

**Wright County NWQ Water Quality/Natural Resources Committee Meeting #6
Monday, August 4, 2008**

Committee Members Present: Dave Wagner, James Olsen, Lance Lindstrom, Mark Kampa, Mike Mcnellis, Rose Thelen and Shelly Jonas.

Staff Present: Stacy Marquardt, Tom Salkowski, Scott Deckert

Others: Franklin Denn (Planning Commission)

Marquardt summarized the meeting agenda, that there would be a review of the map and a review of policy changes. The committee had the most current map. Staff met with Camp Courage and the rest of the land that the camp owns to the east of County Road 7 was added. The local camp manager was in favor of the land use designation, but was not sure about the corporate office.

Marquardt reviewed the proposed policy changes that would limit mining and feedlots in the Resource Lands. Currently there are no gravel mining operations in any of the proposed areas and only two feedlots. Salkowski suggested possibly removing the land north of the County Road and that would eliminate one of the feedlots and would still be able to hook to the State Park.

Marquardt also summarized the proposed AR policy that would allow cluster development in new Resource Lands that were previously AR. The only question to be raised is whether or not the cluster or PUDs should be given the additional "bonus" lots that are currently given for PUDs.

Thelen thought they should not get the bonus lots.

Marquardt wondered what incentive there would be for those in AR to be included in the new proposed Resource Lands.

Thelen thought this is a compromise. They could still get 1 per 10, but not the bonus.

Jonas summarized Annandale's policies. They put everything into a resource area, so everyone has to do an environmental inventory before developing.

Salkowski noted it is legally possible to simply remove the AR designation, because the land use map is not zoning. If the landowner has not rezoned their property, the County can change the land use map legally. But politically, and if they have expectations based on the current Plan, the landowners may feel as if something has been taken away from them.

Thelen mentioned that proximity to natural resources actually adds value to land.

Marquardt asked the committee's opinion on the feedlot policy and wondered if there were any other policies that should be added.

There was brief discussion of the alternative shoreland regulations, non-commercial contractor's yards and land alterations.

Marquardt went through some slides she had made for the landowner meeting. There was discussion on content and order and whether the proposed policies should be included. Marquardt discussed her idea of having an open house format with a short presentation first. She envisioned maps on boards with committee members manning the "stations".

Wagner wondered if there were positive testimonials of people in the NEQ who had their lands affected by this change. Thelen thought we should stress the economic viability of preserving the

land.

Marquardt didn't want a long speech to be given at the landowner meeting. She wants variety and the committee members to be involved.

Committee thought some of the slides should be handouts, particularly the slide with examples of ways to preserve land. There was a discussion on the tax and other benefits for being in a natural resource area.

Wagner thought it would be beneficial to get an example of an individual who has set aside land or preserved land and the benefits they've gained.

Salkowski summarized the general attitude throughout the NEQ plan and how it was received. There was more kickback than we expected, so perhaps we are now a little gun shy. Following was a discussion of the overall attitude of landowners in this quadrant compared to the NEQ.

Salkowski agreed that having several presenters and some variety was a good idea.

Marquardt continued the presentation with the slides outlining the "pros" and "cons" of each area. The group thought the terminology should be changed from "pros" and "cons" to something else. There was a discussion regarding how much material to present in a PowerPoint presentation versus on boards around the room.

There was minor discuss on some of the specific areas and a discussion on the number of landowners that will be notified.

Jonas thought a little more background into how these areas were chosen should be included in a presentation. Further discussion included the amount of text, the order of the presentation, and the role of the County Staff in the process. There was also a suggestion to take pictures of some of the areas and pictures of developed areas next to preserved areas.

Marquardt requested the committee members to take pictures and send them to her. The landowner meeting will be at Annandale High School.

Marquardt took a tally of the AR policy in regard to keeping the bonuses. Most of the members were in favor of keeping the bonuses. There was discussion on how the policy should be written.

Thelen wondered if there was any way for landowners to petition to be in a specific land use district, specifically natural resources. Salkowski said that generally the map is updated all at once and then left alone. It's not done one request at a time. There are all sorts of ways to privately protect land.

Salkowski summarized the process from here on. All agreed there should be one more meeting before the landowner meeting.

The next meeting is set for September 8th at 1:30.