

Eureka Commercial Task Force Minutes from May 30, 2002

The task force convened at the Eureka Town Hall at 7:15 pm.

Present at the meeting: Ken DeMaster, Mark Malecha, Mike Greco, Bob Papke, Chris Nielsen, and Clyde Thompson. Absent: Bob Ruddle.

1. Minutes from May 7 meeting were approved.
2. Mike discussed his report to the Town Board of Supervisors. He gave supervisors copies of all approved task force minutes to date. The board agreed that a liaison was unnecessary so long as minutes are sent to supervisors as they are approved. The task force is expected to make a preliminary report at the September 2002 regular board meeting. The board approved a budget of \$200 for the task force to be used for office supplies. Requests for money for other items (paying speakers, purchasing maps or reports, etc.) must be approved on an individual basis.
3. Comprehensive Plan. Discussion continued on parts of the comp plan that might be relevant to the task force's work. See attached handout for new items. Bob Papke volunteered to research the tax status of hangars at the airport.
4. Mike reported briefly on a conversation with Kurt Chatfield, a planner for Dakota County. Kurt said he thought significant commercial development was unlikely in Eureka in the near future because (1) there is plenty of available commercial-industrial land in Lakeville, Farmington, and Rosemount that already has access to services and infrastructure and (2) Eureka is located far enough from I-35 that it is not as accessible as areas of Scott County, Credit River Twp, etc. that are closer to the interstate. The pressure, if any, is likely to be residential.
5. Pros and cons of development. Discussion continued on pros and cons of development. See attachment for new items.
6. Township history. The group discussed the need for a written history of Eureka since the 1950s, which is where the previous written history of the township ends. Potential sources of information include Lyle Ruh, Russ Ostlie, the Leines, and the Saubers. Chris will talk to Lyle about interviewing him, and Bob Papke will assist as needed.
7. Reports on research:
 - a. Mark found some data on road usage, but is still working on finding projections for future use. Bob Papke will abstract for the group some of the relevant information from the data Mark found.
 - b. Bob Papke is still working on history of commercial development in Farmington. At the Farmington Library, he has researched newspaper articles on microfiche dating back many years concerning commercial development proposals. See Bob

- P. for a list of articles. He also has located a copy of their current ordinances (now in the library).
- c. Mike is working with Dakota County for information on history of development in Farmington, Lakeville, Rosemount. By next meeting, he should have maps for Farmington and Lakeville that show expansion of commercial land uses in 10 year increments from 1970 to present, and tax assessment data for Lakeville, Farmington, Rosemount.
 - d. Ken is still working on getting historical information on commercial development in New Market.
8. Mike reported that Bachmans has contacted the township about building a retail store in Eureka. The store would be for horticultural sales only, and would be seasonal. The group discussed the implications of such development, including parking requirements, traffic implications, the difference between agricultural or horticultural commercial and general retail commercial, the implications of a large retail center for preventing other large-scale retail establishments, and whether it's best to fight such development or work with Bachmans to create something acceptable to the community.
9. Next meeting either June 11 or June 18, depending on when Bob Ruddle's speaker is available. Ken will contact Bob R. by phone to verify the date and get back to the rest of the group by e-mail. There was no agenda established for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Mike Greco, recorder

**Relevant Portions of the Eureka Township Draft Comprehensive Plan
(newest items are in boldface)**

Page	Statement/Reference	Relevance
p. 7	"most of the portion of the [Airlake] industrial park that lies in Eureka is used for an airstrip"	Malecha asked whether this implied that there are portions of the industrial park besides the airstrip that lie in Eureka and 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 "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	Provides vehicle counts for major arterials in Eureka	Malecha asked whether 2010 projections were available for C.R. 23 and C.R. 9, and whether actual versus projected traffic count data were 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? How are hangars at the airport taxed? If owned by a commercial enterprise or used for commercial purposes, shouldn't these be taxed as commercial? Are they exempt because on MAC land? They receive services (fire protection, etc.), and some may be insured as commercial.
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.	Would impact placement of commercial development, infrastructure requirements for development, etc. Mark suggested all new roads should be on section lines or at logical increments thereof to prevent fragmentation, obstructions, and traffic flow problems.
p. 56	Commercial-Industrial Goals and Policies	The existing regulations regarding commercial-industrial development in Eureka. Indicates large-scale industrial or commercial "extremely unlikely" in the near future. Does not define "commercial-industrial."
pp. 19, 43	Floodplain Districts	Floodplain districts prohibit development of any kind
p. 54	Special assessments	Special assessments only to those who directly benefit from services
p. 55	Central sewer facilities	No Met Council plans for central sewer for Eureka, so development must be consistent with on-site septic for now

Issues in Commercial Development Revised May 29, 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.)
- **Decrease commuting time**
- **Convenience**
- **Increased prestige for community**
- **Increased sense of community**

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
- **Increased noise pollution**
- **Increased light pollution**
- **Compatibility issues (between ag, residential, and commercial)**
- **Potential for undesirable businesses**
- **May increase annexation pressures**
- **Potential to decrease property values**
- **Commercial provision for parking**

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.