

Comments on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet and Responses to Comments

Comments were received from the following individuals and organizations:

1. Diane Sanest (Exhibit A)
2. Jason Gottfried, Transportation Planner, Hennepin County Public Works (Exhibit B)
3. MPCA (Exhibit C)
4. US. Army Corps of Engineers (Exhibit D)
5. Metropolitan Council (Exhibit E)
6. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (Exhibit F)

No other comments were received.

The following are summaries of the specific comments and the responses to each. Copies of the actual comments are attached.

A. Diane Sannes

Comment: Where are the comments posted for residents review? How do those that input questions rec'd replies? On what page is this stated?

Response: Comments that are received become part of the public record. All comments, with applicable responses, are provided as part of the final decision when the final decision is publicized. The final decision will be sent to all people that provided comments. This process is not stated in the EAW but is laid out in the rules for environmental review provided by the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB).

Comment: What are the dates of the 30 public comment period? April 11 – May 11? On what page is this stated?

Response: The public comment period is April 19 – May 19. This is stated in the public notice on the availability of the EAW. The EAW form is set by the EQB and includes a series of questions that must be answered as part of the review. The public comment period is not part of the required analysis.

Comment: What is the agenda for the April 26 mtg – who will make presentations? What current residents have been asked to present feedback/questions? What engagement in 2022 was done to Engage current BC residents? How do those that input questions rec'd replies? Or IS only at the April 26 mtg that all Replies will be given? Who will be Replying? On what page is this stated?

Response: The purpose of the April 26 meeting was to describe the proposed project and the EAW. No specific current residents were asked to present feedback/questions. Notice of the meeting was posted on the City's website and pushed out through social media, direct contacts, and the City newsletter. The public notice of the availability of the EAW was published in the Sun Post and on the Minnesota EQB Monitor on the 19th. The public notice was also sent to regulators in accordance with the Minnesota EQB guidelines. As discussed above, all comments with applicable responses are provided as part of the final decision and will be sent to those that provide comments. Replies will not be available prior to the final decision. The replies will be prepared by the City in coordination with the project proposer. This is part of the required process and is not included in the EAW document.

Comment: What plans are there for Home Ownership? Are all Owned homes under an association fee? On what page is this listed?

Response: The proposed plan indicates that all of the homes will be rental homes. The details are discussed on page 2 of the EAW.

Comment: On site contamination/hazardous materials/wastes esp underground water from the Bdale Ford Car site. See page 18-21 – are 2022 updates to plans listed on what page is this listed?

Response: As discussed in the EAW (page 19), a Construction Contingency Plan (CCP) would be prepared for the proposed project and submitted for review and approval by the MPCA Voluntary Investigation Cleanup (VIC) and Petroleum Brownfields (PB) Programs. The CCP would outline methods for segregating and handling unexpected or unknown contaminated media (soil, groundwater etc.) during construction.

As discussed in the EAW (page 21) hazardous materials present within the Ocean Buffet restaurant including all asbestos containing materials would be removed by a licensed abatement contractor prior to demolition of the restaurant building. The abatement contractor would be responsible for removing and disposing of the materials in a manner that meets state and federal regulations.

No updates to these plans are available at this time.

Comment: Page 13 states that upper twin lake is the only waterbody one mile from site – what about Mississippi River and Palmer lake? PLEASE ADD THESE TWO MAJOR WATER WAYS ALSO Note: Shingle Creek Flows into the Mississippi River just 5 miles from the development.

Response: The EAW only requires a discussion of waterbodies within a one-mile radius. Figure 9 in the EAW indicates the one-mile radius from the site and also notes the Mississippi River, as well as other waterbodies that are just outside the one-mile radius.

Comment: Page 17 – Explain how a Complex of this size will not impact Shingle Creek over the stated 3 – 5 year period? And who is responsible when SC is impacted Esp DUST from construction over the building years

Response: The proposed project will not involve any physical effects or alterations to Shingle Creek. All construction and development will take place on the site, which is not immediately adjacent to Shingle Creek. Stormwater from the site will be directed to an on-site stormwater pond. Construction impacts are managed through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit which will be obtained prior to construction. The NPDES permit requires best management practices (BMPs) be implemented to prevent dust and other impacts from the construction process to be conveyed off-site and into nearby stormwater drains or wetlands (such as Shingle Creek). The NPDES permit is enforced by the MPCA, City of Brooklyn Center, and the watershed district. Any violations, enforcement actions, civil penalties, or corrective actions would be the responsibility of the construction team.

Comment: Page 33 Noise – what noise might be expected (by residents) from the planned Event Ctr – inside and out and during what hours

Response: The hours of events have not been determined for the event center. It is anticipated that all events held at the Event Center will be held inside. The Event Center will be subject to noise ordinances from the City of Brooklyn Center.

Comment: Page 34 States Downtown other pages mention City Center or OpSite – Which Term is it – who decides??

Response: The site is part of an area designated by the City as the Opportunity Site, as described on Page 3. This area is included in the Downtown Brooklyn Center Master Plan.

Comment: Page 34 mentions SAFE transportation – what do residents define as safe Transportation?

Response: The discussion of safe transportation is from the Downtown Brooklyn Center Master Plan goals and was not developed as part of the EAW. The definition of safe transportation is up to the City and is not part of the EAW for the proposed project.

Comment: Page 21 Ocean B removal – when is this planned + when will Haz waste be removed?

Response: No dates have been set for the removal of hazardous materials (such as asbestos) from the Ocean Buffet restaurant. A construction schedule is provided on pages 2 – 3 of the EAW.

Comment: Page 35 – what active growth is currently occurring at SCC – Just a car wash in the last 2 years – Still no plans for much empty land along SC for now over 10 years and no plans for empty Space in the HOM building built over 3 years ago.. Currently more businesses Leaving rather than coming!

Response: Comment noted. The EAW does not include specific projects, as no specific projects have been identified. However, the City feels that this area is a growing area with potential for future activities, and therefore those potential effects are discussed on page 35.

Comment: Who maintains the Bee areas after area is complete? What page is this stated?

Response: All common areas, such as the bee areas, will be maintained by the property owner once construction is complete. This is not discussed in the EAW.

Comment: Where are the listed names of current residents/addresses that worked on this project in 2021?

Response: No current residents worked on the preparation of the EAW.

Comment: Will this complete EAW report with comments be give to the task force for their CBA work --- When?

Response: The EAW with the final decision, including comments and responses, will be a public document once complete. The EAW report and comments will be shared with the Citizen Advisory Taskforce once completed.

B. Hennepin County Public Works

Comment: Pg 18, ii. Stormwater – Can you confirm this project will trigger the city’s MS4 infiltration requirement?

Response: it is assumed that development will trigger the City’s MS4 infiltration requirements, however there may be opportunities to sequence out of MS4 requirements due to heavily compacted soils.

C. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Comment: Water resources (Item 12) The Project description indicates that the Project is part of a larger area of development to be constructed at a later date. In addition, the Project has the ability to discharge to a surface water with construction-related impairments. Therefore, if this Project, along with the future portions of the Project will ultimately disturb a total of 50 acres, it will be defined as a Common Plan of Development under the MPCA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) General Construction Stormwater permit (CSW Permit). Therefore, the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the current Project, as well as the later projects, will require submittal to the MPCA for review and approval prior to obtaining CSW Permit coverage.

Response: Comment noted. SWPPP will be submitted as required.

Comment: Due to construction-related impairments of receiving waters, the SWPPP for the Project will require additional best management practices (BMPs), including stabilizing inactively worked soils within 7 days and providing temporary sediments ponds where 5 or more acres drain to a common location.

Response: Comment noted. The SWPPP will follow all applicable regulations.

Comment: The EAW states that wet sediment ponds will be utilized for permanent stormwater management. The MPCA requires use of volume reduction practices to reduce stormwater runoff from the site unless specifically prohibited. Potential soil contamination located at the former car dealership would prohibit use of infiltration in that location. It is unclear whether all soils at the site would prohibit use of infiltration for meeting volume reduction requirements. Also, no green infrastructure practices are listed in the green infrastructure table that could serve to help meet these requirements. Green infrastructure would also serve to provide climate resilience to increased rainfall and urban heat island effects and help the site resist potential flooding due to location in a floodplain. However, the Project

proposer can consider opportunities for infiltration in other locations. Pervious pavements may be utilized to help achieve volume reduction. The Project proposer may also consider green roofs, tree trenches or boxes to intercept runoff. Open spaces could incorporate bioinfiltration areas using native plantings. Water reuse for toilet flushing and/or irrigation can also be utilized to achieve volume reduction. Questions regarding Construction Stormwater Permit requirements should be directed to Roberta Getman at 507-206-2629 or Roberta.Getman@state.mn.us.

Response: Comment noted. Volume reduction practices will be utilized to meet the requirements. Open areas are planned as part of the development. Green infrastructure is being considered as part of the development. However, the specific plans on the trees and green infrastructure were not finalized at the time of the EAW and so the green infrastructure table was not completed.

Comment: The MPCA would like to acknowledge that the GHG calculations provided in Appendix H are excellently documented.

Response: Comment noted.

D. USACE

Comment: The USACE sent a letter to acknowledge that they received the public notice on the EAW, and another letter to confirm that no permit appears to be required for the proposed project. No specific comments were provided in the letter.

Response: No response required.

E. Metropolitan Council

Comment: The staff review finds that the EAW is complete and accurate with respect to regional concerns and does not raise major issues of consistency with Council policies. An EIS is not necessary for regional purposes.

Response: Comment noted. No response required.

Comment - Section 10, Land use: There are two units of the Regional Parks System in the vicinity of the proposed project. These regional trails are depicted in the EAW and the proposed project appears to include plans for making connections to them, most directly to the Shingle Creek Regional Trail. The Council encourages local communities to plan and develop local trail connections to regional parks and trails, consistent with the *2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan*. Council staff encourages the proposer (Alatus, LLC) and RGU (City of Brooklyn Center) to coordinate with Three Rivers Park District on implementing local trail connections to the Shingle Creek and/or Twin Lakes Regional Trails in and around the project area.

Response: Comment noted. Final connections to these trails have not been decided. The proposer and the RGU will coordinate with the Three Rivers Park District to implement the local trail connections.

Comment – Section 6 Project Description: Council staff recommend the developer work closely with Shingle Creek Watershed District and the City to implement stormwater practices that would minimize negative impacts to Shingle Creek and Upper Twin Lake.

Response: Comment noted. The proposer will work to implement stormwater practices to minimize negative impacts as discussed.

Comment – Section 6 Project Description: Staff also recommend the developer select vegetation for landscaping that is native, draught-tolerant, chloride-tolerant or chloride-friendly, and/or provides habitat to known endangered and sensitive wildlife and habitat species in the area, as well as wildlife and habitat historically native to the site area.

Response: Comment noted. The final vegetation and landscaping designs are in process. This suggestion will be considered as the vegetation and landscaping designs are finalized.

Comment – Section 6 Project Description: Should the subject development process, Council staff will adjust upward the forecast allocation for TAZ#1101 by +500 households and +1300 population, debiting the difference from the balance of Brooklyn Center. Metropolitan Council and City staff can discuss a city total forecast adjustment as well; this comment is advisory; Brooklyn Center has not yet surpassed its growth forecast.

Response: Comment noted. No response required.

Comment – Section 20 Transportation: As depicted in an attached map of the EAW, one existing bus stop is directly adjacent to the project site on northbound Shingle Creek Parkway. As site plans are further developed, the project team should coordinate with Metro Transit staff on incorporating the bus stop into the site design, particularly if the stop will be disturbed during construction.

Response: Comment noted. The project team will coordinate with Metro Transit on this bus stop, especially regarding how construction may or may not disturb the bus stop.

Comment – Section 20 Transportation: The mixed- and low- income multifamily housing are planned adjacent to Bass Lake Rd, where there are currently no bus stops on the north side of the street between Shingle Creek Pkwy and Hwy 100. Given the planned intensity and potential for transit ridership at these new housing sites, the project team should coordinate with Metro Transit staff to explore a potential future bus stop on this block of Bass Lake Rd.

Response: Comment noted. The project team will discuss this comment with Metro Transit staff.

F. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR)

Comment 1, Page 13, Groundwater: If unknown well are encountered onsite, they should be sealed in accordance with guidance from the Minnesota Department of Health.

Response: Agreed. Any wells encountered during development of the proposed project will be sealed in accordance with all appropriate regulations and guidelines.

Comment 2, Page 15, Stormwater: We appreciate that the project will reduce the amount of impervious surfaces in the area and improve treatment prior to stormwater being discharged from the site. We encourage the proposer to field verify infiltration design rates given the disturbed nature of the site, which has likely resulted in heavy soil compaction that could retard water movement through the soil. If infiltration is not advisable, please consider reusing stormwater to irrigate project landscaping.

Response: Comment noted. Stormwater infiltration plans have not been finalized. This comment will be considered during planning.

Comment 3, Page 15, Stormwater: We strongly encourage the development to use weed-free, suitable, native seed mixes and plants in project stormwater features and landscaping in order to provide pollinator habitat, especially because the project area is located within a High Potential Zone for the federally-endangered rusty patched bumblebee. The Board of Soil and Water Resources' website contains many great resources for choosing seed mixes and establishing native plants.

Response: Comment noted. Landscaping plans have not been finalized. This comment will be considered during planning.

Comment 4, Page 15, Stormwater: We appreciate that the planned decrease in impervious surfaces will also decrease the amount of road salt used in the project area. Please consider requesting large-scale property managers to develop a chloride management plan and/or participate in the Smart Salting Training offered through the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.

We also encourage cities and counties to consider how they may participate in the Statewide Chloride Management Plan and provide public outreach to reduce the overuse of chloride.

Response: Comment noted. This suggestion will be provided to the property managers as the proposed project is developed.

Comment 5, Page 16, Water Appropriation: The project description and plans state that underground parking is proposed for the development. Please be aware that if sump pumping is required for underground structures in volumes that exceed 10,000 gallons per day or 1 million gallons per year, then a DNR Water Appropriation Permit would be required.

Response: Comment noted. This will permit will be obtained as necessary.

Comment 6, Page 21, Rare Features: DNR concurs that impacts to rare features are not anticipated as a result of this project.

Response: Comment noted. No response required.

Comment 7, Page 26, Dust and Odors: Please do not use projects that contain calcium chloride or magnesium chloride for dust control in areas that drain to public waters.

Response: Comment noted. This restriction will be implemented during construction

Exhibit A

Diane Sannes

From: [Meg McMahan](#)
To: [Wolff, Jennifer](#)
Cc: ["Chris Osmundson"; Smith, Jeff](#)
Subject: FW: BC OPSite EAW Apr 2022
Date: Monday, May 2, 2022 10:34:11 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mmcmahan@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us. [Learn why this is important](#)

See below for comments submitted by Diane Sannes.

Meg

From: makendmeet@aol.com <makendmeet@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 30, 2022 6:37 PM
To: Meg McMahan <mmcmahan@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us>
Subject: BC OPSite EAW Apr 2022

Notes from Tues April 26 EAW mtg

PLS submit these comments/questions to the EAW Process

Thanks if you can reply that you rec'd this message

.....

I attended the Wed night mtg by ACER at City of BC

=I Was surprised to hear MELO say that the building that they are designing would be run/maintained by City of BC

And **Residents/tax payers would pay for this building and ongoing expenses!!!!**

Thanks

Diane Sannes 763 607 1150

this was the auto reply give from the 3 questions I submitted on the web site link

Thank you for your comments! The develop team will compile comments and update the EAW, before formally presenting it to City leadership later in Spring 2022.

April 23

A> where are all comments posted for residents review ?

how do those that input questions rec'd replies ?

on What page is this stated ?

1.What are the dates of the 30 day comment period? April 11 - May 11 ?
on What page is this stated ?

2. what is the agenda for the April 26 mtg --who will make presentations?
What current residents have been asked to present feedback /questions?

What engagement in 2022 was done to Engage current BC residents?

How do those that input questions rec'd replies ? Or IS only at the April 26 mtg that all Replies will be given?

Who will be Replying ???

on What page is this stated ?

April 26 Questions asked on BC Zoom Call

A> where are all comments posted for residents review ? on What page is this stated ?

1.What are the dates of the 30 day comment period? April 11 - May 11 ? on What page is this stated ?

2.what plans are there for Home Ownership? Are all Owned homes under an association fee? on what page is this listed ?

3. On site Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes esp underground water from the Bdale Ford Car site

-see page 18 -21--are 2022 updates to plans listed on what page is this listed ?

4. Page 13 states upper twin lake is the only waterbody one mile from site -

What about Mississippi River and Palmer Lake ?

PLEASE ADD THESE TWO MAJOR WATER WAYS ALSO

Note :Shingle Creek Flows into the Mississippi River just 5 miles from the development

5. page 17 - Explain how a Complex of this size will not impact Shingle Creek over the stated 3 -5 year period ?

and who is responsible when SC is impacted

Esp DUST from construction over the building years

6. page 33 Noise - what noise might be expected (by residents) from the planned Event Ctr --Inside and out and during what hours .

7. page 34 States Downtown other pages mention City Center or OpSite - Which Term is it --who decides ???

7. Page 34 mentions **safe** transportation - what do residents define as safe Transportation ?

8. Page 21 Ocean B removal - when is this planned + when will Haz waste be removed ?

9. page 35 -- what active growth is currently occurring at SCC - Just a car wash in the last 2 years -

Still no plans for much empty land along SC for now over 10 years and no plans for empty Space in the HOM building built over 3 years ago..

Currently more businesses Leaving rather than coming!

10

Who Maintains the Bee areas after area is complete ? What page is this stated ?

11. Where are listed names of current residents/addresses that worked on this project in 2021?

12. Will this complete EAW report with comments be Given to the task force for their CBA work.... When ?

Exhibit B

Hennepin County Public Works

From: [Meg McMahan](#)
To: [Wolff, Jennifer](#); ["Chris Osmundson"](#); [Smith, Jeff](#)
Subject: FW: Opportunity Site EAW (EQB Monitor 04/19/22) - HC staff comments
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 1:05:01 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from mmcmahan@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us. [Learn why this is important](#)

FYI – see comments below.

Meg

Please note my recent email change

Meg (Beekman) McMahan, AICP | Community Development Director
City of Brooklyn Center

6301 Shingle Creek Parkway | Brooklyn Center, MN 55430-2199

Direct: 763-569-3305 | General: 763-569-3330

General Email: communitydevelopment@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us

www.ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us | mmcmahan@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us



From: Jason D Gottfried <Jason.Gottfried@hennepin.us>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 10:13 AM
To: Meg McMahan <mmcmahan@ci.brooklyn-center.mn.us>
Cc: Ashley Morello <Ashley.Morello@hennepin.us>; KC Atkins <KC.Atkins@hennepin.us>
Subject: Opportunity Site EAW (EQB Monitor 04/19/22) - HC staff comments

Hello Meg,

We have circulated the [Opportunity Site EAW posted in the EQB Monitor April 19th, 2022](#) with our transportation and environmental staff and have but 1 specific comment:

Pg 18, ii. Stormwater). *Can you confirm this project will trigger the city's MS4 infiltration requirement?*

Beyond that, we're excited for this project to kickoff, and believe the well-thought out, mixed-use vision for the site will complement surrounding regional and local amenities serving as a popular destination for residents and visitors alike. Furthermore, we appreciate the removal of the direct driveway onto Bass Lake Road, and believe that will allow for a more orderly, safer, and multi-modal friendly environment. No further comments from a Hennepin County infrastructure perspective.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment

Jason

Jason Gottfried

Transportation Planner
Transportation Planning

Office: 612-596-0394 Cell: 612-719-8073

jason.gottfried@hennepin.us

Hennepin County Public Works

1600 Prairie Drive

Medina, MN 55340

(working remotely)

Disclaimer: If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly permanently delete this message from your computer system.

Exhibit C

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

May 16, 2022

Meg Beekman
Community Development Director
City of Brooklyn Center
6301 Shingle Creek Parkway
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

Re: Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site #1 Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Dear Meg Beekman:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site #1 project (Project) located in Brooklyn Center, Hennepin County, Minnesota. The Project consists of mixed-use site redevelopment. Regarding matters for which the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has regulatory responsibility and other interests, the MPCA staff has the following comments for your consideration.

Water Resources (Item 12)

- The Project description indicates that the Project is part of a larger area of development to be constructed at a later date. In addition, the Project has the ability to discharge to a surface water with construction-related impairments. Therefore, if this Project, along with the future portions of the Project will ultimately disturb a total of 50 acres, it will be defined as a Common Plan of Development under the MPCA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) General Construction Stormwater permit (CSW Permit). Therefore, the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the current Project, as well as the later projects, will require submittal to the MPCA for review and approval prior to obtaining CSW Permit coverage.
- Due to construction-related impairments of receiving waters, the SWPPP for the Project will require additional best management practices (BMPs), including stabilizing inactively worked soils within 7 days and providing temporary sediment ponds where 5 or more acres drain to a common location.
- The EAW states that wet sediment ponds will be utilized for permanent stormwater management. The MPCA requires use of volume reduction practices to reduce stormwater runoff from the site unless specifically prohibited. Potential soil contamination located at the former car dealership would prohibit use of infiltration in that location. It is unclear whether all soils at the site would prohibit use of infiltration for meeting volume reduction requirements. Also, no green infrastructure practices are listed in the green infrastructure table that could serve to help meet these requirements. Green infrastructure would also serve to provide climate resilience to increased rainfall and urban heat island effects and help the site resist potential flooding due to location in a floodplain. However, the Project proposer can consider opportunities for infiltration in other locations. Pervious pavements may be utilized to help achieve volume reduction. The Project proposer may also consider green roofs, tree trenches or boxes to intercept runoff. Open spaces could incorporate bioinfiltration areas using native plantings. Water reuse for toilet flushing and/or irrigation can also be utilized to achieve volume reduction. Questions regarding Construction Stormwater Permit requirements should be directed to Roberta Getman at 507-206-2629 or Roberta.Getman@state.mn.us.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions/Carbon footprint (Item 18)

The MPCA would like to acknowledge that the GHG calculations provided in Appendix H are excellently documented.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Project. Please provide your specific responses to our comments and notice of decision on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement. Please be aware that this letter does not constitute approval by the MPCA of any or all elements of the Project for the purpose of pending or future permit action(s) by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. If you have any questions concerning our review of this EAW, please contact me by email at Karen.kromar@state.mn.us or by telephone at 651-757-2508.

Sincerely,

Karen Kromar

This document has been electronically signed.

Karen Kromar
Planner Principal
Environmental Review Unit
Resource Management and Assistance Division

KK:rs

cc: Dan Card, MPCA, St. Paul
Roberta Getman, MPCA, Rochester

Exhibit D

USACE



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, ST. PAUL DISTRICT
180 FIFTH STREET EAST, SUITE 700
ST. PAUL, MN 55101-1678

04/19/2022

Regulatory File No. MVP-2022-00637-MJB

THIS IS NOT A PERMIT

Chris Osmundson
80 S 8th St Suite 4155
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Dear Mr./Ms. Osmundson:

We have received your submittal described below. You may contact the Project Manager with questions regarding the evaluation process. The Project Manager may request additional information necessary to evaluate your submittal.

File Number: MVP-2022-00637-MJB

Applicant: Meg Beekman

Project Name: Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site

Project Location: Section 2 of Township 118 N, Range 21 W, Hennepin County, Minnesota (Latitude: 45.0603332371782; Longitude: -93.311093856826)

Received Date: 04/18/2022

Project Manager: Meghan Brown
(651) 290-5688
Meghan.J.Brown@usace.army.mil

Additional information about the St. Paul District Regulatory Program can be found on our web site at <http://www.mvp.usace.army.mil/missions/regulatory>.

Please note that initiating work in waters of the United States prior to receiving Department of the Army authorization could constitute a violation of Federal law. If you have any questions, please contact the Project Manager.

Thank you.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
St. Paul District
Regulatory Branch

Exhibit E

Metropolitan Council



May 18, 2022

Meg Beekman, Community Development Director
City of Brooklyn Center
6301 Shingle Creek Parkway
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

RE: City of Brooklyn Center - Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) – Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site #1
Metropolitan Council Review No. 22750-1
Metropolitan Council District No. 6

Dear Meg Beekman:

The Metropolitan Council received the EAW for the Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site #1 project in Brooklyn Center on April 19, 2022. The proposed project is located near the Shingle Creek Parkway and Bass Lake Road intersection. The proposed development consists of 25.7 acres that will be developed into a mixed-use redevelopment site. The proposed project would include eight commercial and residential buildings; public plazas; park area; stormwater pond, a plaza; and underground and aboveground parking.

The staff review finds that the EAW is complete and accurate with respect to regional concerns and does not raise major issues of consistency with Council policies. An EIS is not necessary for regional purposes.

We offer the following comments for your consideration.

Section 10. Land Use (Colin Kelly, Regional Parks, 651-602-1361)

There are two units of the Regional Parks System in the vicinity (i.e., within ½ mile) of the proposed project: The Twin Lakes Regional Trail is just south of the project area and the Shingle Creek Regional Trail is just west of it. Both trails are owned, operated and maintained by Three Rivers Park District, the regional parks implementing agency for Brooklyn Center.

These regional trails are depicted in the EAW (e.g., Appendix A, Site Plan figure), and the proposed project appears to include plans for making connections to them, most directly to the Shingle Creek Regional Trail.

Section 10. Land Use states, “The Shingle Creek Regional Trail is planned to be re-routed through along the northern edge of the proposed project Site.”

Council staff is currently reviewing Three Rivers Park District’s Shingle Creek Regional Trail Master Plan. Segment 14 of the existing regional trail corridor encompasses most of the project site and is depicted on Map 205 (figure below). The master plan does not depict the Shingle Creek Regional Trail being re-routed through the northern edge of the proposed project site. Instead, the regional trail continues north.



The Council encourages local communities to plan and develop local trail connections to regional parks and trails, consistent with the *2040 Regional Parks Policy Plan*.

Council staff encourages the proposer (Alatus, LLC) and RGU (City of Brooklyn Center) to coordinate with Three Rivers Park District on implementing local trail connections to the Shingle Creek and/or Twin Lakes Regional Trails in and around the project area.

Section 6. Project Description (Maureen Hoffman, Water Resources, 651-602-1279)

Council staff recommend the developer work closely with Shingle Creek Watershed District and the City to implement stormwater practices that would minimize negative impacts to Shingle Creek and Upper Twin Lake.

Staff also recommend the developer select vegetation for landscaping that is native, draught-tolerant, chloride-tolerant or chloride-friendly, and/or provides habitat to known endangered and sensitive wildlife and habitat species in the area, as well as wildlife and habitat historically native to the site area.

Section 6. Project Description (Todd Graham, Forecasts, 651-602-1322)

The EAW discusses development with a church/assembly building (31,000 sq ft) and apartment buildings with 780 units, total.

The EAW site is the southern end of Transportation Analysis Zone #1101. At this time, the City's 2040 adopted Comprehensive Plan expects TAZ #1101 to gain +260 households, +500 population, and +220 jobs during 2020-2040. Should the subject development proceed, a higher level of households and population would result. Should the subject development proceed, Council staff will adjust upward the forecast allocation for TAZ #1101 by +500 households and +1300 population, debiting the difference from the balance of Brooklyn Center.

Metropolitan Council and City staff can discuss a city total forecast adjustment as well; this comment is advisory; Brooklyn Center has not yet surpassed its growth forecast.

Section 20. Transportation (Victoria Dan, Metro Transit, 612-349-7648)

As depicted in an attached map of the EAW, one existing bus stop is directly adjacent to the project site on northbound Shingle Creek Pkwy. In the site plan, the bus stop is shown at the northwest corner of Building G – Mixed Income Residential. This stop is served by Suburban Local Route 722 which serves Brooklyn Center Transit Center, 69Av/Humboldt, and destinations in Brooklyn Park including Target North Campus. As site plans are further developed, the project team should coordinate with Metro Transit staff on incorporating the bus stop into the site design, particularly if the stop will be disturbed during construction.

The mixed- and low-income multifamily housing are planned adjacent to Bass Lake Rd, where there are currently no bus stops on the north side of the street between Shingle Creek Pkwy and Hwy 100. Given the planned intensity and potential for transit ridership at these new housing sites, the project team should coordinate with Metro Transit staff to explore a potential future bus stop on this block of Bass Lake Rd. Currently, Core Local Route 22 and Suburban Local Route 801 operate on this segment of Bass Lake Rd, and provide service to Brooklyn Center, Minneapolis, Columbia Heights, Saint Anthony, New Brighton, and Roseville.

This concludes the Council's review of the EAW. The Council will not take formal action on the EAW. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Jake Reilly, Principal Reviewer, at 651-602-1822 or via email at Jake.Reilly@metc.state.mn.us. As always, you can also contact your Sector Representative, Eric Wojchik, at 651-602-1330 or via email at Eric.Wojchik@metc.state.mn.us.

Sincerely,



Angela R. Torres, AICP, Manager
Local Planning Assistance

CC: Tod Sherman, Development Reviews Coordinator, MnDOT - Metro Division
John Pacheco Jr. Metropolitan Council District 6
Eric Wojchik, Sector Representative
Jake Reilly, Principal Reviewer
Reviews Coordinator

N:\CommDev\LPA\Communities\Brooklyn Center\Letters\Brooklyn Center 2022 Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site #1 EAW Complete 22746-1.docx

Exhibit F

Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Division of Ecological and Water Resources
Region 3 Headquarters
1200 Warner Road
Saint Paul, MN 55106

Transmitted by Email

May 19, 2022

Meg Beekman
Community Development Director
City of Brooklyn Center
6301 Shingle Creek Parkway
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430

Dear Meg Beekman,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Brooklyn Center Opportunity Site #1 EAW located in Hennepin County. The DNR respectfully submits the following comments for your consideration:

1. Page 13, Groundwater. If unknown well are encountered onsite, they should be sealed in accordance with guidance from the Minnesota Department of Health.
2. Page 15, Stormwater. We appreciate that the project will reduce the amount of impervious surfaces in the area and improve treatment prior to stormwater being discharged from the site. We encourage the proposer to field verify infiltration design rates given the disturbed nature of the site, which has likely resulted in heavy soil compaction that could retard water movement through the soil. If infiltration is not advisable, please consider reusing stormwater to irrigate project landscaping.
3. Page 15, Stormwater. We strongly encourage the development to use weed-free, suitable, native seed mixes and plants in project stormwater features and landscaping in order to provide pollinator habitat, especially because the project area is located within a High Potential Zone for the federally-endangered rusty patched bumblebee. The Board of Soil and Water Resources' [website](#) contains many great resources for choosing seed mixes and establishing native plants.
4. Page 15, Stormwater. We appreciate that the planned decrease in impervious surfaces will also decrease the amount of road salt used in the project area. Please consider requesting large-scale property managers to develop a chloride management plan and/or participate in the Smart Salting Training offered through the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. There are a variety of classes available for road applicators, sidewalk applicators, and property managers. More information and resources can be found at this [website](#). Many winter maintenance staff who have attended the Smart Salting training — both from cities and counties and from private

companies — have used their knowledge to reduce salt use and save money for their organizations.

We also encourage cities and counties to consider how they may participate in the [Statewide Chloride Management Plan](#) and provide public outreach to reduce the overuse of chloride. Here are some [educational resources](#) for residents as well as a [sample ordinance](#) regarding chloride use.

5. Page 16, Water Appropriation. The project description and plans state that underground parking is proposed for the development. Please be aware that if sump pumping is required for underground structures in volumes that exceed 10,000 gallons per day or 1 million gallons per year, then a DNR Water Appropriation Permit would be required.
6. Page 21, Rare Features. DNR concurs that impacts to rare features are not anticipated as a result of this project.
7. Page 26, Dust and Odors. Please do not use products that contain calcium chloride or magnesium chloride for dust control in areas that drain to public waters.

Thank you again for the opportunity to review this document. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Melissa Collins". The signature is written in a cursive style and is set against a light blue rectangular background.

Melissa Collins

Regional Environmental Assessment Ecologist | Ecological and Water Resources
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

Phone: 651-259-5755

Email: melissa.collins@state.mn.us

CC: Chris Osmundson, Alatus, LLC

Equal Opportunity Employer