July 2013 version

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

This Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) form and EAW Guidelines are available at the Environmental Quality Board's website at: http://www.eqb.state.mn.us/EnvRevGuidanceDocuments.htm. The EAW form provides information about a project that may have the potential for significant environmental effects. The EAW Guidelines provide additional detail and resources for completing the EAW form.

Cumulative potential effects can either be addressed under each applicable EAW Item, or can be addresses collectively under EAW Item 19.

Note to reviewers: Comments must be submitted to the RGU during the 30-day comment period following notice of the EAW in the *EQB Monitor*. Comments should address the accuracy and completeness of information, potential impacts that warrant further investigation and the need for an EIS.

1. PROJECT TITLE

Malcolm Yards Mixed Use Redevelopment

2. PROPOSER

Proposer: Wall Development Company
Contact Person: Jeff Ellerd
Title: Development Project Manager
Address: 811 LaSalle Avenue, Ste 210
City, State, ZIP: Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612-767-4005
Fax: 612-767-4004
Email: Jeff@WallCompanies.com

3. RGU

RGU: City of Minneapolis
Contact Person: Hilary Dvorak
Title: Principal City Planner
Address: 250 South 4th Street, Rm 300
City, State, ZIP: Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone: 612-673-2639
Fax: 612-673-2526
Email: hilary.dvorak@minneapolismn.gov

4. REASON FOR EAW PREPARATION: (CHECK ONE)

Required:

☐ EIS Scoping
☒ Mandatory EAW

Discretionary:

☐ Citizen petition
☐ RGU discretion
☐ Proposer initiated

If EAW or EIS is mandatory give EQB rule category subpart number(s) and name(s):

Minnesota Rules 4410.4300 Mandatory EAW Categories:

- Subpart 19D for construction of residential development exceeding the threshold of "….375 attached units in a city within the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area that has adopted a comprehensive plan under Minnesota Statutes, section 473.859…"
- Subpart 32. Mixed residential and industrial/commercial projects with a sum of quotients exceeding 1.0

5. PROJECT LOCATION:

County: Hennepin
City/Township: City of Minneapolis
PLS Location (¼, ¼, Section, Township, Range): NE ¼ of Section 30, Township 29, Range 23
Watershed (81 major watershed scale): Upper Mississippi River Basin
GPS Coordinates: 93 12 45.15° W; 44 58 23.04° N
Tax Parcel Number: 30-029-23-13-0009; 30-029-23-13-0010; 30-029-23-12-0014; 30-029-23-11-0011; 30-029-23-14-0051; and 30-029-23-14-0052.

At a minimum attach each of the following to the EAW:

- County map showing the general location of the project;
- U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale map indicating project boundaries (photocopy acceptable); and
- Site plans showing all significant project and natural features. Pre-construction site plan and post-construction site plan.

Figures:

- Figure 1. Site Location Map
- Figure 2: Site Map – USGS
- Figure 3. Site Map with Aerial Photograph
- Figure 4. Site Development Plan
- Figure 5. Existing Land Cover
- Figure 6. Proposed Land Cover
- Figure 7. Zoning
- Figure 8. Hennepin County Soil Survey
- Figure 9. Groundwater Hazards
- Figure 10. Field Verified Wells
- Figure 11. Prospect Park Residential Historic District
- Figure 12. Historic Landmarks and Districts
- Figure 13. Traffic Study Intersections

Tables:

- Table 1. Project Magnitude Table
- Table 2. Existing and Proposed Land Cover Conditions for the Site
- Table 3. Required Project Permits and Approvals
- Table 4. Redevelopment Metrics

- Table 5. Field Verified Wells
- Table 6. Estimated Wastewater Production

Appendices:

- Appendix 1. National Heritage Information System (NHIS), Query and MNDNR Response
- Appendix 2. US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) IPaC Report (Information for Planning and Consultation)
- Appendix 3. Correspondence from the SHPO Office
- Appendix 4. SHPO Query Results
- Appendix 5. Traffic Impacts Study

6. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

a. Provide the brief project summary to be published in the *EQB Monitor*, (approximately 50 words).

Wall Development Company is proposing a mixed-use redevelopment project on vacant industrial lands. The project area encompasses approximately 10.1 acres and would include up to 800 attached residential units and 80,000 square feet of new commercial development constructed in two phases. The project area would be accessed from Malcolm Avenue and via new private connecting roads.

b. Give a complete description of the proposed project and related new construction, including infrastructure needs. If the project is an expansion include a description of the existing facility. Emphasize: 1) construction, operation methods and features that will cause physical manipulation of the environment or will produce wastes, 2) modifications to existing equipment or industrial processes, 3) significant demolition, removal or remodeling of existing structures, and 4) timing and duration of construction activities.

Wall Development Company (project proposer) is a privately held single purpose real estate development entity. Wall Development Company owns several parcels totaling approximately 19.5 acres that are located in Minneapolis within the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) Area Industrial Employment District (Figure 1). Wall Development Company is proposing a redevelopment project on approximately 10.1 acres of land within this area (see Figures 2 and 3). The parcels within the proposed redevelopment project area (the Site) are adjacent to Malcolm Avenue SE and are generally referred to as Malcolm Yards. Wall Development Company is proposing a two-phase redevelopment project that would include up to 800 attached residential units and approximately 80,000 ft^2 of commercial development consisting of retail, restaurants, and office/maker space.

The Site has a long history of industrial use, dating back to the early 1900s. Past known uses were primarily related to grain storage, transfer, and support for these operations. Four currently vacant buildings are located on the Site. Two are on the former Harris Machinery property located in the south-central portion of the Site and two are on the former Minnesota Medical Foundation property located on the southwest corner of the Site. The Harris buildings were used as part of the

wholesale/salvage business that operated there for many years. The Minnesota Medical Foundation buildings were originally part of the grain operations, but were also used by the University of Minnesota for research in the 1980s and 1990s. All the buildings on the site are in various stages of disrepair. Damage is largely the result of property vandals and vagrants, theft, and fire. The Site is currently vacant and unused. Only the Harris Machinery Building, further described below, is planned to be reused as part of the redevelopment project. The other three existing buildings on the Site will be demolished and removed.

Site Development and Phasing

The proposed redevelopment project will occur in two phases and includes mixed use, residential, and commercial spaces. Phase 1 of the development is anticipated to begin in the fourth quarter of 2018 and will include 380 attached residential units within two buildings. The two residential apartment buildings are shown on Figure 4. It is anticipated by Wall Development Company that one of the apartment buildings will be a multifamily affordable housing project and the other building will be market-rate apartments. One of the apartment buildings will be six stories in height and one of the buildings will be up to twelve stories in height. There will be approximately 20,000 ft^2 of commercial development on the ground and mezzanine level of the twelve-story residential building and 2,000 ft^2 of commercial space in the six-story affordable housing building. An additional 16,000 ft^2 of commercial development will be within the former Harris Machinery Building in the south-central portion of the site (see Figure 4). Wall Development Company intends to reuse and refurbish the Harris Machinery Building to the extent practical, to create the Malcolm Yards Market; an urban food hall consisting of multiple vendors and cuisines. Wall Development Company anticipates that the Malcolm Yards Market and the twelve-story apartment building will be the initial development efforts within Phase I, after project approvals are received.

The specific development plans of Phase 2 are not yet known and will be dictated by market conditions, including the development of Phase 1 and other approved development projects currently under construction south of the Transitway. It is anticipated that Phase 2 will include up to 420 residential units developed in multiple apartment buildings. Phase 2 will also include approximately 42,000 ft^2 of commercial development both as standalone buildings and within the ground and/or lower floors of the Phase 2 residential buildings. The Phase 2 commercial development is anticipated to include a mix of office/maker space (~80%) and retail (~20%) space.

Redevelopment of the Site will also include construction of new private roads to serve the area. The current access to the Site is via Malcolm Avenue, a City roadway, which bounds the Site on the east. Malcolm Avenue provides north-south access to the Site from University Avenue, crossing the limited-access Transitway. New private roads will be constructed to provide east-west access from Malcolm Avenue into the Site, extending to the Malcolm Yards Market (Figure 4). Wall Development Company is also proposing to construct 30th Avenue north of the Transitway and extending into the Phase 2 area. This will initially be constructed as a private road but is anticipated to be built to City of Minneapolis standards to allow the road to potentially become a City street in the future. The current development plan does not include a new

crossing of the Transitway at 30th Avenue; however, Wall Development Company is coordinating with the University of Minnesota and the City of Minneapolis to explore the potential for a new crossing at the Transitway. An additional Transitway crossing (or crossings) would provide additional access to the Site and surrounding properties. In addition to new roads, the redevelopment project will also include a mix of surface and underground parking to serve the proposed developments.

A new greenway and park space is also proposed as part of the redevelopment project. The greenway will consist of a linear east-west space located between Phase 1 and Phase 2 (see Figure 4 – Site Development Plan). A larger park area is proposed on the west end of the Site. A new district stormwater treatment system is proposed for this park area. The system will be developed in a partnership between the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (MWMO), the City of Minneapolis, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, and Wall Development Company. Initial coordination for this partnership has begun. The proposed district stormwater treatment area will be the primary source of stormwater storage and treatment for the Site. The west portion of the greenway will likely be constructed during the initial stages of Phase 1 development with the construction of the Malcolm Yards Market. The remaining portions of the proposed system will be constructed as soon as practical, based on the status of the partnership, available funding mechanisms, and other circumstances. If necessary, temporary stormwater management may be implemented during the early stages of construction while final details are resolved for the district stormwater solution. The Site will be served by City of Minneapolis Water and Sewer utilities.

c. Project magnitude:

Table 1. Project Magnitude Information

Measure	Magnitude
Total Project Acreage	10.1 ac
Linear project length	NA
Number and type of residential units	Up to 380 Attached Units (Phase I) Up to 420 Attached Units (Phase II)
Commercial building area (in square feet)	38,000 ft^2 (Phase I) 42,000 ft^2 (Phase II)
Industrial building area (in square feet)	NA
Institutional building area (in square feet)	NA
Other uses – specify (in square feet)	2.1 acres Park & Greenway Space 1.6 acres Roadway
Structure height(s)	Max approximately 150 feet (12 stories)

d. Explain the project purpose; if the project will be carried out by a governmental unit, explain the need for the project and identify its beneficiaries.

The project will be carried out by a private developer, Wall Development Company, or related business entity. The purpose of the project is to redevelop existing vacant industrial lands that will provide new housing, commercial, office and/or maker space in an area of the City that is currently undergoing various levels of redevelopment.

e. Are future stages of this development including development on any other property planned or likely to happen? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If yes, briefly describe future stages, relationship to present project, timeline and plans for environmental review.

Wall Development Company owns additional land adjacent to the Site to the north and also to the northeast on the other side of Malcolm Avenue. Wall Development Company does not have specific development plans for that property at this time. If future projects are proposed for these lands, Wall Development Company will complete permitting and/or environmental review evaluations as required.

f. Is this project a subsequent stage of an earlier project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes, briefly describe the past development, timeline and any past environmental review.

This proposed redevelopment project is not part of an earlier development project.

7. COVER TYPES

Estimate the acreage of the site with each of the following cover types before and after development:

The Site is comprised of vacant industrial lands and mainly includes vacant buildings and impervious surfaces such as building foundations, old road/driveways, and barren gravel areas. Some of the barren areas have grass and vegetation but there are no areas of maintained grass. The redevelopment project will add new residential and commercial buildings, new roadway and parking areas, and new greenspace and park areas. A comparison of the existing and proposed land cover conditions for the Site is provided in Table 2. Existing and proposed land cover are displayed on Figures 5 and 6.

Table 2. Existing and Proposed Land Cover Conditions for the Site

Cover Type	Before	After
Wetlands/Water/Streams	0	0
Cropland	0	0
Vacant Buildings	4.7	0
Barren/Grass	5.4	0
Commercial	0	0.4
Green Space	0	1.0
Lawn/Landscaping	0	0.3
Mixed Use	0	3.2
Park	0	1.1
Private ROW/Parking	0	1.6
Residential	0	2.5
TOTAL	**10.1**	**10.1**

8. PERMITS AND APPROVALS REQUIRED

List all known local, state and federal permits, approvals, certifications and financial assistance for the project. Include modifications of any existing permits, governmental review of plans and all direct and indirect forms of public financial assistance including bond guarantees, Tax Increment Financing and infrastructure. *All of these final decisions are prohibited until all appropriate environmental review has been completed. See Minnesota Rules, Chapter 4410.3100.*

Table 3. Required Project Permits and Approvals

Unit of Government	Types of Application	Status
Federal		
Federal Aviation Administration	Airspace hazard permit (for any structures more than 200 feet above ground level)	To be applied for if needed; max Phase I structure height is 9 stories (~110 feet).
State		
Minnesota Department of Health	Abandonment of Water Wells	To be applied for
	Water Main Extension Plan Review	To be applied for
	Sanitary Sewer Extension Permit	To be applied for
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Groundwater Appropriation Permit (Construction)	To be applied for, if needed
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit	To be applied for
	Sanitary Sewer Extension Permit	To be applied for
	Response Action Plan Approval	To be applied for (anticipated to be completed for each of the development buildings)
	Storage Tank Registration	To be applied for, if needed
Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry	Plan Review (Plumbing, sewer, storm sewer)	To be applied for, if needed
Regional		
Metropolitan Council	Sanitary Sewer Extension Permit	To be applied for
	SAC Determination Application	To be applied for, if needed
	Comprehensive Plan Amendment approval	To be applied for
Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (MWMO)	Permitting through City, no permitting authority	NA
Local		
City of Minneapolis	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	In process
	Land use applications, including rezoning, subdivision, conditional	To be applied for as needed

Unit of Government	Types of Application	Status
	use permits, variances and site plan review	
	Tax Increment Financing	To be applied for as applicable
	Building permits	To be applied for
	Demolition permit	To be applied for
	Emergency Generator Fuel Storage Permit	To be applied for
	Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan Approval and Grading Permit	To be applied for
	Stormwater Management Plan Approval	To be applied for
	Approval of Easement Vacation (existing utility easement)	To be applied for, if needed
	Temporary Water Discharge Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Water Discharge from Dewatering or Storm Water Ponds	To be applied for, if needed
	Tank Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Remediation Permits	To be applied for, if needed
	Temporary On-Site Storage of Impacted Soil Approval	To be applied for, if needed
	Approval of Impacted Soil Reuse	To be applied for if needed
	After Hours Work Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Lane Obstruction Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Right-of-way Excavation Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Encroachment Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Utility Repair Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Utility Connection Permits	To be applied for, if needed
	Sidewalk Construction Permit	To be applied for, if needed
	Testing & Inspection Agreement	To be applied for, if needed
	Department of Employment and Economic Development, Metropolitan Council, and/or Hennepin County grants for	To be applied for

Unit of Government	Types of Application	Status
	redevelopment, demolition, and clean up	
University of Minnesota	Utility Easement for Crossing Transitway	In process

Cumulative potential effects may be considered and addressed in response to individual EAW Item Nos. 9-18, or the RGU can address all cumulative potential effects in response to EAW Item No. 19. If addressing cumulative effect under individual items, make sure to include information requested in EAW Item No. 19.

9. LAND USE

a. Describe:

i. Existing land use of the site as well as areas adjacent to and near the site, including parks, trails, prime or unique farmlands.

The Site is located in a highly developed urban area and has a long history of industrial uses. There are no prime or unique farmlands on-site. Past known uses were primarily related to grain storage, transfer, and support for such operations. Additional uses included a foundry, machine shop, warehousing, lumber/woodworking, wholesaling, and medical research. A majority of the prior buildings and appurtenances have been demolished. Currently, the Delmar #4 ("United Crushers") grain elevator remains north of the Site, along with remnant footings, foundations, and miscellaneous rail track. Two buildings remain along the south side of the Site near the Transitway (the "Harris Buildings") with an additional two buildings remaining on the far southwest corner of the Site (the "Minnesota Medical Foundation Buildings"). The remainder of the Site is vacant and unused (barren/sparse vegetation).

The project proposer owns property directly adjacent to the north of the Site that was also formerly used for industrial activity and is now vacant/barren. Beyond the Wall property to the north is the SKB waste transfer facility and BNSF railroad. The Surly brewery and Meritex light industrial buildings are located across Malcolm Avenue to the east. To the northwest (west of the "United Crushers" elevator) is the University of Minnesota's track and field practice facility. The University of Minnesota Transitway (Transitway) borders the Site on the south. The Transitway is a limited access roadway owned by the University of Minnesota that connects the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. Per University of Minnesota Ordinance, only emergency vehicles; public works, maintenance and service vehicles; and public carriers (i.e. mass transportation by bus) are allowed to travel on the Transitway.

The area south of the transitway is undergoing significant redevelopment. The timing of redevelopment activities can be attributed to the opening of the Green Line light rail service and stations in 2014. The 29th Avenue SE light rail station is located approximately one block south of the Site. Planned, recently

completed, and in progress development activities in the area include mixed use residential and commercial (retail) redevelopments.

ii. Plans. Describe planned land use as identified in comprehensive plan (if available) and any other applicable plan for land use, water, or resources management by a local, regional, state, or federal agency.

Land use and projects occurring within the Seven-County Metropolitan Area fall under the Metropolitan Council's regional plan, *Thrive MSP 2040*, which sets the direction and guidelines for the region's future growth and development. The Metropolitan Council plans the regional systems that serve local communities within the Metropolitan Area. These regional systems include transportation, wastewater collection and treatment, and recreational opportunities, such as parks. Thrive MSP 2040 provides the basis for policy related to managing the regional systems.

Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth

The City's comprehensive plan is the Minneapolis Plan for Sustained Growth (2009 – and as amended, the Comprehensive Plan). The Site is guided Industrial on the Future Land Use Map and is located within the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial Area (SEMI) Industrial Employment District. City land use policy strongly discourages incorporation of housing in Industrial Employment District's. In 2017, the City Council approved a comprehensive plan amendment to remove the Site from the SEMI Industrial Employment District and to re-guide the Site as Transitional Industrial in order to allow rezoning to districts that allow a mix of uses, including housing. This comprehensive plan amendment has been submitted to the Metropolitan Council, with final review by that agency pending completion of environmental review for the Site.

Due to its proximity to the 29th Avenue light rail station, the Site is within a Transit Station Area (TSA). Land use policies in the Comprehensive Plan support concentration of the highest density development and pedestrian-oriented mixed use near transit stations in ways that encourage transit use and contribute to interesting and vibrant places. The Site is also associated with the University of Minnesota Growth Center. Growth Centers are locations for concentration of both employment generating development and high- to very high-density housing.

Other particularly relevant policies of the Comprehensive Plan include:

<u>Housing</u>

- Housing Policy 3.1: Grow by increasing the supply of housing.
- Housing Policy 3.2: Support housing density in locations that are well connected by transit, and are close to commercial, cultural and natural amenities.
- Housing Policy 3.3: Increase housing that is affordable to low and moderate income households.

Economic Development

- Economic Development Policy 4.1: Support private sector growth to maintain a healthy, diverse economy.

Environment

- Environment Policy 6.3: Encourage sustainable design practices in the planning, construction and operations of new developments, large additions and building renovations.

Open Space and Parks

- Open Space and Parks Policy 7.3: Maintain and improve the accessibility of open spaces and parks to all residents.

Urban Design

- Urban Design Policy 10.9: Support urban design standards that emphasize traditional urban form with pedestrian scale design features at the street level in mixed-use and transit-oriented development.
- Urban Design Policy 10.11: Seek new commercial development that is attractive, functional and adds value to the physical environment.
- Urban Design Policy 10.14: Encourage development that provides functional and attractive gathering spaces.
- Urban Design Policy 10.15: Wherever possible, restore and maintain the traditional street and sidewalk grid as part of new developments.

Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI)/Bridal Veil Area Refined Master Plan (2001)

This seminal land use plan for SEMI area called for the general character and land use of the South SEMI area (which includes the Site) to change from one dominated by manufacturing and industry to one of balance mixed uses (light industrial, office, research, medium-to-high density residential and limited retail/service uses).

Industrial Land Use Study and Employment Policy Plan (2006)

This plan provides policy direction for industrial land use and industrial employment citywide. It created the Industrial Employment Districts that were later incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The comprehensive plan amendment discussed above will change the SEMI Industrial Employment District boundary to exclude the Site.

Stadium Village University Avenue Station Area Plan (2012)

This plan is a policy document produced by the City of Minneapolis, in partnership with the University and Hennepin County, to guide land use and development around the Stadium Village station and surrounding areas along the light rail line for the next 20 years. It did not reevaluate land use guidance for the portion of SEMI within the study area; rather, it just restated and affirmed previously adopted policies for SEMI. With respect to the Prospect Park (29th Avenue) Station Area more generally, this plan supports redevelopment with high density residential mixed use.

University Avenue Innovation District (City Council of Minneapolis Resolution 2015R-402) (2015)
An Innovation District is an economic development tool that utilizes partnerships with higher education institutions, businesses, and government to fuel job growth and redevelopment in targeted locations. This resolution designated the University Avenue Innovation District, which includes the Site. The resolution directs staff to "[c]onsider changes to city policies and practices to allow for experimentation and innovation consistent with City goals and the expressed priorities of the district."

The Site is also located within an urban watershed that drains to the Mississippi River, which is in the jurisdiction of the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (MWMO), a joint powers local government unit. The MWMO Watershed Management Plan 2011 – 2021 was updated in 2016 and identifies goals, strategies, and implementation actions for the watershed.

The opening of the METRO Green Line and two LRT stations along the southern edge of the SEMI area have increased development pressures and opportunities, resulting in the formation of community-based planning groups. Prospect Park 2020 and Prospect North Partnership are working with the City and advocating for innovative, sustainable and coordinated "district" approaches for redevelopment of the 29th Avenue station area, including and surrounding the south SEMI area. The Innovation District Resolution was recently-adopted by the City Council in response to the community's desire for innovation, including regulatory flexibility, as a catalyst for redevelopment. The project proposer has executed a Memo of Understanding (MOU) between the Prospect Park Association, Prospect Park Properties, and Wall Development Company in support for redevelopment of the area to the north of the Transitway, which includes the proposed Site.

iii. Zoning, including special districts or overlays such as shoreland, floodplain, wild and scenic rivers, critical area, agricultural preserves, etc.

Current City of Minneapolis zoning (Figure 7) for the Site is I2 Medium Industrial except for a small area on the west that is zoned I1 Light Industrial. The Site is also subject to the University Area Overlay District, which primarily addresses parking requirements. In recent years, several parcels south of the Transitway have been rezoned from Industrial to C3A, Community Activity Center, for redevelopment with high-density housing and retail uses. It is anticipated that the Site also will be rezoned to C3A. The purpose of the C3A Community Activity Center District is "to provide for the development of major urban activity and entertainment centers with neighborhood scale retail sales and services. In addition to entertainment and commercial uses, residential uses, institutional and public uses, parking facilities, limited production and processing and public services and utilities are allowed."

b. Discuss the project's compatibility with nearby land uses, zoning, and plans listed in Item 9a above, concentrating on implications for environmental effects.

Land Use Compatibility

The proposed project would result in housing and commercial redevelopment in a primarily mixed-use area, which would be similar to the mixed use redevelopment occurring across the Transitway to the south. The proposed mixed use project will also be compatible with the athletic fields located west of the proposed park/stormwater detention area and with the Surly brewing and entertainment use and the light industrial Meritex use across Malcolm to the east. The United Crushers elevator, proposed Midwest Climbing Academy project, and additional land owned by the proposer north of the Site will buffer the new housing from the heavier industrial and railroad uses further north. It is anticipated that the land immediately north of the Phase 2 area will eventually be redeveloped with office or light industrial uses.

Planning Compatibility

As noted above, the City Council has approved a comp plan amendment to remove the Site from the SEMI Industrial Employment District and to re-guide the Site to Transitional Industrial. (This comp plan amendment is pending review at the Met Council.) The redevelopment project will require rezoning to a zoning classification that allows mixed use with housing, most likely to the C3A zoning district. Rezoning from Industrial to C3A will be consistent with the Transitional Industrial guidance and with the association of the Site with the TSA and Growth Center; both those land use features support transit-oriented, mixed use redevelopment with high- to very-high density housing, employment-generating uses, and supporting services. The proposed redevelopment of vacant industrial land will support the housing, economic development, and urban design policies of the Comp Plan by transforming vacant industrial land. The project will promote expansion of district stormwater management systems in furtherance of the City's goals for sustainable design and will provide new park and green space amenities for area residents.

With the amendment of the SEMI Industrial Employment District boundary, the proposed project is also consistent with the other applicable City land use plans. The proposed project is generally consistent with the 2001 SEMI Master Plan that anticipated that the character of the South SEMI area, which includes the Site, will change from one dominated by industrial use to a mixed-use area that includes residential. The project is highly consistent with the goals for high residential density and transit-oriented development described in the Stadium Village University Avenue Station Plan for the land around the 29th Avenue Station.

Zoning Compatibility

The Site is currently zoned Industrial. The redevelopment project will require rezoning to a zoning classification that allows mixed use with housing, most likely to the C3A zoning district.

The Site area is 10.1 acres, where approximately 0.75 acres of the Site will be new roadway and 2.05 acres will be new a new greenway, park, and open space. The

metrics for the proposed redevelopment under consideration for the remaining 7.3 acres of the Site is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Proposed Redevelopment Metrics

	Lot Area	Proposed Gross Floor Area	Proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Proposed Number of Dwelling Units	Residential Density	Proposed Height
Phase 1	136,000 ft^2 3.12 acres	408,050 ft^2	3.00	380 units	122 du/acre	6 – 12 Stories
Phase 2	183,000 ft^2 4.20 acres	457,000 ft^2	2.50	420 units	100 du/acre	6 Stories
Total	319,000 ft^2 7.32 acres	865050 ft^2	2.71	800 units	128 du/acre	6 – 12 Stories

Compliance of the proposed redevelopment project with the C3A District regulations has been evaluated.

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
The maximum FAR before density bonuses in the C3A District is 2.7. Density bonuses of 20% may be achieved for qualifying affordable housing, mixed-use and enclosed parking features. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is also eligible for a 20% density bonus. A 20% FAR density bonus increases the maximum FAR by 0.54 to 3.24. With two bonuses, the maximum FAR for a development in the C3A District is 3.78. A third 20% density bonus increases the maximum FAR to 4.32.

The maximum proposed FAR for Phase 1 exceeds the maximum allowable FAR for the C3A District of 2.7 without bonuses by approximately 12%. Assuming Phase 1 is proposed as a PUD and receives a 20% PUD density bonus, the allowed FAR would be 3.24. If Phase 1 is not proposed as a PUD and did not qualify for additional bonuses, a 12% variance would be required to attain the proposed 3.0 FAR.

The maximum proposed FAR of 2.50 for Phase 2 is below the maximum allowable FAR in the C3A District of 2.7. The combined proposed maximum FAR for Phases 1 and 2 slightly exceeds the maximum allowable FAR in the C3A District without bonuses of 2.7 but is below the maximum allowable FAR with one bonus in the C3A District of 3.24.

Height
The height limit in the C3A District is 4 stories/56 feet. A conditional use permit (CUP) for increased height, or approval of a PUD height alternative, would be required for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 as proposed.

Parking
The parking requirement for each phase will depend upon the actual number of dwelling units and bedrooms, and the specific type and size of commercial uses in the redevelopment project (e.g. retail, restaurant, office). It is anticipated that the total parking requirement for each phase can be met through on-site parking, primarily structured below grade, or above grade with a building wrapping it. If

needed, some amount of parking variance could be considered reasonable in light of the proximity to transit services. Additional parking solutions will also be evaluated as development progresses. This could include above grade or district parking

Other
The proposed residential, office, and restaurant uses in Phases 1 and 2 are all permitted uses in the proposed C3A District. Maker space type uses such as art studios and limited production and processing uses are also permitted. There is no minimum lot area or minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirement in the C3A District. In general, there is no yard requirement for uses in the commercial districts such as C3A.

c. Identify measures incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate any potential incompatibility as discussed in Item 9b above.

As part of the review and approval process for a PUD, the project will be required to incorporate amenities and conditions that mitigate the alternatives granted and potentially adverse impacts associated with requested variances.

10. GEOLOGY, SOILS AND TOPOGRAPHY/LAND FORMS

a. Geology - Describe the geology underlying the project area and identify and map any susceptible geologic features such as sinkholes, shallow limestone formations, unconfined/shallow aquifers, or karst conditions. Discuss any limitations of these features for the project and any effects the project could have on these features. Identify any project designs or mitigation measures to address effects to geologic features.

Bedrock geology in the project area, based on review of the Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County (1989), consists of the Platteville and Glenwood Formations (Plate 2). The Platteville formation consists of fine-grained limestone with thin shale partings on the top and base and is typically approximately 30 feet thick. It is underlain by the Glenwood formation, which consists of a green, sandy shale which is typically 5-7 feet thick. The Glenwood formation is not always reported on drilling records. Surficial geology (Plate 3) consists of sand, gravelly sand, and loamy sand overlain with thin deposits of silt, loam, or organic sediment. Depth to bedrock (Plate 4) is approximately 51-100 feet.

No sinkholes, unconfined/shallow aquifers, or karst conditions have been identified in the project area. Excavation during the construction of the various components of the redevelopment project are anticipated to be limited to the upper 25 feet and are not anticipated to encounter or impact bedrock or other geological features.

b. Soils and topography - Describe the soils on the site, giving NRCS (SCS) classifications and descriptions, including limitations of soils. Describe topography, any special site conditions relating to erosion potential, soil stability or other soils limitations, such as steep slopes, highly permeable soils. Provide estimated volume and acreage of soil excavation and/or grading. Discuss impacts from project activities (distinguish between

construction and operational activities) related to soils and topography. Identify measures during and after project construction to address soil limitations including stabilization, soil corrections or other measures. Erosion/sedimentation control related to stormwater runoff should be addressed in response to Item 11.b.ii.

NOTE: For silica sand projects, the EAW must include a hydrogeologic investigation assessing the potential groundwater and surface water effects and geologic conditions that could create an increased risk of potentially significant effects on groundwater and surface water. Descriptions of water resources and potential effects from the project in EAW Item 11 must be consistent with the geology, soils and topography/land forms and potential effects described in EAW Item 10.

Existing surfaces in the project area include buildings, remnant foundations and other impervious surfaces and vacant areas. The existing surface will be excavated and graded during development activities. Soil units from the Soil Survey of Hennepin County, MN are shown on Figure 8. Soil units within the study area, described by USDA soil taxonomy, include Urban land-Udipsamments (dominantly sandy cut and fill material) with 0 to 2 percent slopes. Most areas in urban land units, such as the on-site Urban land-Udipsamments, have been disturbed by construction with variable soil components. Due to this variability, the soil survey indicates that onsite investigation is required in these areas to fully interpret conditions for specific uses. Site specific subsurface investigations have previously been completed on several parcels within and around the Site as part of environmental investigation work. The results of these investigations confirm the presence of variable fill material within the project area to depths up to approximately 10 feet below grade. Fill is underlain with fine to coarse grained sand and silty sand. Some borings also indicate the presence of organic/peat material or clay beneath the sand.

Grading and excavation activities during re-development would generally disturb the entire Site, but would be phased according to the development plan. Excavation depth will vary dependent on the building structure design. The planned multi-story buildings will require deeper excavations for construction of footings; underground parking is also planned for the mixed-use developments. It is anticipated that redevelopment of the Site would result in an excess of soil materials to be exported from the site. Encountered contaminated soils would require off-site disposal as well; it is anticipated that approximately 4-feet of the surficial soils over the majority of the site area are likely impacted and require excavation (see Question 12 for additional detail). Excavation during construction activities would also include trenching for extension of existing utilities or installation of new utilities (i.e. storm sewer, sanitary sewer, and related infrastructure) to serve the development. Contaminated soil encountered during development of the Site would be excavated and removed from the Site per individual response action plans, dependent on the contaminants and the applicable standard for the type of development (i.e. industrial versus residential).

The existing grade at the Site and the surrounding area is relatively flat with no significant areas of steep slopes. Steep slopes are not anticipated to be constructed as part of redevelopment activities, minimizing the potential for erosion from

stormwater runoff in the proposed condition. However, exposed soils during construction would be susceptible to erosion and sediment transport if not properly managed. Sediment tracking outside the construction area onto adjacent roadways would also be a concern during construction, due to the urban environment and traffic flows in the area. Construction vehicles will be required to use temporary construction entrances equipped with vehicle tracking BMPs to minimize the track out of sediment (i.e. rock pads, mud mats, slash mulch, or equivalent systems).

Some or all buildings may require installation of a sub-slab depressurization (SSD) system due to potential existing contamination. See Question 12 for additional information.

11. WATER RESOURCES:

a. Describe surface water and groundwater features on or near the site in a.i. and a.ii. below.

i. Surface water - lakes, streams, wetlands, intermittent channels, and county/judicial ditches. Include any special designations such as public waters, trout stream/lake, wildlife lakes, migratory waterfowl feeding/resting lake, and outstanding resource value water. Include water quality impairments or special designations listed on the current MPCA 303d Impaired Waters List that are within 1 mile of the project. Include DNR Public Waters Inventory number(s), if any.

There are no water resources within the Site. The Mississippi River is located approximately 0.7 miles to the southeast. This reach of the river (AUID 07010206-503; Lower St. Anthony Falls to L&D #1) is impaired for mercury in fish tissue and fecal coliform. The proposed redevelopment project will not impact surface waters.

ii. Groundwater – aquifers, springs, seeps. Include: 1) depth to groundwater; 2) if project is within a MDH wellhead protection area; 3) identification of any onsite and/or nearby wells, including unique numbers and well logs if available. If there are no wells known on site or nearby, explain the methodology used to determine this.

Groundwater hazards are shown on Figure 9. No vulnerable groundwater areas are located on the Site; the nearest groundwater hazard areas are south of University Avenue. Based on the map, depth to groundwater ranges from 10-30 feet. However, review of subsurface investigation information for the Site and adjacent parcels indicates that groundwater is not present at depths above approximately 35 feet below ground surface. As a result, it is unlikely that groundwater will be encountered during construction.

Field verified wells from the County Well Index (CWI) are shown on Figure 10 and tabulated in Table 5 below. Based on the CWI, there are two active field verified wells in the project area. There also may be wells on the Site that have not been field verified. Non-field verified wells from the CWI database are also shown on Figure 10; however, the locations are approximate and are based on information provided by the driller. Based on site reconnaissance by the project

proposer, there is likely a second well located near well 256731 that is not represented on the well figure. This well is believed to be obstructed with debris. There are no other known non-field verified wells located on the Site.

Table 5. Field Verified Wells

Unique Well No.	Use
256731	Commercial
256787	Unknown

b. Describe effects from project activities on water resources and measures to minimize or mitigate the effects in Item b.i. through Item b.iv. below.

i. Wastewater - For each of the following, describe the sources, quantities and composition of all sanitary, municipal/domestic and industrial wastewater produced or treated at the site.

1) If the wastewater discharge is to a publicly owned treatment facility, identify any pretreatment measures and the ability of the facility to handle the added water and waste loadings, including any effects on, or required expansion of, municipal wastewater infrastructure.

Redevelopment would result in increased wastewater production. Existing sanitary sewer infrastructure within the Site is limited and includes remnant lines from prior uses. There is City of Minneapolis sanitary sewer in Malcolm Avenue that currently serves existing developed areas to the east. This same sewer main extends south across the Transitway where it then runs parallel to the Transitway and routes wastewater south along 30th Avenue. A smaller sanitary sewer main is also located along 29th Avenue, south of the Transitway. Wastewater is conveyed through this existing infrastructure system to Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) interceptor(s) and ultimately to the MCES Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The Metropolitan WWTP, located in St. Paul, is the largest wastewater treatment plant in Minnesota. According to a Metropolitan Council fact sheet for the Metropolitan WWTP, the plant capacity is 250 million gallons per day (GPD). The WWTP discharges to the Mississippi River.

Wastewater generation rates have been estimated by development type for each phase of development based on the 2017 Metropolitan Council Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) Manual (see Table 6 below). Wastewater produced would be typical for residential and commercial development. The estimated peak domestic wastewater generation rate for the full project buildout is 886,800 GPD; average flow is estimated to be approximately 255,700 GPD.

Table 6. Estimated Wastewater Production

Phase	Size (sq ft)	Description	SAC		SAC Equivalency	Flow (gpd)
			Parameter	Units		
Phase 1	16,000	Food/ Restaurant	150	sf	107	29,227
	22,000	Retail	2400	sf	9	2,512
	380	Residential	1	Unit	380	104,120
					Phase 1 Subtotal	135,858
Phase 2	42,000	Office	2400	sf	18	4,795
	420	Residential	1	Unit	420	115,080
					Phase 2 Subtotal	119,875
					Phase 1 and 2 Total	**255,733**

Based on the estimated flows, with confirmation from the City of Minneapolis Department of Public Works, the existing City sewer infrastructure has capacity to collect the additional wastewater from the project.

On-site sanitary sewer infrastructure to accommodate generated flows will be constructed during each phase of development. No on-site domestic wastewater treatment is proposed. On-site sewer infrastructure will be installed as part of private road development (or the potential 30th Avenue extension). The sanitary sewer is anticipated to be routed through a central collection lateral running north/south along the private road/proposed 30th Avenue extension. The wastewater would then be routed either east to the existing sewer main within Malcolm Avenue or south across the Transitway to the sewer main within 30th Avenue. Exact sewer line sizing and location will be determined during final site engineering and design. Sanitary sewer extension permits will be required and will include detailed wastewater flow calculations. Permit applications are subject to review and approval by MCES and MPCA. A Utility Connection Permit will also be required from the City of Minneapolis and coordination with the University for potential Transitway crossings by new sewer lines.

No impacts have been identified from the increase in wastewater production. There is sufficient capacity within the existing systems including the City's sewer main and the MCES Metropolitan WWTP to convey and treat the wastewater flows from the redevelopment project. The permitting process that will be followed during final design/construction of the Site allows for review of the utility plans for the redevelopment to ensure all conditions are in compliance with applicable local and state regulations.

2) **If the wastewater discharge is to a subsurface sewage treatment systems (SSTS), describe the system used, the design flow, and suitability of site conditions for such a system.**

No discharge to SSTS is anticipated.

3) **If the wastewater discharge is to surface water, identify the wastewater treatment methods and identify discharge points and proposed effluent limitations to mitigate impacts. Discuss any effects to surface or groundwater from wastewater discharges.**

No wastewater discharge to surface waters is anticipated.

ii. **Stormwater - Describe the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff at the site prior to and post construction. Include the routes and receiving water bodies for runoff from the site (major downstream water bodies as well as the immediate receiving waters). Discuss any environmental effects from stormwater discharges. Describe stormwater pollution prevention plans including temporary and permanent runoff controls and potential BMP site locations to manage or treat stormwater runoff. Identify specific erosion control, sedimentation control or stabilization measures to address soil limitations during and after project construction.**

Based on existing topography, the Site generally drains from the south and east to the north and west. The majority of the Site drains to the northwest to an onsite detention pond on an adjacent parcel north of the Delmar #4 grain elevator. The pond does not have a defined outlet structure and overflow from the pond, if it occurs, continues to drain to the northwest and likely enters existing storm sewer infrastructure located off-site. A portion of the site drains to the east into the City storm sewer located in Malcolm Avenue and a small portion drains south into the University of Minnesota storm sewer located within the Transitway.

All runoff from the Site and adjacent area that does not infiltrate during overland flow and reaches the storm sewer system ultimately discharges to the Mississippi River. The reach of the Mississippi River receiving runoff has EPA-identified impairments for mercury in fish tissue and fecal coliform. These impairments are not influenced by construction-related activities and the proposed project will not require implementation of additional stormwater management BMPs because of the impairments.

Existing storm sewer infrastructure within the Site and adjacent area is limited. Remnant lines from prior uses likely exist, but historical mapping is limited. Some storm sewer lines are known to be located on property east of Malcolm Avenue that travel north into the rail yard. The existing storm sewer infrastructure in Malcolm Avenue was constructed in 2009 as part of the City's extension of the road to the north. Potential locations for connection to City storm sewer infrastructure are within Malcolm Avenue, the Transitway, or to existing structures at the intersection of 29th Avenue SE and the Transitway.

Connection to existing City storm sewer for discharge from the proposed project is anticipated to be at one or more of these connection points, pending University coordination (regarding utility crossings under the Transitway) and final site design (see below discussion regarding potential district treatment). Since the Transitway and its utilities are privately owned by the University, while it does take some overland runoff from the Site, it cannot be presumed to be available for future physical connections without coordination and approval from the University. Based on discussions with City staff and the requirement to limit post-development runoff rates to existing conditions, the proposed project will not increase stormwater flows at potential connection points or in downstream pipelines.

Per Minneapolis ordinance Chapter 52 (Erosion and Sediment Control and Drainage), erosion and sediment control plan approval is required from the City of Minneapolis for any land disturbing activities in excess of five thousand square feet or five hundred cubic yards. A NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit, administered by the MPCA, would also be required for land disturbing activities greater than one acre, or less than one acre but part of a common plan of development greater than one acre. Separate NDPES Permits would be required for each phase of development. Erosion and sediment control measures to be implemented during and after construction for each development phase would at minimum meet the requirements of the City of Minneapolis ordinance and the NPDES permit.

In addition to temporary measures for construction and redevelopment would require conformance with City of Minneapolis and NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit requirements for permanent stormwater management. Stormwater management is required for all land-disturbing activities greater than one acre or less than one acre but part of a common plan of development (NPDES requirement) or phased/connected actions (City requirement). Discharge rates will be controlled so that there is no increase above existing conditions (demonstrated for the 2-yr, 10-yr, and 100-yr storm events). Water quality treatment will also be provided through retention per the NPDES permit requirements and per the City requirement that 70% total suspended solids (TSS) be removed from a 1.25-inch storm event. The stormwater management plan developed for the project will be subject to City review and approval.

The project proposer is currently working with the Mississippi Watershed Management Organization (MWMO) and their consultant (Barr Engineering) to potentially provide water rate and quality treatment on a district-wide level through implementation of a stormwater treatment system. This district system is proposed to be located in the future park on the western portion of the Site and within the proposed greenway that transects the Site from east to west. The district treatment system is likely to consist of a combination of BMPs to meet or exceed requirements. The current conceptual plan includes a primary infiltration basin (pond), underground storage, and additional infiltration in green spaces that also serve to convey stormwater. Recirculation of stored runoff through infiltration areas for additional treatment is also anticipated. The district treatment system will be sized to be

the primary source for providing the required rate control and water quality treatment to meet City and NPDES permit requirements for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the redevelopment project. The goals of the district treatment system will be to provide capacity to retain and treat a 100-year storm event.

New storm sewer infrastructure will be installed in the project area to divert runoff to the district treatment system. Assuming an agreement can be reached that is similar to one that was completed for a project to the south of the Transitway as part of the Green 4th Street redevelopment, the system will include a discharge connection to the existing storm sewer located within the Transitway and ultimately flow to the Mississippi River. Utility connection permits will be required from the University of Minnesota and/or the City of Minneapolis for new storm sewer connection points for the project. Storm sewer infrastructure will comply with University of Minnesota and/or City of Minneapolis construction standards and specifications.

Impacts to water quality of downstream receiving waters are not anticipated due to required conformance to City of Minneapolis ordinance and the construction stormwater NPDES permit. Although the volume of stormwater generated onsite would increase due to creation of new impervious surfaces, water quality of runoff would likely improve post-development due to the lack of existing stormwater management features and BMPs currently implemented onsite and the addition of new BMPs to meet regulatory requirements. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for the redevelopment project and will address temporary erosion and sediment control BMPs as well as permanent stormwater management features. Since post-development runoff will be limited to existing conditions, storm sewer capacity will not be affected by the proposed project.

iii. Water appropriation - Describe if the project proposes to appropriate surface or groundwater (including dewatering). Describe the source, quantity, duration, use and purpose of the water use and if a DNR water appropriation permit is required. Describe any well abandonment. If connecting to an existing municipal water supply, identify the wells to be used as a water source and any effects on, or required expansion of, municipal water infrastructure. Discuss environmental effects from water appropriation, including an assessment of the water resources available for appropriation. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects from the water appropriation.

Redevelopment will result in increased water demand. Existing water supply infrastructure within the project area is limited. Remnant lines from prior uses likely exist. There is a City of Minneapolis watermain in Malcolm Avenue that currently serves existing developed areas to the east of the project. This watermain is 16-inches in diameter and the City of Minneapolis has indicated that the public water system has capacity to provide water supply/fire suppression services for the proposed project.

It is anticipated that the general layout of the infrastructure within the Site for Phase 1 and 2 would be similar to the sanitary sewer system layout. The exact size and location of infrastructure will be determined during final site design. Final design flows, including fire flows, would also be calculated at that time. Although the watermain in Malcolm Avenue is anticipated to be the main connection point, there may also be connections to the City system at 29th Avenue and/or 30th Avenue, dependent on the potential 30th Avenue extension and private/public road status. A Utility Connection Permit would be obtained from the City of Minneapolis along with any other required permits for construction. No impacts have been identified from the increase in water demand in the area due to the capacity of the existing system and the permitting process that would be followed during final design/construction.

Groundwater levels are not anticipated to be permanently impacted by the proposed project as no new water appropriation wells are proposed, and no permanent dewatering will be required. Temporary construction dewatering is not anticipated, but may be required during site excavations. If required, appropriate permits from the MNDNR and the City of Minneapolis would be obtained for construction and discharge would comply with NPDES permit requirements. Existing on-site wells were previously identified and discussed in Section 11.a.ii above. An evaluation of potential uses for the known on-site wells will be completed during planning. If these wells can practically be used for either irrigation, potable or fire suppression water supply, and/or geothermal uses in an environmentally sustainable way, those options will be reviewed as part of redevelopment of the Site. Any well, either field or non-field verified, known or encountered during construction, will either be re-appropriated for use or will be sealed per MDH requirements. Any other encountered non-field verified wells will also be sealed. Impacts to groundwater or public water supply is not anticipated for the proposed project. Mitigation would be regulated through the development review process, application for required permits and approvals, and well abandonment per MDH requirements.

iv. Surface Waters

a) Wetlands - Describe any anticipated physical effects or alterations to wetland features such as draining, filling, permanent inundation, dredging and vegetative removal. Discuss direct and indirect environmental effects from physical modification of wetlands, including the anticipated effects that any proposed wetland alterations may have to the host watershed. Identify measures to avoid (e.g., available alternatives that were considered), minimize, or mitigate environmental effects to wetlands. Discuss whether any required compensatory wetland mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts will occur in the same minor or major watershed, and identify those probable locations.

There are no wetlands within the project area.

b) Other surface waters- Describe any anticipated physical effects or alterations to surface water features (lakes, streams, ponds, intermittent channels, county/judicial ditches) such as draining, filling, permanent inundation, dredging, diking, stream diversion, impoundment, aquatic plant removal and riparian alteration. Discuss direct and indirect environmental effects from physical modification of water features. Identify measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects to surface water features, including in-water Best Management Practices that are proposed to avoid or minimize turbidity/sedimentation while physically altering the water features. Discuss how the project will change the number or type of watercraft on any water body, including current and projected watercraft usage.

There are no surface waters within the project area.

12. CONTAMINATION/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTES

a. Pre-project site conditions - Describe existing contamination or potential environmental hazards on or in close proximity to the project site such as soil or ground water contamination, abandoned dumps, closed landfills, existing or abandoned storage tanks, and hazardous liquid or gas pipelines. Discuss any potential environmental effects from pre-project site conditions that would be caused or exacerbated by project construction and operation. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from existing contamination or potential environmental hazards. Include development of a Contingency Plan or Response Action Plan.

Environmental assessments have been completed on each of the parcels that together represent the total Site area. Environmental assessments and cleanup activities have also been completed on surrounding parcels. Impacts identified are consistent with historical uses and are not unexpected for industrial property with a history of prior industrial uses. Some of the shallow soil at the Site will require special handling as regulated fill. Additionally, localized areas of more significant impacts have either been identified during previous investigation activities or are expected to be encountered during further characterization of the Site. It is also possible that one or more underground storage tanks may be present on the Site. If encountered, they will be removed and addressed in accordance with applicable state and local regulations.

Near the Site, soil and groundwater impacts have been identified on the property to the northeast across Malcolm Avenue (the Surly Brewery site). The Surly Brewery site has been identified as part of a Superfund site (ADM/Highway 280 site) and classified by the MPCA as a “dump site.” It has been investigated and remediated; however, some impacts remain that are subject to continuing obligations. A solid waste transfer station is located north of the Site. It is permitted by the MPCA and subject to their regulatory requirements.

A Conceptual Response Action Plan was prepared for a larger project area that included the Site in the early 2000s. The plan outlined the methods and procedures to address known impacts and recommended a protocol (i.e., a Construction Contingency Plan) to deal with potential impacts that could be encountered during redevelopment. The redevelopment anticipated at that time did not move forward, and the Conceptual Response Action Plan was not submitted for approval. As part of the new project, similar response planning and additional soil, soil gas and groundwater investigation activities will be completed prior to the start of redevelopment.

Consistent with the need for additional site characterization, the project Site was awarded a Contamination Investigation Grant from the Metropolitan Council in the fall grant round of 2017. Additional investigation will be completed in the coming months. This information will be used to develop site specific Response Action Plans (RAPs) for each specific phase of the project.

To appropriately manage impacted soil that will be encountered during redevelopment, a MPCA-approved RAP will be implemented for each of the new buildings proposed for the Site. The RAP will identify the specific procedures to address impacts. In addition to addressing impacted soil, it is possible that vapor mitigation may also be required and incorporated into the final project design to ensure the buildings are not affected by vapor intrusion. Local permits needed for the RAP would be obtained as part of the process of RAP implementation.

A summary of site specific environmental investigation data for properties on the Site are provided below. Individual reports are available on the City of Minneapolis website.

<u>Factory or Ottertail Lumber Site (445 Malcolm Avenue SE)</u>

The parcel located on the SE corner of the Site was formerly known as the Factory Lumber or Ottertail Lumber site. Several environmental investigations have been completed for this site, including:

- Environmental Profile Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (EnPro Assessment Corp, March 2004)
- Environmental Profile Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (EnPro, April 2004)
- Limited Site Investigation Report Leak 15691 – Factory Lumber Supply (AECOM, June 2012)
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Wenck Associates, Inc., October 2013)
- Phase II Subsurface Investigation (Wenck Associates, Inc., January 2015)

Impacts related to a former aboveground storage tank were identified in the central portion of the parcel; a petroleum release from the tank was reported to the MPCA on April 26, 2004. Past communication between prior property owner(s) and the MPCA regarding the site included a letter issued by the MPCA to TTOTT Properties, LLC on June 28, 2012 for Petroleum Tank Release Site File Closure. The closure letter does not eliminate the possibility of residual contamination, although soil

investigation activities most recently completed during the 2015 Phase II investigation found that remnant petroleum concentrations were generally very low. Some low concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and metals are present in shallow soils, but concentrations did not exceed regulatory screening criteria. Tetrachloroethene (PCE) was detected in excess of the MPCA's Intrusion Screening Values (ISV) for Vapor Intrusion Risk. Additional investigation and potential response actions will be necessary for development and a vapor mitigation system may be required.

Harris Machinery and Canvas Company (501 30th Avenue SE)

The parcel located in the south-central portion of the Site was formerly known as the Harris Machinery and Canvas Company site. Environmental investigations completed for this site include:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Peer Engineering, July 2005)
- Phase I and Hazardous Materials Assessment (Peer Engineering, May 2013)
- Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (Peer Engineering, May 2013)

Subsurface investigation identified limited impacts. Generally, the impacts are from PAHs and metals, and are confined to shallow soils in localized areas. Diesel range organic (DRO) contamination is also present at the site. Evidence of slag, ash or debris was identified in boring samples as well. The Phase II Assessment also recommended additional soil gas testing within proposed building footprints.

Stone Labs or Minnesota Medical Foundation (419 29th Avenue SE)

The parcel located on the SW corner of the Site was formerly known as the Stone Labs or Minnesota Medical Foundation building site. Two buildings on the parcel remain and will be demolished and removed as part of the proposed project redevelopment.

Environmental investigations completed for this site include:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 419-421 29th Avenue SE (STS Consultants, October 2003)
- Phase II Environmental Investigation Results 419 & 421 29th Avenue SE (Peer Engineering, February 2004)
- Hazardous Materials Inventory – 419 29th Avenue SE (Peer Engineering, November 2004)
- Hazardous Materials Inventory – 419 and 421 29th Avenue SE (Peer Engineering, February 2005)

Soil investigation completed on the parcel found low concentrations of barium, chromium, lead, mercury, PAHs and DRO; however, no impacts were identified above regulatory screening criteria. The hazardous material inventory identified asbestos-containing materials (ACM) and recommended careful examination of valves, switches and other mechanical components for hazardous substances and petroleum products. Two water supply wells are also located on this parcel that will need to be abandoned or repurposed as part of this project.

A No Association Determination letter was issued by MPCA on February 26, 2004 for the identified release for this portion of the project site.

Commercial Property (501 Malcolm Avenue)

The parcel north of the Factory or Ottertail lumber site previously was part of the R. R. Howell and Company facility, and housed several commercial buildings. Subsequent uses were related to truck and trailer parts and machining. There are no buildings remaining on the parcel. Environmental investigation data for this site includes:

- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (RESPEC, January 1999)
- Limited Phase II Environmental Assessment (RESPEC, April 1999)

The Phase I assessment identified several recognized environmental conditions connected to the property and the limited Phase II recommended additional assessment primarily based on detected DRO and metals.

Archer-Daniels-Midland Complex/Delmar Elevators (504 29th Avenue SE)

A number of soil and groundwater investigations have also been completed on different portions of the Delmar Elevators site to the north. The Delmar Elevators site has been primarily used as a large-capacity grain storage facility since the early 1900s. A portion of the proposed project Site footprint (Phase 2) overlaps the Delmar Elevators parcel. Environmental investigation data for the Delmar Elevators site includes:

- Summary of Environmental Surface and Subsurface Investigation Activities (Peer Engineering, October 2001)
- Summary of Additional Analytical Testing (Peer Engineering, March 2002)
- Additional Phase II Environmental Investigation (Peer Engineering, April 2004)

Soil impacts have been encountered on several portions of the Delmar site, including near the proposed project location. Generally, impacts are confined to the shallow soils and detected contaminants include metals, PAHs, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and DRO.

Redevelopment of a portion of the Site that includes the Delmar Elevators property would take place as part of Phase 2 of the proposed project. Additional investigation, RAP plan development and implementation, and appropriate mitigation would be completed at a later date, as previously discussed in this section.

b. Project related generation / storage of solid wastes - Describe solid wastes generated / stored during construction and / or operation of the project. Indicate method of disposal. Discuss potential environmental effects from solid waste handling, storage and disposal. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the

generation/storage of solid waste including source reduction and recycling.

Construction activities will result in construction-related waste materials (i.e., wood, packaging, excess materials, etc.) that will be managed appropriately. This will include recycling to the degree possible and offsite disposal as necessary. Demolition activities will result in debris that may be recycled, if possible, or will otherwise be disposed of at a permitted landfill facility under a Special Waste Profile. Solid waste generated from the project following construction will consist of typical mixed municipal waste (MSW). Permanent refuse and recycling collection areas to serve the residential and commercial spaces have not been determined, but locations/design will be compliant with City regulations.

It is anticipated that construction of the underground parking and associated structures will result in excess soil that will require appropriate handling. Based on existing and new environmental investigation results, plans will be prepared to properly segregate, handle and manage any materials either on or off site under the regulatory purview of the MPCA (as discussed in part 12.a above). Each construction project for each Phase of development will have its own plan and approvals to ensure that materials are managed appropriately. It is presumed that some of the soils will require offsite disposition as either an industrial waste or alternative daily cover at a facility licensed to accept such waste.

c. Project related use/storage of hazardous materials - Describe chemicals/hazardous materials used/stored during construction and/or operation of the project including method of storage. Indicate the number, location and size of any above or below ground tanks to store petroleum or other materials. Discuss potential environmental effects from accidental spill or release of hazardous materials. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the use/storage of chemicals/hazardous materials including source reduction and recycling. Include development of a spill prevention plan.

Other than small quantities of fuel and chemicals for heavy equipment for construction, it is unlikely that any significant quantities of hazardous materials will be used or stored on the Site either during construction or operation. Temporary use/storage for construction will comply with local or state regulations, including incorporation of spill containment/prevention measures as applicable.

d. Project related generation/storage of hazardous wastes - Describe hazardous wastes generated/stored during construction and/or operation of the project. Indicate method of disposal. Discuss potential environmental effects from hazardous waste handling, storage, and disposal. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the generation/storage of hazardous waste including source reduction and recycling.

Other than small quantities of fuel and chemicals for heavy equipment for construction, it is unlikely that any significant quantities of hazardous materials will be stored on the Site either during construction or operation. Temporary storage of

materials for construction will comply with local or state regulations, including incorporation of spill containment/prevention measures as applicable. Hazardous waste generation is not anticipated; however, future commercial uses have not been identified for Phase 2. Future tenants would be held to MPCA requirements for hazardous waste.

13. FISH, WILDLIFE, PLANT COMMUNITIES, AND SENSITIVE ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES (RARE FEATURES)

a. Describe fish and wildlife resources as well as habitats and vegetation on or in near the site.

The area consists of primarily vacant barren (sparse vegetation) and previously developed industrial land cover with vacant buildings. There are no wetlands, watercourses, lakes, woodlands, grassland, or other areas on the Site that provide fish and/or wildlife habitat.

b. Describe rare features such as state-listed (endangered, threatened or special concern) species, native plant communities, Minnesota County Biological Survey Sites of Biodiversity Significance, and other sensitive ecological resources on or within close proximity to the site. Provide the license agreement number (LA-____) and/or correspondence number (ERDB 20180130) from which the data were obtained and attach the Natural Heritage letter from the DNR. Indicate if any additional habitat or species survey work has been conducted within the site and describe the results.

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) was contacted to determine if rare plant or animal species or sensitive resources or habitats are present within an approximately one-mile radius of the Site. A query of the National Heritage Information System (NHIS) was completed in August 2017; the query and MNDNR response (received in October 2017) is included in Appendix 1. The results of the NHIS query indicated that two rare features have been documented in the search area. Several state-listed mussels have been documented in the Mississippi River near the proposed project. Also, the rusty patched bumble bee (*Bonbus affinis),* a federally listed endangered species, was documented within 1.5 miles of the Site.

c. Discuss how the identified fish, wildlife, plant communities, rare features and ecosystems may be affected by the project. Include a discussion on introduction and spread of invasive species from the project construction and operation. Separately discuss effects to known threatened and endangered species.

The Mississippi River is located approximately 0.7 miles to the southeast of the Site. Redevelopment at the Site will not directly impact the Mississippi River and stormwater management and protection measures will be implemented as required by applicable permits to ensure the proposed project does not result in water quality impacts to the river. The proposed redevelopment project at the Site will not impact the habitat of the mussel species in the Mississippi River.

The rusty patched bumble bee was recently added to the federal endangered species list on January 10, 2017. The bumble bee has been found in a variety of habitats but prefers areas with wildflowers and native prairie for foraging, nectar, and nesting. Hennepin County contains zones identified as both low-potential and high-potential areas for the bumble bee. The Site is located near a high-potential zone. The Site contains mostly vacant industrial/commercial buildings and vacant lots; the land cover is primarily barren with sparse vegetation. This area on and around the Site has been predominately industrial for more than 90 years. There are no native grasslands present on the site. The vacant lots and barren ground consist of weedy, disturbed areas and are unlikely to support rusty patched bumble bee foraging or nesting habitat.

A US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) IPaC Report (Information for Planning and Consultation) was generated for the immediate project area. Based on USFWS Section 10(a)(1)(B) Voluntary Guidance for Project Proponents dated March 21, 2017, screening precisely defined project areas using the IPaC system may determine whether a project may affect an area where the rusty patched bumble bee is present. An IPaC report was generated using the specific project boundaries for the Site (Appendix 2). The search area for the Site within the report did not include the documented areas as high or low potential for the rusty patched bumble bee. The result of the IPaC report, in conjunction with the lack of suitable habitat on the Site, serve as documentation that the redevelopment project is not likely to incidentally take the species (Incidental take is defined by the USFWS as harm, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collection of a species that results from but is not the intent an otherwise lawful and legal action). This assessment was performed according to the Section 10 (a)(1)(B) described above.

The redevelopment of the Site would include approximately 1.9 acres of park and green space to serve the area. The park and green space would result in an improvement to vegetative cover over the existing conditions. The vegetation/landscaping would be finalized during final site design; the improved vegetative cover may provide foraging resources to pollinators (like the rusty patched bumble bee).

d. Identify measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to fish, wildlife, plant communities, and sensitive ecological resources.

It is anticipated that conformance to regulatory requirements will be protective of water quality for discharge to the Mississippi River and additional mitigation for state-listed mussels will not be required. Construction BMPs, such as storm sewer inlet protection, will be implemented on site for erosion and sediment control during site development as required per City ordinance and the NPDES construction stormwater permit. The permanent stormwater management system will be also be designed to meet City and NDPES requirements.

Based on the IPaC assessment discussed in part c. above, mitigation for the rusty patched bumble bee is not required for the project.

14. HISTORIC PROPERTIES

Describe any historic structures, archeological sites, and/or traditional cultural properties on or in close proximity to the site. Include: 1) historic designations, 2) known artifact areas, and 3) architectural features. Attach letter received from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Discuss any anticipated effects to historic properties during project construction and operation. Identify measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties.

There are no historic designations or known artifact areas/archeological sites on the Site. There are designated historic districts and landmarks near the Site; however, the redevelopment project will not impact those areas. Two potentially historic properties within the Site have been identified by previous studies: the Peterler Car Company (now Harris Machinery and Canvas Company) property and the R.R. Howell Company property. Both properties have experienced a significant loss of integrity and are not eligible for historic designation, although Wall Development Company plans to refurbish and reuse the Harris Machinery Building to the extent practical as part of the redevelopment project. No measures have been identified that need to be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties.

A summary of the data set reviews, regional historic studies, and specific historical evaluations of properties on the Site is provided below.

Data Set Reviews

A query of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) database was completed in November 2017 as part of the evaluation for the redevelopment of the Site. The SHPO database includes records of known archeological sites, historical properties, and architectural properties. Records of properties or sites within the SHPO database include:

- Properties with historic designations or that are listed on the National Register;
- Properties that have had preliminary evaluations and are considered potentially eligible for a historic designation or listing on the National Register. These properties require additional evaluation before they can be listed; and
- Properties that have not been evaluated but may be considered potentially eligible for a historic designation based on their time period. These properties have not yet had preliminary evaluations to determine their current status or potential for official listing or designation.

Correspondence from the SHPO office provided as part of the database review is attached as Appendix 3. The results of the SHPO query indicate that there are no known archaeological sites within or adjacent to the Site. The SHPO query did include records of historical or architectural properties in the vicinity of the Site, as well as records of two potentially eligible properties on the Site; the full list is included as Appendix 4. The two potentially eligible properties that are within the Site are the Peteler Car Company (now Harris Machinery and Canvas Company) property and the R.R. Howell Company property. These two properties are further discussed below. Most of the records identified by the SHPO database search are residential homes located south of University Avenue. The residents in this area, called the Prospect Park Neighborhood, nominated

their neighborhood for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The Prospect Park Residential Historic District was listed on the Register in 2015. This historic district is generally bounded by University Avenue on the north, Williams Avenue on the west, Emerald Street on the east, and Interstate 94 on the south (see Figure 11). The Site is not located within the Prospect Park Residential Historic District and the proposed redevelopment project would not adversely impact the historic character of the National Register district.

The City of Minneapolis GIS datasets of locally-designated Historic Districts and Historic Landmarks were also reviewed. The Site is not located within a designated historic district and there are no City of Minneapolis historic landmarks located within the Site. The nearest locally-designated historic landmarks include: the Prospect Park Water Tower ("Witches Hat") within Tower Hill Park, located approximately 0.25 miles south of the Site; the Hafstad, Jacob House in the Prospect Park neighborhood located approximately 0.5 miles south of the Site; and Fire Station No. 19 located approximately 0.75 miles west of the Site (see Figure 11). The nearest locally-designated historic district is the University of Minnesota Greek Letter Chapter House Historic District located approximately one mile to the west. The proposed mixed-use redevelopment project at the Site would not adversely impact these landmarks or historic districts. Visual impacts are further described under Question 15.

Regional Historic Studies

The Site and surrounding area includes several vacant industrial properties that have been reviewed in the context of potential historical significance as part of previous studies. Past studies that evaluated areas that encompassed the Site include:

- SEMI Historic Resources Evaluation with the SEMI AUAR (1997);
- The Junction of Industry and Freight: the Development of the Southwest Minneapolis Industrial Area (2003);
- Historic Resources Inventory in the Central Core (2011).

The SEMI Historic Resources Evaluation (1997) identified a total of 18 different structures or complexes for further research and evaluation regarding potential historic significance. The properties from the SEMI evaluation that are within the Site are the Peteler Car Company (now Harris Machinery and Canvas) property at 501 30th Avenue SE and the R.R. Howell and Company at 501 Malcolm Avenue SE. Potentially-significant properties within one half mile of the Site include:

- Ziegler Construction Equipment Company, 2331 University Avenue;
- Marquette Elevator, 525 25th Avenue SE;
- Russell-Miller Flour Mill warehouse, 25th Avenue SE;
- Andrews Heating Company (Kempf Paper), 2525 4th Street SE;
- Gas Traction Foundry Company (Boeser), 2965 4th Street SE;
- Electric Steel Elevator (Peavey), 654 25th Avenue SE;
- Pioneer Malting Company (Kurth Malting Co.), 530 25th Avenue SE;
- Archer-Daniels-Midland Complex, 620 Malcom Avenue SE

The Junction of Industry and Freight report for the SEMI (2003) concluded that the SEMI area was not eligible for a National Register designation as a historic district, but also concluded that the following properties were individually eligible:

- Calumet Elevator/Nye Jenks and Company
- Electric Steel Elevator
- McLaughlin Gormley King Company
- Peteler Car Company/Harris Machinery and Canvas Company
- Wabash Screen Door Company

In 2011, Mead & Hunt completed a Historic Resources Inventory of the central core of the City, including the Prospect Park neighborhood and SEMI area. The 2011 report notes that an "intensive historic resources study of the [SEMI] area was conducted in 2003." It does not include any properties in or near the Site as properties recommended for further research as potentially significant; apparently relying on the earlier historic studies of the SEMI area as serving that purpose.

Since the time of the SEMI study (1997) and The Junction of Industry and Freight report (2003) six of the above listed properties and structures have been demolished by either private developers or the University of Minnesota as part of redevelopment projects.

- Ziegler Construction Equipment Company, 2331 University Avenue;
- Marquette Elevator, 525 25th Avenue SE;
- Russell-Miller Flour Mill warehouse, 25th Avenue SE;
- Andrews Heating Company (Kempf Paper), 2525 4th Street SE;
- Gas Traction Foundry Company (Boeser), 2965 4th Street SE;
- Electric Steel Elevator (Peavey), 654 25th Avenue SE;

The Pioneer Malting Company and Archer-Daniels-Midland Complex properties have remaining structures. Neither of those properties are located within the Site, however the Archer-Daniels-Midland Complex is owned by Wall Development Company and is adjacent to the Site immediately to the north. There are three remaining structures on the Archer-Daniels-Midland Complex including the Delmar #1 elevator, the Delmar #4 elevator on the west side of Malcolm Avenue, and the Delmar Annex located east of Malcolm Avenue. All other structures on this property have been demolished. The remaining elevators of the Archer-Daniels-Midland Complex are not part of the proposed redevelopment project and Wall Development Company has no plans to redevelop, repurpose, or demolish these elevators at this time. The Peterler Car Company and R.R. Howell Company properties are located on the Site and are further described below (see Figure 12).

Condition of Properties on the Site Previously Identified as Potentially Significant

Peteler Car Co., (now Harris Machinery and Canvas Co.)
A Site Evaluation of the Harris Machinery and Canvas Site (Hess, Roise, and Co., 2013) was prepared on behalf of a prospective buyer, The Cornerstone Group, as part of a potential redevelopment project. The Site Evaluation included an evaluation of historic significance of the property. The Site Evaluation included the following statement about the overall Harris Machinery and Canvas Site:

"Unfortunately, the site has drastically deteriorated over the past eleven years, when it was first determined potentially eligible for the National Register. Several of the original

buildings have fallen into serious structural disrepair, significantly lessening their historic integrity, one of the conditions for historic designation."

Over the past three years, several buildings on the Harris Machinery and Canvas Co. property were demolished and removed. The buildings were demolished due to the conditions listed in the 2013 Site Evaluation including failing structural building conditions, such as roof collapse and failing masonry, as well as general safety concerns. There are currently two remaining buildings: the Harris Machinery Building (a.k.a. Machine and Erecting Shop) and the Canvas Shop. The 2013 Site Evaluation listed the Harris Machinery Building as having "poor" integrity due to conditions such as: serious roof disrepair including collapse; original windows filled with concrete and glass blocks; and modifications of the historic structure including additions of garage doors and ceilings. An additional limited evaluation of the Harris Machinery Building in 2017 determined that this current building was not the main historical component of the former Peteler Car Co. site and is considered a remnant.

The combination of Harris Machinery Building being a secondary historical structure on the property in terms of its significance and its current state of structural disrepair makes the building an unlikely candidate for designation as a historic structure. Despite the current state of disrepair and lack of official historic status, it is the intent of the Wall Development Company to utilize the Harris Machinery Building as part of the redevelopment project. This building is proposed to become the Malcolm Yards Market and will be refurbished and reused to the extent practical as part of the redevelopment project, including maintaining and restoring significant portions of the historic exterior. The Canvas Shop building is in good structural condition; however, this is a new structure that was added to the site after 1950 and is not within the period of significance. (Hess, Roise, and Co., 2013).

R.R. Howell Company
Since the 1997 SEMI study, 3 of the 6 buildings that comprised the R.R. Howell Co. property were demolished and removed due to their poor condition. There were three remaining structures on the R.R. Howell property that were also in poor condition and were removed within the last three years. The property now only contains a foundation from the main R.R. Howell Co. building and there are no remaining structures. The foundation will be removed during Phase 1 of the redevelopment.

15. VISUAL

Describe any scenic views or vistas on or near the project site. Describe any project related visual effects such as vapor plumes or glare from intense lights. Discuss the potential visual effects from the project. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate visual effects.

Development of the project site would include construction of new multi-story structures. Phase 1 development would include one six-story apartment building and one up to twelve-story building with retail on the first level and apartments above. Some portions of the existing on-site building (the Harris building) are proposed to remain in-place with rehabilitation work to be completed to create a retail space, presuming it is financially viable. Two six-story buildings are proposed for Phase 2 development. The up

to twelve-story building may range from 100-150 feet tall and the six-story buildings may range from 65-85 feet tall.

The only identified scenic views or vistas near the Site are from the top of Tower Hill Park and the Witches Hat water tower in the park. Redevelopment of the vacant industrial land of the Site will not impair the scenic views from the park.

Although development in the project area will change the visual landscape from existing conditions, the surrounding area is a highly developed urban area; the project development is consistent with an urbanized landscape. Also, prior to vacancy of the majority of the project site, previous industrial uses/buildings existed. Existing industrial buildings, including large grain elevator silos, are located on surrounding parcels. It is not anticipated that the project will have significant visual impacts due to new building construction based on historical uses and recent significant redevelopment activities south of the project site. The recent and in-progress development to the south of the project area also includes multi-story buildings. For example, the RISE at Prospect Park development project consists of a 13-story structure (approximately 160-feet tall) that, depending on vantage point, would obstruct the view of the shorter buildings planned for the Site. Also, the area south of the project is addressed in the Stadium Village University Avenue Station Area Plan (2012) which identifies high density mixed use as appropriate for the area and notes that such development may include buildings of significant height.

Building materials for the proposed project would be typical for the type of development and are not anticipated to create impacts due to glare or to be significantly inconsistent with the developed structures in the general area. The proposed park area and greenspace would also create a visible change from existing conditions, but may be considered an aesthetic improvement compared to the current barren/sparsely vegetated state.

16. AIR

a. Stationary source emissions - Describe the type, sources, quantities and compositions of any emissions from stationary sources such as boilers or exhaust stacks. Include any hazardous air pollutants, criteria pollutants, and any greenhouse gases. Discuss effects to air quality including any sensitive receptors, human health or applicable regulatory criteria. Include a discussion of any methods used assess the project's effect on air quality and the results of that assessment. Identify pollution control equipment and other measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects from stationary source emissions.

No significant impacts from air pollutants are anticipated. The proposed project does not include significant stationary point source emission units that would trigger the need for air permitting or air dispersion modeling. Stationary source emissions from for the proposed project would include the heating and cooling systems for the proposed residential and commercial uses and would be similar to other buildings in the surrounding area. The emissions associated with these systems will not require air permitting and the systems are not anticipated to produce significant air quality impacts.

b. Vehicle emissions - Describe the effect of the project's traffic generation on air emissions. Discuss the project's vehicle-related emissions effect on air quality. Identify measures (e.g. traffic operational improvements, diesel idling minimization plan) that will be taken to minimize or mitigate vehicle-related emissions.

Traffic will increase as a result of the redevelopment project as vehicles take people to and from their residences or one of the commercial/retail spaces. The traffic has the potential to cause emissions of particulate matter from direct emissions such as exhaust, brake wear, and tire wear. Maximum potential emissions of particulate matter were estimated using the traffic study estimated counts and emission factors for paved roads from AP-42 Section 13.2.1: Paved Roads.

The traffic study estimated that the net total daily trips for the project are 6,062 trips. The highest hourly estimate for trips is 519 once internal trips and transit trips (i.e. use of public transit such as buses or light rail) are accounted for. The traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment project would result in the emissions of particulate matter. To quantitatively determine a high-end estimate for the potential emissions from traffic related to the project, 25% of the trips were assumed to be delivery-related in four-ton trucks while 75% of the trips were assumed to be resident-related in light-duty vehicles. This is conservative as there are likely to be a higher percentage of resident-related trips in smaller or low emission vehicles. There are ambient air quality standards for two sizes of particulate matter including particulate matter smaller than 10 micron diameter (PM_{10}) and particulate matter smaller than 2.5 micron diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). Based on the estimated number of trips the proposed project would generate approximately 0.6 tons per year of PM_{10} emissions and 0.16 tons per year of $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. These emission levels would not increase ambient concentrations significantly as their impact on air concentrations are less than the significant impact levels (SILs) as calculated using MPCA's Air Quality Dispersion Modeling MN Lookup Table (aq-61). The PM_{10} emissions are only 16% of the annual SIL and 16% of the 24-hour SIL. The $PM_{2.5}$ emissions are 17% of the 24-hour SIL and 14% of the annual SIL. Therefore, there are no expected adverse impacts from emissions from traffic at the project.

Other potential emissions include the combustion byproducts of gasoline or diesel fuel. These emissions are not quantified here as the project-related emissions and impacts are indistinguishable from the emissions from traffic in the project area such as along University Avenue and Highways 94, 280 and 35W. The project is not expected to create new drivers but to relocate them from existing areas. Therefore, the total project impact from traffic is minimal.

c. Dust and odors - Describe sources, characteristics, duration, quantities, and intensity of dust and odors generated during project construction and operation. (Fugitive dust may be discussed under item 16a). Discuss the effect of dust and odors in the vicinity of the project including nearby sensitive receptors and quality of life. Identify measures that will be taken to minimize or mitigate the effects of dust and odors.

Temporary impacts from dust and odor may occur during construction. Grading, excavation, and general earthwork activities would cause dust to occur. Vehicle exhaust from construction equipment may cause diesel fuel odors. Dust and odor impacts would be temporary and would take place during daytime hours during typical construction activities. Significant impacts from odors are not anticipated; weather and wind conditions would influence the level of impact and the receptors. BMPs would be implemented to minimize impacts from dust, including watering dry exposed soil.

It is not anticipated that the proposed project would create permanent dust or odor impacts. Minimal dust would be created due to the implementation of paved roadways and stabilization of exposed soils with vegetative cover. The proposed project does not include significant point source emission sources that would potentially be a source of odors. Odors associated with the redevelopment project would be consistent with nearby land uses and are not anticipated to be objectionable.

17. NOISE

Describe sources, characteristics, duration, quantities, and intensity of noise generated during project construction and operation. Discuss the effect of noise in the vicinity of the project including 1) existing noise levels/sources in the area, 2) nearby sensitive receptors, 3) conformance to state noise standards, and 4) quality of life. Identify measures that will be taken to minimize or mitigate the effects of noise.

Existing noise levels/sources are consistent with a highly developed urban area. There are existing industrial uses to the east and north of the project site, including the SKB solid waste transfer facility and BNSF railroad beyond the vacant industrial property directly to the north of the project area. The area to the south is highly developed with residential and retail/commercial uses. The sources of noise in the area include traffic along Malcolm Avenue accessing the solid waste transfer facility, bus traffic along the Transitway, and operations within the railyards to the north of the solid waste transfer facility.

There are residential areas located to the southwest, south, and southeast. The closest residential houses include apartment buildings located southwest of the Site at 4th Street and 29th Avenue and a residential neighborhood located south of the Transitway on 4th Street. The developed areas nearest to the Site are primarily mixed use including retail/commercial properties. There are some redevelopment projects under construction between the Transitway and University Avenue that will include new residential apartment buildings similar to those proposed at the Site.

Temporary construction noise would occur during the construction timeframe, phased between Phase 1 and 2 developments. Construction noise would be typical of other large-scale residential and commercial construction projects similar to redevelopment efforts currently underway near the Site. Sources of construction noise include use of earthmoving equipment (i.e. bobcats, backhoes, and other excavating equipment), large machinery and trucks, hydraulic tools, and similar equipment necessary for building. The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances regulates the timeframe for construction activities by

limiting the hours that construction and demolition activities can occur, limited to 7 AM to 6 PM Monday through Friday. Operation of construction equipment outside of the regulated timeframe without a permit is prohibited. An After-Hours Work Permit would be required for work outside of the identified weekday time period or for anytime on Saturday, Sunday, or City Holidays. A permit would be obtained for the redevelopment project if needed, which would be determined by the construction contractor.

Operational noise would be regulated by the MPCA as the enforcing agent of the State of Minnesota noise rules. Minneapolis Code of Ordinances would also apply to building operation noise. Occupancy of the proposed project would be subject to such requirements. The redevelopment project includes new residential apartment buildings and new commercial space comprised of retail, restaurant, and office space. These proposed uses for the Site will generate similar noise levels to those that currently exist in the area including local residential traffic. Following construction and occupancy, noise is not anticipated to be noticeably or significantly increased and would be consistent with surrounding land uses.

Quality of life is not anticipated to be affected by the proposed project due to conformance with applicable noise regulations, the temporary nature of construction noise, and consistency of the redevelopment with the surrounding land use and urbanized area.

18. TRANSPORTATION

a. Describe traffic-related aspects of project construction and operation. Include: 1) existing and proposed additional parking spaces, 2) estimated total average daily traffic generated, 3) estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated and time of occurrence, 4) indicate source of trip generation rates used in the estimates, and 5) availability of transit and/or other alternative transportation modes.

The Site is located at the northeast corner of Malcolm Avenue SE and the Transitway, and is bounded by Malcolm Avenue SE to the east, the Transitway to the south, and existing industrial developments and railroads to the north. The current access to the Site is via Malcolm Avenue, which can be accessed via University Avenue or Fourth Street SE. Traffic does not access the Site under existing conditions. Wall Development Company is proposing to construct new private roads on the Site to serve the redevelopment project, including a new site access at the intersection of Malcolm Avenue SE and 5th Street SE.

The Site consists of vacant industrial lands and there are currently no designated parking spaces on the Site. There is limited on-street parking on Malcolm Avenue SE south of the Transitway. Wall Development Company is proposing to meet parking needs for the redevelopment project using primarily structured underground parking. Additional limited surface parking may be included for retail users. The total number of new surface spaces would be determined during the final design and the City approval process for each building on the Site or as part of a PUD. The development plan for the Site indicates an estimated number of underground parking spaces that would be created during Phase 1 of the redevelopment (see Figure 4). There would also be new underground parking added during Phase 2 of the redevelopment. The

final development plan of the Site, including the type and amount of parking to be provided, will require City approval. The final development plan of the Site, including parking, will require City approval.

The proposed project would add a combination of new residential and commercial development to the Site. This development will generate additional traffic at the Site and the surrounding area. The expected trip generation was calculated for each phase of the proposed project. The proposed full redevelopment project (i.e. combined Phases 1 and 2) is expected to generate 400 trips during the a.m. peak hour, 519 trips during the p.m. peak hour, and 6,062 weekday trips. This total estimated trip generation is based on data presented in *Trip Generation*, Tenth Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The Site is located near several public transit options including busses and the Green Line light rail line. Total trip generation estimates include reductions based on the use of available public transit as well as internal trips within the Site. There are Metro Transit bus stops at both the University Avenue SE/Malcolm Avenue SE and University Avenue SE/29th Avenue SE intersections. There is a light rail stop at the University Avenue SE/29th Avenue SE intersection. These bus and light rail stops are less than 0.25 miles from the Site and would be easily accessible from the Site.

b. Discuss the effect on traffic congestion on affected roads and describe any traffic improvements necessary. The analysis must discuss the project's impact on the regional transportation system. *If the peak hour traffic generated exceeds 250 vehicles or the total daily trips exceeds 2,500, a traffic impact study must be prepared as part of the EAW.* Use the format and procedures described in the Minnesota Department of Transportation's Access Management Manual, Chapter 5 *(available at: http://www.dot.state.mn.us/accessmanagement/resources.html)* or a similar local guidance.

A traffic impact study was completed to assess the potential impacts of the proposed redevelopment project on traffic levels and improvements near the Site (Wenck 2017).

The traffic study included evaluation of current and future traffic volumes at the following intersections:

- University Avenue SE/Malcolm Avenue SE
- University Avenue SE/30th Avenue SE
- University Avenue SE/29th Avenue SE
- 4th Street SE/Malcolm Avenue SE
- 4th Street SE/30th Street SE
- 4th Street SE/29th Street SE
- Malcolm Avenue SE/U of M Transitway
- Malcolm Avenue SE/Proposed Site Access

The intersections evaluated within the traffic study are shown in Figure 13. The full traffic impact study is provided as Appendix 5. The traffic study evaluated projected future traffic impacts under several scenarios including the build and no-build scenarios for the year 2022 to estimate traffic impacts from Phase 1 and the build

and no-build scenarios for the year 2027 to estimate traffic impacts from the combined redevelopment in Phases 1 and 2. The results of the traffic study determined that traffic operations would be minimally impacted at most of the intersections evaluated because of the proposed project. No improvements would be needed for either Phase 1 or Phase 2 at the following intersections:

- University Avenue SE/30th Avenue SE
- University Avenue SE/29th Avenue SE
- 4th Street SE/Malcolm Avenue SE
- 4th Street SE/30th Street SE
- 4th Street SE/29th Street SE
- Malcolm Avenue SE/U of M Transitway

Traffic from the proposed project would result in impacts to traffic operations at the University Avenue SE/Malcolm Avenue SE intersection as part of Phase 1 and Phase 2 and the Malcolm Avenue SE/Proposed Site Access intersection as part of Phase 2. There are several existing conditions that contribute to traffic congestion at these two intersections. Under existing conditions, the number and size of trucks on Malcolm Avenue SE results in periodic congestion. The congestion is compounded by on-street parking, which reduces the roadway width and forces trucks to take turns at locations along the roadway. This issue is most prevalent during the midday time period when the industrial uses are fully operating. Another existing condition is that large trucks occasionally have difficulty making the right-hand turn from westbound University Avenue SE onto northbound Malcolm Avenue SE. The existing curb radius at this intersection, combined with the location of southbound vehicles waiting to turn onto University Avenue SE, forces large trucks to wait for an opening in southbound traffic before turning. This condition occurs now and is not a result of the proposed project. Analysis of vehicle queuing at the University Avenue SE/Malcolm Avenue SE intersection indicates that due to existing lane geometry and the high number of trucks, significant southbound queue lengths are expected to occur in the future scenarios. Mitigation options were recommended to accommodate the redevelopment project at the Site and address potential traffic impacts at the University Avenue SE/Malcolm Avenue SE and the Malcolm Avenue SE/Proposed Site Access intersections.

c. Identify measures that will be taken to minimize or mitigate project related transportation effects.

In order to accommodate the proposed development, the following mitigation measures were recommended by the traffic study:

<u>For Phase 1:</u>

- University Avenue SE/Malcolm Avenue SE intersection
  - Provide two southbound lanes at University Avenue SE, with one dedicated left turn lane and one through/right turn lane.
- Malcolm Avenue SE
  - Limit on-street parking as needed to accommodate the proposed lane layout. Continue to monitor operations to determine if additional on-street

parking should be removed in the future.

For Phase 2 (in addition to Phase 1 mitigation):

- Malcolm Avenue SE/5th Street SE/proposed access
    - Monitor intersection operations to determine if all-way stop control is needed in the future.

Wall Development Company would work with the City of Minneapolis to implement the above traffic mitigation measures. The various mitigation measures would be timed to adequately serve the traffic needs of the proposed project and the other properties in the area to insure minimal traffic impacts. Through the implementation of the identified traffic mitigation measures the proposed redevelopment project could be served by the existing roadway network.

19. CUMULATIVE POTENTIAL EFFECTS:

Note: Preparers can leave this item blank if cumulative potential effects are addressed under the applicable EAW Items

a. Describe the geographic scales and timeframes of the project related environmental effects that could combine with other environmental effects resulting in cumulative potential effects.

The proposed project is located within an area addressed in multiple City of Minneapolis planning documents that guide redevelopment of the area. This EAW describes the potential redevelopment of a specific project site in two phases. Phase 1 is anticipated to begin construction during the fourth quarter of 2018 and continue for three to four years. Construction of Phase 2 is not anticipated to begin until at least 2022 and has been estimated to be completed by approximately 2027. The actual timeframe for project completion will be market driven. There are several redevelopment projects that have recently been completed, are planned for, or are in progress in the surrounding area to the south of the Site. There is also the potential for future redevelopment of the adjacent vacant parcels to the north and northeast of the Site. While no specific projects are known at this time for those areas, redevelopment is consistent with the planning documents for the broader vicinity. There are several aspects of the proposed redevelopment project that address potential impacts of the surrounding area as well as the Site. This includes the following items:

- Extension of mixed-use development north of the Transitway consistent with the City's plans to create vibrate areas of the City that include housing, office, and retail uses near transit centers that facilitate the use of public transit and the creation of destinations within the City.
- Collaboration between Wall Development Company, the MWMO, and the City of Minneapolis to develop a district stormwater treatment area on the west corner of the Site to store and treat stormwater from the Site as well as some of the adjacent parcels.
- Inclusion of greenway park and open space to facilitate pedestrian and outdoor uses in an area of the City undergoing redevelopment.

- Inclusion of traffic mitigation strategies along Malcolm Avenue and at the intersection of Malcolm Avenue SE and University Avenue SE that will provide benefits to the proposed redevelopment project at the Site as well as adjacent properties.

  Due to the planning for redevelopment in this area, the consistency with the surrounding land use, and the mitigation measures described in the preceding sections, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in adverse cumulative potential impacts.

b. Describe any reasonably foreseeable future projects (for which a basis of expectation has been laid) that may interact with environmental effects of the proposed project within the geographic scales and timeframes identified above.

There are no known reasonably foreseeable future projects that would directly interact with the environmental effects from the proposed redevelopment project at the Site. Wall Development Company owns additional land adjacent to the Site to the north and also to the northeast on the other side of Malcolm Avenue. Wall Development Company does not have specific development plans for that property at this time. If future projects are proposed for these lands, Wall Development Company will complete permitting and/or environmental review evaluations as required. Potential future environmental review, if needed, for the lands adjacent to the Site would further evaluate environmental impacts in the area.

20. OTHER POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

If the project may cause any additional environmental effects not addressed by items 1 to 19, describe the effects here, discuss the how the environment will be affected, and identify measures that will be taken to minimize and mitigate these effects.

All known potential environmental effects are addressed herein and no other issues have been identified.

RGU CERTIFICATION

*The Environmental Quality Board will only accept **SIGNED** Environmental Assessment Worksheets for public notice in the EQB Monitor.*

I hereby certify that:

- The information contained in this document is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.
- The EAW describes the complete project; there are no other projects, stages or components other than those described in this document, which are related to the project as connected actions or phased actions, as defined at Minnesota Rules, parts 4410.0200, subparts 9c and 60, respectively.
- Copies of this EAW are being sent to the entire EQB distribution list.

Signature Hilary Dvorak Date Feb 13, 2018

Title Principal City Planner

REFERENCES

City of Minneapolis. *Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth – City of Minneapolis Comprehensive Plan*. 2009. http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/planning/cped_comp_plan_update_draft_plan

City of Minneapolis. *Industrial Land Use and Employment Policy Plan (ILUS)*. Adopted 2006; incorporated into the Comp Plan in 2009.

City of Minneapolis. *Stadium Village University Avenue Station Area Plan*. 2012.

City of Minneapolis. University Avenue Innovation District (City Council of Minneapolis Resolution 2015R-402). 2015.

Cunningham Group. *Southeast Minneapolis Industrial (SEMI) / Bridal Veil Refined Master Plan*. 2001.

Hennepin County. *Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County*. 1989.

Hess, Roise, and Co. *A Site Evaluation of the Harris Machinery and Canvas Site*. 2013.

Institute of Transportation Engineers. *Trip Generation*, Tenth Edition. 2017.

Mead & Hunt. *Historic Resources Inventory of the Minneapolis Central Core*. 2011.

Metropolitan Council. *Fact sheet for the Metropolitan WWTP*. 2017.

Metropolitan Council. *Sewer Availability Charge (SAC) Manual*. 2017.

Minnesota Department of Health. County Well Index (CWI). http://www.health.state.mn.us/divs/eh/cwi/

Minnesota Rules, part 4410.4300, Subparts 19D and 32. https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/?id=4410.4300. 2013

Minnesota Rules, parts 4410.0200, subparts 9c and 60. https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/?id=4410.0200. 2016

Mississippi Watershed Management Organization. *MWMO Watershed Management Plan 2011 – 2021*. 2011.

Metropolitan Pollution Control Agency. Air Quality Dispersion Modeling MN Lookup Table (aq-61). https://www.pca.state.mn.us/air/air-quality-dispersion-modeling-aqdm-tools

United States Department of Agriculture. *Soil Survey of Hennepin County, MN.* https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_MANUSCRIPTS/minnesota/MN053/0/hennepin.pdf

University of Minnesota. *Traffic Ordinance*. https://regents.umn.edu/policies/ordinances#ord-5

US Environmental Protection Agency. AP-42 Section 13.2.1: Paved Roads. 2006.

US Fish and Wildlife Service. *IPaC Information for Planning and Consultation*. https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/. 2017.

Wenck. *Traffic Impact Study for the Malcolm Yards Development in Minneapolis, MN*. 2017.