

**Eureka Township Commercial Task Force  
Minutes from April 17, 2002**

The task force met at the Eureka Town Hall from 7:10 to 8:55 pm. Present: Ken DeMaster, Mike Greco, Mark Malecha, Chris Nielsen, and Bob Ruddle. Absent: Bob Papke and Clyde Thompson. Ken DeMaster served as temporary chair, and Mike Greco as temporary recorder.

1. Eureka Comprehensive Plan. Members discussed the draft comprehensive plan and identified items of relevance for our task. Specific items identified are listed in the attachment. Discussion of this document may continue at future meetings.
2. Mission Statement. Mike proposed the following revised mission statement:

The purpose of the Eureka Township Task Force is to research the desirability and feasibility of additional commercial development in Eureka Township—including but not limited to defining "commercial" activity, the positive and negative aspects of such development, and possible locations and timelines for such development—and to report results of said research to the town board on an ongoing basis, culminating with a final comprehensive report.

Final discussion and adoption of mission statement tabled until all members are present.

3. Met Council Rural Issues Group Citizen Meeting. Bob R. and Mike briefly reported on this meeting in Afton on April 11, which centered on discussion of the draft report recently issued by the Rural Issues Group. Based on the meeting, the Met Council seems interested in channeling growth in rural areas to communities that want it, and partnering with these communities to assist with some aspects of development (sewer, transportation, etc.), on the belief that this approach will balance growth with preservation of agricultural areas. Mike passed out summaries of the report that were distributed at the Afton meeting (see him for copies). Full report is available at [www.metrocouncil.org/planning/rural\\_issues/overview.htm](http://www.metrocouncil.org/planning/rural_issues/overview.htm)
4. The remainder of the meeting involved a general discussion of issues related to the team's task. The discussion centered on three major issues: pros and cons of development, various methods of allowing commercial development, and initial items for team members to research. See attachment for details.
5. Next meeting Tuesday, May 7, 2002, at the town hall. Tentative agenda:

Discuss and adopt mission statement  
Elect chair, recorder, and town board liaison  
Individual reports from members on research items  
Assign additional research tasks as necessary

Respectfully submitted,  
Mike Greco, temporary recorder

**Relevant Portions of the Eureka Township Draft Comprehensive Plan**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Statement/Reference</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
p. 7	"most of the portion of the [Airlake] industrial park that lies in Eureka is used for an airstrip"	Does this imply that there are portions of the industrial park besides the airstrip that lie in Eureka and that are zoned industrial (i.e., the Regan property that is for sale)?
p. 39	Table VII-1: Existing Land Use. The table identifies 9 acres as being zoned "commercial/industrial"	Based on the Eureka Township Tax Assessment Map, this appears to include Doc's Trucking at 235th and Cedar (6 acres) and another 3-acre parcel on the east end of C.R. 70.
p. 23	Vehicle counts for major arterials in Eureka	Are 2010 projections were available, and are actual versus projected traffic count data available for previous years to gauge the accuracy of previous predictions?
pp. 28-37	Airlake Airport Comprehensive Development Plan	Is the proposed runway addition still in the works? What restrictions do existing and proposed runways place on development in adjacent areas?
p. 41	"These are not final or permanent decisions. . .re-evaluated in the future as conditions change."	Comp Plan a guideline, but not cast in stone. No guarantee that what is zoned industrial/commercial today will be zoned similarly tomorrow.
p. 43	"If a public sewage treatment system becomes available, this plan will need to be substantially revised."	Public sewage system would impact development possibilities
pp. 51-2	Public Facilities and Services Policies: driveway separations, vision obstructions, frontage roads, etc.	These policies would impact placement of commercial development, infrastructure requirements for development, etc.
p. 56	Commercial-Industrial Goals and Policies	The existing regulations regarding commercial-industrial development in Eureka. However, does not define "commercial-industrial."

**Research Assignments for May 7, 2002 Meeting**

<b>Assignment</b>	<b>Researcher</b>
Status of Regan property: location? zoned industrial? developable?	Bob R.
2010 vehicle count predictions, as well as past predictions and actual counts, for arterial roadways in Eureka	
Airlake Airstrip runway expansion: still planned? Restrictions on development in the vicinity?	
Castle Rock's experience with commercial development	Mark
New Market's experience with commercial development	Ken
Definitions of terms related to commercial development	Mike  see <a href="http://www.lawlibrary.state.mn.us">www.lawlibrary.state.mn.us</a> (click statutes, then indexes)
How many developable residential lots left in Eureka at 1:40	Mike
History of commercial development patterns in Lakeville, Rosemount, Farmington	Mike and Bob P.

**Issues in Commercial Development**  
**Revised April 17, 2002**  
(new items are in boldface)

PRO

- Provides for employment opportunities at home
- Enlarges the tax base
- Increases land values
- Opportunities for matching grants
- Possibly lower residential tax rates
- Pre-planning provides greater control
- Strategic zoning may preclude annexation attempts
- **Putting off development might mean Chub Lake sewer capacity usurped by other communities (Elko/New Market)**
- **If private developers pay for infrastructure improvements, those become public property (bridges, sewers, roadways, etc.)**

CON

- Increases in size (through addition of paid staff) and cost of government
- Contributes to environmental degradation
- Affects the quality of life for residents
- Commercial developmental costs adhere to the township
- Increased traffic and congestion
- Affect on aesthetic qualities in the township
- Can contribute to blight
- If not managed well can lead to issues that Burnsville and Apple Valley are faced with
- Enforcement issues of town rules – Eureka has no police force
- Commercial development can “drive” unwanted residential development
- More paved parking lots can reduce the amount of surface waters returning to the aquifers.
- **Vermillion River already at its limit for sewage capacity—no clear alternatives**
- **Infrastructure/utilities must precede development**
- **Infrastructure improvements will become maintenance/tax burden**

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- **Development should carry its own weight (should pay for necessary infrastructure, services, etc.).**
- **Development should provide monetary benefits to township (tax revenue)**
- **Restrictions on commercial development must be part of a long-term plan and must be justified by a clear rationale in order to be legally defensible.**

### **Methods of Allowing Commercial Development**

1. **Accept existing commercial enterprises and allow no additional commercial development.**

Provides tax revenue for commercial. Township loses "conditions" that are part of CUP. May be hard to justify limiting further commercial development in other areas of township. May be difficult to prevent alternative commercial uses that are undesirable (redevelopment at higher density, etc.).

2. **Restrict development to paved roadways or to major arterials.**

Reduces infrastructure burden, limits commercial growth to higher traffic and higher density areas.

3. **Identify a commercial zone (e.g., northern part of township along C.R. 70 corridor) and limit further development to this area only. Would allow legally defensible restrictions on nature and location of development.**