

City of Pine Island – Community Visioning Meeting Summary Tuesday, June 2, 2009 7:00 p.m.

A “Community Visioning Meeting” was held as a part of the Comprehensive Plan update process in order to obtain input from the community on various aspects of the city’s future growth, transportation, and connectivity issues. Nineteen people were present, including MDG, Inc. and City of Pine Island staff. Four groups were formed with about four to five people in each group and group discussion took place. Notice for the meeting was sent out in the following ways: Press Release to local and Rochester papers, advertisement on Channel 8, Notice on utility bills, direct mailing to the township residents in the proposed growth area and notice on pilive.net.

Those present noted they found out about the meeting by pilive.net (1), city hall (3), channel 8 (1), email (1), newspaper (1), postcard mailing (1) and utility bill (1).

Those in attendance were asked to respond to a number of questions. Following are the responses:

The following are great things about the Pine Island community...

- Friendliness in school system and how people connect;
- Beautiful landscape;
- Activities for all ages and across generations;
- We can enjoy the small community atmosphere but are close to large metropolitan areas;
- People are interested in the history and preservation of the community;
- Good bank;
- Rich in history;
- People make you feel welcome;
- Opportunities;
- Potential;
- Great concentration of historical places in the downtown;
- Location and uniqueness of city;
- Farming roots;
- Walkable;
- Parks and trails;
- Some good downtown uses; and
- Family.

The following are things we need to work on to make Pine Island better...

- Older community so needs upkeep;
- New development is disconnected and bland;
- The cheeto smell;
- More parks;
- Communication;
- Sense of community;
- The comprehensive plan;
- Public participation;
- Appearance of entrances to Pine Island;
- Building a new school;
- Build a good community center and auditorium; and
- Need to develop other businesses other than Elk Run.

In 2035 I want people to say those who participated in this planning effort...

- People made the decisions that were correct, fearlessly and with wisdom;
- Had very good foresight;

- Were visionaries or pioneers and were people who cared and were thoughtful; and
- It was done right and thought out.

In 2035 I want to describe Pine Island to my friend as...

- Family oriented and not all industry;
- A proud place to be from and a caring community;
- Progressive, fun and friendly; and
- A self-sustaining community that has maintained its small town atmosphere and a good destination to stop and spend some time.

The items of strength of Pine Island:

- Highway 52;
- Pine Island is a unique community that has its own identity;
- Progressive school and businesses and overall progressive community;
- Its location and size;
- Community leadership;
- The opportunities;
- The potential;
- Farming roots with some industry;
- Walkable downtown;
- Variety of homes together in one place; and
- The people.

The challenges facing Pine Island:

- A split in social-economic groups that live and work in Pine Island;
- The community has to work to value education enough to invest in it;
- School expansion;
- Transportation network;
- Elk Run;
- The community needs to grow as one community after Elk Run is under construction;
- Communication;
- Sense of Community;
- Update the water and sanitary sewer infrastructure;
- More direct routes; and
- More river crossings.

The following issues relating to connectivity between existing Pine Island and Future Pine Island:

- The Elk Run Development is Pine Island and should be looked at as Pine Island;
- Building roadways, bridges and trail across highway 52 to accommodate all modes of transportation;
- Relationship between streets, buildings, parks, etc. in existing Pine Island should be consistent in new developments.
- Highway 52 interchange plan;
- Different street lights;
- Combine Pine Island logo and Elk Run logo;
- Elk Run and Pine Island are one City so change the Elk Run name;
- Need something beside Highway 52 to keep the town together;
- Another route to Rochester other than Highway 52; and
- Fewer dead end roads.

Our group has identified the following traffic issues, future transportation recommendations and/or concerns within the community:

- Interchange;
- Second Bridge;

- Park and ride lot;
- Accommodate rapid transit;
- High speed or light rail along the Highway 52 corridor;
- Non-motorized traffic and more trails;
- Poor lighting on Main Street;
- The traffic pattern on Main Street; and
- Pedestrian Safety.

Resource and Open Space Preservation

Maps were distributed to the groups so they could mark two areas of significant environmental importance and two areas for investment in parks and open space. The following is a list of the responses.

Areas of Significant Environmental Importance:

- Downtown area;
- The open space next to the School District fields west of the Trail;
- The Douglas Trail but it needs to be opened up by cutting down a few trees;
- The water shed divide in Elk Run;
- The river area in New Haven Township (3);
- The river area by the potential new school site; and
- The area in Roscoe Township west of the City.

Areas of Investment for Parks:

- Preserve the hilltops in the Elk Run area east of Highway 52;
- Preserve the river and adjacent properties for a trail in New Haven Township (2);
- A community park area in New Haven Township within the Elk Run Area;
- An area in Elk Run east of Highway 52; and
- The open space along the river just northwest of the golf course.

Future Land Use

Those in attendance discussed the best locations for future low density residential, medium to high density residential, commercial and industrial development. Using the parcel maps that were provided, each group illustrated their proposed future land use boundaries and locations. Following is a summary of the general locations proposed.

Low Density Residential:

- All outlying areas of the future growth area;
- The eastern area of Elk Run (2);
- West of the current city;
- East of Pine Crest in Pine Island Township; and
- New Haven Township.

Medium to High Density Residential:

- Behind commercial areas along Highway 52 in the Elk Run area;
- Behind a proposed commercial area at a proposed northern interchange on Highway 52 in Pine Island Township; and
- Southwest of the River in New Haven Township.

Commercial:

- Along Highway 52 in the Elk Run area (3);
- Along a proposed commercial area at a proposed northern interchange on Highway 52 in Pine Island Township (3);
- The downtown area (2); and
- Along Highway 52 just to the southeast of the current County Road 11 interchange.

Industrial:

- The area along the north side of Highway 52 in the Elk Run area where the proposed new interchange is going (3);
- The existing industrial area just north and east of the downtown (2);
- North of Pine Island in Pine Island Township along Highway 52;
- South of Highway 52 adjacent to the City of Oronoco;
- A Half mile east of Pine Crest in Pine Island Township; and
- Northeast of Pine Crest.

Open Space:

- Along the rivers;
- The golf course and open space areas along it;
- An area adjacent to County Road 11 in Pine Island Township; and
- An area on the east side of Elk Run.

Transportation Issues:

Those in attendance discussed the best locations for future roadways and what type of classification they should be. Following is a summary of the general locations proposed.

Future Roadways:

- An east-west corridor from the new interchange at Highway 52 to County Road 3 (3);
- A route around the north and east side of the City from CR 11 to the north side of Oronoco; and
- North and south connectors south of the golf course area.

Connectivity Issues:

Connectivity issues were discussed and how to achieve them. This could include transportation items as well as green corridors, and architectural items. Following is a summary of the responses.

- A new interchange at Highway 52 in the Elk Run area (2);
- A new interchange north of Pine Island on Highway 52
- Overpass over Highway 52 in the Elk Run area;
- Two new bridges over the River in the Elk Run Area (2);
- A north-south and east-west trail connection;
- New trails along the river connecting the school and future school site;
- Connect the Douglas Trail to new trails in new developments; and
- Trails along the major transportation corridors.

Community Survey

Surveys were also distributed to the participants of the meeting and a total of 7 surveys were either fully or partially completed. Following is some of the results from the survey process.

1. As part of the community survey process each participant was asked to rate both the current situation and future outlook of different policy areas within the community by scoring them from 1 to 5 with 1 being very poor and 5 being excellent. The following tables show the results from the survey by number and percentage.

COMMUNITY SURVEY RESPONSE TO QUESTION NUMBER 1 – CURRENT SITUATION

Policy Area	1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Average	4 Good	5 Excellent
Vitality of downtown	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Neighborhood quality	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Farmland preservation	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Historic Preservation	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
Housing affordability	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)
Economic opportunity	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)
Housing quality	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Urban aesthetics	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Traffic flow	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Open Space	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Recreation opportunities	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	0 (0.0%)
Air quality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)
Water quality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)
Public safety	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Urban land consumption	1 (4.2%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)
Infrastructure	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)

Source: February 4, 2009 Visioning Meeting Community Survey

COMMUNITY SURVEY RESPONSE TO QUESTION NUMBER 1 – FUTURE OUTLOOK

Policy Area	1 Very Poor	2 Poor	3 Average	4 Good	5 Excellent
Vitality of downtown	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Neighborhood quality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (40.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Farmland preservation	1 (25.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Historic Preservation	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Housing affordability	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Economic opportunity	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Housing quality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Urban aesthetics	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Traffic flow	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Open Space	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Recreation opportunities	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Air quality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Water quality	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)
Public safety	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)
Urban land consumption	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Infrastructure	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)

Source: June 2, 2009 Visioning Meeting Community Survey

2. What in your opinion is the city's sentiment toward the growth of retail and service business outside of the downtown? (7 responses received)
 - a. There is a general consensus that it should be restricted. 0 0%
 - b. There is consensus that it should be restricted in some cases. 0 0%
 - c. There is much disagreement on the issue. 2 29%
 - d. There is a consensus it should be encouraged in some cases. 3 42%
 - e. There is a general consensus it should be encouraged. 2 29%

3. What in your opinion is the city's sentiment toward the growth of industrial/business park establishments? (7 responses received)
- a. There is a general consensus that it should be restricted. 0 0%
 - b. There is consensus that it should be restricted in some cases. 0 0%
 - c. There is much disagreement on the issue. 1 14%
 - d. There is a consensus it should be encouraged in some cases. 2 29%
 - e. There is a general consensus it should be encouraged. 4 57%
4. What is your opinion is the city's sentiment toward residential development? (7 responses received)
- a. There is a general consensus that it should be restricted. 0 0%
 - b. There is consensus that it should be restricted in some cases. 0 0%
 - c. There is much disagreement on the issue. 2 29%
 - d. There is a consensus it should be encouraged in some cases. 3 42%
 - e. There is a general consensus it should be encouraged. 2 29%
5. Each participant was asked to rate their attitude towards certain types of development with 1 being strongly discourage and 5 being strongly encourage. The following table shows the responses in number and percentage.

**COMMUNITY SURVEY RESPONSE TO QUESTION NUMBER 5
ATTITUDE TOWARD DEVELOPMENT**

Policy Area	1 Strongly Discourage	2 Discourage	3 Neutral	4 Encourage	5 Strongly Encourage
Downtown Commercial	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)
Highway Commercial	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
Industrial	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
Business Park/Bio-Tech	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Residential	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)
Multiple Family Housing	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)
Affordable Housing	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)

Source: June 2, 2009 Visioning Meeting Community Survey

6. Each participant was asked in their opinion which issues should be a priority in the City with 1 being low priority and 5 being high priority. The following table shows the responses in number and percentage.

**COMMUNITY SURVEY RESPONSE TO QUESTION NUMBER 6
PRIORITY OF ISSUES**

Issue	1 Low	2 Low- Medium	3 Medium	4 Medium- High	5 High
Improve traffic routes and connections	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)
Limit urban sprawl	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Secure an annexation agreements with Townships	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)
Make land available for residential development	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)
Curtail loss of agriculture land to urbanization	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)
Reduce foreclosure rates	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Increase infrastructure (water, sewer) capacity	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
Downtown preservation & revitalization	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Cope with lack of government funding	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	3 (42.9%)	0 (0.0%)
Avoid destruction of wildlife habitat & wetlands	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)
Promote economic development	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)
Prevent water pollution	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)
Protect groundwater supply (volume)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)
Eliminate city government "red tape"	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Add to park and trail system	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)
Provide sufficient low-income housing	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Reverse govt. encroachment on property rights	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)
Preserve environmentally sensitive land	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (71.4%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)
Embrace green design/development concepts	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	2 (28.6%)

Source: February 4, 2009 Visioning Meeting Community Survey

7. Here is the additional comment that was received.

- Try to use new urbanism ideas concerning mixed use development, roads that connect homes to the town, mixed income development, walkability and local amenities.