ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

Note to preparers: This form is available at http://www.eqb.state.mn.us. *EAW Guidelines* will be available in Spring 1999 at the web site. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet provides information about a project that may have the potential for significant environmental effects. The EAW is prepared by the Responsible Governmental Unit or its agents to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement should be prepared. The project proposer must supply any reasonably accessible data for — but should not complete — the final worksheet. If a complete answer does not fit in the space allotted, attach additional sheets as necessary. The complete question as well as the answer must be included if the EAW is prepared electronically.
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 Pacific Block Development

2. PROPOSER Pacific Flats, LLC
Contact person Walter H. Rockenstein II
Title Attorney for Pacific Flats, LLC
Address Faegre & Benson LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
City, state, ZIP Minneapolis, MN 55402-3901
Phone 612-766-7208
Fax 612-766-1600
E-mail WRockenstein@faegre.com

3. RGU City of Minneapolis
Contact person Rebecca Farrar
Title Senior Planner
Address Planning Division
Community Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Minneapolis
210 City Hall
350 South 5th Street
City, state, ZIP Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone 612-673-3594
Fax 612-673-2728
E-mail Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

4. REASON FOR EAW PREPARATION (CHECK ONE)
EIS scoping ✓ **Mandatory EAW** **Citizen petition**
RGU discretion **Proposer volunteered**
If EAW or EIS is mandatory give EQB rule category subpart number: Minn. Rules 4410.4300 Mandatory EAW Categories **and subpart name:** Subp. 19. Residential development, more than 375 attached units; Subp. 31. Historical places, demolition of structures in a Historic District; and Subp. 32 Mixed residential and industrial-commercial projects.

5. PROJECT LOCATION
County: Hennepin
City/Township: Minneapolis
Section: 22 **Township:** 029 **Range:** 24

Legal description: Block 34, Town of Minneapolis

See Attachment E: ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey.

The project proposes redevelopment of the entire block bounded by Washington Avenue N. on the south, by 3rd Avenue N. on the west, by 2nd Street N. on the north, and by 2nd Avenue N. on the east (the "Pacific Block" or the "Project Site").

Attach each of the following to the EAW:

- **County map showing the general location of the project.** See Attachment A: Hennepin County Map.
- **U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale map indicating project boundaries (photocopy acceptable).**. See Attachment A Minneapolis South Quadrangle
- **Site plan showing all significant project and natural features.** See Attachment B: Project Site and Vicinity, Attachment C: 28-Story Condo Building Alternative Site Plan and Attachment D: 40-Story Condo Building Alternative Site Plan.

6. DESCRIPTION

a. Provide a project summary of 50 words or less to be published in the *EQB Monitor*.

The Pacific Block Development is a mixed commercial, hotel, office, and residential development totaling approximately 750,000 gross square feet proposed on the block bounded by Washington Ave. N., 3rd Ave. N, 2nd St. N., and 2nd Ave. N. in Downtown Minneapolis. The residential component comprises 450 condominium units in two buildings. The Pacific Block is within the National Register "Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District" and, except for one parcel, is within the "North Loop Warehouse Area", a historic district designated by the City of Minneapolis.

b. Give a complete description of the proposed project and related new construction. Attach additional sheets as necessary. Emphasize construction, operation methods and features that will cause physical manipulation of the environment or will produce wastes. Include modifications to existing equipment or industrial processes and significant demolition, removal or remodeling of existing structures. Indicate the timing and duration of construction activities.

(1) Project Description And Alternatives

Pacific Flats, LLC (the "Developer") proposes to build a mixed-use, commercial, hotel, office, and residential infill redevelopment including approximately 69,200 SF of commercial space, a 150-room hotel, 35,800 SF of office space, 450 residential condominium units, and a parking ramp with approximately 800 parking spaces (collectively, the "Pacific Block Development" or "Project") on the Pacific Block in Downtown Minneapolis. The retail space is expected to include a health and fitness club and at least 2 restaurants, including the existing Monte Carlo Club. The office space is expected to include a medical clinic of approximately 8,000 SF.

The Developer is proposing two alternatives for constructing the Project. The alternatives propose the same intensity of development measured by square feet of residential and commercial floor area, but differ in how the residential development is distributed on the site. The commercial development, parking and green spaces are identical in each alternative.

Alternative One. The first alternative calls for 2 residential condominium towers – an 18-story building on Washington Avenue N. and a 28-story building whose major axis parallels 2nd Street N., but with an 8 story wing along 2nd Avenue N. (the "28-Story Condo Building Alternative"). Both buildings would have retail at the street level. See Attachment C, Attachment F: 28-Story Condo Building Alternative Heights, and Attachment G: 28-Story Building Alternative Perspective. This is the Developer's preferred alternative.

This alternative illustrates how a development of 7 times the area of the block potentially permitted in the B4C-1 district and increased by allowed bonuses and premiums (see the discussion in Section 27 of this EAW) would be distributed across the block.

Alternative Two. Alternative Two also includes 2 residential condominium towers – a 40-story tower on the Gehl-Dolphin Building parcel at the corner of 2nd Avenue N. and 2nd Street N. (212 2nd Avenue N) and a 10-story building on Washington Avenue N. (the "40-Story Condo Building Alternative"). The 40-story tower would have lower wings extending along both 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N. Again, both condominium buildings would have retail at the street level. See Attachment D, Attachment H: 40-Story Condo Building Alternative Heights, and Attachment I: 40-Story Condo Building Alternative Perspective.

This alternative distributes the development differently, respecting the Historic District guidelines adopted by the City and limiting building heights on the 90% of the block that is within the District to 10 stories, and 3.74 times that area, and then proposing a 40 story residential tower on the 10% of the block excluded from the local historic district. The resulting development on this part of the block, the 10,692 sf parcel at 212 Second Avenue N, will approach 35 times that area.

The application for approval of the project by the HPC and through the City's Land Use Approval Process must be limited to a single plan, the proposed plan of the developer.

(2) Components Common To Both Alternatives

The Project includes the following major components that are common to both alternatives.

(a) Pacific Flats Building

The street level of the Pacific Flats Building will remain retail, and the upper 2 floors will be refurbished to create office space. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

(b) Monte Carlo Club

The Monte Carlo Club will be retained as a restaurant. The open space to its south will become part of the westerly pocket park. See the discussion under *(f) Green Spaces* below and Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

(c) New Hotel Including Renovated Northwestern Building

A new, 10-story hotel will be constructed adjacent to the existing Northwestern Building that will extend into the Northwestern Building ("New Hotel") and into a wing behind the Monte Carlo Club. The New Hotel will have 150 rooms and an interior courtyard accessible by hotel guests. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H and I.

The New Hotel will have its entrance on 3rd Avenue N. between the Monte Carlo Club and 2nd Street N. The building will begin at the sidewalk, rise 3 stories, set back approximately 20 feet, and then continue up to its 10-story height. The first 4 stories will maintain floor-to-floor heights similar to the Northwestern Building, while the remaining 6 stories will decrease this floor-to-floor height to about 10 feet. An open, interior courtyard at the second level will adjoin this new portion of the New Hotel along its east face. The south face of this portion of the New Hotel will be about 28 feet north of the Monte Carlo Club, creating a 1-lane entrance to the interior parking for the Project and 1 lane for New Hotel drop-off. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

The front 3 bays of the Northwestern Building (approximately 56 feet) will be retained and the back bays will be demolished. The street level along 2nd Street N. will remain retail; the second, third, and fourth stories will be renovated to incorporate hotel rooms. A fifth story with a green roof terrace will be added, set back approximately 20 feet from the building's 2nd Street N. façade. A portion of the New Hotel, the interior hotel courtyard, and part of the Parking Ramp will be constructed in the area opened up by demolishing the rear of the Northwestern Building. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

A south wing of the New Hotel will be constructed behind and over roughly the back third of the Monte Carlo Club. This wing will be 4 stories tall with a green roof terrace, and its south

face will be about 21 feet from the back of the Pacific Flats Building. Construction of this wing will require demolition of all or a part of the 2-story concrete block structure added to the rear of Monte Carlo Club in 1985. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

(d) *Lowry-Morrison Building*
The Lowry-Morrison Building will be completely renovated and will include retail on the ground floor and office space on the upper 2 floors. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

(e) *Parking Ramp*
A 7-level parking ramp will be constructed in the center of the Pacific Block and will provide approximately 800 parking spaces (the "Parking Ramp"). It will include 2 parking levels below grade, a parking and loading level at grade (street level), 4 parking levels above grade, and a green roof terrace above the final parking level. The below grade levels will extend under the New Hotel to serve its guests and under the new condominium buildings to provide private parking for the residents. The street level of the Parking Ramp will supply public parking and loading spaces for the retail businesses, the New Hotel, and the medical clinic. The 4 levels above grade will offer a mix of public parking for the retail and office uses and private parking for condominium units. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

(f) *Green Spaces*
The Project includes landscape and green spaces at the street level and on its roofs. Two public pocket parks are planned. The first is on 3rd Avenue between the Monte Carlo Club and the Pacific Building. The second is on 2nd Avenue N. behind the Lowry-Morrison Building. The parks are connected under the back of the 18-Story or 10-Story Condo Building to form a through-block pedestrian promenade. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

An open space constructed as a raised plaza will be created on the corner of 3rd Avenue N. and 2nd Street N. The current plan anticipates that 50% of the space will support an outdoor dining and activity space for the New Hotel and 50% will be available for public use. This plaza space will be accessible from the New Hotel lobby, the Northwestern Building, and the sidewalks on 3rd Avenue N. and 2nd Street N. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

Green spaces above street level are the green roof terraces, which total 21,000 SF (21%) of the Project's roof area. The roof of the 4-story south wing of the New Hotel, the roof of the story added to the Northwestern Building, the second level interior courtyard for the New Hotel, the roof of the 8-story portion of the condominium building along 2nd Avenue S., and the roof of the Parking Ramp will be green roof terraces. The current plan calls for 50% of the green roof terrace over the Parking Ramp to be available for public use with access from the commercial elevators in the 18 or 10-Story Condo Building. See Attachments C, D, F, G, H, and I.

(3) Components Unique To Alternative One, The 28-Story Condo Building Alternative
The 28-Story Condo Building Alternative would place an 8 and 28-story retail and residential building with integrated, enclosed parking along 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N., and an 18-story retail, office, and residential building on Washington Avenue N.

(a) *28-Story Condo Building*
The Gehl-Dolphin Building and the private parking lots to its west and south would be redeveloped into a new, primarily condominium building with 2 sections – one rising to a height of 8 stories and the other 28 stories (the "28-Story Condo Building"). Located at the corner of 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N., the long axis of the 28-story tower would parallel 2nd Street N., and the smaller 8-story section would face 2nd Avenue N. A common 4-story base would connect the structure to the rest of the development and allow access to the green roof terrace over the Parking Ramp. The 28-Story Condo building would include 320 for-sale dwelling units, retail space, and enclosed parking both above and below ground. See Attachments C, F, and G.

Along 2nd Street N., the first and second floors would house retail uses facing the adjacent sidewalks. The upper floors would be condominium units that terrace back on the fifth and sixth stories to a total of about 37 feet from the façade of the first 4 stories. Maintaining this setback, the taller portion of the building would then rise to 28 stories. See Attachments C, F, and G.

Along 2nd Avenue N., the first and second floors would house retail uses and the entrance to the condominium units, all facing the adjacent sidewalks. Above that would be 3 levels of parking screened from the street and 3 levels of condominium units topped by a green roof terrace. The residential levels would terrace back on the seventh and eighth stories. See Attachments C, F, and G.

(b) 18-Story Condo Building

The Carriage House Building and the private parking lot to its west on Washington Avenue N. would be redeveloped into a new, primarily condominium building with a height of 18 stories (the "18-Story Condominium Building"). The first 4 stories of this building would line up with the facades of the Pacific Flats Building to the west and the Lowry-Morrison Building to the east. The upper 14 floors would be set back approximately 30 feet from this façade and the sidewalk. The first 4 floors would contain retail and commercial uses. The upper 14 floors would contain 130 for-sale dwelling units. See Attachments C, F, and G.

(4) Components Unique To Alternative Two, The 40-Story Condo Building Alternative

The 40-Story Condo Building Alternative would place a 6, 8, and 40-story retail and residential building with integrated, enclosed parking along 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N., and a 10-story retail, office, and residential building on Washington Avenue N.

(a) 40-Story Condo Building

The Gehl-Dolphin Building parcel and the private parking lots to its west and south would be redeveloped into a new, primarily condominium building with 3 sections rising to heights of 6, 8, and 40 stories (the "40-Story Condo Building"). As with the 28-Story Condo Building, a common 4-story base located at the corner of 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N. would connect the condominium structure to the rest of the development and allow access to the green roof terrace over the Parking Ramp. Unlike the 28-Story Condo Building, however, the 40-story tower portion of the building would occupy only the Gehl-Dolphin Building parcel and would rise from the sidewalk on 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N. with limited setbacks at upper levels. The 40-Story Condo Building would include 380 for-sale dwelling units, retail space, and enclosed above and below-ground parking. See Attachments D, H, and I.

Along 2nd Street N., the first 2 floors would house retail uses facing the adjacent sidewalks. The upper floors, to be built on the private parking lot between the Northwestern Building and the Gehl-Dolphin Building parcel, would be condominium units rising to 6 stories, which would terrace back on the fifth and sixth stories from the façade of the first 4 stories by 24 feet and 37 feet, respectively. As noted above, the upper floors built on the Gehl-Dolphin Building parcel would be condominium units that rise 40 stories. See Attachments D, H, and I.

Along 2nd Avenue N., the first 2 floors of the section, to be built on the parking lot between the Gehl-Dolphin Building parcel and the Lowry-Morrison Building, would house retail uses and the entrance to the condominium units, all facing the adjacent sidewalks. The upper floors would include 3 levels of parking screened from the street and 3 levels of condominium units topped by a green roof terrace. The residential levels would terrace back on the seventh and eighth stories. See Attachments D, H, and I.

(b) 10-Story Condo Building

The Carriage House Building and the private parking lot to its west on Washington Avenue N. would be redeveloped into a new, primarily condominium building with a height of 10 stories (the "10-Story Condominium Building"). The first 4 stories of this building would line up with

the facades of the Pacific Flats Building to the west and the Lowry-Morrison Building to the east. The upper 6 floors would be set back approximately 30 feet from this façade and the sidewalk. The first 4 floors would contain retail and commercial uses. The upper 6 floors would contain 70 for-sale dwelling units. See Attachments D, H, and I.

(5) Vehicle And Pedestrian Access To The Project Site

Vehicle and pedestrian access to the Project Site is the same for both alternatives.

(a) Vehicle Access

Vehicle access to the Pacific Block will occur at 3 points. First, a 1-lane, entry-only access will be placed just north of the Monte Carlo Club (west side of the block) primarily to serve the restaurant, hotel, and service vehicles. Once inside the Project Site, a second lane will provide drop-off for the New Hotel. Second, a full entry and exit access will be provided on 2nd Street N. (north side of the block) along the east side of the Northwestern Building. Third, the other full entry and exit access will be provided on 2nd Avenue N. (east side of the block) just north of pocket park that abuts the back of the Lowry-Morrison Building. See Attachment J: Project Access.

(b) Pedestrian Access

Pedestrian access to the Project will be from the sidewalks on all 4 sides and a through-block promenade that parallels Washington Avenue N. behind the Pacific Flats Building, the 18 or 10-Story Condo Building, and the Lowry Morrison Building. See Attachment J.

(6) Demolition

The Carriage House Building will be demolished in Phase 1and the Gehl-Dolphin Building in Phase 2. Neither is a contributing structure to the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) or the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (National District). The back two-thirds of the Northwestern Building and all or part of the 1985 addition to the Monte Carlo Club will also be removed as part of Phase 1. These buildings are contributing structures to the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) and Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (National District).

(7) Construction Methods

The Developer expects that standard construction techniques will be used to build the Project under either alternative. Foundation work next to the historic buildings will require careful attention to design and implementation to avoid damage to these structures. Rehabilitation of the Lowry-Morrison Building will also require care to preserve the structure, but no unusual construction techniques will be used.

(8) Phasing

For both alternatives, the Developer expects to do the work in 2 phases. Construction of the first phase is expected to commence in the fall of 2006, with completion of the second phase expected by the end of 2008.

(a) Phasing For 28-Story Condo Building Alternative

For the 28-Story Condo Building Alternative, Phase 1 would commence in the fall of 2006 and would include build out of the office space on the upper 2 floors of the Pacific Flats Building, construction of the New Hotel including renovation of the Northwestern Building. Phase 2 would commence based on market demand and would involve rehabilitation of the Lowry-Morrison Building, construction of the first 4 levels of the 18-Story Condo Building, and construction of the westerly portion of the parking ramp, building the upper 14 floors of the 18-Story Condo Building, all of the 28-Story Condo Building, and the easterly portion of the Parking Ramp.

(b) Phasing For 40-Story Condo Building Alternative

For the 40-Story Condo Building Alternative, Phase 1 would commence in the fall of 2006 and would include build out of the office space on the upper 2 floors of the Pacific Flats Building,

construction of the New Hotel including renovation of the Northwestern Building, rehabilitation of the Lowry-Morrison Building, construction of the first 4 levels of the 10-Story Condo building, and construction of the westerly portion of the parking ramp. Phase 2 would commence based on market demand and would involve building the upper 6 floors of the 10-Story Condo Building, all of the 40-Story Condo Building, and the easterly portion of the Parking Ramp.

c. 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 increase the opportunity for and diversity of living in downtown Minneapolis.

d. Are future stages of this development including development on any outlots planned or likely to happen? ___ Yes ✓ No
If yes, briefly describe future stages, relationship to present project, timeline and plans for environmental review.

e. 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.

7. PROJECT MAGNITUDE DATA

Total project acreage: 2.47 acres**.**
Number of residential units: unattached 0 **; attached** 450 **; maximum units per building** 28-Story Condo Building Alternative – 320 units; 40-Story Condo Building Alternative – 380 units**.**

The total residential floor area in each Project alternative is 470,000 SF.

Commercial, industrial or institutional building area (gross floor space): total square feet 280,000 SF (commercial, hotel, and office)

The total residential and commercial floor area in each Project alternative is 750,000 SF, not including the parking structure for the 800 parking spaces. Table 7-1 presents a detailed breakdown of the floor areas, residential units, and parking spaces by use, alternative, and development phase.

Table 7- 1: Project Magnitude Summary

	Total	Phase 1	Phase 2
Site Area	107,682 SF 2.47 acres	78,457 SF 1.80 acres	29,225 SF 0.67 acres
Housing Units And SF	450	0	450
Alternative One 2 8-Story Condo Bldg.	470,000 SF	0	470,000
28-Story Condo Bldg.	335,000 SF (320 units)	0	335,000 SF (320 units)
18-Story Condo Bldg.	135,000 SF (130 units)	0	135,000 SF (130 units)
Alternative Two 40-Story Condo Bldg.	470,000 SF	0	470,000 SF
40-Story Condo Bldg.	390,000 SF (380 units)	0	390,000 SF (380 units)
10-Story Condo Bldg.	80,000 SF (70 units)	0	80,000 SF (70 units)
Commercial	280,000 SF	258,900 SF	21,100 SF
Hotel	175,000 SF	175,000 SF	0
Office	35,800 SF	35,800 SF	0
Retail	69,200 SF	48,100 SF	21,100 SF
Parking spaces	800	277	523
Above grade	446	73	373
Below grade	354	204	150
Standard	601	208	393
Compact	199	69	130
Building Coverage (SF / %)	99,705 SF 93%	53,755 SF 50%	45,950 SF 43%
Impervious Surface (SF / %)	77,825 SF 72%	45,375 SF 42%	32,450 SF 30%*

*Impervious surface is less than building coverage due to the green roofs.

Indicate areas of specific uses (in square feet):

Table 7-2: Use Areas

Uses	Existing Areas	Proposed Areas
Office	61,000 SF	35,800 SF
Retail	25,000 SF	69,200 SF
Warehouse	0 SF	0 SF
Light industrial	0 SF	0 SF
Other commercial (specify): hotel	0 SF	175,000 SF (150 rooms)
Manufacturing	0 SF	0 SF
Other industrial	0 SF	0 SF
Institutional	0 SF	0 SF
Agricultural	0 SF	0 SF
Residential	0 SF	470,000 SF (450 units)
Total	86,000 SF	750,000 SF

Building height: See table below.

Table 7-3: Project Building Heights

Building	Existing Height		Proposed Height	
	Stories	Feet	Stories	Feet
Pacific Flats Building	3	48'-7"	3	48'-7"
Monte Carlo Club	2	34'	2	34'
New Hotel				
Central structure			10	121'
South wing			4	65'
Interior courtyard			1	21'
Northwestern Building	4	60'-6"	5	78'
Lowry-Morrison Building	3	50'-11"	3	50'-11"
Parking Ramp			5	61'
28-Story Condo Bldg. Alt.				
28-Story Condo Bldg.			28	305'
18-StoryCondo Bldg.			18	205'
40-Story Condo Bldg. Alt.				
40-Story Condo Bldg.			40	425'
10-Story Condo Bldg.			10	120'

If over 2 stories, compare to heights of nearby buildings.

The 3, 4 and 5 story heights, none higher than 5 stories, of the existing buildings surrounding the project site are typical of the district between Washington Ave. and the River. See Attachment K Nearby Building Heights. Many of these buildings have been renovated for residential and commercial use with little if any changes to the original building envelope. New, infill, construction, with the exception of the 10 story office portion along Hennepin Avenue of the Federal Reserve Bank (which is 3 stories at 1st Avenue), is typically 4 to 8 stories.

East of Hennepin in the former Gateway Urban Renewal District, cleared of most original structures in the 1950's and 1960's, taller new office and residential construction has occurred between Washington and the River. Residential buildings include the buildings at Hennepin and 1st St of 16 stories, and the building along 1st Street N. is 27 stories. Also in the Gateway District is the 33 story Churchill Apartments on Marquette, and the under construction 39 story Carlyle on 3rd Ave. South of Washington on the west side of Hennepin Ave. the City has approved the 24 and 32 story Eclipse residential towers. The City is reviewing the "Two Twenty Two", located at 222 Hennepin Ave., the site of the current Jaguar dealership, a proposed project with 290 dwelling units in a 35 story tower. Neither the Eclipse nor the Two Twenty Two project sites are within a historic district.

8. PERMITS AND APPROVALS REQUIRED

List all known local, state and federal permits, approvals 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.

Table 8-1: Approvals, Permits And Financial Assistance

Unit of Government	Type of Application, Permit, Or Financial Assistance	Status
Federal		
State		
Department of Natural Resources	Water Appropriation Permit for construction dewatering	To be applied for if needed
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency ("MPCA")	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) General Stormwater Permit for Construction Activity	To be applied for
MPCA – Voluntary Inspection and Compliance Program	Response Action Plan	In process
	Construction Contingency Plan	In process
	No Association Letter	To be applied for
	No Further Action Letter or Certificate of Completion	To be applied for
MPCA – Petroleum Brownfields Program	Development Response Action Plan ("DRAP")	To be submitted
	Technical Review and Approval – DRAP Implementation	To be applied for
	Closure Letter	To be applied for if needed
Department of Employment and Economic Development	Contamination Investigation Grant to determine extent of site contamination	Applied for May 2006
	Contamination Cleanup Grant for site remediation	To be applied for
Regional		
Metropolitan Council	Metropolitan Council Environmental Services ("MCES") sanitary sewer connection	To be applied for
	MCES Special Discharge Permit for dewatering discharge	To be applied for if needed

Unit of Government	Type of Application, Permit, Or Financial Assistance	Status
	Tax Base Revitalization Account Environmental Cleanup Grant for site remediation	To be applied for
Local		
Hennepin County	Alteration to County road	To be applied for if needed
	Environmental Response Fund Grant for investigation	Applied for May 2006
	Environmental Response Fund Grant for cleanup	To be applied for
City of Minneapolis	Environmental Assessment Worksheet	In process
	Heritage Preservation Commission Certificates of Appropriateness	To be applied for
	Travel Demand Management Plan approval	In process
	Conditional Use Permits	To be applied for
	Site Plan Review	To be applied for
	Subdivision approval	To be applied for
	Alley Vacation	To be applied for
	Grading/Erosion Control Plan	To be applied for
	Storm Water Management Plan	To be applied for
	Demolition Permit	To be applied for
	Building Permits	To be applied for

It is not the objective of this EAW to develop all the detailed information required for the listed approvals and financial assistance. The Proposer will assemble the required information and apply for these when appropriate.

9. LAND USE

Describe current and recent past land use and development on the site and on adjacent lands. Discuss project compatibility with adjacent and nearby land uses. Indicate whether any potential conflicts involve environmental matters. Identify any potential environmental hazards due to past site uses, such as soil contamination or abandoned storage tanks, or proximity to nearby hazardous liquid or gas pipelines.

a. Current And Recent Past Land Use And Development

(1) Current Land Uses

Presently, the Pacific Block is a mix of commercial uses and parking lots. The Block comprises 107,682 square feet ("SF") and contains 6 buildings totaling approximately 86,000 square feet of gross floor space ("GFS"). They are located in Attachment B and their photos are provided in Attachment P Photos of the Present Development of the Pacific Block. The present buildings are:

- Pacific Flats building, 218-228 Washington Avenue N. ("Pacific Flats Building");
- Monte Carlo Club restaurant, 217 3rd Avenue N. ("Monte Carlo Club");
- Northwestern Glass Company building, 215-223 2nd Street N., which was originally constructed as 2 buildings ("Northwestern Building");
- Gehl Company/Dolphin building, 212 2nd Avenue N. ("Gehl-Dolphin Building");
- Lowry & Morrison Block, 200-204 Washington Avenue N. ("Lowry-Morrison Building"); and

Carriage House/Auto Repair Garage, 206 Washington Avenue N. ("Carriage House Building").

The Pacific Flats Building houses retail uses on the first floor and is vacant on the second and third floors. The Monte Carlo Club is a restaurant. The Northwestern Building includes both retail and office uses. The Gehl-Dolphin Building is used for a temporary staffing business. The Lowry-Morrison Building is boarded and unused except for 1 retail tenant on the first floor. The Carriage House Building houses a temporary service on the second floor and is vacant on the first floor. About 47% of the Pacific block is vacant land (not including the alley), and almost all of that is used for surface parking.

The Pacific Flats Building recently underwent renovation to allow retail uses on the first floor and residential uses on the upper floors. However, the second and third floors have not been divided to create residential units and are unoccupied.

A mix of office and retail uses occupy the other buildings of the block.

(2) Surrounding Land Uses

The area around the Project Site has been developed since the late 1800s and has been used for a variety of purposes, including warehouse, residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

To the west, the adjacent warehouse buildings house a variety of commercial and retail uses as well as offices and artist galleries. Beyond the railroad trench is the bulk of the North Loop (newly constructed?) housing stock. It is primarily warehouse buildings that have been recently converted to residential condominium use and newly-constructed residential condominiums.

To the north, the majority of the neighboring buildings are 3 and 4-story warehouse structures that have been adapted for office, commercial, and restaurant use. Across 1st Street N. is the recently converted 212 Lofts.

To the east, the majority of the adapted warehouse structures house office tenants. Directly across 2nd Avenue N., the Tension Envelope Building has offices on the lower floors and residential condominiums in the upper floors. Along Hennepin Avenue is the Federal Reserve complex as well as a public parking ramp. East of Hennepin in the Gateway District is a variety of office and residential high-rise buildings.

To the south, buildings along Washington Avenue are primarily commercial and office uses, with several restaurants mixed throughout. Further south is the bulk of the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) with commercial, entertainment, office, and restaurant uses.

b. Compatibility With Adjacent And Nearby Land Uses

The Project's proposed commercial, hotel, office, and residential uses are each permitted in the City's downtown zoning districts. The compatibility of these specific proposed uses at this specific site with the adjacent land uses, predominantly retail, office, restaurants, and residential condominiums, will be determined by the City's land use approval process. For a further discussion of compatibility with the character of the historic district and the *Plan For Minneapolis* and other regulations, see sections 25 and 27 of this EAW.

c. Potential Conflicts Involving Environmental Matters

The Project is not consistent with the guidelines of the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District). For a detailed discussion of this, see the responses to section 25 in this EAW.

d. Potential Environmental Hazards Due To Past Site Uses

Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessments ("Phase 1 EA" and "Phase 2 EA") have been prepared

for the Pacific Block. The following presents a summary of the historical information and current facts about environmental hazards developed in these reports.

(1) Project Site History Related To Potential Environmental Hazards

The Project Site was historically occupied with a variety of shops, stores, and manufacturers with uses that could have caused releases to the property.

- From 1885 until the 1950s, tenant space in the Pacific Flats Building was occupied by a tin shop, a soap manufacturer, a leather and saddlery shop, and a machine shop.
- A machine shop occupied an outbuilding on the Monte Carlo Club parcel from about 1890 to about 1920.
- The Northwestern Building was occupied by the Northwestern Glass Company from 1912 until the late 1970s. A permit was issued in 1956 for the installation of 4 plating tanks at the Northwestern Building. In addition, a permit was issued in 1968 for a chemical storage room at the building.
- The fourth floor of the Northwestern Building was occupied at one time by Hennepin County Vocational Services, a licensed small-quantity generator of hazardous waste. Hennepin County Vocational Services generated perchloroethylene ("PCE"), trichloroethylene ("TCE"), trichloroethane ("TCA"), methylene chloride, carbon tetrachloride and chlorinated fluorocarbons used in degreasing and corrosive waste. No violations were reported for this facility.
- A fuel-oil underground storage tank ("UST") is located at the Northwestern Building and used as a backup fuel source during periods of high natural gas demand.
- Ace Lock and Safe Company occupied space in the Lowry-Morrison Building. This business was a licensed small-quantity generator of hazardous wastes and generated ignitable waste. No violations were reported for this facility.
- From the early 1910s until the late 1950s, an auto repair shop and filling station occupied the Carriage House Building. Two gasoline USTs were associated with the filling station. No additional information was available regarding the USTs.
- Oil burner permits were issued for the Pacific Flats Building, the Lowry-Morrison Building, and the Carriage House Building in the 1940s and 1950s. A 265-gallon fuel-oil tank was installed at each building as noted on each permit. No tanks were noted at the Pacific Flats Building, Lowry-Morrison Building, or the Carriage House Building at the time of the assessments.
- Based on historic information, fires occurred at the Monte Carlo Club, the Lowry-Morrison Building, and the Carriage House Building. No additional information was available regarding the fires.
- Historically, several buildings on the Pacific Block have been demolished. It is unclear if the demolition debris were buried on the property or hauled away for disposal.

(2) Off-Site History Related To Potential Environmental Hazards

A review of nearby properties revealed the following:

- The Project Site is in close proximity to several State-regulated facilities located potentially upgradient relative to the Site.
- The Colonial Warehouse facility is located adjacent to and northwest of the Project Site, which is upgradient relative to the Site. A 6,000-gallon fuel-oil UST was registered, and 2 releases were reported at the facility. The releases have been "closed" by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency ("MPCA").

(3) Contamination Found On Project Site

The Phase 2 EA conducted by B.A. Liesch & Associates, Inc. ("Liesch") to assess the environmental conditions discussed above indicated that contamination of soil, groundwater, and buildings exists at the Project Site.

(a) *Soil Contamination*

Contamination is present in the overburden soils at various locations across the Project Site. Liesch engineers compared these levels to the MPCA's Soil Reference Values ("SRVs") and Soil Leaching Values ("SLVs"). The MPCA Tier 1 SRVs represent acceptable chronic exposure risk limits in a residential setting, and MPCA Tier 2 industrial/commercial SRVs represent acceptable chronic exposure risk limits in an industrial or commercial setting. MPCA Tier 1 SLVs represent acceptable risk limits for groundwater impact from the soil-to-groundwater leaching pathway.

Volatile organic compounds ("VOCs") found in soils at the Project Site include ethylbenzene, naphthalene, tetrachloroethene ("PCE"), toluene, 1,1,1-trichlorethane, and trichlorethene ("TCE"). One soil boring in the north corner of the Project Site contained concentrations of TCE and PCE that exceed the MPCA Tier 1 SLV, but that were below the MPCA Tier 2 SRV. One soil boring at the northwest edge of the Project Site, at the current alley, contained a concentration of TCE that exceeds the MPCA Tier 1 SLV but is below the MPCA Tier 2 industrial/commercial SRV. No other VOCs were detected above laboratory detection limits.

Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons ("PAHs") were identified in 9 of the 16 soil borings, primarily on the western half of the block. None of these PAHs, detected individually, exceed MPCA Tier 1 SLVs or MPCA Tier 2 industrial/commercial SRVs. However, Liesch also calculated Benzo(a)pyrene ("BaP") equivalents for each of the borings. The BaP equivalent is a calculated standard for select carcinogenic PAHs. These BaP equivalent calculations indicate that a soil sample taken in the north corner of the existing parking lot between the Carriage House Building and Pacific Flats Buildings exceeds both MPCA Tier 1 SLVs and MPCA Tier 2 industrial/commercial SRVs. These calculations also indicate that the soil samples for 2 other sites on the western half of the Project Site exceed the BaP equivalent MPCA Tier 2 industrial/commercial SRV value.

Various priority pollutant metals were also detected in soils in the Project Site. One occurrence each of selenium, zinc, copper, lead, beryllium, and cadmium were each detected in soil borings. Mercury, ranging in concentration from 1.7 parts per million to 155 parts per million, was detected at 4 different locations, all in the southwestern portion of the Project Site. All other priority pollutant metals detected during the Phase 2 analysis appear to be at concentrations consistent with naturally occurring ranges, and none of these other instances exceed MPCA Tier 1 SLVs or MPCA Tier 2 industrial/commercial SRVs.

The full extent of soil contamination has yet to be identified. Any existing contamination of soils on the Project Site will be addressed as described below.

(b) *Groundwater Contamination*

Of the 16 soil borings taken during the Phase 2 EA, only 1 soil boring encountered groundwater. VOC contamination, primarily from chlorinated solvents, was detected at this location. No other impacts were identified.

The full extent of groundwater contamination has yet to be identified. Any existing contamination of ground water on the Project Site will be addressed as described below.

(c) *Building Contamination*

The Phase 1 EA investigation indicated the existence of suspected asbestos-containing materials in all buildings. Materials that might or are likely to contain asbestos include ceiling panels, floor tiles, sheetrock walls, thermal system insulation, and vinyl baseboard. Sampling and microscopic analysis of these materials would be necessary to determine the actual asbestos content. Asbestos-containing material would be disposed of as described below.

Based on preliminary building assessments and the age of the buildings at the Project Site, it is

likely that some or all of the existing buildings contain lead-based paint. Lead-based paint waste would be disposed of as described below.

(4) Plan To Mitigate Project Site Contamination

A Response Action Plan and a Construction Contingency Plan have been prepared and submitted to the MPCA Voluntary Inspection and Compliance Program ("VIC Program") for approval. A Development Response Action Plan will be prepared and submitted to the MPCA Petroleum Brownfields Program ("PB Program") for approval. A No Association Letter and either a No Further Action Letter or Certificate of Completion for the clean up conducted as part of the Project will be sought from the VIC Program; a Closure Letter will be sought from the PB Program. Project Site contamination will be mitigated as required under these plans prior to and during the demolition phase of the Project.

10. COVER TYPES

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

Table 10-1: Cover Type Comparison

Cover Types	Before (acres)	After (acres)
Types 1-8 wetlands	0.00	0.00
Wooded/forest	0.00	0.00
Brush/Grassland	0.00	0.00
Cropland	0.00	0.00
Lawn/landscaping	0.02	0.48
Impervious surface	2.45	1.99
Other (describe)	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	2.47	2.47

If **Before** and **After** totals are not equal, explain why: Not applicable.

11. FISH, WILDLIFE AND ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE RESOURCES

a. Identify fish and wildlife resources and habitats on or near the site and describe how they would be affected by the project. Describe any measures to be taken to minimize or avoid impacts.

Wildlife habitat on the Pacific Block and surrounding blocks has been removed due to the intense level of development and extensive impervious surface. On-site observation confirms that this area has no natural habitat. Due to the existing limited wildlife value, the Project will have little or no impact on current wildlife, and therefore no wildlife habitat mitigation will be required.

b. Are any state-listed (endangered, threatened or special concern) species, rare plant communities or other sensitive ecological resources such as native prairie habitat, colonial waterbird nesting colonies or regionally rare plant communities on or near the site? ___ Yes ✓ No
If yes, describe the resource and how it would be affected by the project. Indicate if a site survey of the resources has been conducted and describe the results. If the DNR Natural Heritage and Nongame Research program has been contacted give the correspondence reference number: _____.
Describe measures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts.

12. PHYSICAL IMPACTS ON WATER RESOURCES

Will the project involve the physical or hydrologic alteration — dredging, filling, stream diversion, outfall structure, diking, and impoundment — of any surface waters such as a lake, pond, wetland, stream or drainage ditch? ___ Yes ✓ No

If yes, identify water resource affected and give the DNR Protected Waters Inventory number(s) if the water resources affected are on the PWI: . Describe alternatives considered and proposed mitigation measures to minimize impacts.

13. WATER USE

Will the project involve installation or abandonment of any water wells, connection to or changes in any public water supply or appropriation of any ground or surface water (including dewatering)? ✓ Yes ___ No

If yes, as applicable, give location and purpose of any new wells; public supply affected, changes to be made, and water quantities to be used; the source, duration, quantity and purpose of any appropriations; and unique well numbers and DNR appropriation permit numbers, if known. Identify any existing and new wells on the site map. If there are no wells known on site, explain methodology used to determine.

a. Water Wells

Whether water wells are present on the Pacific Block has not been determined at this time. None of the historic information indicates wells were drilled, and none are listed on any well index. If a water well is encountered during development, it will be properly abandoned in accordance with Minnesota Department of Health ("MDH") regulations.

During Project construction, localized dewatering will most likely be required to keep excavations for foundations and utilities temporarily free of standing water. The amount of dewatering is not known and will depend on where the excavation occurs, excavation depth, and groundwater conditions at the time of the excavation. Permanent dewatering will not likely be required. The required permits will be obtained from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources for groundwater appropriation and from Metropolitan Council Environmental Services for discharge to the sanitary sewer system. The construction contractor will comply with all dewatering and discharge regulations in these permits.

b. Connection To City Water Supply System

The Project will connect to the City water supply system for both domestic and fire protection purposes. Average daily water use can be estimated based upon the estimated wastewater flow. See Item 18 in this EAW. Using this method, the average daily water use for the Project is estimated to be up to 200,000 gallons per day ("gpd"). In addition to average daily use, irrigation of landscaped areas during dry periods is expected.

Minimum flow required for fire protection is 500 gallons per minute with a residual system pressure of not less than 20 pounds per square inch (AWWA, Manual M-31, 1989). Actual fire flow requirements will be reviewed by a commercial insurer and will depend on the Project fire protection systems provided in accordance with nationally recognized fire code standards.

14. WATER-RELATED LAND USE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Does any part of the project involve a shoreland zoning district, a delineated 100-year flood plain, or a state or federally designated wild or scenic river land use district? ___ Yes ✓ No

If yes, identify the district and discuss project compatibility with district land use restrictions.

15. WATER SURFACE USE

Will the project change the number or type of watercraft on any water body?

___ Yes ✓ No

If yes, indicate the current and projected watercraft usage and discuss any potential overcrowding or conflicts with other uses.

16. EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION

Give the acreage to be graded or excavated and the cubic yards of soil to be moved: acres 1.8 acres **; cubic yards** up to 50,000 cubic yards **.**
Describe any steep slopes or highly erodible soils and identify them on the site map. Describe any erosion and sedimentation control measures to be used during and after project construction.

a. Steep Slopes or highly Erodible Soils

No steep slopes or highly erodible soils exist on the Pacific Block.

b. Erosion And Sedimentation

The Project will involve removal of pavement, demolition of existing buildings, and excavation for basement space and the below grade portion of the new parking ramp. Ultimately about 1.8 acres of the existing 2.47-acre site will be disturbed, and as much as 50,000 cubic yards of material could be excavated, depending in part on the amount of contaminated soil that might be removed. A detailed grading plan has not been developed at this time, so these are estimated values.

Erosion and sediment control measures will have to comply with the City' erosion control ordinance and the MPCA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) General Permit for Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (MN R100001). To comply with these regulations, the Project contractor must develop an Erosion and Grading Plan (City) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (MPCA) and follow both plans during construction.

Both plans will include best management practices including the following:

- Construction operations will be limited to the Project Site.
- Heavy-duty silt fence and other silt control measures will be used where necessary to control surface water runoff and sediment.
- Stabilized rock construction exits will be installed.
- Surface areas disturbed by grading activities will be restored promptly by buildings, sidewalk, driveways, or plantings.

All erosion control measures will be installed and maintained according to the applicable regulatory requirements.

The permanent sediment control requirements of the MPCA General Permit for Storm Water Associated With Construction Activity (MN R100001) do not apply to this Project because there will be no increase in impervious surface on the Project Site.

17. WATER QUALITY: SURFACE WATER RUNOFF

a. Compare the quantity and quality of site runoff before and after the project. Describe permanent controls to manage or treat runoff. Describe any stormwater pollution prevention plans.

Essentially all of the 2.47-acre Project Site is impervious. Currently storm drainage from the surface parking lots discharges overland to the street gutters and thence to existing storm sewers in 3rd Avenue N., 2nd Street N., and 2nd Avenue N. Roof drainage discharges overland or through underground roof drains to the same municipal storm sewers. The storm sewers connect to a trunk storm sewer or tunnel that discharges to the Mississippi River.

(1) Storm Water Runoff Rate And Volume

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (formerly the Soil Conservation Service ("SCS")) has developed a method to compute storm water runoff rates and volumes. This method was documented in the SCS publication "Technical Release 55" ("TR 55"). For purposes of computing storm-water runoff, an SCS runoff curve number (or runoff coefficient) is selected based on the cover type and soil conditions. The SCS TR 55 method classifies soils into 1 of 4 categories based on drainage characteristics. Soils in hydrologic soil group B are moderately to well drained soils (silty sand loams) and are a predominant soil type found in the Twin Cities. For impervious areas, a curve number of 98 is used for all soil types, and this generates the maximum runoff amounts. The Project Site generates the maximum runoff rate and volume expected from a fully developed site.

Computations of the pre-Project (before) and post-Project (after) peak discharge rates and runoff volumes from the design storm events have not been completed yet. However, given the reduction in the amount of impervious surface on the Project Site, the rate or volume of runoff from the Site will diminish. Generally, the City requires that Project runoff rates not exceed the pre-development runoff rates.

The Project could comply with all runoff rate control requirements applicable to the Project Site without further mitigation. However, the Project design includes green roof terraces that will reduce the volume of storm water runoff.

(2) Storm Water Runoff Quality And Mitigation Measures

Storm water runoff from the Project may include pollutants typically associated with commercial land use. These pollutants include suspended solids, nutrients, trace metals, petroleum-derived hydrocarbons, chloride, and litter. The City requires removal of 70% of suspended solids from the designated design storm event.

The Project will improve storm water runoff by incorporating the following mitigation measures.

- A Storm Water Management Plan will be prepared in compliance with the City's Site Plan Review process. In preparing this plan, storm water pollution prevention practices identified in the MPCA manual *Protecting Water Quality in Urban Areas, Best Management Practices for Minnesota, 1991*, and the Metropolitan Council Environmental Service's *Minnesota Urban Small Site Best Management Practice Manual, 2001* will be evaluated to determine feasible and appropriate practices to be included with the Project. If required, such measures could include wet vault(s), underground filtration chamber(s), bio-retention area(s), or grit separators.
- All Project parking will be enclosed, and these surfaces will drain to the sanitary sewer, not to street gutters or storm sewers.
- The Project is expected to include a green roof terrace totaling 21,000 SF or about 21% of the total roof area. This will reduce the storm-water runoff and suspended solids in the runoff.
- The Project will incorporate other best management practices to manage and reduce storm-water pollution – including diligent maintenance of grounds and landscaping and pavement maintenance.

(3) Summary

Storm water discharges to the receiving waters will be controlled in accordance with all permitting agency requirements. Potential adverse water quality impacts will be reduced by the green roof areas, wet vault(s), grit separators, or some combination of these devices that would be constructed as part of the Project, and by best management practices followed during operation. The Project is expected to reduce the volume of storm water runoff and improve its quality compared to current conditions.

b. Identify routes and receiving water bodies for runoff from the site; include major downstream water bodies as well as the immediate receiving waters. Estimate impact runoff on the quality of receiving waters.

See the response to Item 17.a. immediately above.

18. WATER QUALITY: WASTEWATERS

a. Describe sources, composition and quantities of all sanitary, municipal and industrial wastewater produced or treated at the site.

Wastewater generated by the Project will be typical domestic sewage. This estimated maximum daily flow can be computed by the Metropolitan Council Environmental Services' "Service Availability Charge" method. Based on the anticipated development size, and typical values for average wastewater flows expected from the type of development proposed, the maximum average daily flow is estimated to be 200,000 gallons.

The peak design flow can be determined by application of a peak flow factor to the average daily flow. Peak flow factors are identified in *Recommended Standards for Wastewater Facilities* (A report of the Commission of Great Lakes Upper Mississippi River Board of State Public Health and Environmental Managers, 1990 Edition). The peak flow factors are dependent on population size served and vary from 2.0 to 4.2. Assuming a peak flow factor of 4.0, the estimated peak design flow from the proposed expansion is 1.2 cubic feet per second.

Existing sanitary sewers located in 3rd Avenue N., 2nd Street N., and 2nd Avenue N. receive sewage from the Project Site. The City has indicated that adequate sewer capacity is available to serve the Project.

b. Describe waste treatment methods or pollution prevention efforts and give estimates of composition after treatment. Identify receiving waters, including major downstream water bodies, and estimate the discharge impact on the quality of receiving waters. If the project involves on-site sewage systems, discuss the suitability of site conditions for such systems.

All wastewater from the Project will be treated in the Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Plant in Saint Paul. This plant is owned by the Metropolitan Council and operated by Metropolitan Council Environmental Services. The receiving water is the Mississippi River. The plant is permitted by the MPCA and must meet its permit standards for effluent discharge to the river. The additional waste water from the Project is within the plant's volume capacity and will not alter the plant's ability to meet its permit requirements.

c. If wastes will be discharged into a publicly owned treatment facility, identify the facility, describe any pretreatment provisions and discuss the facility's ability to handle the volume and composition of wastes, identifying any improvements necessary.

See the response to Item 18.b. immediately above.

d. If the project requires disposal of liquid animal manure, describe disposal technique and location and discuss capacity to handle the volume and composition of manure. Identify any improvements necessary. Describe any required setbacks for land disposal systems.

Not applicable.

19. GEOLOGIC HAZARDS AND SOIL CONDITIONS

a. Approximate depth (in feet) to ground water: minimum 24 ft. ; **average** unknown .
to bedrock: minimum 10 ft. **; average** 11 ft. **.**
Describe any of the following geologic site hazards to ground water and also identify them on the site map: sinkholes, shallow limestone formations or karst conditions. Describe measures to avoid or minimize environmental problems due to any of these hazards.

Easement documents indicate the presence of a Minnesota Department of Transportation ("MnDOT") storm water tunnel at least 50 feet below ground level under portions of the Pacific Block. The foundation design

for infill buildings and the parking ramp near the tunnel will need to protect the tunnel while providing sufficient support for these structures.

b. Describe the soils on the site, giving NRCS (SCS) classifications, if known. Discuss soil granularity and potential for groundwater contamination from wastes or chemicals spread or spilled onto the soils. Discuss any mitigation measures to prevent such contamination.

Soil borings indicate that site geology is generally characterized by 10 to 12 feet of silty to sandy surfical soils followed by weathered limestone bedrock.

Based upon soil types present, there is potential for shallow groundwater to be affected by a release from the Project. However, based upon its intended residential and commercial use, the Project will not use significant quantities of petroleum or hazardous substances. If petroleum is used (for example for emergency generators), it would be stored on impervious surfaces, and storage tanks would have secondary containment as required by the City Fire Marshal and
MPCA regulations. Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for impacts from the Project.

20. SOLID WASTES, HAZARDOUS WASTES, STORAGE TANKS

a. Describe types, amounts and compositions of solid or hazardous wastes, including solid animal manure, sludge and ash, produced during construction and operation. Identify method and location of disposal. For projects generating municipal solid waste, indicate if there is a source separation plan; describe how the project will be modified for recycling. If hazardous waste is generated, indicate if there is a hazardous waste minimization plan and routine hazardous waste reduction assessments.

(1) Demolition And Construction Waste

Building demolition will create demolition waste. This waste will be disposed of at an appropriate demolition landfill permitted to accept such waste. Construction activities will generate construction wastes. These wastes will be handled and disposed of at appropriate, permitted disposal facilities.

(2) Solid Waste

The California Integrated Waste Management Board has published Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates that can be used to predict solid waste generation. These rates indicate that, on average, multifamily residential units generate about 5 pounds per unit per day, commercial and retail uses generate about 18 pounds per 1,000 s.f. per day, and restaurants generate about 1 pound per seat per day. Using these averages, the estimated daily municipal solid waste generated from the Project would be approximately 4,500 pounds, or 820 tons per year. Private contractors will haul the solid waste to the Hennepin County Energy Recovery Facility or to private landfills.

The City and Hennepin County currently have an active recycling program. This program reduces the amount of municipal solid waste by collecting waste paper, magazines, newspapers, aluminum cans, glass, and plastic bottles for recycling. Recycling space will be provided in the Project as required by State regulations. See Minn. Rules 1303.1500.

(3) Hazardous Waste

Asbestos containing materials will be inventoried and be removed prior to demolition and disposed of properly in a licensed landfill. Lead based paints and other hazardous building materials will be inventoried prior to demolition and properly disposed of according to State and Federal requirements.

Any hazardous waste generated when the soil contamination is remediated will be handled in accord with the MPCA VIC Program approved Response Action Plan and Construction Contingency Plan. For a more detailed discussion of this process, see Item 9 in this EAW.

b. Identify any toxic or hazardous materials to be used or present at the site and identify measures to be used to prevent them from contaminating groundwater. If the use of toxic or hazardous materials will

lead to a regulated waste, discharge or emission, discuss any alternatives considered to minimize or eliminate the waste, discharge or emission.

The Developer does not expect that significant quantities of toxic or hazardous substances will be stored or used during or after construction. If small amounts of these materials are present during or after construction, they will be stored and handled in conformance with MPCA regulatory requirements.

c. Indicate the number, location, size and use of any above or below ground tanks to store petroleum products or other materials, except water. Describe any emergency response containment plans.

One UST is buried adjacent to the Northwestern Building and holds fuel oil for use in heating the building during periods of high demand. The Developer does not intend to install any USTs, but may store diesel fuel for 1 or more emergency generators in above-ground tanks. These tanks would be installed and maintained in compliance with City Fire Marshall and MPCA requirements.

21. TRAFFIC

Parking spaces added: 640 .
Existing spaces if project involves expansion: 160 .

Total spaces will be comprised of 680 standard spaces and 120 compact spaces.

Estimated total average daily traffic generated: Maximum daily traffic generated at full build-out will be 4,249 trips.

Estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated (if known) and time of occurrence:
Maximum traffic generation will occur during the p.m. peak hour (4:30 to 5:30) when 365 trips will be generated. 230 trips will be generated during the a.m. peak hour.

Provide an estimate of the impact on traffic congestion on affected roads and describe any traffic improvements necessary. If the project is within the Twin Cities metropolitan area, discuss its impact on the regional transportation system.

SRF Consulting Group, Inc. has completed a Travel Demand Management Plan ("TDMP") traffic study for this Project and the Project Site ("Traffic Study"). The traffic analysis was based on a land use program for the Project that included 450 owner-occupied housing units, a 150 room hotel, and 105,000 SF of commercial and retail space. This Traffic Study includes an operations analysis during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours for existing and future no build and build conditions (year 2009).

A copy of the complete Traffic Study is available for review at room 210 City Hall and may be posted on the City's website with this EAW.

Traffic operations were analyzed at the following intersections:

- Washington Avenue N. and 1st Avenue N.
- Washington Avenue N. and 2nd Avenue N.
- Washington Avenue N. and 3rd Avenue N.
- Washington Avenue N. and 5th Avenue N.
- 3rd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N.
- 2nd Street N. and 3rd Avenue N.
- 2nd Street N. and 2nd Avenue N.
- 1st Street N. and 3rd Avenue N.

Current traffic controls include signalization at all intersections, except for the 2nd Street N./2nd Avenue N. and

1st Street N./3rd Avenue N. intersections (all-way stop and side-street stop control, respectively). SRF Consulting Group, Inc. collected a.m. and p.m. peak hour turning movement counts in February 2006. Based on current traffic conditions in the Project area, there is a higher concern with operations during the evening or p.m. weekday peak hour. Therefore, only 2 key intersections were counted during the morning or a.m. weekday peak hour, as identified by City staff (Washington Avenue N./2nd Avenue N. and Washington Avenue N./3rd Avenue N.).

The Project is to be fully constructed by year 2008. Therefore, traffic forecasts were developed for year 2009 (1 year after construction) no build and build conditions. Based on discussions with City staff, an annual growth rate of 1% was applied to the existing peak hour volumes to develop the background traffic forecasts. In addition, trips were added for the Eclipse development, which is expected to develop by year 2009.

a. Trip Generation:

Trip generation estimates for a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic and daily traffic were calculated for the Project based on trip generation rates from the 2003 ITE Trip Generation Reports. Consideration was given to peak hour trips currently generated by the existing developments on the Project Site. The existing land use type and size was reviewed and compared to the proposed land use types and sizes. The existing trips were estimated during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours using the ITE trip generation rates and then subtracted from the future trip generation estimates, prior to distributing trips to the adjacent roadway network. Where applicable, a 15% multi-use trip reduction was applied to account for internal trips amongst the various uses.

The proposed Project is located in Downtown Minneapolis with multiple transit options (light rail and bus transit) available within walking distance. In addition, other mode choices are available (bicycle and pedestrian options). Therefore, a 20% modal reduction was applied to the future trip generation estimates.

b. Trip Distribution And Impact On Regional System

The directional trip distribution for the Project Site-generated trips was developed based on existing travel patterns in the area and regional average daily traffic volumes. The trip generation estimates were distributed to the adjacent roadway network using the directional trip distribution percentages and added to the background traffic forecasts for year 2009.

Based on the resultant trip distribution patterns, it is projected that about 20% of the Site-generated trips will be directly to and from the regional transportation system via Interstate 394 ("I-394").

c. Intersection Capacity Analysis:

To determine how well the existing and future roadway system currently operates, and will operate, an operations analysis was completed for existing (year 2006) condition, year 2009 no build conditions, and year 2009 build conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at each of the respective intersections.

(1) Existing Conditions

Under existing conditions (year 2006),all intersections operate at an acceptable level of service ("LOS") D or better during each peak hour, with existing traffic controls, signal timing, and geometric layout.

(2) Year 2009 No Build Conditions

Under year 2009 *a.m.* peak hour no build conditions, 1 of the 2 key intersections, the Washington Avenue N. /2nd Avenue N. intersection, will operate at an acceptable overall LOS D, with existing traffic controls, signal timing, and geometric layout. The other, the Washington Avenue N./3rd Avenue N. intersection, will operate at an unacceptable LOS E.

Under year 2009 *p.m.* peak hour no build conditions, only 1 intersection will operate at an acceptable overall LOS D, with existing traffic controls, signal timing and geometric layout. All other intersections will operate at unacceptable levels of service.

Signal timing improvements will improve each intersection to an acceptable LOS D or better under year 2009 no build conditions during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

(3) Year 2009 Build Conditions

Under year 2009 *a.m.* peak hour build conditions, both key intersections will operate at an acceptable overall LOS C or better, with existing traffic controls, and geometric layout. Please note that the build condition a.m. peak hour analysis was conducted using the no build condition optimized signal timing.

Under year 2009 *p.m.* peak hour build conditions, all but 1 key intersection will operate at an acceptable overall LOS D or better, with existing traffic controls and geometric layout. The intersection of 1st Street N./3rd Avenue N. will operate at unacceptable LOS F/F. Please note that the build condition p.m. peak hour analysis was conducted using the no build condition optimized signal timing.

In order to improve operations for year 2009 p.m. peak hour build conditions, 2 key intersections (Washington Avenue N./2nd Avenue N. and Washington Avenue/3rd Avenue N.) are recommended for intersection phasing changes, and all intersections are recommended for overall intersection timing improvements (splits and offsets).

d. Mitigation Summary

(1) Year 2009 No Build Mitigation

Minor signal timing improvements (optimizing the network intersection splits and offsets, not the cycle length) will improve the intersection operations to acceptable LOS C under year 2009 no build conditions during the *a.m.* peak hour. It should be noted that minor signal timing improvements could be implemented under existing conditions to reduce the queue issues observed. In order to improve operations for year 2009 *p.m.* peak hour no build conditions, all intersections are recommended for signal timing improvements (intersection splits and offsets, not the cycle length).

(2) Year 2009 Build Mitigation

Under year 2009 build conditions during the *p.m.* peak hour, 2 key intersections (Washington Avenue N./2nd Avenue N. and Washington Avenue N./3rd Avenue N.) are recommended for intersection phasing changes. These 2 key intersections should be modified to include southbound protected/permitted left-turn phases to reduce the directional queues for the southbound approach at each intersection. In addition, all intersections are recommended for overall signal timing optimization (intersection splits and offsets, not the cycle length).

e. Parking

The Project will provide adequate parking to meet the City zoning requirements.

f. Construction

While the Project is under construction, the adjacent parking lanes will be disrupted along each block face. Using the parking lane for construction purposes should limit the impact to the adjacent traffic lanes, thus allowing traffic to continue to flow without interruption.

22. VEHICLE-RELATED AIR EMISSIONS

Estimate the effect of the project's traffic generation on air quality, including carbon monoxide levels. Discuss the effect of traffic improvements or other mitigation measures on air quality impacts. Note: If the project involves 500 or more parking spaces, consult *EAW Guidelines* about whether a detailed air quality analysis is needed.

All intersections analyzed (see Traffic Study) for this Project are predicted to operate at level of service LOS C

or better. Intersections operating at this level of service tend not to have enough idling traffic to cause persistent CO concentrations at the magnitude of the State standards. SRF Consulting Group, Inc. determined that detailed intersection hot-spot analysis is not warranted because no intersections are predicted to operate at LOS E or lower. It should be noted that the detailed turning movements were reviewed in addition to the operations analysis. No violations of State air quality standards are expected as a result of this Project.

23. STATIONARY SOURCE AIR EMISSIONS

Describe the type, sources, quantities and compositions of any emissions from stationary sources of air emissions such as boilers, exhaust stacks or fugitive dust sources. Include any hazardous air pollutants (consult *EAW Guidelines* for a listing) and any greenhouse gases (such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide) and ozone-depleting chemicals (chloro-fluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons or sulfur hexafluoride). Also describe any proposed pollution prevention techniques and proposed air pollution control devices. Describe the impacts on air quality.

An air quality permit might be required for diesel emissions for 1 or more emergency generators installed as part of the Project. This will depend on the type and size of generator installed and its primary fuel. If a permit is required, the Developer will apply to the MPCA for the permit and abide by its requirements.

No other Project air emissions are expected to require an air quality permit.

24. ODORS, NOISE AND DUST

Will the project generate odors, noise or dust during construction or during operation? ✓ Yes ___ No

If yes, describe sources, characteristics, duration, quantities or intensity and any proposed measures to mitigate adverse impacts. Also identify locations of nearby sensitive receptors and estimate impacts on them. Discuss potential impacts on human health or quality of life. (Note: fugitive dust generated by operations may be discussed at item 23 instead of here.)

a. Odors

The construction and occupancy of the project is not expected to generate objectionable odors.

b. Construction Noise

The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances regulates both the hours of operation for construction equipment and allowable noise levels. Construction of the Project will comply with these requirements.

c. Operational Noise

The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances and the MPCA regulate mechanical noise associated with building operation. The occupancy of the Project will comply with these requirements.

d. Demolition And Construction Dust

During demolition and construction, contractors will follow best management practices to reduce dust emissions. During demolition, this will include wetting down the building and debris with hoses as necessary.

e. Fugitive Dust Emissions After Occupancy

Once occupied, the Project is not expected to generate fugitive dust emissions.

f. Traffic Noise

(1) Regulatory Framework

Traffic is a common source of noise in an urban setting and is regulated in Minnesota by the MPCA under Minnesota Statute § 116.07, Subds. 2 and 4. State noise standards have been established for defined daytime and nighttime periods. Two levels are considered: "L_{10}" which applies to noise generated from 10% of any 1 hour period, that is 6 minutes; and "L_{50}" which applies to noise generated for 50% of any 1 hour period, that is 30 minutes. For residential land uses (identified as Noise Area Classification 1 or NAC-1), the State standards for L_{10} are 65 dBA for daytime and 55 dBA for nighttime; the standards for L_{50} are 60 dBA for daytime and 50 dBA for nighttime. For commercial uses (identified as Noise Area Classification 2 or NAC-2) the State standards for L_{10} are 70 dBA for daytime and nighttime; the standards for L_{50} are 65 dBA for daytime and nighttime. For reference, state standards are summarized in Table 24-1.

Minnesota Statute § 116.07, Subd. 2a. states that municipal and county roads, except in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, are exempt from State noise standards. All the roads near the proposed Project Site are Hennepin County or City roads within the City.

Table 24-1: Minnesota State Noise Standards

Land Use	Noise Area	Day (7 a.m. – 10 p.m.) dBA		Night (10 p.m. – 7 a.m.) dBA	
Residential	NAC-1	L_{10} of 65	L_{50} of 60	L_{10} of 55	L_{50} of 50
Commercial	NAC-2	L_{10} of 70	L_{50} of 65	L_{10} of 70	L_{50} of 65
Industrial	NAC-3	L_{10} of 80	L_{50} of 75	L_{10} of 80	L_{50} of 75

(2) Noise Analysis

The proposed Project is located in a developed urban setting with primarily commercial and residential land uses surrounding the Project Site. High traffic roads such as Washington Avenue are located adjacent to or in the vicinity.

A detailed noise analysis was completed to assess existing traffic noise levels in the Project area and to determine what effect the proposed project will have on future noise levels. The Project will increase traffic volumes in some parts of the study area. Increases in traffic can result in increased noise levels, which can be perceived as an annoyance by residents. The noise analysis consisted of determining existing and predicting future noise levels using computer models. Due to traffic noise being the primary source of noise in the area, the computer model will accurately forecast area noise levels.

Noise is defined as any unwanted sound. Sound travels in a wave motion and produces a sound pressure level. This sound pressure level is commonly measured in decibels. Decibels (dB) represent the logarithmic increase in sound energy relative to a reference energy level. To approximate the way that an average person hears sound, an adjustment, or weighting, of the high- and low- pitched sounds is made. The adjusted sound levels are stated in units of "A-weighted decibels" (dBA). A sound increase of 3 dBA is barely perceptible to the human ear, a 5 dBA increase is clearly noticeable, and a 10 dBA increase is heard as twice as loud. For example, if the sound energy is doubled (e.g., the amount of traffic doubles), there is a 3 dBA increase in noise, which is just barely noticeable to most people. On the other hand, if traffic increases to where there is 10 times the sound energy level over a reference level, then there is a 10 dBA increase and it is heard as twice as loud.

In Minnesota, traffic noise impacts are evaluated by measuring or modeling the traffic noise levels that are exceeded 10% and 50% of the time during the hours of the day or night that has the heaviest traffic. These numbers are identified as the L_{10} and L_{50} levels. For example, an L_{10} value of 65 dBA means that the noise level was at or greater than 65 dBA during 10 % of the measurement period

(i.e., more than 6 minutes in any 1-hour period).

(3) Noise Modeling Methodology

Traffic noise impacts were assessed by modeling noise levels at "sensitive" receptor sites (that is, residences and outdoor public areas) likely to be most affected by changes in traffic volumes resulting from construction of the Project.

Three noise modeling receptors (R1, R2, and R3) were selected at proposed residential and outdoor public areas within the Project to represent those sites most sensitive to potential Project-related traffic noise impacts. Attachment L: Noise Modeling Receptor Sites shows the modeled receptor sites. Receptor sites R1 and R2 are classified within the definition of Noise Area Classification Two (NAC-2). Receptor site R3 is classified within the definition of Noise Area Classification One (NAC-1) under the Project's land uses.

Noise modeling was done using the noise prediction program "MINNOISE," a version of the Federal Highway Administration noise model "STAMINA" adapted by MnDOT and approved by the MPCA. This model uses vehicle numbers, speed, class of vehicle, and the typical characteristics of the roadway being analyzed. The computations for the model run to predict noise levels were based on existing (year 2006) and projected (year 2009) no build and build peak daytime and nighttime hours, traffic volumes, existing traffic speeds, and vehicle class percentages.

(4) Noise Modeling Results

Noise modeling results for existing (year 2006) conditions and for the year 2009 are presented in Tables 24-2 and 24-3. Both daytime and nighttime L_{10} and L_{50} are shown for the existing (year 2006) condition and for year 2009 no build and build conditions.

Table 24-2: Noise Modeling Results
Daytime Peak Hour (4:30 – 5:30 P.M.)

Receptor	**Modeled Existing (2006)**		**Modeled 2009 No-Build**		**Modeled 2009 Build**	
	L_{10}	L_{50}	L_{10}	L_{50}	L_{10}	L_{50}
R1 (Outdoor Eating Area)	65	59	65	59	66	60
R2 (Outdoor Public Area)	55	49	56	49	56	50
State Standards	**70**	**65**	**70**	**65**	**70**	**65**
R3 (Proposed Residential)	65	56	**66**	56	**67**	58
State Standards	**65**	**60**	**65**	**60**	**65**	**60**

Bold numbers are above state standards.

Table 24-3: Noise Modeling Results
Nighttime Peak Hour (6:00 – 7:00 a.m.)

Receptor	Modeled Existing (Year 2006)		Modeled Year 2009 No Build		Modeled Year 2009 Build	
	L_{10}	L_{50}	L_{10}	L_{50}	L_{10}	L_{50}
R1 (Outdoor Eating Area)	62	55	63	55	63	55
R2 (Outdoor Public Area)	52	44	53	45	53	45
State Standards	**70**	**65**	**70**	**65**	**70**	**65**
R3 (Proposed Residential)	**61**	**51**	**62**	**51**	**63**	**52**
State Standards	**55**	**50**	**55**	**50**	**55**	**50**

Bold numbers are above state standards.

(5) Results

The increases in background traffic volumes between existing (year 2006) and year 2009 no build conditions resulted in a predicted increase in modeled traffic noise levels of up to 1 dBA, which is not a perceptible difference to the human ear. Increases in traffic between year 2009 no build and year 2009 build result in an increase in modeled traffic noise levels of up to 1 dBA as well. Comparing the existing (year 2006) noise levels to the predicted year 2009 build levels, the noise increases are all 1 dBA, except for the 2 dBA nighttime peak hour increase at Receptor R3. None of these increases are perceptible to the human ear.

State daytime standards are not currently exceeded at any receptor locations but will be exceeded for both the year 2009 no build and build alternatives at Receptor R3. Receptor R2, located in the center of the Pacific Street Block, has buildings which act as noise barriers between traffic noise and the outdoor public area (currently a parking lot), resulting in lower noise levels compared to the other receptors.

Nighttime noise standards are currently exceeded at the proposed residential receptor location (R3) and will continue to be exceeded with the year 2009 no build and build alternatives. Noise levels exceeding the more stringent nighttime standards are common in developed urban and suburban areas, because the "nighttime" period is defined by the MPCA as including the 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 a.m. hour, which is the beginning of the morning rush hour. Other projects have been approved with similar noise levels under these standards of review.

(6) Conclusions

Construction of the proposed project will result in increases in traffic noise of up to 1 dBA which is not a perceptible difference to the human ear. Noise in the proposed residential areas in the Project will exceed daytime and nighttime noise standards. However, the breaks necessary to accommodate the side-street and driveway entrances and the proximity of the development to the roadway would not allow the construction of effective noise barriers. Therefore, no noise mitigation is required or is being considered in conjunction with the Project.

25. NEARBY RESOURCES

Are any of the following resources on or in proximity to the site?
Archaeological, historical or architectural resources? ✓ Yes ___ No
Prime or unique farmlands or land within an agricultural preserve? ___ Yes ✓ No
Designated parks, recreation areas or trails? ✓ Yes ___ No
Scenic views and vistas? ✓ Yes ___ No

Other unique resources? ___ Yes ✓ No
If yes, describe the resource and identify any project-related impacts on the resource. Describe any measures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts.

a. Archaeological Resources

Located in one of the first areas settled when the west side of the Mississippi was opened to pioneers in the mid-nineteenth century, the Pacific Block has been occupied by a variety of buildings since that time. As a result of this development, the ground has been extensively disturbed, making it unlikely that any significant prehistoric or historic artifacts survive.

b. Historic Resources

The project area is historically significant as the area of early commercial growth during the development of the City that established Minneapolis as the trade center for the Upper Midwest. In recognition of this heritage, and to preserve this resource that focuses on some of the oldest standing buildings in the City, the area has been designated both locally and nationally as a historic district.

The block of the project site is entirely within the National Register of Historic Places Minneapolis Warehouse District, and with the exception of the building at 212 Second Avenue North, entirely within the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission's North Loop Warehouse Area District. Each of the buildings on the site except for 212 Second Avenue North and 206/208 Washington Ave. North have been identified as contributing. No contributing structure is proposed for complete demolition for this project. All front facades will be retained, but some of the rear potions of the Monte Carlo Club Restaurant (217 Third Ave. North) and the Northwestern Glass Company (219 Second St. North) will be demolished and replaced by the 7 level (5 story) parking ramp and interior courtyard serving the development.

The project is adjacent to, across 2nd St. North, but not included in the Nationally and Locally designated Saint Anthony Falls Historic District. See Attachment M: Map of St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (National Register)
The Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District, covering 150 buildings, was designated in 1989. Washington Avenue North, from 1st to 9th Avenues N., is the spine of this 30-block district. This National Register district includes the Pacific Block, as well the adjacent blocks, with the exception of the I-394 access at the southwest corner of Washington and 3rd Avenues North. and the far (1st Avenue North.) side of the block between 2nd Street N. and Washington Avenue North, which contains a printing company and parking lots. On the Pacific Block, the Carriage House Buildings at 208 Washington Avenue North and the Gehl-Dolphin building at 212 2nd Avenue North are considered noncontributing; the rest of the buildings on the block contribute to the district. See Attachments N: Map of Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (National Register), B: Project Site, and P: Photos of Present Development of the Pacific Flats Block.

North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District)
The City has established a local district, the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) in the area under the guidelines of the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC). The north end of this district is irregular in shape, including most of the buildings southwest of 2nd Street North between the railroad corridor, 2nd Avenue North, and Washington Avenue N. However, on the Pacific Block, the Gehl-Dolphin Building and lot at 212 2nd Avenue North are excluded from the boundaries. The district also includes the southwest half of the block fronting on Washington that is edged by 1st and 2nd Avenues North and 2nd Street North. The district jumps across 3rd Avenue to pick up the Moline, Milburn and Stoddard Company Building (a.k.a. Appliance Parts Building/Traffic Zone) at 250 3rd Avenue North. The rest of the district is mostly contained between 2nd Avenue North, 6th Street North, and 1st Avenue North, including the buildings fronting on the southeast side of 1st Avenue North. The modern building at the southeast corner of 1st Ave North and Washington Avenues is outside the boundaries of the local district. See Attachments O: Map of North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District), B: Project Site, and P: Photos of Present Development of the Pacific Flats Block.

The proposed renovation of the Lowry-Morrison Building, the demolition of back portion of the Northwestern Building, and the construction of new structures in the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) will initiate a Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) review for appropriateness of the proposed renovation, demolition, and new construction. The HPC has adopted district specific guidelines to assist them and proposers in determining the appropriateness of elements of the proposed renovation, demolition, and new construction. The guidelines for the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) touch on topics such as masonry repair, storefronts, window replacement, roofing, dropped interior ceilings, removal of historical fabric, health and safety code requirements, building entrances, accent banding, and treatment of side or rear walls.

Two sections of the Guidelines, "Guidelines For Rehabilitation of Buildings " and "Infill Construction" addresses the overall compatibility of the elements in the Project with the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District):

II. Guidelines For Rehabilitation of Buildings

1. Masonry repair.
   - A. No exterior sandblasting is permitted.
   - B. Chemical cleaning is not permitted on glazed brick, glazed terra cotta, limestone, marble or other masonry material susceptible to damage from chemical exposure.
   - C. Repointing of masonry joints shall be done with a mortar composition and color to match original mortar, joints shall be tooled to match original profile.

2. Storefronts.
   - A. Wherever existing storefronts remain, critical details shall be retained, e.g., cast iron columns, wood molding, trim, terra cotta ornament.
   - B. Modifications to entries shall be permitted as required for the adaptive reuse of the buildings. Modifications shall be constructed with materials to match original storefronts.
   - C. Handicap accessibility shall be done within the building where ramping with guard rails is required on street facades. Appropriate modifications to the facade will be permitted for on-grade access.
   - D. New storefronts will be permitted where original storefronts have been removed. New storefronts shall replicate original where historical photos exist or be designed in the spirit of the original buildings with characteristics as follows:
     - Clear glass
     - Transoms over storefront
     - Recessed entry doors
     - Raised panels below storefronts
     - Use of historic columns compatible with the buildings and era
     - Storefronts shall be divided into bays corresponding with the window bay pattern above. Bays may be divided with brick, cast iron, terra cotta panels or other historically compatible materials.

3. Window replacement.
   - A. Windows which have unique architectural or historically significant details which cannot be duplicated must be retained.
   - B. Window replacement other than item A shall be permitted if original windows are badly deteriorated or provide inadequate thermal performance. (Use of interior storm windows shall be encouraged.)
   - C. Replacement windows may be wood or aluminum. Window paning shall be provided to replicate existing wood moldings.
   - D. Replacement windows must have a true offset, single- or double-hung operation. (They need not be operable.)
   - E. Replacement windows will have a paint finish. (Anodized windows will not be permitted.)

F. Replacement windows shall have clear glass unless historical documentation suggests otherwise.

4. Roofing.
   A. Modern roofing materials will be permitted on flat roofs.
   B. Original copings on street facings shall be retained or replaced. Metal coping with a paint finish will be permitted as replacement for brick copings on common walls.
   C. Roof top additions which project above parapet walls such as deck, skylights, penthouses, and mechanical equipment shall be set back from the primary building or street facades at least one structural bay.

5. Dropped interior ceilings.
   A. Interior dropped ceilings shall be held away 5'0" from exterior window when they drop below the existing window head.

6. Removal of historical fabric.
   A. Selective removal of original building materials is allowed when deterioration has occurred or for remodeling as part of an adaptive reuse. HPC approval is required to remove any historic building materials.

7. Health and safety code requirements.
   Exterior alterations required by health and safety codes also require HPC review. When necessary, the HPC can argue for exceptions to the building code when life safety issues are not involved.

III. Guidelines For Infill Construction

1. Decision intent.
   A. The intent of these guidelines is for infill construction which characterizes a masonry loading bearing building and not a contemporary curtain wall structure. The existing warehouse buildings followed early commercial ideas for tall buildings which emulate the classic column with a defined base shaft and capital. Creative design concepts are not discouraged.

2. Building massing (General footprint and shape).
   A. Building outline.
      a. New construction shall be built out to the property line on street frontage.
      b. Corner lots: The building shall be built out to both property lines on street frontage.
      c. Buildings which do not require a footprint as large as the site may utilize courtyards or atrium on the interior of the lot.
   B. Building shape.
      a. The building shall be rectangular in shape and volume. Step backs at the upper floors on street facades will not be allowed.
   C. Building height.
      a. Minimum height: 2 stories.
      b. Maximum height: 10 stories.
      c. A story shall be defined as follows:
         (1) First story: 14’0” - 18'0" floor to floor.
         (2) 2-10 story: 10’ 0” - 12'0" floor to floor.
         Deviation in story height will not allow additional stories.

3. Street facade.

A. Building material.
   a. Primary facing material shall be dark brown or red unglazed brick.
   b. Corner buildings shall have dark brown or red unglazed brick on both facades.
   c. The brick shall be modular in size (3 courses per 8").
B. Criteria for storefront option.
   a. The first story storefront shall be divided into bays by masonry piers which correspond with window openings above.
   b. Storefront design shall be complimentary to existing buildings.

The HPC guidelines for the adjacent St. Anthony Falls Historic District limits the height of new buildings to fit within the range of heights for existing buildings, typically 4 to 6 stories high.

At this stage in the planning and design process, design details for the 28-Story Condo Building Alternative and the 40-Story Condo Building Alternative project are not known.

(a) *28-Story Condo Building Alternative And Guidelines*
Both condo buildings in the 28-Story Condo Building Alternative will be constructed partly or wholly within the North Loop Warehouse Historic District. The proposed design is not within conformance of the adopted Warehouse Historic District Guidelines. All rehabilitation and infill construction will require approvals by the HPC.

(b) *40 Story Condo Building Alternative And Guidelines*
In this 40-story Condo Building Alternative, the 40-Story part of the Condo Building will be constructed entirely on the lot on where the Gehl-Dolphin Building is located. That lot is not within the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District) though it is within the national district. All rehabilitation and infill construction will require approvals by the HPC.

After a report by CPED-Planning staff and hearing from the public, the HPC will determine the appropriateness of the design of all the elements of either alternative in the North Loop Warehouse Area (Local District). The decision of the HPC can be appealed to the City Council.

c. Architectural Resources

See the response to Item 25.b. immediately above in this EAW.

d. Designated Parks, Recreation Areas, And Trails

The Project is approximately 4 blocks south of the West River Parkway on the west bank of the Mississippi River. Along the Parkway, bike paths and pedestrian trails meander and connect to the Grand Rounds National Scenic Byway. In addition to the trails and paths, the Downtown Riverfront has many recreational sites, including Boom Island, Nicollet Island, the Mill District Historic Park, the St. Anthony Falls, and the Stone Arch Bridge. The Project will not have an adverse effect on these resources.

e. Scenic Views And Vistas

A view related to the Project Site is the view corridor down Washington Avenue N. in both directions.

26. VISUAL IMPACTS
Will the project create adverse visual impacts during construction or operation? Such as glare from intense lights, lights visible in wilderness areas and large visible plumes from cooling towers or exhaust stacks? x Yes _ No
If yes, explain.

The height of the proposed towers in both alternatives is out of character with the surrounding local and national historic districts and will have a negative visual impact.

27. COMPATIBILITY WITH PLANS AND LAND USE REGULATIONS

Is the project subject to an adopted local comprehensive plan, land use plan or regulation, or other applicable land use, water, or resource management plan of a local, regional, state or federal agency?

_✓_ Yes ___ No

If yes, describe the plan, discuss its compatibility with the project and explain how any conflicts will be resolved. If no, explain.

a. Comprehensive Plan

Comprehensive Plan Policies identify the areas along the Riverfront as well suited for housing and encourages medium to high-density housing development on these sites, providing a location for housing that is near downtown employment and retail.

The Policies also encourage this housing to be developed with certain attributes, including ensuring that new residential development contributes to the sense of neighborhood through appropriate site planning and architectural design; minimizing traffic impacts, maintaining security; providing and maintaining amenities; supporting the retention and development of neighborhood-serving retail; encouraging individual entrances to street-level building tenants; taking care with the design of windows and architectural detailing; preserving, restoring and reusing historic buildings and sites; encouraging the creation of new parks and plazas; and emphasizing good open space design.

b. Zoning

Downtown Minneapolis and the areas adjacent to it are divided into three zoning districts to regulate the type and intensity of development. All of the uses proposed in this project are allowed by the present zoning of the site. The permitted floor area, determined by the Floor Area Ratio (FAR), is the sole regulation of intensity, height and bulk of development in the downtown districts. There are no maximum height or minimum lot area per dwelling unit regulations in these districts. The downtown districts are:

> The *B4 Downtown Business District*, established to provide an environment for retail and office activities of citywide and regional significance. The district also allows entertainment, residential and public uses which complete the mixed use character of the area. The B4 District allows the highest density office development within the downtown area. The B4 District is divided into two subdistricts for building bulk requirements. In the B4-1 District the maximum floor area ratio of all structures shall be eight (8). In the B4-2 District the maximum floor area ratio of all structures shall be sixteen (16).
>
> The *B4S Downtown Service District*, established to provide an environment for a wide range of retail and office activities as well as supportive goods and services not allowed in the B4 District. The B4S District encourages residential uses and hotels. The B4S District is divided into two subdistricts for building bulk requirements. In the B4S-1 District the maximum floor area ratio of structures shall be eight (8) for hotels and dwellings, and four (4) for all other uses. In the B4S-2 District the maximum floor area ratio of all structures shall be eight (8).
>
> The *B4C Downtown Commercial District*, established to provide an environment for a wide range of commercial uses including a mix of retail, office, business services and limited industrial uses. The B4C District is divided into two subdistricts for building bulk requirements. In the B4C-1 District the maximum floor area ratio of all structures shall be four (4). In the B4C-2 District the maximum floor area ratio of all structures shall be eight (8).

The Pacific Block, and the blocks bounded by Washington Ave., the railroad tracks at 4th Avenue N., 1st Street N., and Hennepin Avenue are designated as B4C-1. The general pattern of the downtown districts provides for less building bulk north of Washington Ave. than south of Washington Ave. and less building bulk west of Hennepin Ave. than east of Hennepin Ave. The B4C-1 district has the lowest base permitted FAR of the downtown zoning districts.

The permitted bulk (height, mass) of developments in the downtown districts can be increased beyond the base FAR of 4, 8 or 16 by the FAR bonuses for enclosed parking and affordable housing permitted in section 549.110 of the

Minneapolis Code, and by Floor Area Ratio Premiums described beginning at section 549.190 of the Code. Table 549-4 provides the value for each premium.

Examples of some features that receive incentives are providing outdoor and indoor urban open space, through-block connections, retail uses at the street level, wider sidewalks, rehabilitation of historic structures mixed-use residential development. The complete list of the provisions of these bonuses and premiums can be found in the Zoning Ordinance, available through the City's web site.

The base permitted level of development at a FAR of 4.0 for this 107,682 sf block is 430,728 sf. A development of this size on this block is illustrated by Attachment I, absent the 40 story tower. The development proposes 750,000_sf of floor area, for an overall FAR of the development of 6.96. The additional FAR to increase the intensity of the development beyond the base FAR will be provided by incorporating the design and/or affordable housing features to capture the bonuses and premiums discussed above.

The project will be subject to Site Plan Review under Chapter 530 of the Zoning Code. Site plan review standards have been established to promote development that is compatible with nearby properties, neighborhood character, natural features and plans adopted by the city council, to minimize pedestrian and vehicular conflict, to reinforce public spaces, to promote public safety, and to visually enhance development. The regulations recognize the unique character of land and development throughout the city and the need for flexibility in site plan review.

The City's Land Use Development Review Process will assure compliance with the quantitative standards of the Code and other requirements and the land use application review process of the CPC will determine, after public notice and participation, consistency with the intentional standards of the applicable regulations and policies. The CPC's decision can be appealed to the City Council for the final decision.

d. Heritage Preservation Ordinance:

Historic properties within local districts are considered historic resources. Preservation of these resources are governed by Title 23, Chapter 599 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, which is adopted to promote the recognition, preservation, protection and reuse of landmarks, historic districts and historic resources; to promote the economic growth and general welfare of the city; to further educational and cultural enrichment; to implement the policies of the comprehensive plan, and to provide for the administration of this title including the powers and duties of officials and bodies charged with such administration, the standards for required approvals and the procedures for its enforcement.

28. IMPACT ON INFRASTRUCTURE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

Will new or expanded utilities, roads, other infrastructure or public services be required to serve the project? ___ Yes ✓ No. If yes, describe the new or additional infrastructure or services needed. (Note: any infrastructure that is a connected action with respect to the project must be assessed in the EAW; see *EAW Guidelines* for details.)

29. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Minnesota Rule part 4410.1700, subpart 7, item B requires that the RGU consider the "cumulative potential effects of related or anticipated future projects" when determining the need for an environmental impact statement. Identify any past, present or reasonably foreseeable future projects that may interact with the project described in this EAW in such a way as to cause cumulative impacts. Describe the nature of the cumulative impacts and summarize any other available information relevant to determining whether there is potential for significant environmental effects due to cumulative impacts *(or discuss each cumulative impact under appropriate item(s) elsewhere on this form).*

The height of the proposed towers in both alternatives is out of character with the surrounding local and national historic districts and will have a negative visual impact. Approvals of either of the proposed alternatives will set a precedent that may have the cumulative effect of allowing taller infill buildings in the future throughout this District.

This EAW further analyzes cumulative impacts under each question. This EAW also identifies mitigation

measures to address potential cumulative impacts under each question. One key area of concern for cumulative impacts – traffic – illustrates this cumulative impact analysis.

30. OTHER POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

If the project may cause any adverse environmental impacts not addressed by items 1 to 28, identify and discuss them here, along with any proposed mitigation.

None have been identified or are anticipated.

31. SUMMARY OF ISSUES

Do not complete this section if the EAW is being done for EIS scoping; instead, address relevant issues in the draft Scoping Decision document, which must accompany the EAW. List any impacts and issues identified above that may require further investigation before the project is begun. Discuss any alternatives or mitigative measures that have been or may be considered for these impacts and issues, including those that have been or may be ordered as permit conditions.

The most important environmental issue identified in this EAW is the impact of the project's design on the character of the national and local historic districts that are the site of the project. This impact will be assessed through the City's approval processes.

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 9b and 60, respectively.
- Copies of this EAW are being sent to the entire EQB distribution list.

Signature: _____

Printed Name: Rebecca Farrar

Title: Senior Planner

Date: _____, 2006

Environmental Assessment Worksheet was prepared by the staff of the Environmental Quality Board at the Administration Department. For additional information, worksheets or for *EAW Guidelines*, contact: Environmental Quality Board, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155, 651-296-8253, or http://www.eqb.state.mn.us

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A:	Hennepin County Map and USGS Map
Attachment B:	Project Site and Vicinity
Attachment C:	Alternative One, 28-Story Condo Building Alternative Site Plan*
Attachment D:	Alternative Two, 40-Story Condo Building Alternative Site Plan*
Attachment E:	ALTA/ASCM Land Title Survey
Attachment F:	Alternative One 28-Story Condo Building Heights*
Attachment G:	Alternative One 28-Story Condo Building Perspective*
Attachment H:	Alternative Two 40-Story Condo Building Heights*
Attachment I:	Alternative Two 40-Story Condo Building Perspective*
Attachment J:	Project Access*
Attachment K:	Nearby Building Heights
Attachment L:	Noise Modeling Receptor Sites*
Attachment M:	Map of St. Anthony Falls Historic District
Attachment N:	Map of Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (National Register)
Attachment O:	Map of Minneapolis Warehouse Area (Local District)
Attachment P:	Photos of Present Development of the Pacific Flats Block

* a version of these attachments in color are available for review at the City's website:
http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/planning

ASSISITANCE PREPARING THIS EAW WAS PROVIDED BY:

PACIFIC FLATS, LLC
B.A. LIESCH ASSOCIATES, INC.
BKV GROUP, INC.
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
HAMMEL, GREEN & ABRAHAMSON, INC.
HESS, ROISE & COMPANY
PALANISAMI & ASSOCIATES
SRF CONSULTING GROUP, INC.