave and Amy Tonsager were present; Dave represented the request. The Tonsagers would like to enroll their two (contiguous) parcels in the Agricultural Preserve Program, which is governed by Minnesota Statute 473H.01. The Dakota County website gives details about the Program and its purpose, benefits, and requirements. One of the Tonsagers' parcels is 10.10 acres, while the other is 34.64 acres. Typically, the program parcel(s) must be (total) forty acres in size, although not always. The parcels do not have to be contiguous, as long as each parcel is at least ten acres in size and all the parcels are farmed together as a unit. The Tonsagers' property of 44.74 acres meets the threshold for size. Sharon Buckley stated that there is no minimum requirement for the portion that is in active agricultural production as there is in the Green Acres Program, where the minimum for that requirement is ten acres. Sharon read from the State Statute what "in agricultural use" means. She asked Dave if it were so that their property is primarily wooded. Dave agreed that is so; about six acres are currently in ag use for the production of hay or grain for sale. That use is what is proposed to be continued during the minimum eight years of enrollment in the Agricultural Preserve Program. There are no commercial or industrial uses on the land; except for farm-related such uses, this is not allowed on enrolled land. Also, the statute reads: "Wetlands, pasture and woodlands accompanying land in agricultural use shall be deemed to be in agricultural use." Therefore, it was believed that the wooded portion of the Tonsagers' property qualifies. There is tillable land on each of the parcels, Dave stated.

The Planning Commission does not make the decision for this type of request, as it is totally up to the Board, nor do such requests usually come before the Commission, Sharon stated. However, in this case, the Planning Commission is offering input for the Board; Town Clerk Nanett Sandstrom thought that it might be useful for the Commission

to discuss this particular request as it is a little different from the usual Ag Preserve request. Kenny Miller moved to forward the request to the Board with the recommendation to approve. Vince Mako seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2. Kelly Aggregates Mining Application, 9235 235th St. W.

Kelly Brosseth, property owner, Pat Mason of Ames Construction, and Shawn Dahl of Ames Construction were present to represent the request. Along with them to help answer any questions were Terry Swor, Richard Pennings, and Kate Kleiter, all of American Engineering and Testing. Ron Quanbeck, engineer from TKDA, was present to help represent the Township's interests and to answer any questions as well.

Commissioner Kenny Miller removed himself from the table and the discussion due to a conflict of interest, as stated on previous occasions concerning this request.

Mr. Quanbeck explained the process to date. The Township is considering an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the Brosseth application. The item in front of the Commission was to decide whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required for this project. At a future date there will be a discussion of the Interim Use Permit and what requirements might be placed on it, but the issue for this meeting was just whether an EIS is required.

The Township approved the original EAW. It was then distributed, and comments were received from four different agencies: the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), the Metropolitan Council, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and Dakota County. The Township has thirty days from the completion of the comment period to act on this. Thus, since the comment period ended on December 17, 2008, Ron stated that January 17, 2009, would be the date in question. There is a provision for postponing action if there is insufficient information, Ron said.

There are two possibilities regarding an EIS. One is a mandatory EIS, which applies when the facility will excavate 160 acres or more to a mean depth of ten feet or more. The Kelly Aggregates facility, which is 79.85 acres, is not large enough to trigger a mandatory EIS. Therefore, the only EIS to be considered would be a discretionary one. This is usually required when the proposed project has the potential for significant environmental effects that are not adequately mitigated in the EAW. The memo received from TKDA outlines the Minnesota Rule that provides direction on how to consider "significant environmental effects" and reach a decision on whether an EIS is needed.

The feedback received from the four agencies listed above included a number of comments. The applicants put together responses to these comments, which were then reviewed by TKDA's engineer and planner for Eureka Township, Ron Quanbeck and Sherri Buss, respectively. Mr. Quanbeck and Ms. Buss worked with the applicant's representatives to revise the responses to directly respond to comments received and to clarify measures to be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential impacts of the proposed project. Leggette, Brashears and Graham, Eureka's consulting hydrogeologist

on this project, also reviewed the comments and draft responses and submitted a memorandum. The comments and responses mainly concerned groundwater, the Vermillion River, and a local wetland. TKDA considers the applicant's responses to be adequate and is recommending that the Township make a negative finding for an EIS, Ron stated. Along with the introduction memo, TKDA has submitted a Draft Resolution and a Draft Record of Decision, the latter of which includes the comment letters themselves and the responses to the comments. A few errors in the Record of Decision were noted to be corrected.

The Commission asked some questions of the applicants. Vince Mako asked how it would be known if there were leaching coming from the asphalt that would be stored temporarily as part of the recycling activity of the facility. Kate Kleiter, of American Engineering and Testing, answered this question. She stated that they looked at studies of this leaching and that there are monitoring wells currently installed at the site. They are monitoring for a parameter for the type of leachate that would come from the asphalt, mainly petroleum, Kate said. These checks are usually done quarterly. Kate further said that once the predominant flow of water is established, another monitoring well would be placed in that direction. Vince asked about whether the distance is adequate to moderate the temperature of water before it reaches the Vermillion. Richard Pennings, also of American Engineering and Testing, said that it is. Vince asked about dust generation and control. Another division of American Engineering and Testing looked at this air quality issue, Kate replied. There will be a water truck on site, Pat Mason added. Terry Swor, President of American Engineering and Testing, also added that the material at the site is very clean. The water used in the process will help with this issue, and the proposed facility falls within the parameters of the general permit for this aspect, Terry commented. Vince clarified with the representatives that there would not be any chemical or particulate that wouldn't normally be found on a road. Ron Quanbeck commented that the Ordinance requires the setback; one of the things that those setbacks were based on is dust.

Sharon Buckley reminded the Commission that one of its next steps is the public hearing and looking at the possibility of incorporating such concerns into the requirements of the permit, if it is granted.

Ken Olstad asked whether the assessment of dust is something which happens routinely. Kate Kleiter responded that if the permit requires it, then yes. Also, if there are complaints, they can be checked out, Kate added.

Sharon Buckley asked whether the EAW took into account the impact of the existing mining in the area. Ron said that, as noted in the memo, the EAW has to address cumulative effects and that it does address those projects known at this time. Ron went on to state that, based on the geology of the area, there is a good chance that there will be future projects. From an EAW perspective, there are two ways to address that. One is each project doing its own EAW as it is proposed, with each EAW considering cumulative impacts of existing and known future projects at the time in question. The other way is to do an EIS for an entire area. In order to do that, somebody has to decide

that is what is wanted. That “somebody” could be a group of mining companies, a group of property owners, or it could be the Township. If it were the Township, then the question is how does it get paid for, Ron said. This is something that should be considered; after a number of these come up, agencies are going to look at this and say an EIS should be done.

Another point to keep in mind, Ron offered, is that there will be monitoring, as indicated already. The question there is who is going to look at that. Will it be the applicant who is responsible for reviewing the data and reporting it to the Township, or will it be Township consultants completing independent reviews of the monitoring results, with such reviews being paid for by the applicant out of an escrow account? This is a matter for the permitting process itself, Ron added.

Sharon then asked if the Township could include as one of the conditions of the permit that this operation participate in a community EIS, cooperating with other mining operations in the immediate area, if there should be those in the future. Ron replied that “participate” would have to be defined. One of the good things about doing an overall EIS is that one big environmental study is done. While an EIS is more expensive than doing an EAW for *one* site, it is less expensive than doing an EAW for *each* site. This applicant has gone to the expense of doing an EAW for his site. Do you consider “participate” to be to contribute financially on the same standing as other operations that haven’t done an EAW, or do you mean allow others to use their information that was developed as part of their process, Ron asked. You would have to define “participate,” he said. Nancy Sauber asked Ron if what he is really saying is that this applicant has done what he is required to do. If there is no EIS required of this applicant, and the EAW is completed satisfactorily, this applicant has done all that is being asked of him. Ron agreed that that is correct.

The access to the mine was discussed briefly. It is proposed to be onto Dodd Blvd. There was comment from the County concerning 235th St. W., but it was still felt to be more desirable to place the access onto Dodd. Dust and road maintenance on a Township road would be issues that would be avoided, and the sightlines are better with Dodd. There would be a bypass lane constructed on Dodd that would be paid for by the mining operation.

Can TKDA do a draft of conditions before the public hearing, Sharon asked. Ron said that he anticipates that TKDA would review the application for the IUP and would provide a recommendation which would include conditions, some of which would be those things identified in the EAW. This would be done so as to be available for the public hearing, Ron stated.

Ron commented that another thing to keep in mind is the Dakota County Land Alteration Plan (LAP) review that has to occur. This review should be accomplished before the public hearing, so that the results of that are available for the public hearing. Once the EAW is dealt with, the 60 day clock for action on the application starts. Sharon said that the Ordinance requires that the public hearing be held within 30 days of when the EAW

process is completed. Ron said if the Board approves the EAW at its meeting on January 12, 2009, and does not require an EIS, that would start the 30 days. Pat Mason said that, if it was okay with the Commission, their plans would need to be submitted to the County by January 9 (before the Board meeting) in order to be reviewed at the next scheduled opportunity on January 19th. The Township would have representatives at that review. Shawn Dahl added that if the Board did not approve the EAW and or wanted an EIS, the worst that would happen is that they would withdraw their request for the LAP review at that time.

Sharon asked Ron whether the Record of Decision serves as the Findings of Fact for the IUP. Ron replied that the Record of Decision is for the EAW, and it would be provided to all the commenting agencies from the Environmental Quality Board distribution.

Sharon Buckley moved to forward the EAW to the Town Board with the recommendation for a negative finding for an Environmental Impact Statement. Vince Mako seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

A public hearing was tentatively scheduled for January 26, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

Ron Quanbeck confirmed his intent that the results from the LAP review would be included in the memo for the public hearing.

Pat Mason said that he would like to thank the planner and the engineer from TKDA for their help and cooperation in this process. Since the comment period ended on December 17th, that work had to be accomplished during the holiday season, which was difficult. The applicants sincerely appreciate TKDA's efforts in making the process as smooth as possible, Pat said.

3. Other Land Use and Zoning Issues

Kenny Miller rejoined the Commission for the rest of the meeting.

Randy Allen came forward with questions about an application for a pole barn. His wife had dropped it off, and he wanted to be sure he was following the process correctly. His pole barn burned down, and he wants to replace it. Randy was told that his application could be dealt with at the February meetings of both the Commission and the Board, and that he does not have to wait until the March Board meeting as he thought might be the case. Some questions were answered for Randy, and he was advised to stop in during office hours and check with Nanett.

There were no other land use and zoning issues raised.

C. Approval of Minutes- December 1, 2008

There were two minor corrections made. Kenny Miller moved to approve the minutes as amended. Vince Mako seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, with all but Sharon Buckley voting. Sharon had not been present at the December meeting..

D. Other Business

1. Board Report and Miscellaneous Updates

a. Building Official files from former Building Official, Bob Hegner

Patrick Kelly was at the last Board meeting and reported that Mr. Hegner had told him that the files had all been dropped off, so Mr. Kelly, who had been asked by the Board to look into this matter, was unaware that some may still be missing. It was unclear whether this is so. The Board asked Nancy Sauber to follow up on this, along with Nanett Sandstrom, Town Clerk. Nanett also raised the issue of whether there are monies that are due the Township. She was asked by the Board to determine what the status of that issue is.

b. 235th St. W. culvert/Vermillion River

The Board determined that, at this point, to leave that alone and to watch it to see what may develop with the sediment/flooding issue.

c. Road Haulage Ordinance

The Board approved up to \$500 for Eureka's share of Dean Johnson's review of the road haulage ordinance language submitted to him by Castle Rock Township. The Board had determined that this ordinance could be of benefit to Eureka Township as well and agreed to share the cost of the review. Eureka will make any necessary changes to that language to tailor it to its own needs.

d. Demolition Permit

Ken Olstad will follow up with the Building Inspector about this. The demolition permit is not an "over-the-counter" permit and should come before the Planning Commission.

e. Individual Septic Treatment System (ISTS) permitting

The Township needs to issue a separate permit for an ISTS, whether there is a new building involved, a septic is being replaced, or it is a use such as at a gravel mine for employee use. Minnesota state law was recently changed to require a separate permit. Eureka needs an application form for septic systems that are not part of a new building. When it is the case that a new building is being proposed, the septic system is part of that application form, but there still needs to be a separate permit just for the ISTS issued at that same time that the permit for the building is issued.

f. Temporary Structures

The questions of what temporary structures are allowed, whether they are permitted, and what constitutes a temporary structure were discussed. The matter was raised due to a previously addressed situation in which there was a structure that was deemed to be too close to the property line. The Town Clerk had been instructed by the Board to send a letter to the property owner advising him that the structure was in violation of the setback. However, in addition to that, because of the nature of the construction of the structure in question, and input from the Building Official, the issue of temporary structures was being discussed further. According to the Building Official, the type of construction that may be associated with temporary structures (that exist 180 days or less) is of a type that he cannot permit due to insufficiency regarding snow and wind loads. One type of such construction might be PVC pipe with vinyl sheeting stretched over it.

The Township attorney had forwarded ordinance language dealing with temporary structures from another community that he serves, but Ken Olstad, who reviewed that

language, said that it was more in reference to unsightliness, rather than construction type.

There is also the matter that some of these structures have been allowed in the past for agricultural or horticultural use. Since agricultural buildings do not require Building Official inspection, that may be a separate matter. Whether to allow them for use other than agricultural and horticultural is an issue. If that would be agreed upon, there is still the question of the permitting of such structures. The idea of temporary structures and “permissible” construction types are really two separate matters.

Since there were three issues that the Planning Commission had questions on for the Building Official, Nancy Sauber asked whether it might not be a good idea to invite him to come to a Commission meeting, as he did when first hired, to answer those questions. Nancy said that she preferred that type of exchange to emails so that these questions might be thoroughly explored and dealt with at one sitting.

Kenny Miller said that he would rather research the matter and not have the Official in. Nancy replied that Scott Qualle is the Township Building Official, he has the training and the experience in connection with the State Building Codes to be able to answer these questions, and that might be more efficient. After meeting with Scott, the Planning Commission could decide what it wanted to do and whether there are other questions that may need to be asked or to be researched.

Vince Mako moved to invite the Building Official to attend the February 2, 2009, Planning Commission meeting to answer those questions that the Commission may have. Sharon Buckley seconded the motion. Kenny Miller said that the Commission should understand that the Building Official would be answering questions from his point of view, not as the expert on these issues. Nancy Sauber stated that the Commission would not be asking Scott whether he thought the Township should allow this type of structure or that type of structure, but would be asking him questions about the general category of this type of structure and what his input would be. The discussion continued for some time.

Ken Olstad asked whether it is true that the Commission would be in favor of, for example, a carport made out of piping and a vinyl tarp. Nancy Sauber replied that she would like to know more about that type of construction and how the Building Codes apply before making such a decision and that is why she would like the Building Inspector to come to talk to the Commission. Vince Mako commented that he would say that he would want these things *only* if they meet the requirements of the Codes. Vince said a PVC and plastic structure that would “fall over in a stiff breeze” would not be desirable.

Sharon asked if there were any further discussion before voting on the motion at hand. Ken Olstad replied that he did not believe that the Commission knew what it wanted, so there would be no point in having the Building Inspector come in, and the motion should be voted down. Sharon said she agreed. She further commented that one of the things

for the Inspector was about the ISTS permits as separate permits, and another was that the demolition permit is not an over-the-counter permit. Those two items could be communicated by email, Sharon stated. Nancy Sauber clarified that, on the demolition permit issue, she had asked the question, since it is *not* an over-the-counter permit, why was such a permit issued in the instance of the garage at Rice Lake Heights without its going before the Planning Commission first. Nancy said that she had asked that the Building Official explain that issuance and that was what she had thought Ken had been going to follow up on. Sharon said that could be asked in a phone call or in an email and asked Nancy what she thought. Nancy said that evidently there was resistance to speaking to the Building Official (at the Commission meeting), and if that was how the vote went, then so be it. Vince suggested that the Official could be asked to come in at a future time. Ken said that he thinks the Commission should be clear before the Official would attend a meeting. Kenny stated that he would research these types of structures. Vince said that he agreed with Nancy that the Commission should ask questions of the Building Official, but that he also agreed with Ken that the Commission needs to be prepared. Nancy suggested that the Building Official could be asked for any further clarifications on the issues and that he might be referred to the Ordinances, because she was not sure as she read his email that he was aware of the Township's restrictions of temporary structures-apart from type of construction issue. There is also the matter of allowing these tubing/vinyl structures for ag use, which does not involve inspections by the Official; what feedback might he have about those? Then there is the additional question of allowing these structures for non-ag and non-horticultural uses. Nancy said further that she agreed with what Vince said about the durability of structures; that is the whole point of permitting and the Building Codes. The structure must be safe and sound and should not blow into a neighbor's yard. That would be the major concern and that is why she had thought the Commission could talk to the Inspector. Nancy said that could occur at a later date. Kenny brought up the question of whether the Official would bill the Township if he were to attend a meeting; Nancy said that he could be asked that.

A vote was taken on the motion. Nancy Sauber voted in favor of the motion; the other four Commissioners voted against having the Building Official come to the next meeting. The motion failed.

2. Ordinance Updates

Nancy Sauber said that she had sent the most recent work group language on buildable lots to Supervisor Otto to send to the attorney, as discussed at the last meeting, but she was not aware of whether this had been done. Jeff was in the audience and said that he had not understood that he was supposed to do so. Sharon commented that the Planning Commission does not send items to the attorney, except through the Board attorney contact. Jeff said he would recheck with Nancy to be sure he had the most recent language and then would submit this to the attorney.

Sharon then asked where the Commission was on scheduling a meeting to work further on the Ordinance updates. Nancy reminded Sharon that, at the last Planning Commission meeting, she, Nancy, had suggested that, although the Commission had been hoping to receive the attorney feedback on the buildable lots issue so that it could be included in the

public hearing, she had recommended that the Commission move ahead to schedule a special meeting for Ordinance discussion. Even if the buildable lots review was not back, time is moving on, and Nancy had said that she thought that the work should progress. The Commission had agreed at its December meeting that the scheduling of a special meeting could take place at the January meeting after seeing if the attorney feedback was received. The entire discussion would probably not be accomplished at one special meeting anyway. The Commission scheduled a special meeting for Thursday, January 29, 2009, at 7:00 p.m.

Ken Olstad was asked to send the document he had received from former Commission Chair Mike Greco to everyone on the Commission. Commissioners were asked to bring whatever else they had on the Ordinance updates to the meeting.

3. Rural Collaborative Local Water Plan

A special Town Board meeting is scheduled for January 7, 2009, at 7:00 p.m. with Mark Zabel of the Vermillion River Watershed in attendance. Sharon reminded all that Supervisor Carrie Jennings had recommended focusing on Section 4 of the Plan for discussion that evening.

4. Uniform Street Naming Ordinance

Sharon had looked into this and had talked to Randy Knippel at the County. The County Board has repealed the County Ordinance dealing with this, and the Township has received a procedure manual from the County. The County has authority for the County roads only, and the Township has the authority for the Township roads. What is needed is for the Township to enact an ordinance. The County had also sent a draft ordinance for the Township's use. The goal would be to keep the naming of streets and the numbering of houses consistent throughout the County. Sharon noted that the ordinance from the County did not account for state highways and asked Randy Knippel about this. The County will address this.

The other matter concerns the purchasing, installation, and maintenance of the signs themselves. The Township can enter into an agreement with the County for 2009 so that the County would provide this service, with the Township paying the bill. However, the Township must enact the ordinance first, according to the letter sent. The Commission agreed to put the ordinance item on its agenda with other ordinances. Sharon said she would check on whether the agreement would be a yearly (renewable) agreement or is for one year only. One thing had been said at a Township Officers meeting, whereas the letter before the Commission was not entirely clear on this point. Whether to enter into the agreement if it is for one year only was discussed briefly. Vince Mako said that he thought it would be desirable and then the Township would have a good understanding of what the costs are, so it could be shown accurately in the budget.

5. Permit Application Revisions

Town Clerk Nanett Sandstrom had given further input on the last revision of the application forms. Ken Olstad volunteered to work with Nanett to determine what her issues were with the forms as they have come back from Waldron Associates, the

Township's building inspection firm, and would also communicate again with the Building Official. The Commission had asked Waldron to rework the forms with the most recent input from the Commission. Ken said he will decide after talking with Nanett and the Building Official whether he would do the reworking himself or ask Waldron to fix the forms.

Sharon stated that she would follow up with the demolition permit and ISTS permit issues mentioned above. She said she would send an email to the Commissioners through Nanett.

6. Comprehensive Plan Feedback

Sharon had had a conversation with TKDA planner, Berry Farrington. As the Township gets feedback from surrounding communities and agencies, if there are issues that may need to be discussed, Berry said that the Township could be doing that as it goes along and does not have to wait until all responses are received.

There has been some further communication by Berry with the Metropolitan Council Parks Senior Planner, Jan Youngquist, Sharon stated. Also, Gary Amoroso of Lakeville Public Schools has acknowledged receipt of the Plan. Thomas Stringer, Director of Business for the Northfield Public Schools, has reviewed the Plan and said that they have noted the growth forecast and will take that into account in their planning. Wayne Barstad of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources commented regarding the Chub Lake Wildlife Management Area and sent a ten-page document, "Wildlife Management Area and Local Development Activities Impact Analysis." Bridget Rief of the Metropolitan Airports Commission responded that she would not be able to meet the early review timeframe, but would be able to meet the regular review. Bridget made no further comment at this time. These responses are being compiled, and the Commission will review them at some future date.

7. Newsletter

Sharon will write an article about the Commercial/Industrial Task Force. The Commission discussed the information.

The upcoming openings on the Planning Commission should also be noted in the newsletter.

It was also mentioned that, in the future, when all the permit application forms have been updated, there could be an informative article concerning what permits are required.

*There was a brief recess at 9:30 p.m. The meeting resumed at 9:34 p.m.

8. Request For Qualifications (RFQ) for Commercial/Industrial Land Use Study

Supervisor Cory Behrendt had, that night, given the Commissioners copies of the draft RFQ that he has worked on. Since it was just given out, the Commission had not had time to read it carefully. Cory briefly explained what he had written. There was

discussion of the draft, of the budget, and of the topic in general. Any Commissioner who, after reading the draft, had comments for the Board should submit them before the next Board meeting for their consideration.

9. Capital Improvements Plan

Nancy Sauber had been asked to talk with Nanett regarding the countertop extension and the security/visibility issue. Nancy reported that she had done so. Nanett agreed with the idea of the counter extension which has been suggested in the past. It would be helpful to have delineation between public space and staff space, and this would aid in ensuring the integrity of the Township files and records. While it is perhaps a natural thing for the public to come back into the office space, if there were an extension of the counter, the staff could more appropriately come forward to speak to whomever came in. Nanett also mentioned that Theresa Koentopf will be working at the outside desk area in her role as assistant, increasing the desirability of a separation of space.

Kenny Miller had brought up that Nanett had mentioned that she is not always aware of when a person may be entering the building, so Nancy discussed this with Nanett as well. Nanett said that she may see people approaching, but since her desk is not in line with the window, this is not always the case. There is a switch that Nanett can turn on which will alert her to anyone's entering through the inner door when the outer door is unlocked. However, the alarm is a jolting fire alarm sound and so she does not turn it on. It startles her and the member of the public who is entering. If it could be changed to a doorbell sound, it would be usable. The doorbell at the outer door is also the fire alarm sound, not a doorbell chime. Further, the fire alarm is really supposed to be just that, but it is not connected to act that way regarding the secure storage room. When a fire might be detected, then the ventilation vents into the file storage room are supposed to close so as to make it fireproof. However, since this system is not connected in that way, the vents to the storage room are *always* closed, making that room truly "cold storage." Whenever the door to that room is opened, a rush of cold air enters Nanett's office, making it almost impossible to keep a comfortable temperature there, even with additional heaters. If the system could be set up as it was planned, then the vents would normally be open into the storage room, making it warmer. In any event, the fire alarm sound should probably be reserved for fires.

Sharon will include these items in the Board Report.

E. Training

Nancy Sauber had been going to attend the Wetland Conservation Act training in Arden Hills on December 18, but was too sick to do so. No one else attended. The training will be offered again in 2009.

The Rural Collaborative Water Plan meeting will be held on January 21, 2009, at the Empire Town Hall at 7:00 p.m.

On January 22nd, there will be a Minnesota Association of Township session in St. Cloud about energy efficiency and energy cost reduction for townships.

Other

*Ken Olstad reported that the Township has received official word that Eureka's Community Growth Options (CGO) grant application was not one of those chosen for funding by the 1,000 Friends of Minnesota.

The University of Minnesota is sponsoring a companion program, Ken said, called U-CGO. It provides research assistance to help growing communities on the edge of the Twin Cities for managed growth development. Mike Greco is the contact person at the University for this opportunity.

Kenny Miller moved to adjourn; Ken Olstad seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Submitted by,

Nancy Sauber, Recorder