

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET**

**CURRIE PARK LOFTS DEVELOPMENT**

**City of Minneapolis**

Department of Community Planning and Economic Development  
Land Use, Design and Preservation

May 6, 2013

**Table of Contents**

	<b>Page No.</b>
1. Project Title .....	1
2. Proposer.....	1
3. RGU.....	1
4. Reason for EAW Preparation .....	1
5. Project Location.....	1
6. Description .....	2
7. Project Magnitude Data.....	4
8. Permits and Approvals Required.....	5
9. Land Use.....	6
10. Cover Types.....	7
11. Fish, Wildlife and Ecologically Sensitive Resources.....	7
12. Physical Impacts on Water Resources.....	8
13. Water Use .....	8
14. Water-Related Land Use Management District .....	8
15. Water Surface Use.....	9
16. Erosion and Sedimentation.....	9
17. Water Quality: Surface Water Runoff.....	9
18. Water Quality: Wastewaters.....	10
19. Geologic Hazards and Soil Conditions.....	10
20. Solid Wastes, Hazardous Wastes, Storage Tanks .....	11
21. Traffic .....	11
22. Vehicle-Related Air Emissions .....	13
23. Stationary Source Air Emissions.....	14
24. Odors, Noise and Dust.....	14
25. Nearby Resources .....	14
26. Visual Impacts .....	15
27. Compatibility with Plans and Land Use Regulations.....	15
28. Impact on Infrastructure and Public Services.....	17
29. Cumulative Impacts.....	18
30. Other Potential Environmental Impacts .....	18
31. Summary of Issues .....	18
RGU Certification .....	19

Appendix (Figures, Tables and Attachments).....listing continued on next page

## Table of Contents

(Continued)

### Appendix

(Figures, Tables and Attachments)

#### Figures

Location Map.....	Figure 1
USGS Map.....	Figure 2
Potential Development Phases .....	Figure 3a
Existing Site – Aerial Photo .....	Figure 3b
Site Plan.....	Figure 3c
Geographical Coordinates .....	Figure 4
Primary Zoning Districts .....	Figure 5
Overlay Zoning Districts .....	Figure 6
Phase 1 and Phase 2 Massing Illustration.....	Figure 7
Phase 1 Rendering, Plans and Elevations.....	Figures 8a-f
Phase 2 Preliminary Site Plan and Elevation .....	Figures 9a-c

#### Tables

Trip Generation Estimates (Phase 1).....	Table 1 (page 12)
Trip Generation Estimates (Phase 2).....	Table 2 (page 12)
2015 Build Alternative Operational Analysis Results.....	Table 3 (page 13)

#### Attachments

Travel Demand Management Plan (RLK) .....	Attachment A
Minnesota State Historical Preservation Office Response .....	Attachment B
The Currie Park Development Project: A Historical and Architectural Assessment Hess Roise and Company, 2007.....	Attachment C

# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

**Note to preparers:** This form and EAW Guidelines are available at the Environmental Quality Board’s website at: <http://www.eqb.state.mn.us/EnvRevGuidanceDocuments.htm>. 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** Currie Park Lofts (Phase 1: Five15 on the Park; Phase 2: to be named)

**2. Proposer** Fine Associates LLC on behalf of  
Currie Park Developments, LLC  
Contact person Robert Kueppers

**3. RGU** City of Minneapolis  
Contact person Becca Farrar-Hughes

Title Associate  
Address 80 South 8<sup>th</sup> Street, 1916 IDS Center  
City, state, ZIP Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Phone 612-332-2561  
Fax 612-334-3348  
E-mail [rkueppers@fineassociates.com](mailto:rkueppers@fineassociates.com)

Title Senior City Planner  
Address Room 300 Public Service Center, 250 S. 4<sup>th</sup> St.  
City, state, ZIP Minneapolis, MN 55415  
Phone 612-673-3594  
Fax 612-673-2728  
E-mail [rebecca.farrar@minneapolismn.gov](mailto:rebecca.farrar@minneapolismn.gov)

**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 and subpart name:

Mandatory per 4410.4300, subpart 19 D (attached residential units in a number greater than 375);  
 Connected Actions and Phased Actions per 4410.1000, subpart 4.

**5. Project location** County Hennepin City/Township Minneapolis  
 SE¼ of NE ¼ and NE ¼ of SE ¼ Section 26 Township 29N Range 24W

**GPS Coordinates**

Latitude: 44°58’09.213”  
 Longitude: 93°15’02.859” (Figure 4 in Appendix)

**Tax Parcel Numbers**

<u>Address</u>	<u>Tax Parcel Number</u>
1500 6 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-41-0062
1506 6 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-41-0063
1514 6 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-41-0064
1500 5 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-14-0082
1501 5 <sup>th</sup> Street South [1]	26-029-24-41-0067

1506 5 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-14-0083
1507 5 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-41-0066
1515 5 <sup>th</sup> Street South	26-029-24-41-0065
1505 4 <sup>th</sup> Street South [2]	26-029-24-14-0084

[Note 1]: This parcel is listed as 1505 5<sup>th</sup> St. S. in Hennepin County property records and in **Figure 3b in Appendix**.

[Note 2]: This parcel is listed as 1507 4<sup>th</sup> St. S. in Hennepin County property records and in **Figure 3b in Appendix**.

**Attach each of the following to the EAW:**

- *County map showing the general location of the project;* **Figure 1 in Appendix**
- *U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale map indicating project boundaries (photocopy acceptable);* **Figure 2 in Appendix**
- *Site plan showing all significant project and natural features.* **Figure 3 in Appendix**

**6. Description**

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

This EAW studies Phase 1 and Phase 2 (of a potential 3 phase development) of the Currie Park Lofts project. The total project area encompasses 2.41 acres of land along 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue S., between 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Street S. near the Cedar-Riverside LRT station. Two new 6-story, 74 foot tall buildings are proposed to be developed as Phase 1 and Phase 2 would consist of a total of approximately 369 rental housing units, 5,650 SF of ground-level neighborhood-serving retail space with structured and enclosed parking on site that accommodates 344 spaces.

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.*

The project site comprises approximately 104,963 SF or 2.41 acres of developable property along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. between 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. in Minneapolis (the “Site”). The Site is zoned R6 (Multiple-family) District and is located in the Cedar-Riverside Transit Station Area (TSA), the Pedestrian-Oriented (PO) Overlay District and the University Area (UA) Overlay District (**Figure 5 and 6 in the Appendix**). The Site is approximately 4 blocks from the West Bank campus of the University of Minnesota, which is a designated Growth Center.

The project would be developed in two phases: Phase 1 as proposed would include 259 residential units, 5,650 SF of ground level neighborhood-serving retail space, occupy 74,768 SF of land and is planned for construction in 2013-2015; and Phase 2, would include up to 110 residential units which would occupy the remaining 30,195 SF of land, and would be developed after Phase 1 is complete. The two phases of the development will be taken independently through the City’s land use, design and approval process.

Phase 1 would develop a parcel that fronts on 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. and extends from 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. to roughly the location of vacated 5<sup>th</sup> St. S. The parcel is currently occupied by parking lots and by a residential single-family structure, formerly a Gluek Brewing Company saloon, with a newer garage. The Minneapolis City Council has required that the former Gluek Brewing Company saloon building (located at 1500 6<sup>th</sup> St. S.) be relocated to another parcel located at 1527 6<sup>th</sup> St. S.

Phase 1 plans a six-story (approximately 74 foot tall) H-shaped building, which would include 259 apartment units (80% affordable at 50% and 60% MMI) and about 5,650 SF of ground-level neighborhood-serving retail space. A total of 242 parking stalls and 280 bicycle spaces would be provided in an underground garage and in a structured parking facility on the first level of the building, with access and egress from 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. The commercial space, at the ground level along 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S., will be used for neighborhood-serving retail uses that would include (1) a child care center totaling 3,000 SF; (2) a 700 SF office use; and (3) a 1,950 SF restaurant, sit down or delicatessen with a maximum of 30 seats. **Figure 8 in the Appendix** illustrates the site plan and the elevations of Phase 1.

Exterior materials will include cast stone or masonry, metal panels, cement board panels and metal elements. Features of the building include walk-up units along both 15th Avenue South and 6th Street South, a landscaped courtyard facing 6th Street South and a second floor terrace with children’s playground and picnic areas.

The proposed Phase 2 plan, which is still conceptual, would include up to 110 dwelling units in a six-story building with ground-level and underground parking that would accommodate a total of 102 off-street parking spaces (see site plan and elevation in **Figure 9 in the Appendix**).

Each phase would be an individual project, and it would be reviewed by all applicable City Staff including Public Works and CPED Staff independently. Phase 1 would require the removal (relocation and demolition) of existing structures, and each phase would require excavation for below grade structures. Construction would occur within a developed urban neighborhood. Each phase would have permanent underground stormwater chambers designed to meet the City and Watershed's requirements for water quality and rate control.

The combination of the total number of dwelling units planned for Phase 1 and Phase 2 (369) and the proposed neighborhood-serving ground-level retail space (5,650 SF) would not trigger the need for a mandatory EAW as Minnesota Environmental Review Rules require that mixed-use developments (4410.4300 subpart 32) are subject to environmental review if a project includes both residential and industrial-commercial components, if the sum of the quotient obtained by dividing the number of residential units by the applicable residential threshold of subpart 19, plus the quotient obtained by dividing the amount of industrial-commercial gross floor space by the applicable industrial-commercial threshold of subpart 14, equals or exceeds one. Phase 1 and Phase 2 has a ratio of .998 which is less than one. However, Minnesota Environmental Review Rules require that the City of Minneapolis prepare an EAW if the total number of units that may ultimately be developed on all "contiguous" land owned by the project proposer exceeds 375 units. Currie Park Developments, LLC owns a building and related parking lot at 1501-1507 6th St. S., which is separated from the Currie Park Lofts development land by 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. This property is zoned I1 (Light Industrial) with the Industrial Living Overlay District (ILOD), but it could be developed in the future to include residential units. The City has determined for the purposes of determining whether an EAW is required that the property at 1501-1507 6th St. S. is contiguous to the Site and that more than 6 residential units could ultimately be developed on it thus resulting in a total of 375 attached dwelling units. Based on those conclusions the City has determined that an EAW is required.

No development rights are being requested for the contiguous property and the timing and design of any future development of that property are uncertain. In 2007, when Currie Park Developments, LLC was purchasing that property, there were plans for development of the contiguous property. The recession and stagnation of the real estate market that occurred in the following years made those plans no longer feasible. Moreover, a substantial portion of that site is occupied by a structure that was formerly a saloon operated by the John Gund Brewing Company. The State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) has recently indicated that any future development of the contiguous property, should "lower the building height down to 2 or 3 stories right around the smaller historic structure." (**Attachment B**)

Development of the contiguous property at 1501-1507 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. will be contingent on the market demands that exist at an undetermined time in the future. The property at 1501-1507 6<sup>th</sup> Street South does contain the John Gund Brewing Building, which has been determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places by SHPO, and the I1 zoning of that site with an ILOD result in limitations to the use of the property for a multifamily complex.

At this time there are no plans, or even a general design concept, for a future development of the contiguous property, and therefore an environmental review for that parcel cannot be completed at this time.

If development of the contiguous property becomes feasible as a multifamily housing development, and Currie Park Developments, LLC still owns the property, an EAW will be prepared as required, consistent with the Minnesota Environmental Review Rules, Connected Actions and Phased Actions per 4410.1000, subpart 4.

*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.*

Both phases of the project would be developed by a private developer.

The initial purpose of the development is to replace surface parking lots, dilapidated structures and a vacant house with a mixture of housing choices that are lacking or underrepresented in this neighborhood. Phase 1 will add 208 rental units affordable at 50% and 60% MMI levels (out of 259 units) to the housing supply in the urban core of Minneapolis: these affordability levels are desirable in this neighborhood.

Low and very low income affordable housing, including Section 8 and subsidized housing is abundant in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood. A cluster of this housing type is located adjacent to the development Site: to the east, the Riverside Plaza complex includes 669 project-based Section 8 units and southeast of the Site, the Cedars apartment complex includes 582 subsidized rental units whose residents have an average yearly income of \$9,390: 93.5% of them are below 30% AMI.

The neighborhood has minimal "workforce housing" (affordable at 60% MMI) for moderate-income individuals and families in spite of its concentration of jobs. Major education and medical institutions are a few blocks from the Site, which is adjacent to the Minneapolis downtown business district: about 100,000 jobs exist within one mile of the Site. Because of the shortage of workforce

housing, many of the individuals that work at the employment centers in the area do not live in the neighborhood: this is an obstacle to the economic improvement and integration of the Cedar-Riverside community.

Phase 1 would provide new housing well suited for the neighborhood workforce because of its rent levels, proximity to the major centers of employment, and connectivity with the means of mass transit. The close connectivity of the Site with the means of mass transit is ideal for affordable housing.

Phase 1 would include a number of three-bedroom units, suitable for large families with children. Large, new affordable housing units are lacking in this neighborhood. Phase 1 would include landscaped space for family recreation, and notably for children's activities. The latter are planned for an enclosed terrace, surrounded by many of the family units planned for this development. These units would have direct access to the terrace and its facilities in order to optimize their usefulness to the residential community. In addition, to serve as amenities for the residents of Phase 1, these outdoor recreational areas are intended to mitigate any overuse of the recreational facilities of Currie Park by the new residents.

A second purpose is to improve the safety and the livability of the area. Both Phase 1 and Phase 2 would follow the principles of green, street-oriented urban infill design: their perimeter would integrate townhouses and retail uses at street level, a landscaped plaza, pedestrian-level lighting, windows and balconies, varied building materials, and underground/enclosed parking. These "eyes on the street" features would foster pedestrian activity, increase the safety of the area and create a sense of community.

Further, by creating a pedestrian corridor that would connect the LRT station with the neighborhood, development of the Site would eliminate the present isolation of the Cedar-Riverside LRT station, which is now separated from Cedar Avenue by an area characterized by vacant lots and surface parking. Concerns about the lack of safety of this area limit the use of this LRT station for the people who live, work and study in this neighborhood. This greatly decreases the potential of the Hiawatha LRT line and possibly the forthcoming Central Corridor line as catalysts for improvement for the neighborhood residents.

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

Currie Park Developments, LLC owns a building and related parking lot at 1501-1507 6th St. S., which is separated from the Currie Park Lofts development land by 6th St. S. This property is zoned I1 with the ILOD but it could be developed in the future. Development of that property is contingent on the market forces that exist at an unknown time in the future. Further, the presence of a building on site that is (John Gund Brewing Building) deemed by SHPO to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places and its I1 zoning of that site result in limitations to the use of the property for a future multifamily complex.

At this time there are no plans, or even a general design concept, for a future development of the property, and therefore an environmental review for that parcel cannot be completed at this time.

If development of the contiguous property becomes feasible as a multifamily housing development, and Currie Park Developments, LLC still owns the property, an EAW will be prepared as required, consistent with the Minnesota Environmental Review Rules, Connected Actions and Phased Actions per 4410.1000, subpart 4.

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.

Not applicable.

## 7. Project magnitude data

Total project acreage 2.41 acres

Number of residential units: 369 attached - maximum units per building: Phase 1: 259 units; Phase 2: up to 110 units

Commercial, building area (gross floor space): approximately 5,650 total SF

Indicate areas of specific uses (in square feet):

Office Manufacturing 0

Retail Other industrial 0

Warehouse Institutional 0

Light industrial Agricultural 0

Other commercial (specify)

Restaurant: approx. 1,950 SF  
 Office: approx. 700 SF  
 Child Day Care: approx. 3,000 SF

*Building height: If over 2 stories, compare to heights of nearby buildings*

Phase 1 parcel. To the south, across 6<sup>th</sup> St. S.: a one-story commercial property that houses the Darul-Quba Cultural Center and a two-story café. To the east: the Riverside Plaza high-rise apartment buildings: Chase House (23 and 25 stories); E Building (13 and 20 stories); McKnight Building (39 stories); F Building (13 and 20 stories); and B and D Buildings (3 to 21 stories). Chase House, E Building and a three-story parking garage serving Riverside Plaza are the nearest structures to the proposed Phase 1 parcel. To the west, across 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S., is Currie Park, which has outdoor or recreational park open space.

Phase 2 parcel. To the northwest: the 2-story Mixed Blood Theater, which is separated from the parcel by a small parking lot owned by the theater. To the west, across 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.: the one-story Brian Coyle Community Center, which provides a number of services and recreational facilities to the neighborhood. To the east: the E Building of Riverside Plaza (13 and 20 stories).

Overall contextual assessment. The proposed Phase 1 and Phase 2 buildings, each 6 stories (74 feet) tall, would occupy the western portion of the block on which the closest buildings are 13 and 23 story high-rises within the Riverside Plaza complex. The Phase 1 and 2 buildings would provide a transition from the high-rise scale of the nearby Riverside Plaza towers to the 1-2 story buildings and park land which are located across 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S., 4<sup>th</sup> St. S., and 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. from the block. The proposed Phase 2 building would be built on a portion of the Phase 2 site that is separated from the Mixed Blood Theatre by the theatre’s parking area.

**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. All of these final decisions are prohibited until all appropriate environmental review has been completed. See Minnesota Rules, Chapter 4410.3100.*

The following lists the primary permits and approvals needed for both phases of the project.

<u>Unit of government</u>	<u>Type of application</u>	<u>Status</u>
<b>State:</b>		
Pollution Control Agency	Sanitary Sewer Connection Permit	To be applied for
	Construction Stormwater Permit (NPDES)	To be applied for
	Registration permits for generators	To be applied for
	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	To be applied for
Department of Health Metropolitan Council Environmental Services	Water Main System Extension Permit	To be applied for
	Approval of dewatering discharge (if necessary)	To be applied for
<b>Local (City of Minneapolis):</b>		
Mississippi River Watershed District Public Works	Grading/Stormwater Permit	To be applied for
	Travel Demand Management Plan	See Attachment B
	Grading/Erosion Control Plan Storm Water Management Plan	To be applied for To be applied for
Planning Commission	PUD	Approval Pending for Phase 1
	Conditional use permits and variances	Approval Pending for Phase 1
	Site Plan Review	Approval Pending for Phase 1
	Preliminary plat	Approval Pending for Phase 1
	Vacation of sidewalk easements	Approval Pending for Phase 1
	Final plat	To be applied for

	All Phase 2 permits	To be applied for
Regulatory Services	Wrecking/Moving Permits Building Permits	To be applied for To be applied for

**Financing Sources:**

City - Met Council HLA Funds	Acquisition	Committed*
HCHRA TOD Funds	Street & site improvements, site preparation	Committed*
CPED Trust Fund	Construction	Committed*
Met Council LHIA	Construction	Committed*
Minneapolis CPED	Tax Increment Financing	Applied for
Minneapolis CPED	LMIR 1 <sup>st</sup> Mortgage	Applied for
MHFA Deferred Loan	Construction	Committed*
Met Council LCDA	Site preparation & stormwater management	Committed*
Minneapolis CPED AHIF Funds	Gap financing	Committed*
Met Council LCA TOD Funds	Site preparation & stormwater management	Committed*
Hennepin County AHIF	Affordable housing assistance	Applied for

\*Contingent upon completion of the development, and continuing review and approval of the progress by the funding agency.

**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.

Much of the Site is currently vacant or occupied by bituminous parking areas. Six blighted commercial buildings and a two-unit blighted residential structure were demolished in 2006-2009. The commercial buildings comprised several one-story warehouses which over the years were used for dog food manufacturing, storage and as a mosque. The demolished buildings contained hazardous materials, including lead and asbestos, which were fully remediated before demolition. This work was funded by a grant from Hennepin County. The Site is now free of environmental hazards.

One small building at 1500 6th Street S. remains within the development footprint. This building was originally built, and operated for approximately 15 years, as a Gluek Brewing Company bar (a “tied house”). Later it was remodeled as a coffee shop, then gutted and converted into a private residence. SHPO concluded that this building does not have historic significance. However, the City’s Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) and the Minneapolis City Council required that the building be moved to a nearby lot owned by the proposer instead of demolished (1527 6<sup>th</sup> St. S.). A detached two-car garage constructed less than 20 years ago at 1500 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. would be demolished.

The use of the Site for a high density residential development with a small amount of commercial space is compatible with the adjacent land uses, which are also primarily high-density residential and small scale commercial space. Adjacent to the east of the project area is the Riverside Plaza high-rise apartment complex. At the northwest border of the project is the Mixed Blood Theatre, and across 4<sup>th</sup> St. S. is a City-owned surface parking lot. To the south of the project, across 6<sup>th</sup> St. S., is a commercial building which houses the Darul-Quba Cultural Center and a café. The Cedars high-rise apartment complex and a one-story commercial building with a number of small shops are located farther southeast along 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. Currie Park and the Brian Coyle Community Center are located across 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. from the project.

Braun Intertec Corporation (Braun) conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Site in general conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527-05 and 40 CFR Part 312.

The Braun reconnaissance verified that the Site consisted of an approximately 2.41-acre property that included a two-story plus basement residence constructed in 1902 and a two-car detached garage constructed in the early 2000s in the southwest portion of the property. An asphalt-paved surface parking lot was present in the southern portion of the Site. Historic aerial photographs indicated Site buildings (excepting those located at 1500 6th Street S) were demolished by 2010.

This assessment identified no recognized environmental conditions or historical recognized environmental conditions in connection with the Site. Although not considered a recognized environmental condition, the following additional consideration was identified:

*“Historical information indicates the Site was occupied by multiple residences and commercial buildings since at least 1885. It is unknown if the demolition debris was buried on the property or hauled away for disposal. Geotechnical borings advanced at the Site in 2007 and 2012 did not identify indications of building debris, and a soil sample submitted for laboratory analysis in 2007 did not exhibit concentrations exceeding regulatory criteria. Nevertheless, based on the age of the historic buildings and the potential for on-site burial, the possibility exists that materials may be buried on-Site in locations previously not sampled. The potential also exists that fill soil at the Site could require special management and/or disposal procedures during excavation activities associated with future development at the Site. Examples of scenarios where special management/disposal procedures would be needed include but may not be limited to the encounter of debris (e.g. asbestos-containing materials, brick, glass, metal, lumber, ash, slag, cinders) or soils with indications of staining or odors.”*

The ESA did not identify any National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) considerations, with the exception of the following:

*“The Site is bounded by 4<sup>th</sup> St. S., 15th Ave. S., and 6<sup>th</sup> Str. S. Based on 2011 traffic count data, The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT) Metro Traffic Data Map indicates that 16,200 vehicles per day traverse Cedar Ave S (approximately 490 feet east of the Site) and approximately 8,300 vehicles per day traverse Washington Ave (approximately 540 feet northwest of the Site). Based on this information, noise mitigation considerations may be required in the construction design and/or materials for the proposed residential project.*

*Hennepin County is located within EPA designated Radon Zone 1, which indicates a higher potential for elevated radon levels inside of a dwelling. Appropriate construction design and materials for the proposed project may reduce potential radon intrusion concerns.*

*No known or suspected friable asbestos containing material (ACM) was observed at the Site. Other building material (floor tile and sheetrock) were observed to be generally good condition. Based on the age of the Site building and our observations, an ACM survey will be required to demolition of the Site building.*

*Painted surfaces within the building interior and exterior did not appear to exhibit indications of peeling or chipping. However, based on the age of the Site building and our observations, survey of the building for lead-based paint will be required prior to its demolition.”*

**10. Cover types.** Estimate the acreage of the site with each of the following cover types before and after development:

	<i>Before</i>	<i>After</i>		<i>Before</i>	<i>After</i>
<i>Type 1-8 wetlands</i>	0	0	<i>Lawn/landscaping</i>	1.40	0.365
<i>Wooded/forest</i>	0	0	<i>Impervious surfaces</i>	1.0	2.045
<i>Brush/grassland</i>	0	0	<i>Stormwater Pond</i>	0	0
<i>Cropland</i>	0	0	<i>Other (describe)</i>	0	0
			<b><i>TOTAL</i></b>	2.41	2.41

**TOTAL**

**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.

The Site, designated as urban neighborhood by *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*, is in an established commercial, industrial and residential area of Minneapolis that has been fully developed since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is approximately one block from the Cedar-Riverside Activity Center and from Cedar Avenue and Riverside Avenue, which are both designated Commercial Corridors in this location. It is in close proximity to the University of Minnesota which is a designated Growth Center. With the exception of Currie Park, vegetation is limited to isolated lawns and landscaping around single and multi-family buildings with brush in areas along the Hiawatha LRT corridor. A turf grass cover on portions of the Site is a temporary condition following demolition of the blighted buildings. A Natural Heritage Information System Data Request Form was submitted to the Department of Natural Resources on April 25, 2013, to request identification of fish, wildlife and ecologically

sensitive resources. The response to the request will be available and addressed with all other responses received during the 30-day comment period.

b. *Are any state-listed (endangered, threatened or special concern) species, rare plant communities or other sensitive ecological resources on or near the site?*  Yes  No

A Natural Heritage Information System Data Request Form was submitted to the Department of Natural Resources on April 25, 2013, to request identification of fish, wildlife and ecologically sensitive resources. The response to the request will be available and addressed with all other responses received during the 30-day comment period.

*If yes, describe the resource and how it would be affected by the project. Describe any measures that will be taken to minimize or avoid adverse impacts. Provide the license agreement number (LA-\_\_\_\_\_) and/or Division of Ecological Resources contact number (ERDB \_\_\_\_\_) from which the data were obtained and attach the response letter from the DNR Division of Ecological Resources. Indicate if any additional survey work has been conducted within the site and describe the results.*

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 Public Waters Inventory number(s) if the water resources affected are on the PWI: Describe alternatives considered and proposed mitigation measures to minimize impacts.*

Not applicable.

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.*

The present properties are, and the proposed project would be connected to the City of Minneapolis water supply. Estimated water demand is based upon the Service Availability Charge (SAC) Procedure Manual (Metropolitan Council, Environmental Services, January 2013). One SAC unit (274 gallons per day as peak day usage) is assigned to each residential unit. With approximately 369 proposed residential units, the two phases of the project would require an estimated use of 101,106 gallons per day for their residential portion. The 5,650 SF of commercial space include 1,950 SF for a restaurant use. Commercial use is 100 gal/day per 1,000 SF and restaurant use (fixed seat) is 600 gal/day per 1,000 SF. Thus, the use for the commercial space is estimated to be 1,565 gal/day (including 1,200 gal/day for the restaurant use). The total estimated water use is 102,920 gallons per day.

The project would have no impact on sole source aquifers. The Site is served by the Minneapolis Water Works: the City of Minneapolis obtains water from the Mississippi River for potable consumption under the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources' appropriation permit (No. 786216-1). Potable supplies are adequate to meet the needs of the project without modification to the existing system.

The proposed fire protection and domestic water services would be from existing water mains in 4<sup>th</sup> St. S. (16"), 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S. (16") and 6<sup>th</sup> St. S. (12"). Discussions with the City of Minneapolis Water Department indicate that adequate water supply and pressure is available to meet the needs of the proposed development.

It is unknown whether construction dewatering would be necessary during the excavation of the lower level parking structures, which would be approximately 8 feet below existing grade. Based on soil borings taken at the Site by Braun Intertec in 2007 and 2012 no significant dewatering is expected. Should construction dewatering be necessary, permits from the Metropolitan Council would be obtained and, if the quantities exceed 10,000 gallons per day, a ground water appropriation permit would be obtained from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources.

14. **Water-related land use management district.** *Does any part of the project involve a shore land 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.*

Not applicable.

15. **Water surface use.** *Will the project change the number or type of watercraft on any water body?   Yes   X  No  
If yes, indicate the current and projected watercraft usage and discuss any potential overcrowding or conflicts with other uses.*

Not applicable.

16. **Erosion and sedimentation.** *Give the acreage to be graded or excavated and the cubic yards of soil to be moved:*

Total acres to be graded or excavated: 2.41

Approximately 21,000 cubic yards are estimated to be excavated at the Phase 1 site and hauled to an off-site disposal site. A maximum 12,000 cubic yards could be excavated at the Phase 2 site and hauled to an off-site disposal site.

*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.*

There are no naturally existing steep slopes on the Site. The subsurface granular soils would erode in the presence of precipitation. However, the exposed soils would be confined in the Site's underground garage excavation and there would be no natural drainage way for eroded soils to flow from the Site.

A well-developed Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented by the contractor to minimize erosion on the Site. The SWPPP would be prepared per the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and would be included in the plan development package received by the City and in the Construction Documents. The plan would specify erosion and sediment control practices to be utilized during construction to minimize the potential for stormwater pollution.

Temporary Best Management Practices (BMP) including protection of street-level storm water inlets, perimeter silt fences, crushed rock construction entrances, and periodic street sweeping would be utilized. Permanent erosion and sediment controls, such as vegetation establishment, would be implemented into the plan to ensure long term stability of the Site. Stormwater treatment facilities would also be designed and implemented to meet City, Watershed and MPCA requirements.

The applicant would be required to obtain an MPCA – NPDES Permit as well as a City of Minneapolis Erosion Control Permit, which enforces the City's erosion control ordinance. These permits would help ensure the implementation of best management practices for erosion and sediment control during construction.

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.*

Currently none of the Site runoff is treated. Most of the current storm water runoff is from parking lot and roof drainage.

To obtain a building permit, the applicant must obtain approval from the City for a Storm Water Management Plan, which, among other measures, would require treatment of 100% of the on-site storm water during construction and removal of 80% of the total suspended solids to comply both with the City and the MPCA requirements. Permanent storm water management measures for Phase 1 would include sedimentation tanks for stormwater runoff treatment.

The water quality of the stormwater runoff from the Phase 1 site after construction would be improved by the proposed rooftop and underground rate control and sedimentation facilities that are designed to remove 80% of the post-construction, site generated sediment and 60% of the phosphorus. After construction most of the runoff would come from the roof, walkways and plazas. All the parking areas of Phase 1 would be enclosed and covered.

The Phase 2 stormwater management plan is not designed yet, but it would be provided as required under Title 3, Chapter 54 of the Minneapolis City Code, as well as MPCA requirements, and would be implemented to meet both those requirements.

Considering the nature of the existing Site and lack of treatment and stormwater rate control, the proposed stormwater management of the parcels would likely reduce the rate of runoff and improve the water quality entering the public storm sewer system.

*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.*

The receiving water body for the storm water runoff from the site is the Mississippi River, through the City's storm sewer system. The quantity of runoff from existing to proposed conditions would be decreased, and the quality improved by the required on site treatment, described in 17a above.

#### 18. **Water quality: wastewaters**

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

Estimated sanitary wastewater generated on the Site from the residential units and commercial uses is 102,920 Gallons per Day based on the following proposed design basis:

- 369 residential units at 274 gallons per residential unit per day (101,380 gal)
- 5,650 sq. ft. commercial space including 1,950 SF for a restaurant: 100 gal/day per 1,000 SF for commercial space (370 gal); 600 gal/day per 1,000 SF for a Fixed Seat Restaurant (1,170 gal).

b. *Describe waste treatment methods or pollution prevention efforts and give estimates of composition after treatment. Identify receiving waters, including major downstream water bodies (identifying any impaired waters), 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.*

Sanitary wastewater would flow in the City of Minneapolis sanitary sewer system to a Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) sanitary sewer interceptor. The sewage would be treated at The Metropolitan Waste Water Treatment Plant (MCES) and discharged to the Mississippi River.

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.*

No pretreatment of wastes from this development is proposed or required. The specific points of connection to the public system would be determined with City Staff at the time of application for Building Permits. Wastes would be discharged to the Metropolitan Waste Water Treatment Plant. The Metropolitan Plant has a capacity of 251 million gallons per day, it discharges to the Mississippi River, and it utilizes advanced secondary treatment with chlorination/dechlorination. The Metropolitan Plant has the ability to handle the volume and composition of the sanitary waste discharged from the Site.

#### 19. **Geologic hazards and soil conditions**

a. *Approximate depth (in feet) to ground water: minimum average; to bedrock: minimum average.*

The depth to groundwater in the vicinity of the Site is more than 30 feet below land surface.

The depth to bedrock in the vicinity of the Site is less than 50 feet below land surface (Bloomgren, Cleland and Olsen, 1989).

*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.*

No geologic site hazards to ground water have been identified.

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

The general soil profile encountered in the soil borings consisted of a shallow layer of fill over alluvial deposited sands and glacial deposited sands and clays to the boring termination depths. A layer of previously placed fill was encountered at all boring locations. The fill ranged from 4 to 12 feet and consisted of poorly graded sand with silt, silty sand, clayey sand and sandy lean clay. The alluvial sands consisted of poorly graded sand and poorly graded sand with silt. The alluvial soils contained variable amounts of gravel, cobbles and potentially boulders. Below the alluvial deposits, glacial deposits were encountered at several borings. The glacial deposits generally consisted of poorly graded sand, poorly graded sand with silt, silty sand, clayey sand and sandy lean clay. The glacial deposits contained variable amounts of gravel, cobbles and potentially boulders.

Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) for the Site, which reviewed factors that include regulatory status, distance from the Site, and/or location relative to the regional groundwater flow direction, no facilities are identified in the

GeoSearch report that warrant further consideration as potential recognized environmental conditions, with the exception of the following:

*“ Numerous voluntary investigation and cleanup (VIC) listings and LUST listings were identified within 0.5 mile of the Site. Based on their regulatory status (closed or “inactive”), distance to the Site, and/or location (hydro-geologically down or cross-gradient), none of the listings appear to represent an environmental concern for the Site.”*

**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.*

No significant volumes of hazardous wastes are anticipated to be encountered/generated during construction. The project has committed to a waste management plan during demolition and construction that diverts at least 25% of debris away from landfills.

Solid waste generated from the completed project would consist of mixed municipal/residential waste materials. After occupancy, it is estimated that each residential unit will generate about 50 pounds of solid waste per week or weekly solid waste generation of about 18,500 pounds for the entire 2.4 acre Site. A source recycle/separation plan would be implemented in accordance with City requirements. Mixed municipal solid waste not recycled would be either incinerated at the Hennepin County Energy Recovery Center or hauled to a sanitary landfill.

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.*

No toxic substances are anticipated to be stored and used in any significant quantity during construction or after construction. Hazardous materials such as fuels and certain construction materials would be on site during construction and would be stored and handled in conformance with 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.*

During construction, there may be small quantities of fuel stored above ground on site. The contractor would be responsible for fuel storage to ensure compliance with state and local regulations. The project would likely have emergency generators on site as a back-up source of power for life safety issues. The backup generators would be designed with internal fuel tanks. No underground fuel tanks are anticipated for the project.

**21. Traffic.**

*If the peak hour traffic generated exceeds 250 vehicles or the total daily trips exceeds 2,500, a traffic impact study must be prepared as part of the EAW. Using the format and procedures described in the Minnesota Department of Transportation’s Traffic Impact Study Guidance (available at: <http://www.oim.dot.state.mn.us/access/pdfs/Chapter%205.pdf>) or a similar local guidance, provide an estimate of the impact on traffic congestion on affected roads and describe any traffic improvements necessary. The analysis must discuss the project’s impact on the regional transportation system.*

Parking spaces added:

- Phase 1 – 242 spaces, plus 2 drop off spaces;
- Phase 2 – 102 spaces;

Existing spaces (if project involves expansion): N/A

Estimated total average daily traffic generated:

- Phase 1 - 1,523 trips/day;
- Phase 2 - 586 trips/day;

Estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated (if known) and its timing:

As part of the Travel Demand Management Plan for Currie Park Lofts, estimates of peak hour and daily trip generations were conducted. Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the trip generation calculated for AM and PM peak hours as well as daily traffic for Phases

1 and 2 respectively. Phase 3 land uses remain undefined and will be addressed by a separate traffic analysis at the time of development.

**Table 1  
Trip Generation Estimates<sup>1</sup> – Phase 1 Proposed Land Uses**

Land Use	ITE Land Use Code	Size	Trips Generated:				Weekday ADT
			AM peak		PM Peak		
			Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	
Mid-Rise Apartment	223	259 units	24	54	59	43	1,410
Day Care Center	565	3,000 SF	19	17	18	20	238
Office	710	700 SF	1	0	0	1	8
Coffee/Donut Shop – No Drive-Thru	936	1,950 SF	108	104	40	40	248
Total – Gross			152	175	117	104	1,904
			327		221		
Internal Capture Trips <sup>2</sup>			30	35	23	21	381
			65		144		
<b>Totals</b>			<b>122</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>1,523</b>
			<b>262</b>		<b>177</b>		

1. Per the data and methodologies in Trip Generation, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, published by ITE.
2. An adjustment of 20% was applied to account for trip generation internal to the project and resulting from pedestrian trips

**Table 2  
Trip Generation Estimates<sup>1</sup> – Phase 2 Proposed Land Uses**

Land Use	ITE Land Use Code	Size	Trips Generated:				Weekday ADT
			AM peak		PM Peak		
			Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	
Mid-Rise Apartment	223	110 units	10	23	25	18	732
Total – Gross			10	23	25	18	732
			33		43		
Internal Capture Trips <sup>2</sup>			2	5	5	4	146
			7		9		
<b>Totals</b>			<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>586</b>
			<b>26</b>		<b>34</b>		

1. Per the data and methodologies in Trip Generation, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, published by ITE.
2. An adjustment of 20% was applied to account for trip generation internal to the project and resulting from pedestrian trips

The Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition was used, to estimate trip generation potential for this Site.

Due to this development’s location just east of Downtown Minneapolis, within one block of the Cedar/Riverside LRT stop, and within walking distance of the University of Minnesota West Bank and Augsburg College campuses, the Currie Park Lofts Development site is well-situated to facilitate use of alternate modes of transportation.

The Hiawatha Bike Trail crosses 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue South just south of 6<sup>th</sup> Street. There is also a NiceRide Minnesota shared bike facility in Currie Park just across the street from this proposed development.

The location of the Site would enable residents to easily bike commute to downtown and to connect to the Mississippi River trails. From there bicyclists would be able to branch out throughout the extensive and growing metro bicycle trail and bike lane network.

This site is well-suited to transit use. This site is adjacent to two light rail transit (LRT) stations – one block north of the Cedar Riverside Station along the Hiawatha Line, and one less than a quarter-mile southwest of the West Bank Station on the future Central Corridor LRT line.

Regarding traffic operation, Build and No-Build alternatives were assessed. The year 2017 was used as the design year, as it would be the year after Phase 2 of the project was completed. Results of the 2017 No-Build analysis indicate that all study area intersections are projected to operate at acceptable overall Levels of Service for the 2017 No-Build conditions.

As listed in Table 3, the results of the AM and PM peak hour analysis for the 2017 Build conditions show that the operations of study area intersections and the proposed Site access are predicted to be acceptable with the addition of Site-generated traffic. Specifically, the overall Level of Service for all intersections is not anticipated to change and the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queue lengths increase slightly with the addition of Site-generated traffic.

**Table 3**  
**2017 Build Alternative Operational Analysis Results**  
 (Overall Intersection Levels of Service and Comments)<sup>1</sup>.

<b>Intersection</b> (Cedar Ave. &)	<b>AM</b> <b>LOS</b>	<b>PM</b> <b>LOS</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Washington Ave. WB Ramps	B/C	<b>B/C</b>	AM: 95 <sup>th</sup> NB LT queue 149 feet (149% of storage length). PM: 95 <sup>th</sup> NB LT queue 116 feet (116% of storage length).
Washington Ave. EB Ramps/3 <sup>rd</sup> Street	<b>A/B</b>	<b>B/B</b>	AM: 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK. PM: 95 <sup>th</sup> SB LT queue 129 feet (129% of storage length).
Riverside Ave./4 <sup>th</sup> Street	<b>B/B</b>	B/C	AM: 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK. PM: 95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK.
5 <sup>th</sup> Street (Pedestrian Crossing)	<b>A/B</b>	<b>B/B</b>	95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK.
6 <sup>th</sup> Street	A/B	A/B	95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK.
7 <sup>th</sup> Street <sup>2</sup> .	a	a	95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK.
I-94 Westbound/LRT Shop & Yard	<b>B/B</b>	<b>B/B</b>	95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK.
I-94 Eastbound <sup>3</sup> .	a	a	95 <sup>th</sup> percentile queues OK.

1. Overall LOS reported from Synchro. First letter represents intersection LOS, while second letter represents worst LOS of individual approach. Upper case letters indicate signalized intersections, and lower case letters indicate unsignalized intersections.
2. Level of Service changes from Existing in **Bold**.
3. Unsignalized intersection. LOS reported is for the critical westbound approach.
4. Unsignalized intersection. LOS reported is for the critical southbound left turn movement.

In conclusion, results of the operational analyses indicate that the study area intersections operate acceptably for both the No-Build and Build scenarios. Analysis indicates acceptable operations at all intersections.

Because of the transit, bicycle and walking amenities that exist in the area, the 45% mode share seems achievable for this development. Nevertheless, a smaller internal capture percentage (20%) was tested, with acceptable results. As a result, the peak hour vehicular traffic generated by this Site would have negligible impacts on the surrounding roadway network.

The only mitigation measure suggested for response to this development would be the on-going assessment of signal timings and coordination at intersections along Washington Avenue to the east of this site. In addition, the applicant has developed a series of travel demand management strategies to assist the City of Minneapolis in achieving its goals of enhancing the local transportation system.

Full traffic analysis and TDM strategies can be found in the Travel Demand Management Plan (**Attachment A**) developed for the Currie Park Lofts.

**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.*

Based upon the Traffic Demand Management Plan for the project all intersections studied would be operating at acceptable levels of service. The anticipated new traffic generated for this project over and above the traffic which was generated by the

former commercial and residential buildings and parking lots on the Site would not create congestion at the intersections in the am or pm peak periods. Violations of the local or state air quality standards are not anticipated 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.*

The natural gas heating and cooling systems are expected to consist of individual furnace/air conditioning systems for each residential unit. No adverse impacts to air quality are expected as a result of the project.

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.)*

Odors: The construction and occupancy of the project would not be expected to generate objectionable odors.

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

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

Demolition and construction dust: During demolition and construction, contractors would follow best management practices to reduce dust emissions. During demolition, this would include wetting down the building and debris with hoses as necessary. Demolition would be limited to the removal of bituminous surface parking and one two-car garage structure.

Fugitive dust emissions after occupancy: Once occupied, the project is not expected to generate fugitive dust emissions.

25. **Nearby resources.** *Are any of the following resources on or in proximity to the site?*

*If yes, describe the resource and identify any project-related impacts on the resource. Describe any measures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts.*

*Archaeological, historical or architectural resources?  Yes  No*

Several structures of historical or potential historic significance need to be considered when evaluating this proposal (**Attachment C**). First, the nearby Riverside Plaza high-rise apartment development (previously known as Cedar Square West) is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Second, two buildings that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has deemed that two properties are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the Fire Station G/Engine House 5 at the corner of 4th St. S. and 15th Ave. S., which is now used as the Mixed Blood Theatre premises; and the John Gund Brewing complex at the southwest corner of 6th St. S. and 15th Ave. S., which is now used for the Darul-Quba Cultural Center and a café. SHPO has concluded that the Phase 1 of this development will have no adverse effect on any of those three historic or potentially historic structures.

SHPO has not reviewed any Phase 2 plans as they are not available yet, but the developer would consult with SHPO as plans are developed. In the developer's latest communication with SHPO it was stated that Phase 2 can likely be constructed up to the height of Phase 1, but only if it is somewhat stepped away from the potentially historic Mixed Blood Theatre building. Likewise, SHPO suggests that a future Phase 3 should result in building height of 2-3 stories around the John Gund Brewing complex (**Attachment B**).

*Prime or unique farmlands or land within an agricultural preserve?  Yes  No*

*Designated parks, recreation areas or trails?  Yes  No*

Currie Park and the Regional Bike Trail are in close proximity to the Site. They would not be affected by the proposed development for several reasons.

As summarized below, both indoor and outdoor recreational facilities would be provided as part of the development and would be readily accessible for all residents. The developer anticipates that these on-site amenities would help to mitigate the additional

use of Currie Park and its facilities by the new residents.

The outdoor amenities for Phase 1 would include landscaped areas at its perimeter for a total of about 6,935 SF, plus additional plantings/green roofs and a courtyard/plaza facing 6th St. S. for an additional 3,781 SF of landscaped area, for a total of almost 12,000 SF of landscaping on the premises (25% of the building footprint of 56,410 SF). While the Zoning Code requires that there are a minimum of 19 trees and 97 shrubs on the Site, Phase 1 is planned to have 42 canopy and ornamental trees, and 413 deciduous and coniferous shrubs, in addition to perennials and grasses: this far exceeds the minimum quantities required for the Phase 1 development. When the Phase 2 plans are at a more advanced stage, they would be submitted for City approval, and it is expected that they also would meet or exceed the code requirements. Additional plantings are planned for a large landscaped terrace (10,845 SF) on the second level of the Phase 1 building, which would be used for recreational children's activities, including playgrounds for children of different ages, a bocce ball court and picnic areas for family gatherings. Also the landscaped plaza facing 6th St. S. has been designed as an outdoor gathering place for the residents and their families.

The indoor amenities of Phase 1 would include two separate indoor gymnasium areas for adult workouts, a 1,500 SF party room, a 390 SF conference/gathering room, and a 210 SF "office center" and wi-fi lounge on each floor. A separate 3,000 SF children's daycare facility to serve both residents and the general public would be located in a ground level tenant space off of 15<sup>th</sup> Ave. S.

To encourage and enhance the use of the Regional Bike Trail by its residents, bicycle parking would be provided at a ratio of more than 1 bicycle space per unit. A secured area in the parking facilities would be dedicated to parking and storage facilities for bicycles.

Scenic views and vistas?  Yes  No

Other unique resources?  Yes  No

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?  Yes  No  
If yes, explain.

Not applicable.

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.

The proposed use is consistent with the zoning of the Site (R6, High Density Residential), and with the *Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth* (the City's Comprehensive Plan), which designates the Site as an urban neighborhood, as well as the *Franklin-Cedar/Riverside Area Master Plan* and the *Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan*.

The *Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth* states the following about urban neighborhoods, "Predominantly residential area with a range of densities, with highest densities generally to be concentrated around identified nodes and corridors." "More intensive non-residential uses may be located in neighborhoods closer to Downtown and around Growth Centers." Commercial Corridors typically have a mix of uses, with commercial uses dominating. These corridors accommodate high density (50-120 du/acre), transitioning down to medium density in surrounding areas. Activity Centers and Growth Centers typically have a mix of uses including a high intensity of uses, "including employment, commercial, office, and residential uses. The features typically accommodate high density (50-120 du/acre) and very high density (120-200 du/acre), dependent on context."

The following policies and implementation steps of *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth* apply to this proposal and support the construction of both Phase 1, a new 6-story, 259 unit residential development that includes neighborhood serving retail uses within the ground level of the building, and Phase 2, a new 6-story, 110 unit residential development.

- Land Use Policy 1.1 states: "Establish land use regulations to achieve the highest possible development standards, enhance the environment, protect public health, support a vital mix of land uses, and promote flexible approaches to carry out the comprehensive plan." This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (1.5.1) "Ensure that land use regulations continue to promote development that is compatible with nearby properties, neighborhood character, and natural features; minimizes pedestrian and vehicular conflict; promotes street life and activity; reinforces public spaces; and visually enhances development."
- Land Use Policy 1.2 states: "Ensure appropriate transitions between uses with different size, scale, and intensity." This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (1.2.1) "Promote quality design in new development, as well

as building orientation, scale, massing, buffering, and setbacks that are appropriate with the context of the surrounding area.”

- Land Use Policy 1.3 states: “Ensure that development plans incorporate appropriate transportation access and facilities, particularly for bicycle, pedestrian, and transit.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation steps: (1.3.1) “Require safe, convenient, and direct pedestrian connections between principal building entrances and the public right-of-way in all new development and, where practical, in conjunction with renovation and expansion of existing buildings”; and (1.3.2) “Ensure the provision of high quality transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access to and within designated land use features.”
- Land Use Policy 1.5 states: “Promote growth and encourage overall city vitality by directing new commercial and mixed use development to designated corridors and districts.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (1.5.1) “Support an appropriate mix of uses within a district or corridor with attention to surrounding uses, community needs and preferences, and availability of public facilities.”
- Land Use Policy 1.8 states: “Preserve the stability and diversity of the city's neighborhoods while allowing for increased density in order to attract and retain long-term residents and businesses.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (1.8.1) “Promote a range of housing types and residential densities, with highest density development concentrated in and along appropriate land use features.”
- Land Use Policy 1.12 states: “Support Activity Centers by preserving the mix and intensity of land uses and by enhancing the design features that give each center its unique urban character.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (1.12.7) “Encourage the development of medium- to high-density housing immediately adjacent to Activity Centers to serve as a transition to surrounding residential areas.”
- Land Use Policy 1.13 states: “Support high density development near transit stations in ways that encourage transit use and contribute to interesting and vibrant places.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (1.13.1) “Encourage pedestrian-oriented services and retail uses as part of higher density development near transit stations”; and (1.13.4) “Encourage architectural design, building massing and site plans to create or improve public and semi-public spaces near the station.”
- Housing Policy 3.1 states: “Grow by increasing the supply of housing.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (3.1.1) “Support the development of new medium- and high-density housing in appropriate locations throughout the city.”
- Housing Policy 3.2 states: “Support housing density in locations that are well connected by transit, and are close to commercial, cultural and natural amenities.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (3.2.1) “Encourage and support housing development along commercial and community corridors, and in and near growth centers, activity centers, retail centers, transit station areas, and neighborhood commercial nodes.”
- Urban Design Policy 10.4 states: “Support the development of residential dwellings that are of high quality design and compatible with surrounding development.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation steps: (10.4.1) “Maintain and strengthen the architectural character of the city's various residential neighborhoods”; (10.4.2) “Promote the development of new housing that is compatible with existing development in the area and the best of the city’s existing housing stock.”
- Urban Design Policy 10.5 states: “Support the development of multi-family residential dwellings of appropriate form and scale.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation step: (10.5.2) “Medium-scale, multi-family residential development is more appropriate along Commercial Corridors, Activity Centers, Transit Station Areas and Growth Centers outside of Downtown Minneapolis”.
- Urban Design Policy 10.6 states: “New multi-family development or renovation should be designed in terms of traditional urban building form with pedestrian scale design features at the street level.” This policy includes the following applicable implementation steps: (10.6.1) “Design buildings to fulfill light, privacy, and view requirements for the subject building as well as for adjacent properties by building within required setbacks”; (10.6.2) “Promote the preservation and enhancement of view corridors that focus attention on natural or built features, such as the Downtown skyline, landmark buildings, significant open spaces or bodies of water”; (10.6.3) “Provide appropriate physical transition and separation using green space, setbacks or orientation, stepped down height, or ornamental fencing to improve the compatibility between higher density and lower density residential uses”; (10.6.4) “Orient buildings and building entrances to the street with pedestrian amenities like wider sidewalks and green spaces”; (10.6.5) “Street-level building walls should include an adequate

distribution of windows and architectural features in order to create visual interest at the pedestrian level”; (10.6.6)  
“Integrate transit facilities and bicycle parking amenities into the site design.”

The proposed uses are consistent with two additional plans that must be considered when evaluating the proposal: the *Franklin-Cedar/Riverside Area Master Plan*, which was adopted by the City Council in 2001, and the *Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan*, which was adopted by the City Council in 2008.

The *Franklin-Cedar/Riverside Area Master Plan* was part of a series of long-range plans for transit-oriented development (TOD) around Hiawatha LRT station sites, and is the City’s guiding document for transit-oriented development in the proposed project area. The area of study included Cedar/Riverside, Seward, East Phillips, and Ventura Village. The Master Plan focuses on land uses, urban design, public infrastructure, and amenities located within a 1/2-mile of the stations. The purpose of the Plan was to guide changes that build upon neighborhood strengths and capitalize on opportunities that may include: (1) future mixes of new businesses, housing, and neighborhood amenities; (2) improvements to the pedestrian environment; (3) enhancement of parks and green space; and (4) improving the accessibility and fit of the station with the neighborhood.

The Master Plan calls for the following as it relates to the Site: “...Placement of new development at the corner of 6th Street and 15th Avenue that will provide a ‘front door’ to the station visible from Cedar Avenue and increase activity levels in the station block.” It specifically recommended the Site for additional residential development with some commercial component. The Master Plan states that such development “could eliminate several blighted properties, take advantage of views to Currie Park and downtown and add pedestrian activity and interest...” Also, it should include “adequate sidewalks, pedestrian-scaled lighting and attractive landscaping”. The Master Plan also recommended that commercial redevelopment is added at the ground level, to enhance safety and pedestrian enjoyment. The development plan for Phase 1 and Phase 2 will satisfy all the above recommendations.

The Master Plan defined guiding principles and recommendations for transit-oriented development in an urban context, many of which are satisfied by the proposed development plans, including:

- Provide an attractive pedestrian cityscape.
- Facilitate connectivity with the bus/transit network.
- Facilitate traffic by pollution-free means, such as bicycle traffic.
- Include a variety of residential housing types, including multistory residential buildings and urban townhouses.
- Have primary entrances at ground level, oriented to and visible from the street.
- Use parking ramps and below grade garages screened from view from the street.
- Use varied building scale, and materials related to the existing residential character.

The *Cedar Riverside Small Area Plan* provides updated land use policy for the Cedar Riverside portion of the area covered in the *Franklin-Cedar/Riverside Area Master Plan*. The Small Area Plan calls for high-density residential uses on the Site as identified on the future land use map. Applicable land use recommendations include: “Focus the most intensive development near future transit stops and existing commercial areas and encourage the provision of open space and active stormwater management in new developments”; “Infill housing within the interior of the neighborhood should be complementary in bulk and height to adjacent uses.”

Applicable urban design recommendations of the Small Area Plan include: “Encourage the development of safe public and private spaces using principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), including: “a. Access: Safe movement and connections; b. Natural surveillance and sightlines: See and be seen; c. Layout: Clear and logical orientation; d. Activity mix: Eyes on the street; e. Sense of ownership: Showing a space is cared for; f. Quality environments: Well-designed, managed and maintained environments; g. Physical protection: Using active security measures”; “Enhance the safety, quality, and quantity of public gathering spaces, both indoors and outdoors”; “Continue to improve accessibility to and comfort in park properties and other open spaces”; “Support increased indoor community activity space, particularly for youth in the neighborhood”; “Parking is discouraged between the primary building façade and the street; surface parking should be adjacent to or in the rear of buildings. Structured parking is encouraged for new developments.”

The proposed development satisfies all the above urban design recommendations, including the applicable CPTED principles. The applicant is incorporating environmentally sensitive stormwater management, including on-site stormwater retention and filtration. The proposed buildings would not result in significant impacts to light, wind and air in relation to the surrounding area, as they are significantly smaller relative to the existing buildings located on the block. The active uses proposed within the ground level of the building provide natural surveillance. There would be windows on all sides of the building that allow people to observe adjacent public spaces and the entrances are connected to the public sidewalk. The Site is further designed with landscaping, fencing, and architectural features to delineate space and control access.

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 XNo.*

*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.)*

Not applicable.

However, it is important to note that the City is proposing to reconstruct 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue South around the same time construction is expected to begin on this project.

A Traffic Demand Management Plan prepared by RLK Incorporated analyzed the proposed Phases 1 and 2 of the development. It concluded that the study area intersections would operate acceptably for both the No-Build and Build scenarios, and that peak hour vehicular traffic generated by the Site would have negligible impacts on the surrounding roadway network.

Furthermore, each phase of the development would require separate land use approvals which would evaluate impacts to infrastructure and public services.

29. **Cumulative potential effects.** *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 potential effects. (Such future projects would be those that are actually planned or for which a basis of expectation has been laid.)*

*Describe the nature of the cumulative potential effects and summarize any other available information relevant to determining whether there is potential for significant environmental effects due to these cumulative effects (or discuss each cumulative potential effect under appropriate item(s) elsewhere on this form).*

No cumulative impacts are identified or anticipated.

The Traffic Analysis studied the cumulative impact of this project on the intersections under review. The Traffic Analysis suggests that no additional geometric improvements would be necessary to the public streets. Traffic signal timing would need to be adjusted as the area wide developments come on line.

Municipal sewer and water systems have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed project, along with past present and future development.

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.*

Not applicable.

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.*

Further investigations would be required in the future before Phase 2 and the potential Phase 3 can be developed.

A Traffic Demand Management Plan (prepared by RLK Incorporated) that analyzed the traffic impact from Phases 1 and 2 concluded that the study area intersections would operate acceptably for both the No-Build and Build scenarios, and that peak hour vehicular traffic generated by Phase 1 and 2 would have negligible impacts on the surrounding roadway network. Phase 3 land uses have not been determined yet and their potential traffic impact will be addressed by a separate traffic analysis at the time of Phase 3 development.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has concluded that the Phase 1 building would have no adverse impact on the nearby historic buildings (Cedar Square West/Riverside Plaza, the John Gund Brewing Company complex, and Fire Station G/Mixed Blood Theatre). However, SHPO has noted that development of Phase 2 has the potential to affect Fire Station G and development of Phase 3 has the potential to affect the John Gund Brewing Company complex. SHPO has suggested that the height of new Phase 2 and Phase 3 buildings be reduced to 2-3 stories in the area immediately adjacent to the historic structures but that height could be stepped up further away. Further historic review would therefore be necessary for both Phase 2 and Phase 3 at the time of their development.

**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



Date

5/6/13

Rebecca Farrar-Hughes

Title: Senior City Planner

**Environmental Assessment Worksheet** was prepared by the staff of the Environmental Quality Board at the Minnesota Department of Administration, Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis. For additional information, worksheets or for *EAW Guidelines*, contact: Environmental Quality Board, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155, 651-757-2873, or <http://www.eqb.state.mn.us>.