



# Beltline Station Development

---

Environmental Assessment Worksheet

August 2021

# Table of Contents

1. Project Title .....	3
2. Proposer .....	3
3. RGU .....	3
4. Reason for EAW Preparation .....	3
5. Project Location .....	4
6. Project Description .....	4
7. Cover Types .....	7
8. Permits and Approvals Required .....	7
9. Land Use .....	8
10. Geology, Soils, and Topography/Land Forms .....	10
11. Water Resources .....	11
12. Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes .....	16
13. Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, and Sensitive Ecological Resources (Rare Features) .....	18
14. Historic Properties .....	21
15. Visual .....	21
16. Air .....	21
17. Noise .....	23
18. Transportation .....	23
19. Cumulative Potential Effects .....	28
20. Other Potential Environmental Effects .....	29
RGU Certification .....	30

## List of Tables

Table 1: Project Magnitude .....	5
Table 2: Cover Types .....	7
Table 3: Permits and Approvals Required .....	7
Table 4: Soil Types Within Project Limits .....	11
Table 5: Impaired Waters within One Mile of the Construction Limits .....	12
Table 6: State-Listed Species Within 1-Mile of Project Limits .....	19
Table 8: Vehicle Trip Generation Summary .....	25

# List of Figures

Figure 1: Site Map .....	32
Figure 2: County Map.....	33
Figure 3: USGS Map.....	34
Figure 4: Existing Zoning.....	35
Figure 5: Future Land Use .....	36
Figure 6: Water Resources .....	37
Figure 7: Wellhead Protection, Drinking Water Supply Management Area, and Wells Sites .....	38

# Attachments

- Attachment A: Site Plan
- Attachment B: Wetland Delineation
- Attachment C: SHPO Database Information
- Attachment D: Traffic Analysis

# Environmental Assessment Worksheet

This Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) form and EAW Guidelines are available at the Environmental Quality Board's website at:

<http://www.eqb.state.mn.us/EnvRevGuidanceDocuments.htm>. The EAW form provides information about a project that may have the potential for significant environmental effects. The EAW Guidelines provide additional detail and resources for completing the EAW form.

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

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

## 1. Project Title

---

Beltline Station Development

## 2. Proposer

---

**Proposer:** Sherman Associates

**Contact Person:** Will Anderson

**Title:** Senior Developer

**Address:** 233 Park Ave

**City, State, ZIP:** Minneapolis, MN, 55413

**Phone:** 612-604-0866

**Email:** wanderson@sherman-associates.com

## 3. RGU

---

**RGU:** City of St. Louis Park

**Contact Person:** Jennifer Monson

**Title:** Senior Planner

**Address:** 5005 Minnetonka Blvd

**City, State, ZIP:** St. Louis Park, MN, 55416

**Phone:** 952-928-2841

**Email:** jmonson@stlouispark.org

## 4. Reason for EAW Preparation

---

Check one:

Required:

☐ EIS Scoping

Discretionary:

☐ Citizen petition

☒ Mandatory EAW

☐ RGU discretion

☐ Proposer initiated

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

Mn Rule 4410.4300, Subpart 32 (Mixed residential and industrial-commercial projects)

## 5. Project Location

---

**County:** Hennepin

**City/Township:** St. Louis Park

**PLS Location ( $\frac{1}{4}$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}$ , Section, Township, Range):** Section 6, Township 28N, Range 24W

**Watershed (81 major watershed scale):** Mississippi River - Twin Cities

**GPS Coordinates:** 44°56'41.3"N 93°20'21.4"W

**Tax Parcel Number:** 0602824240046; 0602824130003; 0602824120091

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

- **County map showing the general location of the project** (See Figure 2)
- **US Geological Survey 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale map indicating project boundaries** (See Figure 3)
- **Site plans showing all significant project and natural features. Pre-construction site plan and post-construction site plan.** (See Figure 1 and Attachment A)

## 6. Project Description

---

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

Sherman Associates Development, LLC is proposing to redevelop an approximately 7-acre site south of CSAH 25 and east of Beltline Blvd in St. Louis Park, Minnesota. The mixed-use, transit-oriented development is located immediately north of the Southwest LRT Beltline Blvd. Station, and will include one mixed-use building and two residential buildings with a total of 403 multi-family units and up to 21,800 square feet of ground floor commercial. The proposal also includes a parking structure, parking within each building, and surface parking.

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

A mixed-use redevelopment is proposed on an approximately 7-acre site south of CSAH 25 and east of Beltline Blvd in St. Louis Park, Minnesota. See Figure 2 for project location. The project is anticipated to consist of four buildings:

- 1. Parking Ramp/Retail.** Located in the southwest corner of the site, this area will consist of a 4-story, a parking structure with 560 parking spaces that includes 268 spaces for park and ride purposes, and 1,800 square feet of ground floor commercial.

2. **Building 1.** Located in the northwest corner of the site, this area will consist of a 7-story, mixed-use building with approximately 20,000 square feet of ground floor grocery, approximately 159 units of multi-family housing above, and below grade parking.
3. **Building 2.** Located in the northeast corner of the site, this area will consist of a 4-story, residential building with approximately 84 units of affordable multi-family housing with below grade parking.
4. **Building 3.** Located in the southeast corner of the site, this area will consist of a 5-story residential building with approximately 160 units of market-rate, multi-family housing with below grade parking.

Vehicular access to the development will be from Beltline Blvd on the western side of the development and County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 25 from the north via new connections at Monterey Drive and Lynn Ave, all of which are being constructed as part of the Southwest LRT project. Pedestrian and bicycle access to the site will be achieved through crosswalks at the Beltline Blvd and CSAH 25 intersection, as well as from the Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail, which runs parallel to the south side of the site. The project will be installing a multi-use trail and sidewalks along CSAH 25 and Beltline Blvd, a mixed-use trail along the backage road from Beltline Blvd, and sidewalks along the new Monterey Dr. connection. As part of the METRO Southwest LRT Extension (also known as Green Line Extension) Beltline Station is being constructed just south of the development, allowing easy light rail access to and from the site.

There are several utilities running through the site, including stormwater pipes and a Metropolitan Council force sewer main. Portions of these utilities are expected to be relocated as part of the redevelopment. All other utilities are available to serve the site, unless otherwise noted.

In anticipation of development at the site, all existing buildings including one former commercial and one former light industrial building have been demolished. Excavation has also begun on portions of the site due to construction for the Beltline Blvd Station and a multi-use trail bridge being constructed over Beltline Blvd as part of the Southwest LRT project.

Construction will be conducted over two phases. Phase 1 is anticipated to begin in 2021 and includes buildings 1, 3, and the parking ramp. Phase 2 includes building 2 and constructed is anticipated to begin by the summer of 2022.

### c. Project magnitude

Table 1: Project Magnitude

Measure	Magnitude
Total Project Acreage	7
Linear Project Length	N/A
Number and Type of Residential Units	403 multi-family units
Commercial Building Area (square feet)	21,800

Measure	Magnitude
Structure Height(s)	Parking ramp: 4 stories Building 1: 7 stories Building 2: 4 stores Building 3: 5 stories

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

The purpose of this project is to redevelop three existing commercial and industrial parcels into a mixed-use, transit-oriented residential and commercial development.

The City of St. Louis Park Economic Development Authority (EDA) owns portions of the site and has a preliminary development contract with Sherman Associates to redevelop the site.

In 2014, the EDA applied for a federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) grant for a structured parking ramp to be located immediately north of the Southwest LRT Beltline Blvd Station platform in lieu of a large parking lot. The EDA was subsequently awarded a \$6.4 million grant through the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) CMAQ program that is regionally administered by the Metropolitan Council.

The EDA and Sherman Associates entered into a Preliminary Development Agreement (PDA) on February 5, 2018 in which the parties pledged to work cooperatively together toward a mutually acceptable mixed-use, mixed income, transit-oriented development plan for the Beltline Blvd Station Site. Sherman Associates then purchased the 4725 Highway 7 property for the future park and ride in February 2019.

On October 21, 2019, the EDA approved a Subrecipient Agreement with the Metropolitan Council which specified the terms under which the CMAQ funds would be disbursed to the EDA. On November 2, 2020, the EDA entered into a Cooperative Construction Agreement with the Metropolitan Council under which the EDA committed to constructing a multi-level parking structure on the 4725 Highway 7 property just prior to the start of revenue service. The parking facility would serve the larger mixed-use, transit-oriented development on the site. Those additional stalls would need to be funded locally outside of the CMAQ grant.

The parties, including the City of St. Louis Park, Sherman Associates, Metropolitan Council, and Hennepin County have been working collaboratively on a joint development vision for the site. The redevelopment will provide community benefits, including more housing opportunities through mixed income and affordable housing and a grocery store accessible by transit.

**e. Are future stages of this development, including development on any other property, planned or likely to happen? ☐ Yes ☒ No**

**If yes, briefly describe future stages, relationship to present project, timeline, and plans for environmental review.**

Not applicable.

**f. Is this project a subsequent stage of an earlier project? ☐ Yes ☒ No**

If yes, briefly describe the past development, timeline, and past environmental review.

Not applicable.

## 7. Cover Types

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

Table 2: Cover Types

Cover Type	Before (Acres)	After (Acres)
Wetlands	0.26	0.0
Deep Water/Streams	0.0	0.0
Wooded/Forest	1.3	0.0
Lawn/Landscaping	2.5	1.6
Impervious Surface	2.8	5.4
Other (describe)	0.0	0.0
Total	7.0	7.0

## 8. Permits and Approvals Required

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

Table 3: Permits and Approvals Required

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
<b>Local</b>		
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	Stormwater Management Permit	To be applied for
	Erosion Control Permit	To be applied for
	WCA Replacement Plan Approval	To be applied for, if needed
City of St. Louis Park	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	To be applied for
	Preliminary and Final Plat	To be applied for
	Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development	To be applied for
	Right-of-way Vacation	To be applied for
	Building Permits	To be applied for
	Demolition Permits	To be applied for
	Public Right-of-Way permit	To be applied for
	Sewer and Water Permit	To be applied for
	Erosion Control Permit	To be applied for
	Dewatering Permit	To be applied for



Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
<b>Regional</b>		
Metropolitan Council	Notification of intent to perform a demolition	To be applied for
	Construction Site Stormwater Permit	To be applied for
	Sewer Connection Permit	To be applied for
	Southwest LRT Project Office Coordination for access modification	To be applied for
Hennepin County	ROW Vacation	To be applied for
	Work in ROW Permits	To be applied for
	Driveway Modification	To be applied for
<b>State</b>		
Minnesota Department of Health	Notification of Asbestos Related Work	To be applied for
	Water Extension Permit	To be applied for
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	Notification of intent to perform a demolition	To be applied for
	Construction Site Stormwater Permit	To be applied for
	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit	To be applied for
	401 Water Quality Certification	To be applied for, if needed
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources	Water Appropriation Permit	To be applied for
Minnesota Department of Transportation	Driveway access permits and utility permits	To be applied for
<b>Federal</b>		
US Army Corps of Engineers	Section 404 Permit	To be applied for, if needed

## 9. Land Use

### a. Describe:

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

#### *Existing Land Use*

The site consists of three previously developed but currently vacant parcels that include paved and gravel parking lots, and existing ROW surrounded by manicured lawn, wooded area, and wetlands. All previous buildings and parking areas have been demolished by the City of St. Louis Park and Southwest LRT construction contractors. The land use adjacent and nearby is mainly industrial, business park, and high- and low-density residential.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> City of St. Louis Park Existing Land Use Map, 2017. Available at: <https://www.stlouispark.org/home/showpublisheddocument/15304/637110593130700000#page=4>

### *Parkland and Trails*

There are no parklands or trails within the project limits; however, the Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail runs parallel to the south side of the site (see Figure 5).

Carpenter Park is less than a quarter-mile northwest of the project site and Bass Lake Preserve is 0.3 miles to the southeast (see Figure 6).

### *Prime and Unique Farmlands*

There are no prime or unique farmlands within the project site as it is located within an urban area.

**ii. Planned land use as identified in comprehensive plans (if available) and any other applicable plan for land use, water, or resource management by a local, regional, state, or federal agency.**

According to the City of St. Louis Park 2040 Future Land Use Map (see Figure 5), the planned land use for the site is transit-oriented development and right-of-way.

As per the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Plan, the transit-oriented development land use designation allows a mix of uses including commercial, office, residential, civic, and parks/open space. The uses must be oriented toward the transitway stations along the planned Southwest LRT extension. The goal of this designation is to create pedestrian-scale developments within a ten-minute walk of a transitway station. The focus of the designation is on block sizes, lot sizes, and building forms that create a pedestrian-rich environment, rather than a specific mix of uses. It is expected that residential uses will make up approximately 75 to 85 percent of uses; the remaining 15 to 25 percent will likely be commercial, office, and other similar uses. The net residential density range allowed is 50 to 125 units per acre.

The transit-oriented development designation will assist the City to achieve the Livable Community Principles that are part of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the goals within *Thrive MSP 2040*. *Thrive MSP 2040*<sup>2</sup> is the Metropolitan Council's future vision for the region and includes policy plans on transportation, housing, water resources, and regional parks. The City of St. Louis Park is identified as an urban center, which includes the largest, most centrally located, and most economically diverse cities in the region. Urban centers are expected to plan for continued population growth and increased redevelopment densities.

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

### *Current Zoning*

The existing zoning of the site is I-G (General Industrial). The City intends to rezone the property to a planned unit development to accommodate the proposed development, and to bring the sites into conformance with the 2040 Future Land Use transit-oriented development designation. It is anticipated that the planned

---

<sup>2</sup> Thrive MSP 2040. Available at: [https://metro council.org/Planning/Publications-And-Resources/Thrive-MSP-2040-Plan-\(1\)/ThriveMSP2040.aspx](https://metro council.org/Planning/Publications-And-Resources/Thrive-MSP-2040-Plan-(1)/ThriveMSP2040.aspx)

unit development will have a mix of commercial and residential uses with convenient multi-modal connections via major roadways and the future Beltline transit station.

#### *Overlay Districts*

The project site is not located within any land use or zoning overlay districts.

The project site is not located within a shoreland, floodplain, wild and scenic river, critical area, or agricultural preserve.

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

Existing nearby land uses include transit-oriented development, low to medium density residential, commercial, and light industrial uses. The project proposes transit-oriented, mixed-use residential and commercial uses and focuses accessibility of the site to the nearby future LRT station. This is compatible with the future land use identified in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, which allows a mix of uses such as commercial, office, residential, civic, and parks/open space. The proposed project is compatible with and supports existing and future land uses for the area.

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

Not applicable.

## *10. Geology, Soils, and Topography/Land Forms*

---

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

According to the Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County<sup>3</sup>, the bedrock geology of the project site consists of Platteville Formation and Glenwood Formation (Lake Ordovician). The Platteville Formation is typically between 25 to 30 feet thick and composed of tan to gray limestone and dolostone. The Glenwood Formation, between 3 to 7 feet thick, is a grayish-green to brownish-gray, calcareous, sandy, and phosphatic shale.

The surficial geology consists of Pleistocene-age Grantsburg sublobe till deposits, which are typically loam-textured till, ranging from loamy sand to clay. They can be oxidizing gray to yellow-brown in color and are commonly banded with reddish-brown Superior lobe till or sand.

There are no known sinkholes, shallow limestone formations, unconfined/shallow aquifers, or karst features present within or near project limits.

**b. Soils and Topography – Describe the soils on the site, giving NRCS (SCS) classifications and descriptions, including limitations of soils. Describe topography, any special site**

---

<sup>3</sup> Geological Atlas of Hennepin County. Available at: <https://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/200919>

conditions relating to erosion potential, soil stability, or other soil limitations, such as steep slopes or highly permeable soils. Provide estimated volume and acreage of soil excavation and/or grading. Discuss impacts from project activities (distinguish between construction and operational activities) related to soils and topography. Identify measures during and after project construction to address soil limitations including stabilization, soil corrections, or other measures. Erosion/sedimentation control related to stormwater runoff should be addressed in response to Item 11.b.ii.

According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey<sup>4</sup>, there are two soil types within the site. Due to the location of the site and the classification of the soil, the soil type is not rated for an erosion hazard rating, meaning that there is not enough information to make a determination regarding soil erodibility. Details on the soil types found within the project limits are included in Table 4.

Table 4: Soil Types Within Project Limits

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Erosion Hazard Rating	Percent of Project Limits
U1A	Urban land—Udorthents, wet substratum, complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Not rated	92.2%
U4A	Urban land—Udipsamments (cut and fill land) complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Not rated	7.8%

The bedrock topography varies from 826 to 850 feet in elevation across the site.

The proposed project would require approximately 47,000 cubic yards of excavation.

A NPDES permit is required because the project will disturb more than one acre of land. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared. All unpaved areas disturbed during construction will be revegetated in accordance with the standard NPDES permit requirements. In areas with steep slopes, special consideration will be given to prevent erosion during construction, such as erosion control blankets, along with vegetation establishment to permanently stabilize side slopes and any areas impacted as a result of construction.

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

## 11. Water Resources

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

<sup>4</sup> Web Soil Survey. Available at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm>

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

There is only one surface water, a wetland, located in the project area. Aquatic resources within the construction limits were delineated using a routine Level 2 delineation method.<sup>5</sup> A wetland delineation was completed (Kimley-Horn 2019) for all wetland boundaries as shown in Attachment B.

There are multiple regulatory agencies with potential regulatory authority in the study area, specifically the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), via Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD), via the Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA); however, the wetland is not anticipated to be regulated by either. The USACE may not take jurisdiction over the wetland due to its isolated nature and the MCWD may not regulate the wetland due to the history of disturbance on the study area. Final regulatory status will be determined when permit application are prepared.

Several of the DNR Public Water Basins within one mile of the project site are on the MPCA's 303d 2020 Impaired Waters list (see Table 5 and Figure 6)<sup>6</sup>.

Table 5: Impaired Waters within One Mile of the Construction Limits

Waterbody	Assessment Unit	Impaired Cause
Bass Lake	27-0015-00	Nutrient/eutrophication biological indicators
Cedar Lake	27-0039-00	Mercury in fish tissue
Bde Mka Ska	27-0031-00	Mercury in fish tissue; Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) in fish tissue
Twin Lakes	27-0656-00	Nutrient/eutrophication biological indicators

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

<sup>5</sup> Level 2 delineation methodology outlined in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (USACE, 1987) along with the Midwest regional supplement (USACE, 2012). More information available at [http://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Regulatory-Program-and-Permits/reg\\_supp/](http://www.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Regulatory-Program-and-Permits/reg_supp/)

<sup>6</sup> More information related to impaired waters is available at <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/minnesotas-impaired-waters-list>

A review of nearby well records via the Minnesota DNR's Water-Table Elevation and Depth to Water table data (Minnesota Hydrogeology Atlas series HG-03)<sup>7</sup>, the depth to groundwater varies from 0 to 20 feet across the project site.

The project site is within the St. Louis Park Drinking Water Supply Management Area (DWSMA) and St. Louis Park Wellhead Protection Area (WPA) and adjacent to the Edina DWSMA and Edina WPA (See Figure 7).

Based on the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed by Braun Intertec for the site in 2013, there may be a well on the site. If wells are encountered during construction, they will be sealed in accordance with current Minnesota Department of Health regulations.

**b. Describe effects from project activities on water resources and measures to minimize or mitigate the effects below.**

**i. Wastewater – For each of the following, describe the sources, quantities, and composition of all sanitary, municipal/domestic, and industrial wastewaters projected or treated at the site.**

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

Based on the Metropolitan Council's Sewer Available Charge determination standards for the proposed improvements with the proposed uses (see site plan in Attachment A), the additional wastewater flows are projected to be approximately 114,258 gallons per day (GPD). Wastewater is expected to be equivalent to domestic strength wastewater. In the event a specific user would have wastewater stronger than domestic strength wastewater, a pretreatment facility would be required to be installed.

The sanitary sewer service will be provided by the City of St. Louis Park. The existing system currently has the capacity to handle the increase in wastewater generated by this type of development based on coordination and discussions with the Public Works Department. It is connected to Metropolitan Council's Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Plant in Saint Paul, MN. Currently, the plant has a maximum capacity of 314 million gallons per day. During the month of April 2021, the plant had an average flow of 168 million gallons per day, which results in an excess capacity of around 146 million gallons per day.<sup>8</sup> A sewer line will be stubbed off of the existing sanitary main on-site and provide connections to the proposed additions. The proposed buildings will be connected to this main line. Manholes will be provided every 200 feet to provide access to the main line on the site for serviceability and monitoring. Dual Metropolitan Council sanitary forcemains

---

<sup>7</sup> Available at [https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/groundwater\\_section/mapping/mha/hg03\\_plate2.pdf](https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/groundwater_section/mapping/mha/hg03_plate2.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Available at: [https://metro council.org/Wastewater-Water/Services/Industrial-Waste/IWPP-Pubs/Sewer\\_Expansion\\_Appl\\_Data-pdf.aspx](https://metro council.org/Wastewater-Water/Services/Industrial-Waste/IWPP-Pubs/Sewer_Expansion_Appl_Data-pdf.aspx)

in the northern portion of the Site will need to be relocated to allow for development. All sanitary sewers are located outside the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) required setbacks from a well. No on-site wells have been identified; however, if any wells are encountered, they will be properly sealed per the MDH code prior to construction of the proposed development.

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

Not applicable.

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

Not applicable.

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

The Regional stormwater treatment and detention BMPs constructed in Carpenter Park (northwest corner of Beltline Boulevard (Ottawa Ave S.) and CSAH 25) were sized to account for the stormwater treatment requirements of this site. Rate control requirements still apply, and thus a combination of above ground stormwater biofiltration gardens, along with underground pipe detention are proposed. Filtration and pipe attenuation will be more desirable on this site as opposed to infiltration due to site contamination as is further described in Response 12a. Development must meet the stormwater management requirements of the City of St. Louis Park and the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District.

A 66" reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) storm sewer currently transverses the Site flowing from north to south ultimately discharging into Bass Lake. A separate project by the City of St. Louis Park is underway, evaluating improvement and/or relocation of the existing 66" RCP storm sewer. The site development will discharge to said 66" RCP storm sewer, maintaining general existing drainage patterns.

**iii. Water Appropriation – Describe if the project proposes to appropriate surface or groundwater (including dewatering). Describe the source, quantity, duration, use,**



**and purpose of the water use and if a DNR water appropriation permit is required. Describe any well abandonment. If connecting to an existing municipal water supply, identify the wells to be used as a water source and any effects on, or required expansion of, municipal water infrastructure. Discuss environmental effects from water appropriation, including an assessment of the water resources available for appropriation. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects from the water appropriation.**

Construction dewatering may be required for the redevelopment of the project site. Construction activities related to dewatering will include discharging to temporary stormwater BMPs. Any temporary dewatering will require a DNR Temporary Water Appropriations General Permit 1997-005 if less than 50 million gallons per year and less than one year in duration. It is anticipated that the temporary dewatering would only occur during utility installation and potential construction of building footings.

Water appropriation for new wells or an increase in authorized volume is not anticipated for the project as the City's current system can accommodate the development. No wells have been identified within the project site; therefore, no well abandonment is anticipated.

#### **iv. Surface Waters**

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

One 0.26-acre wetland, located in the southwest corner of the proposed development, will be impacted by the proposed development. The wetland impact is anticipated to be permanent, resulting from roadway/parking lot fill or building development. The wetland stormwater functions will be replaced as part of the proposed stormwater management. Specifically, runoff from the site will be routed to the regional stormwater treatment and detention BMPs constructed in Carpenter Park (northwest corner of Beltline Boulevard (Ottawa Ave S.) and CSAH 25).

If the USACE or MCWD determine the wetland is regulated, wetland impacts will be replaced at a minimum of 2:1 replacement ratio with wetland replacement in accordance with CWA and/or WCA requirements. It is anticipated that wetland bank credits would be used for replacement of the wetland impacts. Mitigation plans would be submitted to MCWD and/or USACE prior to the final acceptance of the project.



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

No lakes, streams, or ponds are located within the site. Therefore, no impacts to any surface water features are anticipated.

## 12. Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes

---

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

There is potential for contamination within the project site. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed by Braun Intertec for the site in 2013. The site has previously been used for a machine shop, manufacturing, and automotive repair purposes since 1946. The past and current operations at the site included processes that have involved the use of heavy metals, organic solvents, hazardous substances and petroleum products.

At the time of the ESA, the site was occupied by Vision Bank. This building was demolished in 2020 and the parking lot was removed. Currently, the only significant existing infrastructure within the project site is the CSAH 25 frontage road.

The potential environmental hazards identified in the Phase I ESA for the Beltline Station Development project site are as follows:

- One approximately 300-gallon diesel fuel aboveground storage tank (AST) used as the fuel source for a back-up generator was located in a concrete block storage building near the southwest corner of the site. The AST appeared to be in good condition and no significant staining was noted beneath or surrounding the AST. Beneath and surrounding the back-up generator that the AST was connected to; however, significant staining was noted. Based on this observation, the significant staining from the back-up generator connected to a diesel fuel AST is considered a recognized environmental condition.

- Three air compressors were located at the site, two in the basement of the site building and one in the building addition containing the back-up generator. Significant staining was noted on the flooring beneath these compressors. Based on these observations, the staining observed is considered a recognized environmental condition.
- Minor dumping of several electronic monitors were observed on the wooded southeast corner of the site. The potential exists that buried materials are present at the site that require management as solid or hazardous waste.
- Historical records suggest that the site was in a topographic low and may have been a wetland and/or may have been connected to Bass Lake located south of the site. If fill soils are encountered during redevelopment, which could include demolition debris and other wastes, additional evaluation of the fill soils might be required for management and disposal purposes.
- Based on a historical review, a well is or may be located at the site. If the well is no longer planned to be used, we recommend that the well be properly abandoned in accordance with Minnesota Department of Health regulations.

The project proposer will conduct a Phase II ESA prior to construction. If any contamination is identified during the pre-demolition survey, an Abatement Plan and Response Action Plan (RAP) will be developed that outlines the safe handling and disposal of the identified contamination and hazardous materials found on the project site.

**b. Project Related Generation/Storage of Solid Wastes – Describe solid wastes generated/stored during construction and/or operation of the project. Indicate method of disposal. Discuss potential environmental effects from solid waste handling, storage, and disposal. Identify measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects from the generation/storage of solid waste including source reduction and recycling.**

All solid wastes generated by construction of the proposed project would be disposed of properly in a permitted, licensed solid waste facility.

Construction of the proposed development will generate construction-related waste materials such as wood, packaging, excess materials, and other wastes, which will either be recycled or disposed of in proper facilities in accordance with state regulations and guidelines.

Hazardous waste products are not anticipated to be produced or stored within the proposed development.

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

No above ground or underground storage tanks have been identified within the project boundary. A fuel tank for an emergency generator is anticipated as part of the proposed development.

Any hazardous waste materials used/stored during construction and/or operation of the project will be disposed of in the manner specified by local or state regulation or by the manufacturer. A spill prevention plan will be developed, and proper spill prevention controls will be in place for any vehicle refueling or maintenance that occurs on site during construction.

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

The previous buildings and associated parking lots have already been removed by the city and the Southwest LRT project. It is not anticipated for there to be unregulated fill that has been previously placed on the site. If it is encountered, an Abatement Plan would be prepared by the contractor to address removal and proper disposal of any regulated materials. The plan would be reviewed by the MPCA prior to demolition. Following abatement and demolition activities, a comprehensive Abatement Closeout Report would be prepared, which would document the removal, management, and disposal of the regulated materials. This report would be submitted to the MPCA for final closeout.

Regulated material and/or waste will be managed in accordance with state requirements. No known toxic or hazardous wastes are anticipated to be generated on the site. Toxic or hazardous waste to be stored on the site during construction will include fuel and oil necessary to operate heavy construction equipment and during operations may include commercial cleaning supplies.

### 13. Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, and Sensitive Ecological Resources (Rare Features)

---

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

The majority of the land within the project area has been previously disturbed through construction of roadways and commercial areas. Habitats in the project area include wooded areas, manicured landscaping, and wetlands.

Due to fragmented and low-quality urban habitat, the wildlife that inhabit this area are generalist species adapted to highly disturbed urban conditions. These species are generally more tolerant of human presence and activities, including vehicular traffic and urban development, and have demonstrated by their presence that they adapt readily to the human environment.

- b. Describe rare features such as state-listed (endangered, threatened, or special concern) species, native plant communities, Minnesota County Biological Survey Sites of**

**Biodiversity Significance, and other sensitive ecological resources on or within close proximity to the site. Provide the license agreement number (LA-965) and/or correspondence number (ERDB) from which the data were obtained, and attach the Natural Heritage letter from the DNR. Indicate if any additional habitat or species survey work has been conducted within the site and describe results.**

#### *State-Listed Species*

A review of the DNR Natural Heritage Inventory System database was conducted per license agreement LA-965 for the area within approximately one mile of the project site. The database includes the known occurrences of any state endangered, threatened, or special concern species. The review identified five species that may be found near this area. The species are listed in Table 6.

**Table 6: State-Listed Species Within 1-Mile of Project Limits**

Species	Group	Status	Last Observed	Habitat
Least Darter	Fish	Special Concern	2017	Small rivers and streams, littoral zones of lakes
Pugnose Shiner	Fish	Threatened	1941	Small rivers and streams, littoral zones of lakes
Rusty-patched Bumble Bee	Insect	Endangered	1986	Grasslands and tallgrass prairies
Late Hawthorn	Plant	Special Concern	2020	Mesic loamy soil, with Elm, Basswood, Ash, and Sugar Maple trees
Edible Valarian	Plan	Threatened	2020	Calcareous fens, wet meadows, and moist prairies

No sites of biodiversity significance exist within one mile of the proposed project site.

#### *Federally-Listed Species*

The rusty patched bumble bee is an endangered species that prefers grassland with flowering plants from April through October, underground and abandoned rodent cavities or clumps of grasses above ground as nesting sites, and undisturbed soil for hibernating queens to overwinter. The project limits are located within in a low potential zone for the rusty patched bumble bee.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Rusty Patched Bumble Bee Map. Available at <https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/insects/rpbb/rpbbmap.html>.

The project area is located within a county containing documented northern long-eared bat hibernacula.<sup>10</sup> ; however, is not within ¼ mile of a known hibernacula or within 150 feet of a maternity roost tree. Tree removal is proposed as part of this project on site and will occur outside of the active roosting season (June 1 -July 31<sup>st</sup>).

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

No impacts to rare features are anticipated. One 0.26-acre wetland, located in the southwest corner of the proposed development, will be impacted by the proposed development and may displace fish, wildlife, and plant communities within or nearby the wetland.

#### *Stormwater*

Stormwater run-off can cause a number of environmental problems. When stormwater drains off a construction site, it can carry sediment and pollutants that harm lakes, rivers, streams, and wetlands.

#### *Invasive Species*

Invasive species are plants and animals that are not native to an area and are capable of causing harm. Certain measures can be taken to limit the likelihood of introducing invasive species, such as securing local materials to avoid the long-range movement of goods or washing vehicles prior to accessing the project site. Additionally, landscape designs should include native, non-invasive plants.

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

The proposed development includes landscaping, parks, and stormwater retention areas that can provide habitat for wildlife and plant communities that are generally more tolerant of human presence. The landscaped area will include a blend of biodiverse, native, drought-tolerant plant species that could provide pollinator habitat.

#### *Invasive Species*

Invasive species will be controlled on site during construction and proposed landscaping will not include any DNR-identified invasive species. Additionally, best management practices will be followed when relocating construction equipment from other sites.

#### *Stormwater*

During construction of the proposed development, best practices of wildlife friendly erosion control and temporary stormwater management will be implemented.

---

<sup>10</sup> Townships Containing Documented Northern Long-Eared Bat Maternity Roost Trees and/or Hibernacula Entrances in Minnesota. DNR and USFS, April 1, 2019. Available at [https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/ereview/minnesota\\_nleb\\_township\\_list\\_and\\_map.pdf](https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/ereview/minnesota_nleb_township_list_and_map.pdf).

## 14. Historic Properties

---

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

The Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) database was reviewed to determine whether any known cultural resources have been previously identified within the project area. The SHPO database response noted that there are several resources nearby; however, no known resources have been identified in the project area (see Attachment C).

It is not anticipated that archaeological sites will be uncovered during the construction of this project as the project site has been significantly disturbed with previous development activities. However, if cultural materials are encountered during the construction, a qualified Professional Archaeologist will be contacted to assess the discovery and provide guidance.

## 15. Visual

---

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

The proposed development will include three four to seven story residential buildings and one four-story parking garage. The overall all look would be visually similar to the surrounding buildings. There are no scenic views or vistas on or near the project site. Views from CSAH 25 and Beltline Blvd would be similar to those experienced currently. No projected related vapor plumes or glare from intense lights are anticipated. No visual impacts have been identified.

Due to the multi-family and commercial uses within the development there will be lighting needed for parking lots and pedestrian connections for use outside of daytime hours. These lights will have shields to minimize glare and effects to wildlife and neighboring properties. Lights for the development will be subject to city ordinances and the Planned Unit Development Master Plan review process.

## 16. Air

---

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

No stationary source air emissions are anticipated; therefore, no mitigation is required. No significant impacts are anticipated from the typical residential/commercial systems that will provide heating and cooling for the proposed development.

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

Typical of most developments, the proposed project will generate air pollution as a result of increased motor vehicle activity. Motor vehicles emit a variety of air pollutants including carbon monoxide (CO), hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, and particulates. The primary pollutant of concern is CO, which is a byproduct of the combustion process of motor vehicles. CO concentrations are generally highest in the vicinity of signalized intersections where vehicles are delayed and emitting CO. Generally, concentrations approaching state air quality standards are found within about 100 feet of a roadway source. Further from the road, the CO in the air is dispersed by the wind such that concentrations rapidly decrease.

The Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has developed a screening method designed to identify intersections that will cause a CO impact above state standards. MnDOT has demonstrated that even the 10 highest traffic volume intersections in the Twin Cities do not experience CO impacts. Therefore, intersections with traffic volumes lower than these 10 highest intersections will not cause a CO impact above state standards. MnDOT’s screening method demonstrates that intersections with total daily approaching traffic volumes below 82,300 vehicles per day will not have the potential for causing CO air pollution problems. None of the intersections in the study area exceed the criteria that would lead to a violation of the air quality standards.

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

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

The project will generate temporary fugitive dust emissions during construction. These emissions will be controlled by sweeping, watering, or sprinkling, as appropriate or as prevailing weather and soil conditions dictate. Dust emissions are not anticipated during occupancy as all ground surfaces will either be impervious or vegetated. During construction, contractors will follow best management practices to reduce dust emissions. Once occupied, the project is not expected to generate fugitive dust emissions.



## 17. Noise

---

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

### *Existing Noise*

The project site is located in an urban area surrounded by city and county roads. Existing noise at the site is largely emitted from the surrounding roadways. Nearby sensitive receptors include the residential areas to the north, Carpenter Park to the northwest, and businesses to the south.

### *Construction Noise*

The St. Louis Park City Code regulates both the hour of operation for construction equipment and allowable noise levels. Construction of the project will adhere to requirements identified in the St. Louis Park City Code, Chapter 12-124, which states, "No person shall engage in, permit, or allow construction activities involving the use of power equipment, manual tools, movement of equipment, or other activities except between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekdays and between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays." A permit will be obtained from the City for work outside these hours as applicable.

### *Operational Noise*

The St. Louis Park City Code and MPCA regulate mechanical noise associated with building operation. The occupancy of the proposed project will comply with these requirements and will not reduce the quality of life to the surrounding neighbors.

Building design will incorporate noise reduction technologies in interior spaces as a result of existing local traffic.

## 18. Transportation

---

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

### *Parking*

The site is currently vacant. Redevelopment will include the construction of a parking structure, parking within each building, and surface parking:

- Parking Structure: 560 stalls, that includes 268 stalls for park and ride purposes
- Building 1 – Level P1: 83 stalls
- Building 2 – Level P1: 65 stalls



- Building 3 – Level P1: 97 stalls
- Surface parking: 107 stalls
- **Total: 912 stalls**

### *Existing Traffic Volumes*

The existing roadway network near the site includes Beltline Blvd, CSAH 25, Lynn Avenue, and the South Service/Frontage Road. The roadway network is described below.

- Beltline Blvd is classified as a Proposed Major Collector per the City of St. Louis Park Comprehensive Plan. The 2018 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) is 10,500 vehicles per day. The posted speed limit is 30 miles per hour (mph). However, per the City's recommended speed limit map, Beltline Blvd is anticipated to have a posted speed limit of 25 mph. An improvement project is being completed in 2021 on Beltline Boulevard south of Park Glen Road to convert the roadway from a 4-lane section to a 3-lane section with on street bike lanes.
- CSAH 25 is a Hennepin County road and is classified as a Minor Augmenter. The 2018 daily volume on CSAH 25 at Lynn Avenue is 18,200 vehicles per day and the posted speed limit is 45 mph.
- Lynn Avenue is a local city street and does not have a published AADT volume. A 13-hour traffic count conducted at the Lynn Avenue/ South Frontage Road intersection in September 2019 was used to estimate a total daily volume of approximately 350 vehicles per day. There is no posted speed limit on Lynn Avenue.
- Park Glen Road is a two-lane undivided roadway that serves as an access road for commercial and residential developments on the east and west sides of Beltline Boulevard. Park Glen Road is designated as a city street in the City of St. Louis Park's Comprehensive Plan. Per the City's recommended speed limit map, Park Glen Road is anticipated to have a speed limit of 20 mph. AADT volumes on Park Glen Road are not available.

### *Traffic Generation*

An updated traffic analysis was conducted in June 2021 for the proposed project. The study utilized data collected in 2019 as part of the original traffic analysis (see Attachment D for full report). Anticipated trip generation estimates were calculated using information within the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. Standard ITE trip rates were used to develop the gross new trips generated by the site. Reductions were applied to the trips generated to account for internal capture of the mixed-use development as well as pass-by trips from the adjacent roadways. The trip generation was based on the following uses:

- Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) (ITE code 221) (403 total units)
- Supermarket (ITE code 850) (analyzed as 32,000 square feet)
- Coffee/Donut Shop without Drive-Thru (ITE code 936) (1,800 square feet)

Based on the proximity to the Beltline Blvd LRT station, a mode split of 15% transit was assumed for the residential land use and 10% transit was used for the commercial land uses. The trip generation for both scenarios is shown in Table 8.

Table 7: Vehicle Trip Generation Summary

Land Use Description	Trip Generation		
	Daily	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour
Multifamily Housing	2,195	145	180
Supermarket	3,420	125	295
Coffee/Donut Shop	645	185	65
<b>Total Site Trips</b>	<b>6,260</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>540</b>
Internal Site Capture	-760	0	-120
Multimodal Reduction	-735	-50	-50
Pass-by Reduction	0	0	-90
<b>Total External Trips</b>	<b>4,765</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>280</b>

#### Availability of Transit

Transit service is currently available near the project area and will be expanded in the near future. There is one bus route within the study area, and the METRO Green Line Beltline Boulevard Station is currently under construction and is anticipated to open in 2024.

**Route 17F** is a local bus route from St. Louis Park to Downtown Minneapolis with major stops along Minnetonka Boulevard, Lake Street, and Hennepin Avenue. The 17F is a spur route of Route 17 and is currently not running due to the COVID-19 pandemic. It is assumed that the route will resume service in the future. The connecting bus service at the Beltline Boulevard Station to support the METRO Green Line will be determined by Metro Transit prior to opening days of the LRT service.

**METRO Green Line Extension** will operate from downtown Minneapolis to Eden Prairie. The Beltline Station will be located on the east side of Beltline Boulevard immediately south of the proposed development. Based on the proximity to this station, it is anticipated that the METRO Green Line will be the most likely alternate mode of transportation for site trips.

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

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/accessmanagement/resources.html>) or a similar local guidance.

### *Traffic Impact Analysis*

The traffic analysis evaluated intersection capacity for the following intersections:

- CSAH 25 and Beltline Blvd/Ottawa Ave S
- CSAH 25 and Lynn Ave
- CSAH 25 and Monterey Ave (future intersection)
- Beltline Blvd and CSAH 25 South Service Rd
- Beltline Blvd and Park Glen Rd
- Beltline Blvd and backage road (future intersection)

The capacity analysis was performed to determine the delay and level of service (LOS) for the study intersections for the Opening Year (2024) conditions. The future year analysis scenarios include:

Opening Year (2024) No-Build Conditions – The no-build traffic volumes are the anticipated future traffic volumes with area growth taken into consideration and the inclusion of the planned Beltline Station park-and-ride. In this scenario, access would be provided to the proposed site based on the improvements described above.

Opening Year (2024) Scenario 1 Build Conditions – The Scenario 1 Build traffic volumes would be the anticipated traffic from the proposed development in addition to the no-build traffic volumes. Access to the site would remain the same as Opening Year (2024) No-Build Conditions.

Opening Year (2024) Scenario 2 Build Conditions – The Scenario 2 Build traffic volumes would be the anticipated traffic from the proposed development in addition to the no-build traffic volumes. The development project is proposing site access modifications in order to make the retail component of the site viable. These changes would better facilitate access into and out of the site and include:

- Convert the right-in only access on Beltline Boulevard that connects to the backage road to a ¾ access and shift the intersection further to the north. This would add left-in access from southbound Beltline Boulevard to the backage road and right-out access from the backage road to northbound Beltline Boulevard. The proposed ¾ access is located to still provide a minimum 60-foot median between the railroad crossing and the access, which meets the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) requirements for the proposed quiet zone.
- Add right-out access from Monterey Avenue to eastbound CSAH 25 to convert the CSAH 25 and Monterey Avenue intersection to a right-in/right-out intersection. The location of the access would remain the same as the Opening Year (2024) No-Build scenario

The analysis found that multiple movements at the intersections near the redevelopment site experience failing levels of service under the Opening Year (2024) No-Build conditions. In the

Build (2024) conditions, in general, the same movements are anticipated to have LOS E/F operations under Opening Year (2024) Scenario 2 Build Conditions compared to Opening Year (2024) Scenario 1 Build Conditions. The only additional movement that is expected to operate at LOS E under Opening Year (2024) Scenario 2 Build Conditions is the eastbound left-turn movement at CSAH 25 and Beltline Boulevard/Ottawa Avenue S in the AM peak hour. The overall increase in delay compared to Opening Year (2024) Scenario 1 Build Conditions is only approximately two seconds and this movement is not directly affected by development traffic.

Additional sensitivity modeling scenarios showed that the distribution of site traffic away from Beltline Blvd and a new traffic signal at Beltline Blvd and Park Glen Rd would both result in improved intersection LOS and less queuing in the study area.

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

The analysis for all scenarios shows LOS E vehicular operations at several study intersections, but the proposed site is in a prime location to encourage users to access the site via other modes of transportation.

The changes to the accesses analyzed in Scenario 2 are necessary to be able to lease space, attract tenants and customers, and make this transit-oriented development a success. These improvements are not necessarily a product of poor operations, but viability of the site. These improvements are:

- Modify the access at Beltline Blvd/backage road to allow left-in and right-out movements. This access is already planned to be constructed as a left-in as part of the Southwest LRT project. As part of the Beltline Station development, the access would be modified to construct a right-out.
- Modify the access at CSAH 25/Monterey Ave to allow right-in and right-out movements. This access is already planned to be constructed as a right-in as part of the Southwest LRT project. As part of the Beltline Station development, the access would be modified to construction a right-out.

Based on the results of the Opening Year (2024) No-Build and Build analyses, several improvements should be considered as traffic volumes increase within the study area.

As traffic volumes on Beltline Boulevard grow, it will become increasingly difficult for vehicles on Park Glen Road to turn onto Beltline Boulevard. A traffic signal may be required to provide gaps for vehicles on Park Glen Road. However, the analysis shows that the proposed Beltline Station Development will not trigger the need for the traffic signal. Based on conversations with the City of St. Louis Park, there are not currently plans to install a traffic signal at the intersection, but it is expected to be installed when the vacant parcel on the northeast side of the intersection is developed. The City is also exploring options to fund the signal prior to the redevelopment of the parcel.

With the anticipated northbound queues on Beltline Boulevard, there is the potential for northbound vehicles to block the southbound left turning traffic at the  $\frac{3}{4}$  access. It is recommended to install additional signage for northbound Beltline Boulevard to not block

the intersection. The queue cutter signal for the SWLRT should also help provide gaps in northbound traffic

The CSAH 25/Monterey Avenue Right-in/Right-out is not anticipated to be a desirable movement for vehicles destined to the west on CSAH 25. However, signage should be provided on site to direct traffic to either the right out onto Beltline Boulevard or the signal at CSAH 25 and Lynn Avenue. There should also be prohibited U-turn signage on the eastbound approach of CSAH 25 at Lynn Avenue. The median at CSAH 25 and Lynn Avenue could also be redesigned with a minimal radius on the eastbound approach to discourage U-Turns. Any changes to the median will need to be verified so that they do not impact other turning movements.

## 19. Cumulative Potential Effects

---

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

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

Cumulative effects are defined as the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or persons undertakes such actions. The geographic areas considered for cumulative effects are those areas adjacent to the project site, and the timeframe considered includes projects that would be constructed in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Adjacent projects include the METRO Southwest LRT Extension. This LRT extension will run parallel to the south side of the site. It will also include the construction of Beltline Station at the intersection of Beltline Blvd and the Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail. This project is currently under construction and a portion of the proposed project site is currently being used as a staging area for the Southwest LRT extension.

A new trail bridge for Cedar Lake LRT Regional Trail will be constructed over the LRT and freight rail tracks. Construction on the bridge is currently ongoing.

Redevelopment opportunities exist both close to this site and in the broader vicinity even though the area is a built-out urban environment. The proposed development will implement plans and policies adopted by the City of St. Louis Park.

The proposed project is not expected to have any adverse impacts. Due to the proposed urban characteristics and for the somewhat restricted opportunities for new development in this area, no cumulative potential impacts of this development are anticipated.

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

*Parkway Residences*

Parkway Residences located northeast of the proposed project site along West 31<sup>st</sup> Street near Glenhurst Avenue S and CSAH 25 started development in Spring of 2020. The project includes construction of four new multifamily buildings, the rehabilitation of three existing apartment buildings, and the demolition of 12 existing buildings.

Environmental effects of this project will be similar to those experienced during the Beltline development.

#### *Beltline LRT Station*

The planned Beltline Blvd Station will be located at the intersection of Beltline Blvd and Hwy 25, adjacent to the project site. It will include a passenger drop-off area, and bus stop. A Metropolitan Council LRT park and ride ramp is being constructed as part of the proposed development. A new trail bridge is being constructed over the LRT and freight rail tracks and Beltline Blvd. Currently, the northwest corner of the Beltline Development site is being used as a staging area for this project. Construction is expected to be complete in 2023. Environmental impacts of this project will be similar to those experienced during the Beltline development.

#### *Extra Space Storage*

The Extra Space Storage building located west of the project site has received approvals for a 45,000 square foot addition. Construction started summer 2020.

- c. Discuss 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.**

There are no other major development projects that have been identified within the project area. No cumulative potential impacts of this development are anticipated.

## **20. Other Potential Environmental Effects**

---

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

The proposed development is a transit-oriented development adjacent to a METRO Green Line Extension light rail station. The Beltline Station development will complement the transit functions in and around the site and will transform the site and will emphasize a neighborhood scale of connected streets, with traffic calming measures and pedestrian features, that will significantly improve the aesthetic of the area.

Energy efficiency with performance functionality will be aggressively deployed to achieve sustainable conservation and ongoing reduction of the project's carbon footprint. Furthermore, the project proposer has development solar arrays in the metro area to provide renewable energy to reduce the carbon footprint of new development.

The project will contribute to the urban tree canopy and provide multi-modal connections, which is consistent with relevant policies identified in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

## RGU Certification

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

**I hereby certify that:**

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

Signature Jfi Mon

Date August 24, 2021

Title Senior Planner