

**Eureka Township Envisioning Committee
Minutes from May 9, 2002**

Members present: Mike, Jody, Pat, Bev, Matt, Amy, Randy, Jerry and Ray.

Not present: Bob

1. **Minutes** of 4/25/02 approved after correction as follows:

Naming of the scenarios, Matt will follow up with a better understanding of these scenarios.

2. **Announcements.** The Met Council is in the process of conducting a Natural Resources Inventory and Assessment for the metro area. They may present details of the plan at the next 2030 Blueprint meeting on June 5. Check the Met Council website () for details.

3. **Town Center** We talked more about town center scenarios, which Matt noted are all similar to the Met Council Rural Areas notion of a "Hamlet." The scenarios discussed were "Mandatory Cluster" (or Ia—Town Center with Variable Densities and Mandatory Clustering), "Preservation" (or Ib—Town Center with Uniform Densities without Clustering), and a "Hybrid" scenario (or Ic—Town Center with Variable Densities, Clustering, and TDRs or PDRs). The group agreed that it made sense to create a smaller town center than we had initially envisioned, and to add more density (residential) near the town center. There was a lot of discussion about these maps and the impact to indexes, especially septic and water. Higher densities would obviously require some sort of community septic or sewer system. The group agreed that none of us are qualified to speculate about the impact of a sewer system, a mound system, or a collective system. It may be enough to point out in our public presentation and report that there are issues regarding sewer and water in various locations throughout the township that should be considered for growth.

In the next meeting we will talk in more detail about a town center, the design, architecture, etc. Matt noted that he will try to focus on 4-section plots for the maps he produces for our public presentation. This will allow us to provide some details about density and building placement in key areas (these will vary with each scenario) without having to actually decide on placement of buildings for the entire township for every scenario.

3. **Rural Character ASSIGNMENT:** Mike received input from 4 of the 9 members regarding our vision of 'rural character'. Other members asked that Mike send out what has been submitted so far so the others can use those as examples. **Please submit what 'Rural Character' means to you, to Mike ASAP and before the next meeting.**

4. **Other Town Center examples:** Matt brought in examples of Lino Lakes Town Center and Erwin, WI, Town Center. Someone suggested we tour towns nearby that have a town center or new urbanist designs that might be relevant to our work. This might be combined with trips to visit examples of bad (i.e., sprawling) 1:10 development. The link below refers to the William's college property listings Matt talked about. <http://www.williams.edu/admin-depts/bg/comsf.htm>. Other web resources on town centers will be added to the Envisioning Resources list at <http://www.cura.umn.edu/test/envision.html>.

5. **New Scenario:** The group used tracing paper over a map of Eureka and small pieces of paper to refine the Urban Progression scenario (Ivb—Northern 1/5, Dodd, and Cedar (with or without TDRs) that was begun at the last meeting. Working in the northern 1/5 of the township only, each person had the opportunity to add paper pieces representing commercial, residential, or mixed use areas to help us envision growth and add amenities near higher populations. We agreed that development along the main roadways (specifically Cedar and Dodd) should allow these areas to remain as open and undeveloped as possible to preserve the rural scenery. It was suggested that access roads could serve driveways to homes rather than have many driveways off a busy road like Dodd. Further, a greenway or scenic viewshed could be added to either side of the roadway to preserve the rural beauty.

We avoided adding any more growth to the industrial area at the north end of Eureka, because it would attract possible annexation by Lakeville. Developers would likely prefer that this area remain part of Eureka because the tax rate is substantially lower in Eureka compared with Lakeville. However, the township has no real leverage against Lakeville to prevent them from annexing. Bev said that it is a problem for townships everywhere, and that townships have no laws protecting them from the cities that swallow them up. The current laws favor the bigger towns or city of Lakeville in this case.

6. The group discussed various additional homework assignments or outside projects that people could volunteer to work on as we prepare for a public presentation and written report for the township. These included:

- Taking photos of the township (with accompanying map showing location where photo was taken)
- Taking photos in other towns/cities in the metro area (e.g., examples of town centers, town halls, public spaces, new urbanist designs, residential clustering, etc.)
- Doing a video tour of the township (especially the main thoroughfares—if this were in digital format, Matt might be able to superimpose CommunityViz 3D modeling over the video)
- Aerial photos or video of the township and surrounding areas
- PowerPoint presentation incorporating photos, maps, etc.
- Bike or bus tour of the township
- Road trips on various themes: town centers (Red Wing, Stillwater, Galena, IL), new urbanist design, bad residential 1:10 development, bad commercial development, etc.)
- Writing portions of the final report (history of Eureka, relevant characteristics of the township, development pressures on the township, description of CommunityViz, glossary of terms, etc.)

If there are other items you think should be added to the list, or to volunteer to work on any of these projects, e-mail Mike,

7. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting will be Wednesday, May 22, 2002. Email Mike by evening on 5/21 if you cannot make it. Other meeting dates: Thursday, June 6
Thursday, June 13
Wednesday, June 26

Tentative agenda for next meeting:

- Town Center Design
- Finalize Urban Progression scenario
- Identify sending and receiving areas for TDR scenarios

Respectfully submitted, Amy Nielsen.