

APPENDIX A: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT DC2040

The formal six-month public review period on the draft Dakota County Comprehensive Plan (DC2040) was held from April 1 to October 1, 2018, and the draft DC2040 was placed online, provided at County libraries, and publicized through the web and other media.

Adjacent and Affected Jurisdictions

Notice of availability was sent to 96 adjacent and potentially affected jurisdictions identified by the Metropolitan Council, including cities and townships within the county; adjacent counties, cities, and townships; several regional, State, and federal agencies; Independent School districts and watershed management organizations within the county, and Regional Park Implementing Agencies. Table A.1 includes the comments received and staff responses.

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
Apple Valley	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 26 – Proposed Roadway Expansion Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSAH 23 (Cedar Ave) to be expanded to more than 6 lanes. CSAH 42 (150th Street W.) to be expanded to more than 6 lanes. CSAH 42 (150th Street W.) to be expanded to 6 lanes. CSAH 31 (Pilot Knob Road) to be expanded to 6 lanes. CSAH 46 (160th Street W.) to be expanded to 6 lanes. <p>The City of Apple Valley wishes to continue to collaborate with Dakota County to ensure all County road expansion project use context-sensitive planning processes and road designs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 38 – Gaps in Existing Pedestrian System: None of the gaps identified in the pedestrian system map in Apple Valley are designated as “High Priority” missing segments, but the City’s <i>Bike Walk Apple Valley</i> plan ranked the south CSAH 42 segment west of CSAH 31 as a high priority gap. The gaps identified along CSAH 38 force cyclists and pedestrians to cross the street to stay on an off-street pathway. This is a significant barrier for those who wish to travel east-west in Apple Valley. Page 51 – Contributing Planning Activities: Does not include the Metropolitan Council’s <i>Principal Arterial Intersection Conversion Study</i>. The City of Apple Valley wishes to continue to participate in all planning activities related to grade separated intersections of any County roadways in Apple Valley. The City notes several projects of interest in the Dakota County CIP that could impact the City. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The City would ask Dakota County to consider construction of a pedestrian path along the south side of the 140th Street between Cedar Ave (CSAH 23) and Galaxie Ave and directing pedestrians and cyclists to cross CSAH 23 on the south side of the intersection. This may remove a need for a pedestrian overpass 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The County will re-evaluate expansion needs after the new travel demand model is done as part of the full Plan update, and will work with the City Comment noted. Scoring criteria were applied consistently County-wide with different results than at a city level. Dakota County will work cities to address gaps along County highways. Comment noted <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The County supports City efforts to construct a trail along the north side of 140th St east of Cedar and agrees that it is an important element to improving pedestrian/bike facilities in the area. However, the County does not believe it negates the need to provide an overpass of Cedar on the north side of the 140th St intersection. Comment noted

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>on the north side of the intersection. The City’s priority is for a skyway at 147th Street transit station. A skyway at 140th Street should be considered when the need for additional park and ride locations has been resolved.</p> <p>b) The City notes that the County intends to study the Palomino station in 2021 and 2022.</p> <p>c) The City notes that the County intends to update the Red Line IUP in 2022.</p>	<p>c) Comment noted</p>
Burnsville	<p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Bloomington advised us that they are coordinating with MN DOT to provide a trail connection from the future new I-35W bridge to planned trails in Bloomington, including the Minnesota Valley State Trail (DNR project). Bloomington is also working to complete a trail connection along Old Cedar Avenue from East Old Shakopee Road to the bridge. A trailhead at the end of Old Cedar is also being rebuilt with USFWS. The first phase, tentatively to be constructed in 2019-2020, is planned to extend between Lyndale / I-35W and Old Cedar Bridge. The City of Burnsville is interested in working with Dakota, Hennepin, and Scott counties along with the cities of Savage, Eagan, and Bloomington and other partners to ultimately connect the Black Dog Trail in Burnsville to the Big Rivers Regional Trail, and trails that cross the Minnesota River north into Bloomington. The City of Burnsville is interested in working with Dakota County and Eagan to provide trail connections to the Black Dog Trail. We would also like to coordinate with Dakota County and Scott County, including City of Savage, to provide a future trail connection to Scott County East Trail and the Lake Marion Greenway Trail. <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please include a statement of support for proper closure or remediation of landfills in the Plan. If Freeway Landfill contaminates the groundwater, this region will have a significant challenge. The City would like to obtain support from Dakota County for moving Freeway Landfill trash to Burnsville Sanitary Landfill, Inc. landfill. 	<p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted Comment noted Comment noted <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. County policy SW.8 on page 107 supports long-term and post-closure care of landfills. Dakota County will work with MPCA and the City to identify the best solution for the Freeway landfill.
Inver Grove Heights	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Update Map 3.1, County Transportation System, to include the Amana Trail segment of CSAH 28. Update Map 3.22, Ten-Ton Highways, to include CSAH 26 from 55/149 to the New 63? 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Map has been updated Map has been updated
ISD 197: West St. Paul-Mendota Heights-Eagan	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In our ongoing discussion with the Minnesota Vikings, it is clear that there will be increased demands on our road/transportation infrastructure. In our review of the plan, it is unclear if/how the County plans to address this increased demand. 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Existing and future land uses identified in City plans will be reflected in the 2040 traffic modeling to be completed the in

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> We have more specific comments regarding Thompson Park Activity Center (TPAC) given out ongoing partnership with the County. There is a need to increased upper lot parking spaces for renters and older adults. On a monthly basis, the lodge parking lot is full. At times, the lower lot is full as well. However, event when there are spaces in the lower lot, many of our older adults cannot walk the distance from the lower to the upper lot at TPAC. The hill in the upper lot, that divides the parking are from the building, creates safety issues because there is no sight line to the parking lot. By removing the hill and creating increased parking, it would also allow for increased accessible parking for older adults. 	<p>next full Transportation Plan update. Capacity improvement needs identified in the plan update will based on these 2040 traffic projections.</p> <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted and will be addressed in the current master plan update for Thompson County Park
Lakeville	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lakeville staff understands that County staff is scheduled to complete a full Transportation Plan update in 2019 to reflect city land use changes and development in respective 2018 Comprehensive Plans, including updating Traffic Analysis Zones and the County transportation model. Lakeville staff would like to participate in the process of considering proposed revisions to County cost-share policies. Please confirm timing of County update (2019 –p 11, 2 years – p 43, 2020 – p 57) Figures 3.1-3.22 should be reviewed to reflect Lakeville’s current southern City limits and recent highway/trail public improvements (Dakota County project numbers 5-50, 9-07, 9-36, 9-42, 9-46, 9-48, 9-52, 46-45, 50-03, 50-17, 50-19, 60-21, 70-21, 70-22). Figure 3.1 (p 17) Consider identifying figure as “existing” or adding “future” county highway segments in legend. Figure 3.2 (p 18). Review for consistency with Lakeville Transportation Plan. Figure 3.3 (p 21). Review to confirm CSAH 60 (west of I-35) requires ½ mile full access spacing – this is not reflected on current County Plat Needs Map or highlighted on Figure 3.3 or represented on Figure 3.6 (2040 ADT < 35,000). Is ½ mile full access spacing required for Cedar Avenue (CSAH 23) south of CSAH 70 and CSAH 31 south of 179th Street (future CSAH 9)? Should ½ mile full access spacing be shown for CSAH 70 based on recommendations of Principal Arterial System Study? Should CSAH 23 and CSAH 70 be shown as future principal arterial based on recommendations of Principal Arterial System Study? Also, show existing segments as constructed (i.e., 179th Street). Figure 3.8 (p 26). Consider identifying “2 lanes” in legend as 2 lanes <i>divided</i>. Also, review plan for Consistency with Dakota County Plat Needs Map (i.e., Figure 3.8 doesn’t reflect proposed expansion of 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The plan has been revised to clarify that the full Transportation Plan update is anticipated for start in 2019 and completion in 2020. The City will be involved with the update. Lakeville boundary checked, comments on project status noted Map has been revised Comment noted. The County used its GIS data and the MN GEO Spatial Commons as source. Please consider updates to those as needed. Map 3.3 has been revised to correct CSAH 60. CSAH 23 south of 70 is on the County’s current plat needs map, as is CSAH 31 south of 179th. The access spacing status of CSAH 70 and CSAH 23 is ½ mile, consistent with the recently adopted Principal Arterial Study.

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>CSAH 9 east of CSAH 23, CSAH 50 east of CSAH 9, etc.).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Consider identifying transitways with METRO reference (i.e., Orange, Red) in “Integration of Modes” (pp51-56). 8. “Transit Planning and Operations” (p 28). Consider referencing partnership with I35W Solutions Alliance. 9. “Regional Transitways” (p 29). METRO Red Line should be reviewed/revise to clarify that the existing transitway stops at the Apple Valley Transit Station, and that the planned transitway extends to 215th Street. METRO Orange Line should be reviewed/revise to clarify that the planned transitway stops at Burnsville Parkway with Phase 1. Future station at Kenrick Avenue Park and Ride is being studied. 10. Figure 3.11 should be reviewed/revise to reflect Metro Transit – Express Service along I-35 to the Kenrick Avenue Park and Ride to I-35/CSAH 60 Park and Pool to Scott County. 11. “Transit Facilities” (p 31). Consider adding Kenrick Avenue Park and Ride Facility. 12. Table 3.3 should be reviewed/revise to reflect correct addresses for Kenrick Avenue and Lakeville Cedar Park and Ride facilities. 13. Figure 3.13 (p 35). Consider adding future I-35 MnPASS/HOV lanes extension to CSAH 70. 14. Figure 3.19 (p 44). Should be revised to include Lakeville South High School. Consider adding Ritter Farm as a “high visit regional park” and King Park, Aronson/Quigley-Sime Fields as “sports-complex.” 15. “Aviation – Airlake Airport” (p 50). The Airlake Airport Long Term Comprehensive Plan was adopted in April 2018. Also Minnesota Rules 8800.2800 lists eligible public water for seaplane operations. 16. Consider clarifying “Contributing Planning Activities” (pp 51-56). What is the determination/intended purpose in selecting/identifying specific studies and reports? METRO Orange Line Extension Phase II Study is not referenced; Principal Arterial Study is referenced with generic explanation – recommendations are not identified; Kenrick Avenue Park and Ride Expansion Feasibility Report is not referenced. <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lakeville supports the County’s added objective (#7) to Water Management Vision and Goals (p 97) “to identify, prioritize and restore drained wetlands and other water retentions sites to improve water quality, enhance wildlife habitat, and prevent/mitigate flood damage to public infrastructure and private property.” Is the County considering creating/expanding a County-wide wetland bank? 2. Lakeville supports the County’s added objective (#9) to Water Management Policies (p 97) “to collaborate with others in the control of aquatic invasive species.” 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Comments noted, will consider in next plan update 7. Plan has been revised 8. Plan has been revised 9. Map updated for METRO Red Line, Orange Line is correct as-shown. 10. Comment noted 11. Comment noted 12. Data verified and updated 13. Comment noted 14. Comment noted, map used Metro Council data 15. Noted, plan revised 16. This section identifies major studies but may not include all recommendations. The METRO Orange Line Extension Study is identifying key components of a potential extension into southern Burnsville and Lakeville, and will evaluate and identify stations, routing, runway facilities, operational needs, and costs. The Study is ongoing in conjunction with Metro Transit's planning and construction of Phase 1 of the METRO Orange Line and city planning in the study area. Study completion is expected in summer 2019. <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The County is working on wetland banking for County projects and

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>3. Lakeville supports the County’s added objective (#6) to Water Supply Vision and Goal (p 102) “work with state, regional and local partners on water supply issues.”</p>	<p>partnering with the VRWJPO on credits that would be for sale to other entities.</p> <p>2. Comment noted, Lakeville’s support is appreciated</p> <p>3. Comment noted, Lakeville’s support is appreciated</p>
Lower Minnesota River Watershed District	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i> The following recommendations for inclusion in the DC2040 are suggested to strengthen the County’s plan and better align the DC2040 and the District plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Ordinance 132, Dakota County Storm Sewer System, include a standard that restricts infiltration practices within 50 feet of a septic tank or drain field. 2. In Section 18 of Ordinance 50, require the lowest level of proposed structures to be a minimum of two feet above the 100-year flood elevation. 	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted. Ordinance changes will be considered upon approval on the Comprehensive Plan
Metro Airports Comm.	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure 3.20, page 47: The noise contours shown for MSP appear to be outdated (2005 or 2007 forecast contours). We have actual 2017 noise contours that we’ve provided to several cities for use in their Comprehensive Plans. Please let me know if you would like GIS shapefiles of the 2017 noise contour to use in updating this graphic. 2. Aviation, page 50: Suggest the following updates to this section (changes highlighted in yellow). Airlake Airport — The Airlake Airport is under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Airports Commission (MAC) and is located in Lakeville and Eureka Township, west of CSAH 23 (Cedar Avenue) and south of CSAH 70 (215th Street). It is classified as a reliever airport with a 4,099-foot runway. It had 37,000 annual operations (landings and takeoffs) in 2015. Approximately 133 aircraft are based at the airport which serves private, recreational, and some business aviation purposes. MAC adopted a 2035 comprehensive plan for the airport in 2018 that recommends extending the runway to 4,850 feet, in an alignment that does not necessitate moving Cedar Avenue. However, the 2035 plan identifies a need to relocate the intersection of 225th Street and Cedar Avenue further to the south. 3. Aviation, page 51: Suggest the following updates to this section (changes highlighted in yellow) St. Paul Downtown Airport (Holman Field) — The St. Paul Downtown Airport is under the jurisdiction of the MAC and is located south of the Mississippi River in St. Paul and just north of South St. Paul. It is classified as a primary reliever for Minneapolis St. Paul International Airport (MSP). It is expected to 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Map has been updated 2. Comment noted. This will require further discussion between the County and MAC to ensure traffic safety is not compromised. 3. Plan has been updated with suggested language 4. Plan has been updated with suggested language

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>experience an increase in operations as MSP becomes congested. Expansion of the St. Paul Downtown Airport has recently occurred, but expansion is limited by topographical and site constraints.</p> <p>4. Contributing Planning Activities, Page 51-56: Suggest adding the Airlake 2035 LTCP to this list; a brief description is below: The MAC completed a 2035 Long-Term Comprehensive Plan for Airlake Airport in 2018. The plan envisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displacing the Runway 12 threshold to provide airspace clearance over railroad tracks • Extending Runway 12-30 with declared distances to maximize overall airfield utility for existing users • Reconfiguring the taxiway and expanding the apron area <p>Any required environmental review for the planned improvements at Airlake Airport will be completed prior to construction.</p>	
Minnesota DNR, Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>Mississippi River Corridor Critical Area Plan preliminarily approved with these changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please acknowledge provisions in 6106.0130, Subp 4. ROW maintenance 2. Clarify that County does not operate barge fleeting. 3. Clarify that County does not operate recreational marinas 	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan has been revised to include the desired maintenance standards under MR22. 2. Plan has been revised 3. Plan has been revised. Note that the 2003 Spring Lake Park Reserve Master Plan proposed future houseboat camping at the shore and a boating day use area below Schaar’s bluff.
Minnesota DNR, Region 3	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wildlife. Include natural resource planning considerations in the transportation chapter, such as language from the Land Use and Natural Resources chapter: “LR 5. Incorporate ecosystem protection and restoration into County facility, park, greenway, and highway design and maintenance.” DNR’s Best Practices for protection of species and Roadways and Turtles Flyer for self-mitigating measures to incorporate into design and construction plans. Examples of more specific measures include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing entrapment and death of small animals especially reptiles and amphibians, by specifying biodegradable erosion control netting (‘bio-netting’ or ‘natural netting’ types (category 3N or 4N)), and specifically not allow plastic mesh netting. (p. 25) • Providing wider culverts or other passageways under paths, driveways and roads while still considering impacts to the floodplain. • Including a passage bench under bridge water crossings. (p. 17) because typical bridge riprap can be a barrier to animal movement 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted and will be considered in the update of the County’s full Transportation Plan in 2019.

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>along streambanks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curb and storm water inlet designs that don't inadvertently direct small mammals and reptiles into the storm sewer. (p. 24). Installing "surmountable curbs" (Type D or S curbs) allows animals (e.g., turtles) to climb over and exit roadways. Traditional curbs/gutters tend to trap animals on the roadway. Another option is to install/create curb breaks every, say, 100 feet (especially important near wetlands). • Using Smart salting practices to reduce impacts to downstream mussel beds, as well as other species. • Fencing could be installed near wetlands to help keep turtles off the road (fences that have a j-hook at each end are more effective than those that don't). • Consulting Rare and Endangered species databases prior to project planning. <p><i>Parks and Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Somewhere in the document, whether in the parks chapter, or elsewhere, there could be a section describing outdoor recreational components not provided by, but available in the County. For instance, there are considerable hunting and fishing opportunities within Wildlife Management areas. There are also State-supported grant-in-aid trails that connect your community to an extensive network of trails throughout the state. To raise awareness of this recreational activity network, we suggest including snowmobile trails on at least one inventory in the document. The snowmobile GIA Program webpage below also has more information on the program and funding: https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/grants/recreation/gia_snowmobile.htm ! <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key Issues. We suggest adding another key issue to the list on page 89- groundwater quality and quantity are also at risk. Nitrates threaten drinking water supplies and natural resources compete for groundwater with agricultural irrigation and municipal water supplies. 2. Water. Goal 5.4 (p. 90) includes water in the list of natural resources to protect, but there are not many specific policies or action related to water. Perhaps include a reference to relevant policies from the county's different water plans? 3. Calcareous Fens. Consider adding the following information underlined (source, DNR wetland web pages) to the Calcareous Fens description: <u>Calcareous fens, one of the rarest natural communities in the United States</u>, are wetlands fed by groundwater with large quantities of dissolved calcium carbonate (CaCO₃, or lime). Calcareous fens often have rare plant species adapted to the unique environment and receive protected protection under the <u>Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act</u>. Indicator plant species, soil characteristics, and groundwater relationships are used in fen identification. Calcareous fens are a special resource because their unique characteristics are 	<p><i>Parks and Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted. Plan revised to include more information on other public recreation areas. <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted and addressed under water resources section 2. Comment noted 3. Plan has been revised 4. Plan has been revised 5. Comment noted. DNR staff from the MRCCA program provided a courtesy review of the draft DC2040. 6. Comments noted <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Plan revised b. Plan revised c. Plan revised d. Plan revised e. Plan revised f. Plan revised

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>difficult to restore if degraded and essentially impossible to re-create. <u>Calcareous fens are highly susceptible to disturbance. Reduction in the normal supply of groundwater results in oxidation of the surface peat, releasing nutrients and fostering the growth of shrubs and tall, coarse vegetation that displaces the fen plants. Nitrogen-rich surface water runoff into fens promotes the invasion of aggressive exotic plants, especially reed canary grass, that also outcompete the fen plants. Flooding drowns the fen plants. The soft, saturated character of the peat makes almost any level of activity within them, by humans or domestic livestock, highly disruptive.</u> DNR identifies the following calcareous fen areas in Dakota County, all located within the Minnesota River valley.</p> <p>4. Trout Streams. We appreciate the discussion of trout streams. Having a trout stream so close to a metropolitan area is a Dakota County gem. Consider adding the following concepts into your document: <i>Within the Vermillion River Watershed exists a highly valued public trout fishery and supports a self-sustaining wild brown trout population. Trout streams are particularly reliant on groundwater flow because the temperature of this source water is cool in the summer (and relatively high in winter). Potential issues facing the present nature of trout within the watershed are changes in groundwater transport rates or supply to the river. Shifts that increase impervious surface runoff and/or groundwater withdrawals will reduce the quantity and quality of trout habitat. The Vermillion River can benefit from projects that include wise groundwater use and development that encourages infiltration over runoff.</i></p> <p>5. MRRCA. The previous comments do not assess whether the draft comprehensive plan complies with the MRCCA plan minimum requirements. If you are interested in further review of your MRCCA chapter for consistency with the MRCCA plan minimum requirements, please submit it to the Metropolitan Council. The Metropolitan Council will then forward the plan to the appropriate DNR staff.</p> <p>6. Suggested Technical Edits</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. In the Existing Parks, Natural Areas, and Greenways map (p. 63) for clarity, add DNR in front of Scientific and Natural Areas and Wildlife Management Areas. b. The following information on page. 94 needs to be updated changed as shown, “Trout Brook and Pine Creek feed into the Cannon River in Goodhue County and are managed by DNR’s Central Region (3)5 in Wabasha County. Both streams were stocked with trout at one time and now support naturally reproducing trout populations.” c. Include DNR in the list of state and local agencies with water-related responsibilities, p. 102. d. In Minnesota River section, page 94, consider adding “bluffs” with banks. e. In the Trout stream discussion of Kennaley’s Creek, page 94, we recommend saying these creeks are primarily within the NVNWR, because other landowner include Northern States Power, Met 	

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>Council and MN DNR.</p> <p>f. In the Collaboration bullet point on page 102, DNR could be added to the list.</p>	
Minnesota DOT	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Due to strong freight activity in Dakota County, it should consider additional emphasis in the following areas: Play a leading role in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Truck Routes – Coordination of truck routes/planning in industrial and urban areas with restrictions and enforcement in adjacent residential areas Complete Streets – Treatments that consider truck movement as part of total vehicular traffic can include: time-of-day delivery windows to reduce conflicts with other street users, and design guidelines for curb pullouts that can be used at different times for bus, truck parking, and other vehicles Land Use Planning and Polices - Land use planning and policies to ensure freight development areas are designated and preserved and that development occurs adjacent to existing infrastructure Also supporting MnDOT in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freight as a good neighbor Integrate freight into all planning projects First/Last –mile connections Intermodal and multimodal facilities Urban goods movement programs Truck size and weight 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> & 2. The County acknowledges the importance of moving freight safely and efficiently in Dakota County and the region, and understands the critical role the County transportation system plays in supporting freight. Additional freight consideration will be included as part of the 2019 Transportation Plan Update.
MVTA	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on guiding principles, page 13. Public and Agency Involvement: Transit providers should also be included in transportation planning documents, studies, and projects. Context-Sensitive Design: Consider adding language on how transit fits into context-sensitive designs, including standards and aesthetics for bus stops/shelters as well as lighting and spacing of pedestrian crossings along transit corridors. Page 24: Goals 3.2 and 5.2 reference a multi-modal transportation system with land uses that support car-free lifestyles. However, emphasizing mobility with limited land access on minor arterials creates a challenging environment for public transit and land uses that support transit use. The separation of mobility and the transit goals within the County's Plan has carried over to implementation, such as a priority for transit on CR 42 (through the County-led East West Transit Study) yet the design focus is on vehicle throughput which limits the number of pedestrian crossings, bus pullouts, and increases overall walking distances. We strongly suggest the County work toward a vision that doesn't put both goals on competing paths. Page 36: Five transit stations (first bullet) including Rosemount 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestions for Transportation Guiding Principles will be addressed when the County's full Transportation Plan is updated in 2019. Comment noted, will consider in full transportation Plan update Comment noted, will consider in full transportation Plan update Noted, plan text revised Noted, language on working with providers has been added

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>Transit Station.</p> <p>5. Transit market area descriptions as defined by the Metropolitan Council may not represent the full service needs of Dakota County. MVTA encourages the County to work with local providers to determine the appropriate level of service for each area, regardless of its designations.</p> <p>6. Page 38: Figure 3.11. Consider adjusting symbology. It appears Route 489 (which is classified as local), is covering up express service. Express is the primary type of service in the 35E corridor to Saint Paul.</p> <p>7. MVTA's express routes using County Road 60 (491/492) were re-routed in the Fall of 2016 to use County Road 42. MVTA can provide updated route information if needed.</p> <p>8. Page 39: Second bullet at top of page. These are MVTA's five member cities within Dakota County, we also have three cities in Scott County - Savage, Prior Lake, and Shakopee.</p> <p>9. Page 40: Rosemount Transit Center: and Downtown Saint Paul (Route 484).</p> <p>10. Park and Ride Table: Consider updating this table to use the 2017 Annual Regional Park-and-Ride System Report as it contains more accurate and up-to-date information on MVTA facilities.</p> <p>11. Planned Transit Stations and Facilities: There is an expansion of Apple Valley Transit Station planned in 2019 (and funded by the Regional Solicitation, Dakota County, and MVTA), consider recognizing here.</p> <p>12. Page 150: Transit Service Expansion Capital and Operating Costs: What will determine how this money will be spent? (County led studies or MVTA growth concepts?) To date, the County has been focused on capital, with the exception of the DCTC pilot.</p>	<p>6. Map updated</p> <p>7. Map updated</p> <p>8. Noted, plan revised</p> <p>9. Noted, plan revised</p> <p>10. Noted, plan revised</p> <p>11. Noted, plan revised</p> <p>12. Comment noted</p>
National Park Service, Mississippi National River and Recreation Area	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Clarify relation between MNRRA and MRCCA, e.g., <i>In 1988, the U.S. Congress established the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area (MNRRA), a unit of the National Park System. The MNRRA shares the same boundary as the MRCCA, and the park's Comprehensive Management Plan (CMP), signed by the Governor and Secretary of the Interior, incorporates by reference the MRCCA program for land use management. Rather than institute a separate layer of federal regulations, the MNRRA largely relies on the MRCCA to manage land use within the park. This reliance establishes a unique partnership and framework for land use management amongst the local, state and federal governments to protect the intrinsic resources of the Mississippi River Corridor.</i></p> <p>2. Clarity: In the <i>Objectives</i> section "Corridor" is used multiple times, but a direct connection to what "Corridor" refers to is not established. Amend the language in the Goal 5.11 section to "... values of the Mississippi River Corridor (Corridor) ..."</p>	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Plan has been revised</p> <p>2. Comment noted</p> <p>3. Dakota County's Greenway Guidelines are consistent with PCAs being identified and the County encourages and collaborates on open space protection and management. The County does not own or manage land along the BRRT or MRRT other than a narrow trail corridor, and has no direct management role in PCAs</p>

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>3. While Spring Lake Park Reserve (SLPR) is the largest area of county owned/operated lands and facilities within the MRCCA, it should not be the only area that PCAs are identified and planned for. The Plan identifies and describes two Greenways that include the Big River Regional Trail and the Mississippi River Regional Trail. Part of what makes these trails special are the resources such as bluffs and vegetation that meet the definition of PCAs. Identify/plan for PCAs associated with BRRT and MRRT.</p> <p>4. PG. 127-130 – <i>POLICIES and GOALS</i> – Again, the policies and goals for PCAs are only directed towards SLPR. They should apply to all county facilities including the Greenways with the Big Rivers Regional Trail and the Mississippi River Regional Trail.</p> <p>5. We appreciate the map displaying the Shore Impact Zones (SIZ), but we would like to see the diagram of the SIZ from the MRCCA rules included in plans as well. It can be difficult to accurately depict the SIZ at larger scales and including the diagram helps alleviate this issue</p> <p>6. We appreciate the attention and planning towards identifying and describing the Public River Corridor Views (PRVCs). We think an overview map that shows the location of each PRCV would be helpful for future use of the plan.</p>	<p>owned by other agencies.</p> <p>4. See above</p> <p>5. Plan has been revised</p> <p>6. Plan has been revised</p>
Ravenna Township	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Chapter 5: Land Use & Natural Resources, p 86: Standards Adopted by Reference – The Dakota County Comprehensive Plan adopts by reference all future revisions to its official controls which are identified in the Plan upon their approval by the Board of Commissioners, including all future amendments made as a result of State law and rules. If this includes the Vermillion River Watershed Joint Powers Organization standards we have a concern over a new standard of theirs. They are making a change to their standard regarding Stormwater Prevention requirements for building projects. The practices are being reduced from 1 acre (43,560 sq. ft.) to 5,000 sq. ft. As a township, we are rejecting this standard.</p>	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Comment noted. The VRWJPO standard is not a County standard, and would not be administered by the County.</p>
Rosemount	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <p>1. Of late, Dakota County has discussed local assistance in economic development initiatives and the Plan policies continue this trend. As a growing community, the City looks forward to working collaboratively with the Transportation Department so infrastructure needs are identified and placed within the CIP to facilitate development and increased tax base. A project of continued interest to the City is installation of the full interchange at County Road 42 and State Hwy 52. Construction of the full interchange will enhance economic development initiatives at the City. Further, Rosemount looks forward to partnering with the County to creatively problem solve development issues that arise such as access, safety, and right of way dedication.</p> <p>2. Rosemount supports investigation and ultimately construction of a</p>	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <p>1. Comment noted. The City will be involved in plan update</p> <p>2. Noted, the Arterial Connector Study is identified as a contributing planning activity.</p> <p>3. Comment noted and appreciated</p>

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>reliever within the Hwy 3 corridor. The City Council is concerned about previous discussions related to expansion of Hwy 3, north of Downtown. The City believes it is more prudent to dedicate limited resources to provision of appropriate relievers which would include extension of Akron Avenue and projected traffic signalization at County Road 42. Such focus on traffic improvements would also open new opportunities for economic development in Rosemount.</p> <p>3. Rosemount appreciates the County’s interest in transit related issues and looks forward to additional transit opportunities within Rosemount similar to the recently launched Route 420 extension to DCTC. Rosemount is very interested in implementation strategies coming from the Robert Street Corridor Study such as express service along Hwy 52, which would serve local residents in several communities. Additional transit connections for our residents to the future Orange line are also desired.</p> <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. It is noted in the Plan that the overall County population will increase over the next decade but the number of youth (students) will remain roughly the same, with larger increases in older age brackets. While this may be true overall, a community such as Rosemount will continue to experience population growth in the 5-20 year cohort and encourages the County to recognize appropriate amenities and services. Examples of such amenities have been provided in the developed portion of the County, and similar options will be desired in the developing edge cities, including Rosemount.</p> <p>2. P104 indicates that there is wastewater treatment within Rosemount. This is no longer the case, as the Metropolitan Council has closed that Plant.</p> <p>3. Rosemount continues to request that the Dakota County Board take a more proactive role in waste management within the County. Many cities in the Metro Area have made deliberate decisions about appropriate disposal of waste in their county. It appears that Dakota County is going to allow the private market to determine the method and location, regardless of the potential land use impacts to existing residents. As noted in the City Council’s June letter, the City has requested Board leadership to engage in open public discussion on a long term solution for waste management in the County.</p> <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <p>1. The City is working with the County regarding appropriate locations for regional trails. Exact locations should consider private development goals and work with the construction of individual projects so as to benefit adjoining neighborhoods.</p>	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Comment noted. Demographics of communities within the County vary, and the County seeks to work with each community based on their needs.</p> <p>2. Plan has been revised.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. Dakota County does not have statutory authority to intervene in waste facility siting. The County would license a private sector facility only after the LGU has approved it and the State has permitted it. The State has expressed a preference for private sector ownership and operation of waste facilities. Policy 5 of the County Solid Waste Master Plan states that the County will take a collaborative role in private market facility development.</p> <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <p>1. Comment noted</p>

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
Rural Collaborative via Bolton and Menk	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Nininger Township acknowledges the planned functional/jurisdictional class change of Jacob Ave when the roadway extension between County Road 46 and County Road 47 is completed. Marshan Township is planning for a connection between Highway 61 and Highway 316, extending 170th St further east. This road has not been funded, and it is anticipated to be an “Other” arterial once completed. The County’s existing pedestrian and bicycle system map is different from the data we obtained from the County’s GIS within the Rural Collaborative Area. Essentially, the only trails we both show are the bike-supportive shoulders on County Road 46, 85, and segments of County Road 47. All other shoulders are inconsistent between our maps, submitted to the County on April 30, 2018. The Rural Collaborative requests further coordination to ensure our maps of shoulder-supportive bikeways are consistent. <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are two new MUSA staging areas planned in western Empire Township, bordering Lakeville. These are shown in the draft Dakota County Rural Collaborative Plan submitted to the County April 30, 2018 and in the image below. <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The existing parks, natural areas, and greenways map on page 63 shows scientific and natural areas and wildlife management areas in the legend. However, not all of the SNAs and WMAs in the Dakota County Collaborative are shown in this map. Please include the following natural areas in your final draft: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chimney Rock SNA in Marshan Township Hampton Woods WMA, located in both Castle Rock and Hampton Townships Mud Creek WMA in Greenvale Township Additionally, Empire Township notes different northern boundaries for Vermillion Highlands Research Recreation WMA. The northern boundary is north of 170th Street E, as shown on the DNR website/GIS data. 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted Comment noted, the study identifies this as a potential future local jurisdiction roadway. Comment noted. These data have been undergoing extensive updating. Staff will provide the same dataset to Bolton and Menk as is being used in the County Plan. <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Map revisions have been addressed. Map will be changed.
Scott County	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> On page 31 staff suggests an expansion to the definition of Metro Mobility as “a shared ride public transportation service for certified riders who are unable to use regular fixed-route buses due to a disability or health condition. Trips are provided for any purpose.” The Transportation element states the transportation plan will be completely updated in 2019 (page 11). When Dakota County begins updating the transportation plan, please consider the following 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted and plan revised Dakota County will include a future functional class system in its full Transportation Plan update. The East-

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>important highlights of the Scott County 2040 Transportation Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A future functional classification system was prepared, identifying ultimate functional classifications of Scott County roadways at full-build out. This future classification will allow the County to implement long-range corridor studies and prevent short-term developments from impacting a roadway’s end use (i.e., prevent direct accesses, implement access spacing guidelines, etc.). ▪ East-West principal arterials have been identified in the Future Functional Classification map (Figure VI-19) for CSAH 42/CSAH 78/MN TH 41 (future river crossing); CSAH 8 from US TH 169 to eastern County border (CSAH 70 in Dakota); and MN TH 19/CSAH 86 from US TH 169 to eastern County border (CSAH 86 in Dakota). These roadways serve as major east-west corridors through both Scott and Dakota counties. Scott County requests that the previous identified corridors be mapped in the Dakota County Comprehensive Plan Update. <p>3. Scott County looks forward to collaborating with Dakota County on future transportation planning efforts. There is an opportunity in the next round of plan updates to collaborate on a more synchronized process to take advantage of our common transportation issues South of the River. Scott County staff is interested in partnering with Dakota County staff to identify and prepare a work plan that meets both of our common objectives. When Dakota County begins updating the transportation plan in 2019, please consider ways to collaborate with Scott County.</p> <p>4. Scott County and the City of Savage requests Dakota County’s continued support to reduce congestion, improve mobility and safety in the State Trunk Highway 13 Corridor between US 169 and 35W. Please include in the County’s Plan a description of the TH 13 Dakota -Yosemite Avenue Corridor Study, the grade separation construction project at Dakota Avenue, future corridor studies and proposed construction projects at Chowen and Washburn Avenue. Additionally, these efforts will continue to serve the Ports of Savage and all associated and other industrial businesses in the TH 13 Corridor.</p> <p>5. Staff commends the plan’s discussion of autonomous and connected vehicles and their impact on the county’s transportation system in the future. Scott County is partnering with the University of Minnesota’s Resilient Communities Project this academic year to research and present case studies on how AV/CV could impact local development patterns and interact with existing infrastructure. We are happy to share the results of this student-led research to Dakota County staff once completed.</p>	<p>West connections also will be considered as part of the future functional class efforts.</p> <p>3. Dakota County will seek Scott County’s involvement in the full Plan update.</p> <p>4. Dakota County identifies the TH 13 corridor study, but has not included recommendations from each plan. The County has identified the 13 as an eligible trunk highway project under its sales and use tax-eligible projects.</p> <p>5. Thank you</p>
Three Rivers Park District	<i>Parks-Trails:</i>	<p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted 2. Plan has been revised

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please continue to coordinate with Three Rivers Park District as Lake Marion Greenway nears implementation at the Scott/Dakota County border so we can determine the best route through Murphy-Hanrehan Park Reserve. 2. Please label Murphy-Hanrehan Park Reserve, noting the hyphen between Murphy and Hanrehan. 3. The official Murphy-Hanrehan Park Reserve boundaries are noted on the attached Map A. It appears that northern boundary may not be consistent with current property ownership. Please modify the map (and others if applicable) if found to be inaccurate. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Map updated
Vermillion River Watershed Join Powers Organization	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 90, under the “Land Resources Vision and Goals” section. It is stated: “Agricultural operations in Dakota County are sustainable, significant contributors to the county’s economy and the wellbeing of county residents.” Based on the definition of sustainability on page 88, the data the County and VRWJPO (perhaps the NCRWMO too) has supports that agricultural operations in the County may not be sustainable based on existing environmental and perhaps societal burdens of continued production agriculture under currently applied management practices. 2. Page 90, Goal 5.4. Specific role(s) of Dakota County in conserving or protecting air quality and minerals should be stated with this goal. Dakota County has a goal to conserve or protect minerals, but objective 4 is seeking to find the County role. In order to have the goal, shouldn’t Dakota County have a role already in place? Since Dakota County doesn’t regulate land use, except in Shoreland, the roles should be explicitly stated. 3. Page 97. Water Management Policies. Add an additional policy to work with local communities and state agencies to identify and implement TMDL waste-load allocation reduction projects required under the MS4 permit. 4. Page 102, Goal 5.6. Consider adding another objective that indicates the County will work to identify high quality infiltration areas to be protected from contamination and to utilize for maintaining future groundwater recharge. 5. Page 104. Wastewater Goals. There are no objectives listed to accompany the goals listed. The objectives should state what the County will do or the role it will fill in Wastewater. 	<p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. The Plan vision describes a desired future state, including sustainable agriculture. 2. Comment noted – the County role has not been defined in some areas related to natural resource quality, but could include research, education, collaboration, and other levels of involvement. The Plan has been revised to add air quality to Objective 4. 3. Plan has been revised 4. Plan has been revised 5. Plan has been revised
Washington County	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pages 19 and 21: Please confirm if the information in Table 3.2 and Figure 3.3 reflects projected 2030 or 2040 Average Daily Traffic. 2. Page 29: Washington County is grateful to Dakota County for its contribution to our joint transitway planning efforts and looks forward to continued collaboration. 	<p><i>Transportation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 3.2 and Figure 3.6 state the projected 2030 volumes, based on slower growth in the past decade and in discussion with Metropolitan Council

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>3. Please clarify the paragraph for the Red Rock Transitway (Bus Rapid Transit) to reflect the Implementation Plan completed in 2016 (not 2014) suggested that extension of service to Hastings is supportable in the long-term. The Alternatives Analysis Update completed in 2014 identified bus rapid transit as the preferred mode for the corridor. The information as currently presented mixes the plans and resulting recommendations.</p> <p>4. Page 35: Please consider updating the METRO Gold Line alignment to turn south at Helmo Avenue/Bielenberg Drive terminating at Woodbury Theatre.</p> <p>5. Pages 41 and 42: Please update Figures 3.17 and 3.18 to reflect the Point Douglas Regional Trail that extends from Hastings north across the Mississippi River and into Washington County as built. It should be shown as an existing (not planned) trail.</p> <p>6. Page 134: Please update Table 6.1 to reflect bus rapid transit (BRT) and not commuter rail as the mode under development for the Red Rock Corridor.</p> <p>7. Pages i, 36, and 38-42: Continue to identify health, equity, transportation, and park/trail needs through studies and gap analysis.</p> <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Healthy Communities – Please note: Dakota County does not include a component on Healthy Communities in its draft comprehensive plan, but it is a component of the Resiliency and Sustainability chapter of the draft Washington County Comprehensive Plan. Page 10: Washington County is encouraged by Dakota County’s recognition of the “physical environment as a component for influencing the health of all residents and the vitality of the community.” In addition the County has identified the intersection of the social determinants of health on factors included in long term planning. Other items of particular note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page i: Trends identified which can impact health including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growth and density of a suburban area ○ The need for transit and multimodal transportation ○ Environmental factors effecting or promoting health • Page 3: Demonstrated commitment to community engagement during the planning process, utilizing a variety of methods to gather resident input. • Areas of the plan that reflect “Health in All Policies” concepts include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pages 11-13: Guiding Principles for Transportation ○ Pages 12, 59, 75, 88: Regional opportunities for connectedness ○ Pages 13 and 33: Complete Streets ○ Page 33: Transit Oriented Development ○ Page 59: Guiding Principles for Park System 	<p>staff.</p> <p>2. Thank you</p> <p>3. Comment noted, language modified to “implementation plan does not suggest Hastings service implementation in the near- to medium-term.”</p> <p>4. Map has been revised</p> <p>5. Map has been revised</p> <p>6. Comment noted, table revised</p> <p>7. Comment noted</p> <p><i>Land Use-Natural Resources:</i></p> <p>1. Comment noted</p> <p>2. Comment noted</p> <p>3. Comment noted</p> <p>4. Comment noted</p> <p>5. Comments noted – efforts are being collaboratively addressed with Dakota County Public Health.</p> <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <p>1. Comment noted.</p>

Table A.1: Agency Review Comments		
Jurisdiction	Comments	Proposed Response – Recommendation
	<p>2. Pages i, 36, and 38-42: Continue to identify health, equity, transportation, and park/trail needs through studies and gap analysis.</p> <p>3. Page 3: Consider implementing ongoing community input and methods to hear from diverse or underserved populations when addressing equity.</p> <p>4. Page 154: Consider building on the Farm Land plan to a) include agriculture assets to provide access to healthy, locally sourced food, b) County, city and township support/collaboration to have access to healthy, safe and affordable food, c) consider access to healthy food and locally sourced food as an economic development factor.</p> <p><i>Parks-Trails:</i></p> <p>1. Page 61: Consider a reference to tobacco free recreation space for visitors (either 4.1 Great Places or 4.3 Protected Places).</p>	

Public Comments Received on the Draft DC2040

Online survey: April 1 to October 1, 2018

- By the end of 2019 you are definitely going to need a 3rd lane on Northbound Cedar Avenue from 138th Street to HWY 13.
- This comprehensive plan is excellent based upon growth assumptions and other economic realities. The only thing that could improve this plan is to accelerate the development of each area strategically. Money might not always be available in the proportions of today. And increased development will encourage growth in every sector. Thank you for a job well done.
- Please prioritize the high needs for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in West Saint Paul. We especially need a N-S corridor for bikes (Delaware Ave would be a good use). I'm also looking forward to improved busing on the Robert St. corridor.
- More sidewalks, businesses set back from streets, more flowers, gardens, beautification, less shade, more trails.

Burnsville International Festival: Saturday, July 21, 2018

65 individuals stopped to view displays, ask questions, or add a sticky note comment to the displays.

- Need more swimming in lakes and beaches
- Where are transit benches and shelters
- Thank you for installing pedestrian flashing lights at Burnsville Parkway near the Wyndham Hills Condos. It's much easier to cross.
- General comments on appreciation of the trail and greenway system, interest in future trails.
- General comments expressing interest in the METRO Orange Line project

Dakota County Library, Rosemount: Wednesday, August 1, 2018

21 individuals stopped to view displays, ask questions, or write down comments.

- Hope Lakeville will do a Post Office that is not in a mall and has better access for a drop box outside. Getting inside PO is very inconvenient when events are going on.

- We like the trail system by Lake Marion
- There has been too much growth – would like fewer people. Rosemount is becoming like Bloomington.
- Appreciate that the countryside has protected open space
- Interested in greater water and groundwater protection
- Buffers are effective in cleaning up several lakes in the county
- Deer are an increasing problem and traffic hazard
- Simple solutions like not mowing ditches or adding a flushing bar to haying/harvesting equipment can help protect nesting birds.

Dakota County Fair: Wednesday, August 8, 2018

27 individuals stopped to view displays and ask questions. No written comments were received.

Social Media/Next Door

Mona Sommers, July 31, 2018

Any plans on making roads safer for bikers? There are not many roads with bicycle lanes and no clear structure for bike commuters. Cars drive carelessly, me and my kids got hit by car when biking. It might be a low population, but deserves safe riding conditions.

Marlon Tucker, July 30, 2018

Outstanding. I am so impressed with this plan. Mother Earth is first.

Clifford S., August 20, 2018

Bicyclists should be following the same rules that cars do, like stopping for red lights, and signaling turns. Or even staying in the bike lane, instead of riding side by side at 10 miles an hour on a 30+ mile an hour road. And what taxes do they pay to maintain the road? I pay 250 dollars a year for tabs and 45 cents a gallon towards road repair. A person on a bike cannot sustain the common speed limit on the street that was designed for automobile traffic. Many of which do not follow any of the laws for being on the road. All while contributing nothing towards road repair. That being said, yes, we do need to share the road. However, to blame all accidents on the driver of a motor vehicle is erroneously dangerous. Pulling into traffic without signaling or looking, and running red lights can get you killed; and this is not the fault of the driver. I'm not saying this was what happened to you and your kids, but many times it is the case. We all have to be more educated on safe travels along roadways that bikes are allowed on, not just car drivers.

Jamie T., July 31, 2018

How about cracking down on speeding? It's appalling how fast people drive around here and I rarely see any cops sitting out.