

CITY OF MINNETRISTA



CITY COUNCIL CONSENT AGENDA ITEM

Subject: Res. No. 69-26 Negative Declaration of the Need for an Environmental Impact Statement

Prepared By: Nickolas Olson, Senior City Planner
Through: David Abel, Community Development Director

Meeting Date: June 15, 2026

Overview: The City of Minnetrista (“City”) is the Responsible Governmental Unit for this project, and M/I Homes of Minneapolis, LLC (“M/I Homes”) is the Project Proposer. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) has been prepared for this project (“Proposed Project”) in accordance with Minnesota Rules Chapter 4410. The EAW was developed to assess the potential impacts of the project and other circumstances to determine if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.

The EAW was filed with the Minnesota EQB and circulated for review and comments to the required EAW distribution list, which included 22 different public and local agencies. A “Notice of Availability” for the initial EAW was published in the *EQB Monitor* on April 14, 2026. A Notice of Availability was also published on the City’s website. This notice provided information about the statutorily required public comment process that is used in determining the need for an EIS for the Proposed Project.

The public review and comment period for the Mixed Residential South Area Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) began on April 14, 2026, and was closed on May 14, 2026. The following responses were prepared to address questions and comments received during the public review and comment period.

The following agencies provided comment letters, organized alphabetically:

- Hennepin County Environment & Energy
- Metropolitan Council
- Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)

All comments received during the EAW comment period were considered in determining the potential for significant environmental effects.

Mission Statement:

The City of Minnetrista will deliver quality services in a cost effective and innovative manner and provide opportunities for a high quality of life while protecting natural resources and maintaining a rural character.

Recommended Action: Motion to adopt a resolution finding that the Proposed Project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects and an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Attachments:

1. Mixed Residential South Area Environmental Assessment Worksheet
2. Mixed Residential South Area Findings of Fact
3. Res. No. ____ Negative Declaration of the Need for an Environmental Impact Statement

Mission Statement:

The City of Minnetrista will deliver quality services in a cost effective and innovative manner and provide opportunities for a high quality of life while protecting natural resources and maintaining a rural character.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

Project: Mixed Residential South Area

Location: Minnetrista, MN

June 2026

Prepared for:



MINNETRISTA
MINNESOTA

Prepared by:



Table of Contents

1. Project Title.....	4
2. Proposer.....	4
3. RGU.....	4
4. Reason for EAW Preparation.....	4
5. Project Location.....	4
6. Project Description.....	5
7. Climate Adaptation and Resilience.....	10
8. Cover Types.....	14
9. Permits and Approvals Required.....	15
10. Land Use.....	17
11. Geology, Soils and Topography/Landforms.....	23
12. Water Resources.....	26
13. Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes.....	34
14. Fish, wildlife, plant communities, and sensitive ecological resources (rare features).....	37
15. Historic Properties.....	42
16. Visual.....	43
17. Air.....	43
18. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions/Carbon Footprint.....	44
19. Noise.....	47
20. Transportation.....	48
21. Cumulative Potential Effects.....	50
22. Other Potential Environmental Effects.....	51

List of Tables

Table 1. Existing Conditions of Project Site Parcels.....	6
Table 2. Summary of Units.....	7
Table 3. Project Magnitude.....	8
Table 4. Project Resource Category and Climate Trend Interaction.....	11
Table 5. Cover Types, Before and After.....	14
Table 6. Tree Canopy, Before and After.....	14
Table 7. Permits and Approvals.....	15
Table 8. Anticipated Project Lot Count.....	19
Table 9. Anticipated Project Unit Count.....	19
Table 10. Concept Plan Land Use Summary & 2040 Comprehensive Plan Comparison.....	19

Table 11. NRCS Soil Classifications	24
Table 12. Public Waters within 1 Mile of Project Site	26
Table 13. Wells within One Quarter Mile of Project Site.....	27
Table 14. Estimated Sanitary Sewer Flow Rate.....	28
Table 15. Estimated Water Supply.....	31
Table 16. Delineated Wetlands on Project Site.....	32
Table 17. Potentially Contaminated Sites within One Mile of Project Site	34
Table 18. Potentially Contaminated Agricultural Sites within One Mile of Project Site	35
Table 19. Estimated Waste	35
Table 20. Federally Listed Species in/near Project Site and Effects Determination	38
Table 21. Historic Properties within 1 Mile of Project Site	42
Table 22. Construction Emissions.....	45
Table 23. Operational Emissions	45
Table 24. Statutory Noise Limit Standards	47
Table 25. Trip Generation Summary	48

Appendices

Appendix A: Figures

Appendix B: Agency Requests

Appendix C: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Calculator Analysis

Appendix D: Wetland Delineation Report

Appendix E: Traffic Study

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

This most recent Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) form and guidance documents are available at the Environmental Quality Board's website at: <https://www.eqb.state.mn.us/>. The EAW form provides information about a project that may have the potential for significant environmental effects. Guidance documents provide additional detail and links to resources for completing the EAW form.

1. Project Title Mixed Residential South Area

2. Proposer

Contact Person:	Emily Becker	Paul Robinson
Title:	Land Dev. & Entitlements Mgr. M/I Homes of Minneapolis, LLC	Development Director Rachel Development
Address:	5354 Parkdale Drive #100	4180 Napier Ct NE
City, State, ZIP	St. Louis Park, MN 55416	St. Michael, MN 55376
Phone:	(763) 586-7217 (o), (320) 333-6459 (c)	(612) 791-7080
Email:	ebecker@mihomes.com	probinson@racheldevelopment.com

3. RGU

Contact Person:	David Abel
Title:	Community Development Director
Address:	7701 Co Rd 110 W
City, State, ZIP	Minnetrista, MN 55364
Phone:	(952) 241-2523
Email:	dabel@ci.minnetrista.mn.us

4. Reason for EAW Preparation

Required:

- EIS Scoping
- Mandatory EAW

Discretionary:

- Citizen Petition
- RGU discretion
- Proposer Initiated

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

EAW, Minnesota Rules 4410.4300, Subp. 19(D). Residential development.

5. Project Location

County:	Hennepin County
City/Township:	City of Minnetrista
PLS Location:	S ½ of Township 117N, Range 24W, Sections 33

Watershed (81 major watershed scale): Mississippi River – Twin Cities
GPS Coordinates: 44.864700, -93.720390
Tax Parcel Numbers: 33-117-24-32-0001, 33-117-24-32-0002, 33-117-24-42-0003 (south of Hwy 7 only), 33-117-24-43-0003
Appendix A, Figure 1: Project Location and Figure 2: USGS Quad Map

6. Project Description

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

The proposed project is a residential development in the City of Minnetrista, Hennepin County, Minnesota. The development will be built on approximately 163 acres and will be developed with 357 to 422 detached single family and attached townhome residential units, stormwater management areas, curvilinear roads, and open spaces.

- b. Give a complete description of the proposed project and related new construction, including infrastructure needs. If the project is an expansion include a description of the existing facility. Emphasize: 1) construction, operation methods and features that will cause physical manipulation of the environment or will produce waste, 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.

M/I Homes of Minneapolis, LLC (“Proposer”) is proposing to develop four parcels totaling approximately 163-acres for a mixed residential development to include unsewered and sewer residential uses (“Project”). The sewer area comprises approximately 143-acres that will include between 357 and 422 residential units, consisting of both detached single-family homes and attached townhomes, organized around buffered wetlands and open green spaces. Approximately 20-acres of the Project Site is guided rural residential and is subject to the requirements of an existing conservation easement that covers approximately 12.7 acres of the rural residential area. The 20-acre rural residential property is anticipated to be purchased by the Project Proposer and therefore is included and separately described throughout this analysis.

The Project is located along the southern boundary of the City of Minnetrista on land that has historically been used for agricultural production (“Project Site”). The Project Site is located south of Minnesota State Highway 7 (TH 7), west of Victoria Drive/Kings Point Rd, north of the Laketown Township/Carver County border, and east of Grimm Rd (Figure 1). The Project will incorporate a new internal curvilinear street network with access connections to TH 7 north of the Project Site.

The Project will be developed in phases over approximately 5-10 years, with initial site work expected to begin in 2027. Development will begin at the main entrance road and progress around the site.

Existing Property

The Project Site has predominantly been used for agricultural production and cultivation for the past several decades, with secondary areas used for the farmstead, conservation and delineated wetland areas. It is classified as Agricultural and Undeveloped on the City’s Existing Land Use Map. The Project Site is characterized by significant farmed areas, with some grasslands, forested

areas and rolling topography that generally slopes toward wetland depression areas. The 163-acre Project Site is comprised of four parcels, which are summarized below (Table 1).

Table 1. Existing Conditions of Project Site Parcels

Parcel ID	Location	Parcel Size (Acres)	Existing Condition
3311724320002	4520 Grimm Rd	0.38	Single-family residential structure
3311724320001	7635 State Hwy 7	109.3	Farmstead, accessory buildings, cultivated land, woodland and wetland areas
3311724420003	7501 State Hwy 7 (south of Hwy 7 only)	25.6	Cultivated land, wetland area
3311724430003	7385 State Hwy 7	27.7	Farmstead, accessory agriculture structures, cultivated land, wetland areas
TOTAL		162.98	

General Development Plan

Figure 3. Concept Plan shows the extent of the Project and shows the low end of the potential development range of the Project. The Project Proposer anticipates a mixed-residential development, and the ultimate density will be determined as part of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. As shown on the Concept Plan, there are approximately 296 single family detached lots and 61 attached townhome units for a total of 357 residential units. If necessary to comply with the City’s density requirements, conversion of the detached 65-foot lots to twin home lots and/or reducing the single-family lot sizes could achieve an additional 65 units for a maximum of 422 residential units. The new residential development will be served by a new internal road network, stormwater ponding, wetlands, buffer areas, and green space.

Residential Development Summary (Sewered)

The Project considers the development of the site with 357 to 422 sewered residential units. The following mix of sewered residential development is proposed:

- *Single Family Detached Lots (Units):* 253 – 296 lots are planned to be developed with detached single-family homes with the following lot sizes:
- *Attached Twin Home/Townhome Units:* 61 - 169 units are planned to be developed with attached residential units (townhome units).

Table 2. Summary of Units

LOT SIZE	LOT COUNT	
	Low	High
40-foot wide	62	122
50-foot wide	115	131
65-foot wide	119	0
TOTAL	296	253
Attached Twin Home/Townhome	61	169
TOTAL UNIT	357	422

Unsewered Residential Development Summary (Exception)

Approximately 20 acres are excluded from the sewer development area and are planned to remain unsewered and designated for rural residential uses. A maximum of two large Rural Residential Lots will be created any redevelopment or development of the lots will be subject to the requirements of an existing conservation easement that covers approximately 12.7 acres of the 20-acre area. The following summary of unsewered residential development is proposed:

- *Single Family Detached Rural Residential Lots:* 2 lots of 10 acres each

Infrastructure and Public/Semi-Public Uses

The following infrastructure, public and semi-public areas are shown on the Concept Plan:

- Wetlands – 21.9 acres delineated (approximately 9 acres are within the conservation easement area that will be protected as part of any development)
- Right-of-way (TH 7) – approximately 8.6 acres
- Stormwater Management – approximately 18.7 acres (ponding areas to be determined if areas will be dedicated as public outlots)

To assess impacts, this EAW considers the maximum potential unit count of 422 residential units in most sections of the document, except when evaluating a range of units or residential densities is more appropriate.

Infrastructure and Project Area Improvements

The proposed Project includes the following improvements:

Demolition, Grading, and Utilities

The existing homesteads, farm structures and site improvements will be removed as part of the site development process. Mass rough grading and grading of stormwater management facilities will be completed across the site. Gravity sanitary sewer will be constructed to a proposed lift station on the south side of TH 7 from which proposed forcemain will be constructed along the south side of TH 7 to approximately 2,000 feet west. The forcemain will connect to an existing manhole located at the easterly southside entrance of Buddy Boy Barbeque. The watermain will be constructed to serve lots on the Project Site, connecting to either an existing 12-inch watermain

on the north side of TH 7 or to a new line on the south side of TH 7 that the City of Minnetrista may install.

Road Improvements

The Project Site will be accessible via two (2) access points off TH 7. Within the TH 7 corridor, the frontage of the Project Site is located at a high point and both access locations were selected to optimize grades and sight lines. The primary access is located midway between Upland Farm Road and Oak Road and is spaced at approximately 1/4-mile from each of these existing roadways. The east access is located approximately 550 feet east of Oak Road; this access is planned to be a partial access (i.e., either three-quarter or right-in / right-out). Further discussion with MnDOT should occur to review the access scenarios identified in the Traffic Study (Appendix E) to determine the appropriate intersection configurations and implementation timeline, including potential improvements to TH 7 at the access points.

Internal to the Project Site, a local network of curvilinear roadways and cul-de-sacs will be constructed as shown in the Concept Plan. Streets will include sidewalks on both sides.

Stormwater Management

The stormwater management system will include the installation of curb and gutter, catch basins, and storm sewer pipes throughout the Project Site, that will connect to stormwater ponds, filtration basins, and an irrigation system. The stormwater management system will be designed to meet all City and Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) requirements.

During site construction, erosion and sediment controls (such as silt fence, inlet protection, etc.) will be installed and maintained per the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit requirements.

Project Schedule

The Project will be phased over a 5-to-10-year period progressing according to market demand with initial site work planned to begin in 2027. The Traffic Study (Appendix E) assumed most units would be complete by 2030 for a conservative approach to the traffic analysis. Initial site development will begin at the main entrance road located near the center of the development site and progress radially depending on the builder and/or unit mix.

c. Project magnitude:

The project magnitude is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Project Magnitude

Description	Size (approximate)
Total Project Acreage	163 acres
Linear project length	N/A
Number and type of residential units	357 - 422 Residential Units (Sewered) 253 - 296 Detached Single Family 61 - 169 Attached Townhome 2 Future Rural Residential Lots (Unsewered - Exception)
Residential building area (in square feet)	N/A
Commercial building area (in square feet)	N/A

Description	Size (approximate)
Industrial building area (in square feet)	N/A
Institutional building area (in square feet)	N/A
Other uses – specify (in square feet)	Local Road Network: 20 acres ROW Dedication (TH 7): 9 acres Open space (green space, ponding, wetlands, wetland buffers): 52 acres
Structure height(s)	Maximum 35'

- 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 the Project is to develop a new residential neighborhood in Minnetrista with a mix of both single-family detached and attached townhome units. The development will support the City’s goals of providing a mix of housing choices as the population in the community continues to increase.

- 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.

- f. Is this project a subsequent stage of an earlier project?

- Yes
- No

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

7. Climate Adaptation and Resilience

- a. Describe the climate trends in the general location of the project (see guidance: *Climate Adaptation and Resilience*) and how climate change is anticipated to affect that location during the life of the project.

Present and anticipated future shifts in Minnesota’s climate include greater intensity rainfall events, increased instances of localized flooding, more frequent freeze/thaw cycles, diminished snow cover, extreme heat, drought, and associated infrastructure damage and safety hazards. The following assesses climate trends as they pertain to the Project Site.

Temperature Trends

The Project Site is situated in the Mississippi River – Twin Cities major watershed. Per the Minnesota Climate Explorer tool¹, the average annual temperature (1895-2025) has trended upward by approximately 0.23°F/decade within the Major Watershed District (Figure 4).

The average annual temperature in 2024 was 48.9°F in the Major Watershed which is higher than the average since 1895. Climate models generally predict an increase in average temperature, with average annual temperature ranges from 36.9°F to 57°F during mid-century (2040-2059) (Figure 5). The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources State Climatology Office also anticipates warming winters, a continued increase in the frequency and magnitude of extreme rainfall events, and an increase in the severity, coverage, and duration of heat waves through the end of this century.

Precipitation Trends

Per the Minnesota Climate Explorer tool, the average annual precipitation for the Mississippi River – Twin Cities major watershed has trended upward by approximately 0.28 inches/decade (1895-2024). The annual rainfall in 2024 was 35.5 inches, which is higher than the average since 1895 (Figure 6). Climate models generally predict an increase in average annual precipitation with ranges from 10 inches to 72.7 inches during mid-century (2040-2059) (Figure 7). The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources State Climatology Office also anticipates warming winters, a continued increase in the frequency and magnitude of extreme rainfall events, and an increase in the severity, coverage and duration of heat waves through the end of this century.

- b. For each Resource Category in the table below: Describe how the project’s proposed activities and how the project’s design will interact with those climate trends. Describe proposed adaptations to address the project effects identified.

¹ “Minnesota Climate Explorer,” MN DNR, accessed July 15, 2025, <https://arcgis.dnr.state.mn.us/climateexplorer/main/historical>

Table 4. Project Resource Category and Climate Trend Interaction

Resource Category	Climate Considerations	Project Information	
		Climate Change Risks and Vulnerabilities	Adaptations
Project Design	<p>Increase in impervious surface coverage.</p> <p>Building architecture, materials choices and site design may negatively affect urban heat island conditions in the area .</p> <p>Presence of buildings may reduce opportunities to leverage solar resources.</p> <p>Potential for increased freeze/thaw cycles.</p>	<p>In the future, the Project Area is anticipated to experience increased annual temperatures, annual precipitation and freeze/thaw cycles, more frequent and heavier rainfall events, and increased heat island effects.</p> <p>During intense rainfall events the increased impervious surfaces may result in occurrences of localized flooding in the immediate Project Area</p> <p>Dark roofing and siding materials absorb heat during daylight hours and emit heat at night contributing to heat island effects and potentially contributes to warming trends.</p> <p>Water softeners that use salt increase chlorides in wastewater treatment plants and thereby streams.</p>	<p>Proposed native trees and landscaping will reduce runoff and mitigate heat island effect.</p> <p>Consider building exterior materials and colors that are lighter and reflect heat.</p> <p>Energy efficient appliances and lighting will be incorporated into building design.</p> <p>Building/lot orientations should consider south-facing roof opportunities to maximize solar options.</p> <p>Vegetative plans should consider placement to minimize rooftop shading where lot orientations support solar options.</p> <p>Water efficient design will be incorporated into landscaping.</p> <p>Design should consider snow storage and icy conditions.</p> <p>Consider incorporating chloride management strategies to reduce use of chlorides.</p> <p>Developers may consider water softeners that do not use salt to reduce chlorides going to the wastewater treatment plant.</p>

Resource Category	Climate Considerations	Project Information	
		Climate Change Risks and Vulnerabilities	Adaptations
<p>Land Use (See Item 10 for more detail)</p>	<p>Conversion of cropland to suburban development will increase impervious surface coverage and may contribute to increased occurrences of local flooding.</p> <p>Alterations of floodplain areas may impact stormwater storage volumes and contribute to increased wetland areas.</p>	<p>Lack of deep-rooted vegetation and tree cover could contribute to erosion and washouts in high rainfall events</p> <p>Increased impervious surface will contribute to heat island effects as temperatures rise</p>	<p>The Project's design will provide effective drainage for the site while capturing and treating stormwater runoff in a manner consistent with local (City and Watershed), state, and federal standards.</p> <p>The Project includes approximately 52 acres of open space including ponding, wetlands, and buffer areas.</p> <p>Design standards for building materials and landscaping should be considered to incorporate light/reflective colors and native vegetation around ponding, open space and natural areas.</p>
<p>Water Resources (See Item 12 for more detail)</p>	<p>Current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence water resources.</p>	<p>Surface and groundwater resources may increase in temperature, pollutant content, and volume due to increased temperatures and runoff. More severe storm events are projected which will require drainage systems to be adequately designed and maintained to accommodate the increase in water volume and flow rates.</p>	<p>Stormwater BMPs will be designed to meet City and Watershed District criteria for rate and volume control, and criteria for MPCA water quality requirements.</p> <p>Recommended use of native plants and perennials for landscaping within wetland buffers and within landscape areas</p> <p>Consider water reuse systems to reduce water usage, especially for landscaping areas.</p>

Resource Category	Climate Considerations	Project Information	
		Climate Change Risks and Vulnerabilities	Adaptations
Contamination/ Hazardous Materials/Wastes	Current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the potential environmental effects of generation/use/ storage of hazardous waste and materials.	The proposed Project has the potential to generate hazardous waste typical of residential developments.	<p>Determination of hazardous waste.</p> <p>Proper storage and labeling.</p> <p>Tracking waste with manifests.</p> <p>Following disposal regulations based on generator status.</p>
Fish, wildlife, plant communities, and sensitive ecological resources	Current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the local species and suitable habitat.	Suitable habitat for species may become unsuitable due to land use changes, increased temperatures, and increased runoff.	Climate-appropriate native plantings and stormwater BMPs will provide suitable habitat for small mammals, insects, and bird species.

8. Cover Types

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

Table 5. Cover Types, Before and After

Cover Types	Before (acres) ¹	After (acres)
<20% Impervious (rural residential lots)	-	20.3
< 50% Impervious (residential development)	10	24.7
> 50% Impervious (ROW, sidewalks)	-	28.6
Grasses	5.3	-
Agricultural Land	75.7	-
Wetland Shrubs/Wetland Emergent Vegetation	26.6	-
Delineated Wetlands ²	-	21.3
Forest/Tree Plantation	45	38.3
Stormwater Pond (wet sedimentation basin)	-	18.7
Open Space	-	10.7
TOTAL	162.6	162.6

¹ Source: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Minnesota Land Cover Classification System. Available at <https://gisdata.mn.gov/dataset/biota-landcover-mlccs>. See Figure 8 for map of existing cover types.

² 21.9 acres of wetlands were delineated and approved by NOD. Approximately 0.6 acres of wetland impacts are anticipated. Mitigations must follow all WCA rules and requirements.

Table 6. Tree Canopy, Before and After

Trees	Percent
Percent tree canopy removed or number of mature trees removed during development	15%

The City of Minnetrista’s tree preservation ordinance mandates that subdivisions creating more than five (5) lots are required to preserve all significant trees, except those that must be removed to facilitate the reasonable development of the property. At least 70 percent of the total caliper inches of significant trees on the property must be preserved. If the total caliper inches of trees to be removed exceeds the permitted 30 percent, replacement trees must be provided at a ratio of one caliper inch for each inch removed beyond the allowed 30 percent.

As part of the land use approval process, the Project Proposer must submit a tree inventory for the City to review. Given the Concept Plan, it is estimated that approximately 7 acres of trees will be removed, or 15 percent of the existing tree canopy on the Project Site. If the 30 percent maximum is exceeded, appropriate tree replacement may be required.

9. 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 7. Permits and Approvals

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
Federal		
US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Section 404 Clean Waters Act – Wetland Permit	To be applied for, if required
	MPCA 401 Certification, if required	
State		
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Construction Permit	To be applied for
	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)	To be applied for
	Sanitary Sewer Extension Permit	To be applied for
	401 Water Quality Certification	To be applied for
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	MN Natural Heritage Database Review	Complete
	Dewatering permit	To be applied for, if needed
Minnesota Department of Health (MDH)	Water main plan review and water supply connection	To be applied for
	Well abandonment	To be applied for
Minnesota Department of Transportation	Access Permit	To be applied for
	Right-of-Way Permit	To be applied for
	Utility Crossing Permit	To be applied for
	Drainage permit	To be applied for
Metropolitan Council	Sewer Extension Permit Review & Approval	To be applied for
	Sewer Facility Connection Permit	To be applied for
	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	To be applied for
Local		
Hennepin County	Wetlands/Surface Water Permitting	To be applied for, if needed
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District	Stormwater Management Permit	To be applied for

City of Minnetrista	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	To be applied for
	Rezoning (PUD)	To be applied for
	Preliminary and Final Plat	To be applied for
	Building Permits	To be applied for
	Road/access permits	To be applied for
	Sign permits	To be applied for
	Development Agreement	To be applied for
	WCA Review and Approval	To be applied for, if applicable
	WCA Replacement Plan	To be applied for, if applicable

Cumulative potential effects may be considered and addressed in response to individual EAW Item Nos.10-20, or the RGU can address all cumulative potential effects in response to EAW Item No.22. If addressing cumulative effect under individual items, make sure to include information requested in EAW Item No. 21.

10. Land Use

a. Describe:

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

The Project Site has predominantly been used for agricultural production and cultivation for the past several decades. It is classified as Agricultural and Undeveloped on the City's Existing Land Use Map.

The Project Site is bordered by TH 7 to the north and Carver Park Reserve in the City of Victoria to the south. Adjacent properties in the City of Minnetrista are developed with detached single-family residential and commercial uses. Several of the surrounding properties to the east and west are currently undeveloped or are used for agricultural production.

There are several City parks and nature preserves within one mile of the Project Site, including Merz Marsh Park, Alder Nature View Park, the Six Mile Marsh Prairie and Trail, the Baker-Carver Regional Trail (existing and planned segments), and Carver Park Reserve. The German Baptist Cemetery is approximately 1/2 mile from the Project Site.

The Project Site is not within or adjacent to any Wildlife Management Areas (WMA), Waterfowl Production Areas (WPA), or National Wildlife Refuges (NWR).²

Per the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (Figure 9), approximately 107 acres or 67% of the Project Site is classified as prime farmland, prime farmland if drained, or farmland of statewide importance. Prime Farmland, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and is available for these uses. Farmland of statewide importance is defined as land that has agricultural value but does not meet the criteria for prime or unique farmland.

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

The City of Minnetrista is in western Hennepin County, approximately 25 miles southwest of Minneapolis and St. Paul and within the Metropolitan Council's regional planning jurisdiction. Due to its proximity to the Twin Cities and accessibility to the TH 7 corridor, development in this area of Minnetrista is anticipated by the community

Metropolitan Council 2040 Comprehensive Plans

The Project Site in the City of Minnetrista has a Diversified Rural community designation in the Metropolitan Council's Thrive MSP 2040³ regional development guide. Diversified Rural communities are designated to ensure land availability to accommodate growth post-2040 for the future expansion of regional urban services. The City's land areas within the Diversified Rural provide interim rural residential land uses at densities at or below 4 dwelling units per 40 acres consistent with the Metropolitan Council's policy. This designation ensures

² "Minnesota Natural Resource Atlas," Natural Resources Research Institute, accessed December 2025 https://mnatlas.org/gis-tool/?id=k_0047

³ "Thrive MSP 2040," Metropolitan Council, accessed December 2025, <https://metrocouncil.org/Planning/Imagine-2050/Thrive-2040.aspx>

that when regional wastewater is extended, that development can be achieved cost-effectively and efficiently. Thrive MSP 2040 is the current regional policy until such time local comprehensive plans are updated and adopted in accordance with the 2050 regional plan as described below.

The Metropolitan Council adopted its Imagine 2050⁴ regional long-range plan on February 12, 2025, which sets the regional policy for the next comprehensive planning period which is defined as 2030-2050. In late September 2025, the Metropolitan Council distributed system statements to each city in the seven-county metropolitan region that cities will use along with the Imagine 2050 framework to update local comprehensive plans by December 31, 2028. In the Imagine 2050 Land Use Policy Plan, the Project Site remains designated within the Diversified Rural community designation.

Additionally, the Project Site shares its southern border with the Carver Park Reserve which is a part of the Metropolitan Council's Regional Park system, is managed by Three Rivers Park District, and is open to the public. The Carver Park Reserve is comprised of approximately 2,800-acres and is predominantly natural areas, surface waters, open spaces and trails. There are hiking, horseback riding, and mountain biking trails near the proposed Project Site, in this northeastern-most portion of the park reserve. Both the 2040 and 2050 Regional Parks and Trails Policy Plans identify the Carver Park Reserve; however, no expansion of the park area, regional trail or search corridors within or adjacent to the Project Site are identified within the policy plans.

City of Minnetrista Comprehensive Plan

The City of Minnetrista adopted its 2040 Comprehensive Plan in November 2019.⁵ The City of Minnetrista is responsible for administering zoning and land use within the municipality.

Housing

Per the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, Minnetrista expects to add 4,000 new residents and 2,100 new households by 2040. The Project will add up to 422 detached single-family and attached townhome residential units to the City's housing stock.

Land Use

As shown on the City's Future Land Use Map, the Project Site is zoned for Staged Development and guided Urban Reserve (Figures 10 and 11). Urban Reserve areas are identified in City planning documents as future urban areas that are important to preserve at development densities similar to the Rural designation (1 dwelling unit/10 acres) prior to Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) expansion. Development in the Urban Reserve should be planned to accommodate future subdivision in the event of MUSA expansion. The Project will require a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) to amend the land uses to Residential Low-Medium, and rezone to Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Tables 8, 9 and 10 provide tabulations of the Project and the anticipated future land uses.

⁴ "Imagine 2050," Metropolitan Council, accessed December 2025, <https://imagine2050.metrocouncil.org/>

⁵ "2040 Comprehensive Plan," City of Minnetrista, accessed December 2025

Table 8. Anticipated Project Lot Count

Lot Size	Lot Count	
	High End of Density Range	Low End of Density Range
40-foot wide	122	62
50-foot wide	131	115
65-foot wide	0	119
TOTAL	253	296

Table 9. Anticipated Project Unit Count

Lot Size	Unit Count	
	Low End of Density Range	High End of Density Range
40-foot wide	62	122
50-foot wide	115	131
65-foot wide	119	0
Townhomes (w/o)	24	132
Townhomes (slab)	37	37
TOTAL	357	422

Table 10. Concept Plan Land Use Summary & 2040 Comprehensive Plan Comparison

2040 Comprehensive Plan			Project – Concept Plan			
Future Land Use	Required Density (du/ac.)	Comp Plan area (ac.)	Uses	# of Dwelling Units	Proposed Area (ac.)	Density (du/ac.)
Residential Low-Medium	3.0 – 5.0	114	40' lots	62-122	101.2 – 119.8	3.0 – 3.5
			50' lots	115-131		
			65' lots	0 - 51		
			65' lots	0 - 68		
			Townhome	24 – 132		
			Slab	37		
Subtotal Residential (Sewered)				357 - 422		3.5
Rural Residential	1 DU/10 Ac.		10 Ac.	2	20.03	0.1/Ac.
Subtotal Residential (Unsewered)				2		1 DU/10 Ac.
Open Space			Open Space		10.7	
Wetlands			Wetlands ²		14.3	
Wetland Buffers			Wetland Buffers		8.3	
Pond Outlots			Pond Outlots		0 - 18.7	
ROW (TH 7)			Hwy 7 ROW Dedication		8.6	
TOTAL				359 - 424		3.0-3.5¹

¹ Density range is for sewer residential development. Exception area with unsewered rural residential is excluded from calculation.

² Wetland area within Residential Low-Medium future land use designation is approximately 14.3 acres.

As shown in Table 10, the net residential density of the Project once fully built out is calculated to be 3.0 to 3.5 units/acre in the Residential Low-Medium land use area. Net acres for development were determined based on the Metropolitan Council’s guidance which permits removal of wetland, wetland areas, public parks, storm water ponds/public storm water treatment outlots, trails and open space, and arterial road rights-of-way.

Transportation

The 2040 Comprehensive Plan identified that a portion of TH 7 (east of the project study area) may be experiencing some levels of congestion during peak travel periods. However, these areas are outside of the immediate project area. The comprehensive plan does state that “when redevelopment occurs, each of the agencies shall generally work to modify and/or relocate access points to meet current access spacing guidelines.” Note that the plan did not contemplate development of the Project Site.

The City of Minnetrista is not within the regional transit authority service area. However, the City is served by Transit Link, a dial-a-ride service that provides connections throughout the seven-county metropolitan area. Minnetrista residents also have access to the Metro Vanpool program, which provides financial assistance for vanpools to-and-from work destinations. As the area continues to develop, there may be opportunities to expand bus routes, but none are planned for near the development at this time.

Wastewater

The Project Site is not within the 2040 MUSA, but the site is within the Long-Term Service Area (LTSA) which plans for sewer some time post-2040. Further description regarding the wastewater improvements is provided in Item 12.

Water

The City of Minnetrista operates seven (7) municipal water supply wells, which are divided into North and South systems. The proposed Project will be served by the South System.

The City’s South System has a firm capacity of 1,900 gallons per minute (gpm). While there is an existing 12-inch watermain that runs parallel to TH 7 on the north side that is part of the South System and may serve the Project, or the Project Site may connect to a new trunk watermain on the south side of TH 7.

Parks & Trails

There are several City parks and nature preserves within one mile of the Project Site, including Merz Marsh Park, Alder Nature View Park, the Six Mile Marsh Prairie and Trail, and Carver Park Reserve. A multi-use path is planned along TH 7. It would be included in the Hennepin County Bikeway System.

MnDOT Hwy 7 Study – Hopkins to St. Bonifacius

MnDOT is currently conducting the *Hwy 7 Study - Hopkins to St. Bonifacius* which included new traffic data prior to any roadway closures within the study area. This study recommends the future corridor vision along Hwy 7, which includes a 3/4 intersection at Highland Road, a multilane roundabout at Kings Point Road / Victoria Drive (CR 11), a multi-use trail along the entire segment, and the potential for a median barrier between intersections. Reconstruction currently is planned for the year 2029.

Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) Management Plan

The Project Site is in the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD) and is located in the Six Mile Creek-Halsted Bay Subwatershed.

The post-construction condition will be required to manage and store stormwater on site, which is anticipated to be an improvement over the existing conditions since the existing site is used for agricultural production, and stormwater runoff is not currently managed in a storm event. Additionally, any impacts to the wetlands on the Project Site must comply with mitigation and replacement requirements.

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

The Project Site is zoned as Staged Development District. The Urban Reserve and future urban areas are traditionally zoned as Staged Development District which is similar to the Agricultural District in density (1 dwelling unit/10 acres) but is intended to preserve larger tracts of land for areas that are planned to be urbanized in the future. Subsequently to the CPA, the Project Site must be re-zoned to be consistent with an urbanized land use designation. Due to the mix of residential densities associated with the Project it is anticipated that the site will be rezoned to PUD. The City's PUDs allow flexibility from certain dimensional standards and allow for a mix of housing styles within a development plan.

There are no mapped Federal Emergency Management Area (FEMA) floodways, 100-year, or 500-year floodplains on the Project Site.

There are no special districts or overlays on the Site. There are no wild and scenic rivers or other critical areas in or near the Project Site. The Project Site is not enrolled in the Agricultural Preserve program.

- iv. If any critical facilities (i.e. facilities necessary for public health and safety, those storing hazardous materials, or those with housing occupants who may be insufficiently mobile) are proposed in floodplain areas and other areas identified as at risk for localized flooding, describe the risk potential considering changing precipitation and event intensity.

Not applicable. No critical facilities are proposed within or near a floodplain area.

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

The City's 2040 Future Land Use Plan guides the Project Site Urban Reserve. Several parcels to the north and west are similarly guided and planned for future urbanization once the MUSA is extended. There are several similar developments in the City, including Woodland Cove, which is located east of the Project Site.

As previously described, the Project Site is outside the MUSA boundary. Development with extension of sanitary sewer will necessitate a MUSA Staging Map amendment to bring the Project Site into the MUSA.

The Project Site shares its southerly border with the Carver Park Reserve, which is predominantly passive park uses including an internal trail network, wooded areas, surface waters and open space. New single-family lots are proposed to abut the shared property line extending from the southeasterly corner of the Project Site to the west approximately 1,800-feet. The proposed lots terminate where the wetland areas expand and protected natural areas are proposed on the west

end of the site (See Figure 3. Concept Plan). The Figures show that within the park the shared border is wooded and there appears to be an internal trail which meanders but generally runs parallel to the shared property line. The trail is setback between approximately 85 feet on the west end of the Project Site and up to 150 feet as the trail heads east towards CSAH 7. As shown in Figure 2, topography along the shared border is rolling. The proposed single family lot development in this area has the potential to impact the wooded areas and vegetation in the park if lot lines are not clearly identified or marked. Additionally, trail users may see rooftops and homes along this border, which is currently unobstructed since the Project Site is undeveloped. Residential uses adjacent to parks are generally compatible, however, certain mitigation may be beneficial to protect the wooded areas within the park and the park boundary to ensure private lots do not encroach on the park land.

- c. Identify measures incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate any potential incompatibility as discussed in Item 10b above and any risk potential.

A CPA is required to re-guide the Project Site from Urban Reserve to Residential Low-Medium density. In addition to re-guiding the sewer staging plan, the MUSA boundary and other correlated infrastructure components should be addressed to ensure staging of the development coincides with the availability of utilities to serve the development. The City's comprehensive sewer plan must also be updated regarding metershed M436 to include the proposed sewer extensions and project area. In addition to the land use amendment, the Project will require MUSA expansion and a community designation change from Diversified Rural to Suburban Edge. Rezoning from Staged Development District to PUD will also be required once the CPA is approved.

As part of the PUD and plat process, the City will require the Project Proposer to address the shared property line with the Carver Park Reserve to ensure that setbacks are maintained and wooded areas within the park are not disturbed. Potential mitigation should be coordinated with Three Rivers Park District and may include marking the park border with signage or a combination of strategies. The Project Proposer has met with Three Rivers Park District prior to starting concept planning, and again recently to discuss a proposed trail system.

11. Geology, Soils and Topography/Landforms

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.

Per Plate 2, Bedrock Geology of the Geologic Atlas⁶, general bedrock on the Project Site includes St. Lawrence Formation, Jordan Sandstone, and Lone Rock Formation. The western half of the site is characterized by St. Lawrence Formation and Jordan Sandstone, while the east is mostly Lone Rock Formation.

Per Plate 3, Surficial Geology of the Geologic Atlas⁷, geology on the Project Site is largely composed of loam to clay loam diamict. Wetland and depression areas on the Project Site are characterized by organic detritus and organic clayey silt to sand.

Plate 6, Bedrock Topography and Depth to Bedrock of the C-45 Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County⁸ notes that the depth to bedrock is between 126 - 200 feet in the western half of the Project Site and 200 – 300 feet in the eastern half of the site.

The Minnesota Natural Resource Atlas does not identify any karst features near the project area.

Based on publicly available information, there are no known limitations of the geologic features on the Project Site. Given the information evaluated in the Geologic Atlas for the Project Site, no significant effects are anticipated resulting from the Project. Project design is expected to include subsurface/geotechnical exploration to properly site roadways, stormwater features, and other improvements. Full engineering plans will be developed as part of the land use and development permitting process that will confirm subsurface conditions are appropriate for siting roadways, stormwater management areas, and other improvements.

b. Soils and topography

Describe the soils on the site, giving NRCS (SCS) classifications and descriptions, including limitations of soils. Describe topography, any special site conditions relating to erosion potential, soil stability or other soils limitations, such as steep slopes 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 12.b.ii.

Existing Topography

Based on LiDAR contour information, the ground surface elevations across the Project Site range

⁶ "C-45 Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County – Plate 2," University of Minnesota, 2018, <https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstreams/9def04e8-4b81-43d7-8c16-68a1a93913e7/download>

⁷ "C-45 Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County – Plate 3," University of Minnesota, 2018, <https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstreams/60ab1e1a-f13e-4edb-91bd-j8bb5fdb3acd/download>

⁸ "C-45 Geologic Atlas of Hennepin County – Plate 6," University of Minnesota, 2018, <https://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstreams/d6c53354-856f-4208-87e0-ca1ca4j8684b/download>

from approximately 936 to 1048 feet above mean sea level (msl). Surficial drainage generally drains toward onsite wetlands and tributaries, and ultimately west toward Mud Lake and the Six Mile Creek.

Existing Soils

Table 11 identifies soils found at the Project Site per the NRCS web soil survey (Figure 9 NRCS soil classification mapping). Lester loam, found throughout most of the Project Site including on steep slopes, is a deep, well-drained soil. The Angus-Kilkenny and Lester-Kilkenny complexes are areas with a mix of Angus or Lester (well drained, loamy) and Kilkenny (wetter, clayier) soils often used for crops like corn and soybeans, and indicating fertile but erosion-prone land for development or farming. Approximately 10.7 acres of the site has very steep slopes.

Table 11. NRCS Soil Classifications

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in Area of Interest (AOI)	% of AOI	Slope %	Soil Erosion Factor (Kw) ¹	Wind Erodibility Group ²	Hydrologic Soil Group ³
L22D2	Lester loam, moderately eroded	12.0	7.4%	10 – 16%	.32	6	C
L22E	Lester loam	20.0	12.3%	10 – 22%	.24	6	C
L23A	Cordova loam	4.1	2.5%	0 – 2%	.28	6	C/D
L24A	Glencoe clay loam	12.0	7.4%	0 – 1%	.28	6	C/D
L36A	Hamel, overwash-Hamel complex	4.6	2.8%	0 – 3%	.24	6	C/D
L37B	Angus loam	7.8	4.8%	2 – 6%	.28	6	C
L40B	Angus-Kilkenny complex	33.9	20.8%	2 – 6%	.28	6	C/D
L41C2	Lester-Kilkenny complex, moderately eroded	43.8	26.9%	6 – 10%	.32	6	C
L41D2	Lester-Kilkenny complex, moderately eroded	15.3	9.4%	10 – 16%	.32	6	C
L45A	Dundas-Cordova complex	1.1	0.7%	0 – 3%	.43	5	C/D
L49A	Klossner soils, depressional	3.0	1.8%	0 – 1%		2	B/D
L50A	Muskego and Houghton soils	5.1	3.2%	0 – 1%		2	C/D
Total for Project Area		162.8	100%				

Source: United States Department of Agriculture: Natural Resources Conservation. Web Soil Survey. Available at <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>

¹ Erosion factor Kw indicates the susceptibility of a whole soil profile (including rocks) to sheet and rill erosion by water. The estimates in Table 11 are based primarily on percentage of silt, sand, and organic matter, and on soil structure and saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ksat). Values of Kw range from 0.02 to 0.69. Other factors being equal, the higher the value, the more susceptible the soil is to sheet and rill erosion by water.

² A wind erodibility group consists of soils that have similar properties affecting their susceptibility to wind erosion in cultivated areas. The soils assigned to group 1 are the most susceptible to erosion, while those assigned to group 8 are the least susceptible.

³ Soils are classified by the NRCS into four hydrologic soil groups, A, B, C, and D with A having the lowest runoff potential (high infiltration rate) and D having the greatest runoff potential (low infiltration rate). If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic soil group (e.g., A/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second letter is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned dual classes.

Construction Activities

The site is planned to be graded in phases as each part of the development is constructed. Earthwork is anticipated to be generally balanced across the site and approximately 750,000 cubic yards of grading is anticipated. Initial site work is anticipated to be performed to align with each phase and rough grading of all roadways, installation and construction of stormwater features and building pads will be completed prior to the buildout of each phase. Vegetation and topsoil will be removed, along with any softer clays near the surface. All work will be completed in compliance with grading and stormwater plans that will be reviewed and approved as part of the land use and development permit process.

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be developed in coordination with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) construction permit that will identify temporary best management practices (BMPs) (e.g., inlet protection, erosion control blanket, silt fence, etc.) to control erosion and stormwater runoff during construction.

Operational Activities

Permanent BMPs will be identified as part of the land use and development permit plans and will be installed as part of site construction. The SWPPP will specifically identify permanent BMPs (seed, mulch, stormwater ponds, filtration areas) to manage erosion and stormwater runoff after construction is complete. All land area disturbed during the Project construction and development activities will either be constructed on and appropriate stormwater management features installed or will be revegetated and restored according to an approved landscape plan. Post-construction, the Project Site will be fully developed and homeowners or homeowners associations will be responsible for maintaining the required landscaping and site improvements.

12. Water Resources

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

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

Within one mile of the Project Site, there are two (2) public watercourses, eight (8) public water basins, and four (4) public water wetlands. The associated PWI number and name of the public watercourse is provided in Table 12. Public waters are shown in Appendix A – Figure 14.

Table 12. Public Waters within 1 Mile of Project Site

Public Water Name	Type	AUID	PWI Number(s)	303d Impaired Waters
Minnehaha/Six Mile Creek	Public Water Watercourse	07010206-551	10038a	Yes
Minnehaha/Six Mile Creek	Public Water Watercourse	07010206-549	10038a	No
Minnetonka-Halsteds Bay	Public Water Basin	27-0133-09	27-133	Yes
Mud Lake	Public Water Basin	27-0186-00	27-186	No
Parley Lake	Public Water Basin	10-0042-00	10-420	Yes
Stone Lake	Public Water Basin	10-0056-00	10-056	No
Unnamed Lake	Public Water Basin	10-0142-00	10-142	No
Unnamed Lake	Public Water Basin	10-0141-00	10-141	No
Unnamed Lake	Public Water Basin	10-0140-00	10-140	No
Unnamed Lake	Public Water Basin	10-0138-00	10-138	No
Six Mile Marsh	Public Water Wetland		27-960	No
Unnamed Wetland	Public Water Wetland		27-959	No
Unnamed Wetland	Public Water Wetland		27-961	No
Unnamed Wetland	Public Water Wetland		27-962	No

Source: DNR Public Waters Inventory (PWI) Maps. Available at: https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/watermgmt_section/pwi/maps.html

Minnehaha/Six Mile Creek, Minnetonka-Halsteds Bay, and Parley Lake are classified as impaired waters according to Minnesota’s 2024 Impaired Waters List.⁹ Minnehaha/Six Mile Creek (AUID 07010206-551) from Mud Lake to Lake Minnetonka is listed as impaired for aquatic life due to the presence of nutrients. Minnetonka-Halsteds Bay (AUID 27-0133-09) is listed as impaired for aquatic recreation due to the presence of nutrients and for aquatic consumption due to the presence of mercury in fish tissue and has a total maximum daily load (TMDL). Parley Lake (AUID 10-0042-00) is listed as impaired for aquatic recreation due to the presence of nutrients and has a TMDL.

A Notice of Decision (NOD) for a wetland delineation was issued on October 21, 2025, and is included in Appendix D. As reported in the NOD, there are approximately 21.9 acres of

⁹ “Minnesota’s impaired waters list,” MPCA, 4/1/2024, <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/air-water-land-climate/minnesotas-impaired-waters-list>

naturally occurring wetlands on the Project Site. Delineated wetlands are shown in Appendix A – Figure 13.

There are no trout streams/lakes, wildlife lakes, migratory waterfowl feeding/resting lakes, or outstanding resource value waters within or adjacent to the Project Site.

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

The Minnesota Natural Resources Atlas¹⁰ identifies the depth to the water table as between 1 to 20 feet for most of the Project Site, and up to 50 feet or more along the northern boundary of the Site. Hennepin County is in Minnesota’s East-Central groundwater province in which surficial and buried sand and gravel aquifers are common. These unconsolidated aquifers are underlain by thick and extensive Paleozoic (sandstone and carbonate) and Precambrian (sandstone) aquifers. The water table aquifer encountered in soil borings and in the Natural Resources Atlas is the unconfined aquifer that receives water directly from the ground surface. The primary potable water aquifers in the City of Minnetrista are the Prairie Du Chien-Jordan Aquifer, the Franconia-Ironton-Galesville Aquifer, and the Mt. Simon-Hinckley Aquifer.

The Minnesota Department of Health Well Index¹¹ identifies three (3) existing wells on the Project Site and ten (10) additional wells within a quarter mile of the Site, which are listed in Table 13 (Figure 12). If any other undocumented wells are found during site construction activities, they will be sealed and abandoned following all MDH guidelines. All well sealing activities will be properly documented and appropriate notification to the MDH will be provided for public record. The Project Site is not within a wellhead protection area.

Table 13. Wells within One Quarter Mile of Project Site

Well ID	Well Depth
559662	205
189590	159
174343	155
405959	214
692531	255
639123	275
655054	176
494848	282
618595	197
750825	110
655052	290
505912	218
453885	177

Source: Minnesota Department of Health (MDH). *Minnesota Well Index*. Available at: <https://mnwellindex.web.health.state.mn.us/>

¹⁰ “Minnesota Natural Resources Atlas,” *Water Table – Depth*, MN DNR, accessed December 16, 2025, <https://mnatlas.org/gis-tool/>

¹¹ “Minnesota Well Index”, MN Department of Health, accessed July 15, 2025, <https://mnwellindex.web.health.state.mn.us/>

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

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

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

The City of Minnetrista’s Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Plan identifies assumed wastewater generation by land use, while Metropolitan Council’s Sewer Access Charge (SAC) system estimates sewer flow on a per unit basis. Table 14 conservatively estimates the total gallons per day (gpd) produced by the Project based on the high unit count and assumed daily flow rates per SAC, for single-family detached and attached units. Per the City’s Sanitary Sewer Plan, a peak flow factor of 4.0 should be applied when sizing pipe or determining lift station capacity.

Table 14. Estimated Sanitary Sewer Flow Rate

Land Use	Units	Daily Flow Rate (Gallons/Unit/Day)	Total Gallons per Day (gpd)
Single-family attached and detached residential	422	274	115,628

All sanitary sewer will gravity to a proposed lift station in the northwest corner of the Project Site, where it will be pumped along the south side of TH 7 to an existing manhole. Upgrades to the City of Minnetrista’s sanitary sewer system will be evaluated to confirm capacity.

Per the City of Minnetrista’s 2040 Comprehensive Plan, all wastewater collected in the City is conveyed through the MCES system to the MCES Blue Lake Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), located in the City of Shakopee. The WWTP provides primary and secondary treatment before discharging treated effluent into the Minnesota River. The Blue Lake WWTP has a capacity of 42 MGD and had an actual average daily flow of 26.46 MGD over the past 12 months, indicating that the plant has sufficient capacity to treat an additional 0.09 MGD wastewater produced by the Project.

- 2) If the wastewater discharge is to a subsurface sewage treatment systems (SSTS), describe the system used, the design flow, and suitability of site conditions for such a system. If septic systems are part of the project, describe the availability of septage disposal options within the region to handle the ongoing amounts generated as a result of the project. Consider the effects of current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated changes in rainfall frequency, intensity and amount with this discussion.

If residential units are developed on the exception parcel, each lot will be required to demonstrate compliance with MN Rules 7080 for SSTS and any other applicable

Hennepin County or Minnetrista permitting standards. Primary and secondary drainfields for each system must be properly sited to ensure they are out of all flood prone areas and that proper separation from wells or other structures is provided.

- 3) If the wastewater discharge is to surface water, identify the wastewater treatment methods and identify discharge points and proposed effluent limitations to mitigate impacts. Discuss any effects to surface or groundwater from wastewater discharges, taking into consideration how current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the effects.

Wastewater will not be discharged to any surface water due to the Project. No effects are anticipated to surface or groundwater, as effluent will be conveyed through the MCES system to the MCES Blue Lake WWTP.

- ii. **Stormwater** - Describe changes in surface hydrology resulting from change of land cover. Describe the routes and receiving water bodies for runoff from the project site (major downstream water bodies as well as the immediate receiving waters). Discuss environmental effects from stormwater discharges on receiving waters post construction including how the project will affect runoff volume, discharge rate and change in pollutants. Consider the effects of current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated changes in rainfall frequency, intensity and amount with this discussion. For projects requiring NPDES/SDS Construction Stormwater permit coverage, state the total number of acres that will be disturbed by the project and describe the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), including specific best management practices to address soil erosion and sedimentation during and after project construction. Discuss permanent stormwater management plans, including methods of achieving volume reduction to restore or maintain the natural hydrology of the site using green infrastructure practices or other stormwater management practices. Identify any receiving waters that have construction-related water impairments or are classified as special as defined in the Construction Stormwater permit. Describe additional requirements for special and/or impaired waters.

Existing Conditions

The Project Site has historically been used for agricultural production. Typically, agricultural fields are irrigated, and fertilizers containing nitrogen, phosphorous, and potassium are commonly applied. The existing site has a gently sloping topography and generally slopes down toward wetland depression areas. Since there are no stormwater management systems currently onsite, surface water that does not infiltrate during storm events and flows to the wetlands, natural depressions, and tributaries, and may not be contained on-site.

Construction and Post-Construction Conditions

The post-construction condition will be required to manage and store stormwater on site, which is anticipated to be an improvement over the existing conditions since the existing site is used for agricultural production, and stormwater runoff is not currently managed in a storm event.

The change in land use from agriculture to residential development will likely decrease the amount of suspended solids and increase other components typical of urban runoff, such as oil, grease, and chemicals. The change in land use will also increase the impervious coverage on the site to an estimated 36 acres of impervious area (approximately 22% of the Project

Site). Impervious coverage will increase slightly if residential density increases to 4.7 units per acre. Development at either density will require stormwater management facilities that meet the requirements of the City and Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD). MCWD permit requirements include volume control of 1-inch times the site's impervious surface, rate control so as not to increase the peak runoff rate from the Project Site, and treatment for phosphorus and sediment removal prior to discharge. While NRCS soil information indicates that on-site soils do not have high infiltration rates, in final design, soil borings or infiltration tests will be required to confirm that infiltration is not possible, with results provided to MCWD.

The creation of open space within the development will provide some mitigation of potential adverse effects from the increased impervious surfaces. However, it is expected that the volume of runoff will increase over existing conditions during significant storm events because of the increase in impervious surface area. Climate trends indicate future rainfall volumes will increase, potentially leading to increased stormwater volumes and discharge rates. Modeling for the storm sewer system design considers current and projected climate trends.

Stormwater will be managed onsite through a system of curb and gutter, pipes, and stormwater ponds and filtration basins. Stormwater will be managed in accordance with applicable City, Hennepin County, MPCA, Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD), and DNR requirements. All stormwater that leaves the site must meet rate control and quality standards and must account for the increased impervious surface associated with development.

Land disturbing activities, including material export, will comply with the policies identified in the City's Comprehensive Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP), MCWD regulations, and the MPCA through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit. The Project will be required to utilize best management practices (BMPs) to prevent erosion and control sedimentation. All BMPs will be described in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the Project. The grading and erosion control plans for the Project will be reviewed as a part of the City of Minnetrista's land use, development, and building permit process, including review for consistency with the City's SWMP.

- 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. Discuss how the proposed water use is resilient in the event of changes in total precipitation, large precipitation events, drought, increased temperatures, variable surface water flows and elevations, and longer growing seasons. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects from the water appropriation. Describe contingency plans should the appropriation volume increase beyond infrastructure capacity or water supply for the project diminish in quantity or quality, such as reuse of water, connections with another water source, or emergency connections.

Dewatering

Dewatering is not anticipated as part of site construction; however, any groundwater encountered during utility installation or other excavation will be discharged into temporary sediment basins within the Project Site. If water use exceeds 10,000 gallons per day (GPD) or one million gallons per year, a water appropriation permit must be obtained from the Minnesota DNR. The Proposer must evaluate the expected water usage as part of the land use permit process and is required to obtain the necessary permit from the DNR.

Existing Wells

The Minnesota Department of Health Well Index identifies three (3) existing wells on the Project Site and ten (10) additional wells within one quarter mile of the Site, which are listed in Table 13 (Figure 12). If any other undocumented wells are found during site construction activities, they will be sealed and abandoned following all MDH guidelines. All well sealing activities will be properly documented and appropriate notification to the MDH will be provided for public record.

Post-Construction

The City of Minnetrista operates seven (7) municipal water supply wells, which are divided into North and South systems. The Project will be served by the South system, which has a firm capacity of 1,900 gallons per minute (gpm). Water in the South system is stored in a 400,000-gallon elevated storage tank located on Kings Point Road and a 500,000-gallon elevated storage tank located on Highway 7.

The Project will be served by the South System, which is mostly comprised of 6-inch, 8-inch, 10-inch, and 12-inch watermains. There is an existing 12-inch watermain that is part of the South system that runs parallel to TH 7 on the north side, which may serve the Project. Alternatively, the Project Site may connect to a new trunk watermain on the south side of TH 7.

Table 15. provides an estimate of the anticipated gallons per day for the Project and assumes that the development will accommodate household sizes that are roughly the average for the City of Minnetrista.

Table 15. Estimated Water Supply

Use	Proposed Development	Estimated Residents ¹	Residential per Capita Demand (Gallons per Capita per Day) ²	Gallons per Day (gpd)
Single-family detached residential	217 – 296 Units	599 - 817	95	56,905 – 77,615
Single-family attached residential	61 – 205 Units	168 - 566	95	15,960 – 53,770

¹ Assumes 2.76 people/HH

² Source: City of Minnetrista 2040 Comprehensive Plan, adopted Water plan

There are also likely to be three new small wells drilled for irrigation reuse basins to supplement the basins’ water levels in low rainfall times.

iv. **Surface Waters**

- a) **Wetlands** - Describe any anticipated physical effects or alterations to wetland features such as draining, filling, permanent inundation, dredging and vegetative removal. Discuss direct and indirect environmental effects from physical modification of wetlands, including the anticipated effects that any proposed wetland alterations may have to the host watershed, taking into consideration how current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the effects. 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.

Table 16 provides a summary of delineated wetlands on the Project Site.

Table 16. Delineated Wetlands on Project Site

Wetland ID	Type			Onsite Area (Acres)
Wetland 1	Shallow marsh with wet meadow portion and seasonally flooded fringe	Type 3/2/1	Depression	2.66
Wetland 2	Deep/shallow marsh with open water and wet meadow portions and a partially farmed seasonally flooded fringe	Type 5/4/3/2/1	Depression/ Slope	11.63
Wetland 2A	Wet meadow	Type 1	Depression	0.01
Wetland 4	Wet meadow	Type 1	Depression/ Slope	0.19
Wetland 5	Farmed wet meadow	Type 1	Depression	0.58
Wetland 6A/6B	Deep/shallow marsh with open water and wet meadow portions and a partially farmed seasonally flooded fringe	Type 5/4/3/2/1	Depression/ Slope	6.46
Wetland 7	Wet meadow	Type 2	Slope	0.03
Wetland 8	Wet meadow	Type 2	Slope	0.10
Wetland 9A/9B	Wet meadow	Type 2	Slope	0.03/0.10
Wetland 10	Wet meadow	Type 2	Depression	0.09

Source: Wetland Delineation – TEP Revised Existing Conditions, Kjolhaug Environmental Services Company, Inc.

The Project Site is located on parcels that had a previous Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) violation that was addressed via a replacement plan, including 4:1 mitigation of impacted wetland areas. The development must maintain the restored wetland area and value resulting from the restoration plan and as outlined in the Deed of Restrictions and Covenants on the deed title. Based on the Concept Plan, approximately 0.6 acres of wetland impact are anticipated due to road crossings and storm water treatment facilities. Any wetland or buffer impact must comply with all wetland replacement or mitigation rules and regulations established by the City, WCA, and MCWD, and a replacement plan should be included in materials submitted for review to the Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) alongside other required WCA application materials.

- b) **Other surface waters** - Describe any anticipated physical effects or alterations to surface water features (lakes, streams, ponds, intermittent channels, county/judicialditches) 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, taking into consideration how current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the effects. 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.

Stormwater ponds will be constructed and designed to manage quantity and quality including rate and volume control. The post-construction conditions will be required to comply with all stormwater management rules established by the City of Minnetrista, Hennepin County, MPCA, MCWD, and DNR. The post-construction conditions may be improved from the existing agricultural condition since wetland buffer areas will be reestablished, and stormwater management features will be implemented. Current Minnesota climate trends indicate that the area will experience greater rainfall and precipitation. The construction of wetland buffers, stormwater management areas, and open spaces will help to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of stormwater leaving the site post-construction.

13. Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes

a. Pre-project site conditions

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

A review of the MPCA's What's in my Neighborhood (WIMN) database was conducted to identify potentially contaminated sites within or in the vicinity of the Project Area. One (1) MPCA site was identified within the Project boundary; however, the MPCA determined that cleanup adequately addressed the petroleum tank release, and the site file was closed in 2008. Within one mile of the Project Site, ten (10) other sites were identified. Table 17 summarizes potential sites within one mile of the Project Site, also shown in Appendix A – Figure 15.

Table 17. Potentially Contaminated Sites within One Mile of Project Site

Site ID	Location	MPCA Program	Status
194965	7635 Highway 7	Petroleum Remediation, Leak Site	Inactive
129734	4250 Creekview Cir	Aboveground Tanks; Underground Tanks	Active
49736	4275 Creekview Cir	Aboveground Tanks; Industrial Stormwater; Solid Waste, Permit by Rule	Active
231220	560 S Maple St Ste 110	Hazardous Waste, Small quantity generator	Active
254329	Highway 5 and County Road 10	Emergency Response	Active
105975	8201 Highway 7	Petroleum Remediation, Leak Site; Underground Tanks	Active
136962	8201 State Highway 7	Hazardous Waste	Inactive
192772	7170 Highway 7	Brownfields, Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup; Petroleum Remediation, Leak Site	Active
254185	4300 Highland Rd	Hazardous Waste, Minimal quantity generator	Active
105414	Saint Bonifacius Lift Station/-24	Aboveground Tanks; Petroleum Remediation, Leak Site; Underground Tanks	Active
53601	8090 Highway 7	Feedlots	Active

Source: MPCA What's in My Neighborhood, available at <https://mpca.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=9d45793c75644e05bac197525f633f87>

A review of the Department of Agriculture's (MDA) WIMN database was also conducted to identify potentially contaminated agricultural sites within or in the vicinity of the Project Site. The MDA is the lead agency for response to, and cleanup of agricultural chemical contamination in Minnesota. There are no MDA sites within the Project Site boundaries. Within one mile of the Project Site, two (2) sites are identified, detailed in Table 18. The Project will not directly impact these closed sites; thus, adverse effects because of the Project are not anticipated.

Table 18. Potentially Contaminated Agricultural Sites within One Mile of Project Site

Location ID	Location	Contaminant	Status
Within One Mile of Project Site			
2631144061	Lotus Drive	Other	Closed
2631144059	Woodland Cove	Other	Closed

Source: "What's in My Neighborhood," Minnesota Department of Agriculture, <https://mnaq.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=85bade4ea512411aa32a80079246255f>

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 solidwaste including source reduction and recycling.

During construction, the Project will generate solid waste and construction waste material. All waste generated will be properly disposed of off-site. Post-construction, residents and tenants will generate municipal solid waste which will be hauled away by licensed garbage haulers. Residents will be encouraged to recycle. Waste generation estimates are provided in Table 19 and assume waste management levels will be comparable to other residential developments within the State of Minnesota.

Table 19. Estimated Waste

Use	Estimated Units	Estimated Residents	Rate (lbs/person/day)	Total (lbs/day)
Residential	422	1,165	2.4	2,796

Source: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2018 Fact Sheet. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2020-11/documents/2018_ff_fact_sheet.pdf

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 new above or below ground tanks to store petroleum or other materials. Indicate the number, location, size and age of existing tanks on the property that the project will use. Discuss potential environmental effects from accidental spill or release of hazardous materials. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the use/storage of chemicals/hazardous materials including source reduction and recycling. Include development of a spill prevention plan.

Development of the Project and related site work will be required to comply with all City, County, NPDES, and other regulatory permits necessary to complete the work. Storage of hazardous materials on the Project Site during construction will be limited to construction vehicles and machinery. This equipment, in addition to temporary storage tanks for diesel fuel or hydraulic fluids, may be left onsite throughout the duration of construction depending on phasing and scheduling. Construction vehicles, as well as associated storage of their fuels, will be required to follow a spill prevention plan, if applicable. No hazardous materials will be permitted or stored on the Project Site post-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 waste including source reduction and recycling.

During construction and site work, vehicles containing gasoline will be present onsite. The construction and development process will not involve significant amounts of hazardous waste. Any hazardous waste generated will be properly disposed of in accordance with state and federal laws.

14. Fish, wildlife, plant communities, and sensitive ecological resources (rare features)

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

As shown in Table 5. Cover Types Before and After, and Figure 8 sourced from the Minnesota Land Cover Classification System (MLCCS), the existing site's coverage is predominantly classified as agricultural land, which is consistent with the existing land use. The Project Site has been used for agricultural production for the past several decades. Suitable habitat within agricultural areas is unlikely due to cultivation activities and prior pesticide use typical with active farming practices; however, wildlife typically found in agricultural settings may include small mammals such as rabbits, squirrels, deer, and birds. The wetland areas may provide habitat for reptiles and amphibians, and pockets of suitable habitat for birds and pollinators particularly within the conservation easement area may be present.

Land north, west, and east of the Project Site has been developed or is currently used for agricultural production. Carver Park Reserve is located directly south of the Project Site and is characterized by tamarack bogs, cattail marshes, and hardwood forests. The Park is home to a variety of wildlife that is common to the region, including beaver, deer, fox, coyote, muskrats, bats, and turkeys.

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

Native Plant Communities and Sites of Biodiversity Significance

The Natural Communities and Rare Species of Carver, Hennepin, and Scott County, Minnesota map by the Minnesota County Biological Survey was reviewed, and no natural communities or rare species are identified on or proximate to the Project Site¹².

State-Listed Species

The DNR's Natural Heritage Information System (NHIS) was queried to determine if known occurrences of rare, endangered, or special concern species or other sensitive ecological habitats exist within the Project Site. The Natural Heritage Review (NHR) letter is attached to this document (see Appendix B) (MCE# 2025-00895). A summary of rare features that may be impacted by the Project as outlined in the NHR letter is as follows:

- Henslow's sparrow (*Centronyx henslowii*), a state-listed endangered bird species, has been documented in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. Suitable nesting habitat for this species includes uncultivated and un-mowed grasslands and old fields with standing, dead vegetation, and a substantial litter layer.

¹² "Natural Communities and Rare Species of Carver, Hennepin, and Scott Counties, Minnesota," Minnesota Biological Survey, 1997, <https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/mcbs/maps/olmsted.pdf>

- The Project Site overlaps with a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (*Bombus affinis*) high potential zone.
- Minnesota’s bats, including the federally endangered northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) may be found throughout Minnesota.

Federally Listed Species

The USFWS Information of Planning and Consultation (IPaC) was similarly queried. Results are attached to this document (see Appendix B) (Project Code: 2026-0015604). Within the memo, IPaC identifies the Northern Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) as an endangered species within the Project area. The NLEB roosts underneath bark, in cavities or in crevices of both live and dead trees. The Project area is not located within a location containing any documented NLEB maternity roost trees or hibernacula entrances.¹³

The list of species was then submitted to the USFWS to solicit an effects determination of the potential development of the Project Site on the identified species. The following list of species, listing status, and determinations of effect is provided by the USFWS:

Table 20. Federally Listed Species in/near Project Site and Effects Determination

Species	Status	Effects Determination
Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (<i>Bombus affinis</i>)	Endangered	May effect – not likely to adversely affect
Salamander Mussel (<i>Simpsonaias ambigua</i>)	Proposed Endangered	May effect
Monarch Butterfly (<i>Danaus Plexippus</i>)	Proposed Threatened	No effect
Western Regal Fritillary (<i>Argynnis idalia occidentalis</i>)	Proposed Threatened	No effect determination
Whooping Crane (<i>Grus americana</i>)	Experimental Population, Non-Essential	No effect
Northern Long-eared Bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>)	Endangered	Not likely to adversely affect
Critical Habitat	Status	Effects Determination
Rusty Patched Bumble Bee critical habitat	Proposed	Project site may overlap

- Discuss how the identified fish, wildlife, plant communities, rare features and ecosystems may be affected by the project including how current Minnesota climate trends and anticipated climate change in the general location of the project may influence the effects. Include a discussion on introduction and spread of invasive species from the project construction and operation. Separately discuss effects to known threatened and endangered species.

The fish, wildlife, plant communities, rare features and ecosystems identified above that have potential of being impacted by the Project are as follows:

Impacts Analysis for State-Listed Species

Henslow’s sparrow may be impacted where there is disturbance in areas that contain suitable nesting habitat during their breeding season, between May 15 and July 15. Suitable habitat

¹³ Townships Containing Documented Northern Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) Maternity Roost Trees and/ or Hibernacula Entrances in Minnesota. DNR and USFS. April 1, 2016.

proposed to be disturbed on the existing site is limited to un-mowed grasslands in the southeastern corner of the site, as shown in MLCCS mapping.

Analysis of potential impacts to the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee and Northern Long-eared Bat is provided below under impacts for federally listed species.

Impacts Analysis for Federally Listed Species

While the NHR letter indicates that the proposed project will result in a take of the rusty patched bumble bee, a determination of “may effect – not likely to adversely affect” was provided by the USFWS for this species as shown in Table 20.

Rusty Patched Bumble Bee

The Project Site is within the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee High Potential Zone. The Rusty Patched Bumble Bee (*Bombus affinis*) is federally listed as endangered and may be present in suitable habitat within High Potential Zones.

Habitat needs of the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee include overwintering habitat, nesting habitat, spring foraging habitat, and summer and fall foraging habitat. Overwintering habitat consists of woodland edges, as well as upland forest and woodland interiors. Woodland types generally consist of even-aged maple-basswood or oak-hickory, and the overwintering queens can be found in shady areas with loose soils, little vegetation, and leaf litter. Nesting habitat (colonies) includes grasslands and shrublands, upland forest, and woodland edges extending approximately 30 meters into the woodland. Loose soil and leaf litter in these areas can provide nest building sites.

Spring foraging habitat and fall foraging habitats are similar and can be found in areas with nectar and pollen sources, including plants such as goldenrods, coneflowers, and gentians. These areas can include woodland edges, upland forest, upland grassland, and shrubland, palustrine wetlands, flower gardens, and agricultural land if not heavily treated with pesticides. Spring ephemeral species and upland forest and woodland interiors that contain nectar and pollen sources are also used for spring foraging.

Areas of the Project Site proposed to be disturbed and developed are currently comprised primarily of cultivated agricultural land and suitable habitat for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee is unlikely to be present in these areas given past pesticide use typical of farming activities. Pockets of wetland areas within the urbanized development area may provide suitable habitat for the RPBB and minimal impact to wetland areas is planned as part of the site development process. Post-construction, there is likely to be an increase in suitable habitat for the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee with the introduction of native plantings in the wetland buffer areas.

The portion of the Project Site with the most likely suitable habitat for the RPBB is within the conservation easement that will remain in perpetuity, and no land disturbing activities are permitted within the easement.

Therefore, it is unlikely that the proposed Project will adversely affect the RPBB and no suitable habitat will be removed as part of the site development provided proper mitigation and permitting is followed.

A determination of “may effect” was provided by the USFWS for the Salamander Mussel:

Salamander Mussel

The Salamander Mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*) is a proposed endangered species that inhabits rivers, streams, and in some cases lakes with natural flow regimes. Seasonal low flow is expected in some systems and can be tolerated by the Salamander Mussel, though periodic drying or intermittent flow in lake and river habitats generally cannot support mussel assemblages. Salamander Mussels prefer shelter habitat with space under slab rock/bedrock crevice type structures where there is stability from swift current.

Because there are no rivers, streams or lakes in or near the Project Site, the Project will not have direct impacts on the Salamander Mussel provided proper mitigation and permitting is followed. However, the Project does have the potential to indirectly impact the Salamander Mussel by pollution or siltation. Temporary and permanent BMPs to prevent erosion and sedimentation, and transmittance of pollutants to downstream waters are recommended mitigation.

A determination of effect was not provided by the USFWS for the Western Regal Fritillary; however, their habitat is similar to the Monarch Butterfly per USFWS species information. Both the Western Regal Fritillary and the Monarch Butterfly are pollinators found in tall-grass prairies with milkweed and other flowering plants. Given that the USFWS determined that the development of the Project Site will have no effect on the Monarch Butterfly, it is assumed that the conclusion is the same regarding the Western Regal Fritillary.

Determinations of no effect were provided for the Monarch Butterfly, and Whooping Crane. A determination of “not likely to adversely affect” was provided by USFWS for the Northern Long-eared Bat.

Invasive Species

Invasive species are a major cause of biodiversity loss and are considered biological pollutants by the DNR. Invasive species can be moved on construction equipment, landscaping equipment, and other debris. Invasive species pose a significant threat to native ecosystems and biodiversity, and their spread is a major concern during both the construction and operational phases of a project. These species can be unintentionally introduced through construction equipment, vehicles, and materials that carry seeds, plant fragments, or soil from invested areas. Once established, invasive species can outcompete native vegetation, alter soil chemistry, and degrade habitat quality for wildlife. Disturbed soils and exposed areas created during construction provide ideal conditions for these species to take hold and spread rapidly. Without proper management, invasive species can lead to long-term ecological imbalances and increased maintenance costs.

The Project should not introduce any new invasive species to the Project area during construction. Post construction, the Project will include a landscape and planting plan to vegetate the filtration basins/pond buffers with native/non-invasive species that are desirable habitat for several of the species and features identified in 14b. The Project Proposer will use the BWSR or MnDOT native seed mixes where appropriate.

Construction contractors will be directed to properly manage onsite equipment to ensure development does not spread noxious weeds through construction vehicle traffic. If any invasive species are encountered during the grading/site grubbing process, they will be removed, and proper mitigation implemented to remove them from the Project Area.

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

The Minnesota DNR provides specific guidance regarding the avoidance, minimization, or mitigation of impacts to species identified above during construction and site development activities. The Project Proposer shall comply with the following mitigation plan:

- To minimize impacts to the Henslows' sparrow, disturbance in areas that may contain suitable nesting habitat should not occur during their breeding season, between May 15 and July 15.
- Products used for erosion control will be selected that have biodegradable netting.
- The Project Proposer will only use weed-free mulch, topsoil, and seed mixes for restoration of the site.
- To minimize impacts on the bat population, the Project Proposer will evaluate areas scheduled for tree clearing for signs of bat roosting prior to tree removal.
- To minimize impacts to the rusty patched bumble bee population, the DNR recommends reseeding disturbed soils with native species of grasses and forbs using BWSR seed mixes or MnDOT seed mixes which should be included in stormwater management plans and considered for other open space areas. The USFWS recommends avoiding pesticides and planting native flowering plants to provide food. If nests are found, they should be undisturbed, and the sighting reported to the Minnesota USFWS Ecological Services Field Office.

The Project's Concept Plan (Figure 3) protects the majority of the existing wetlands and surrounding buffer areas. Post construction, wetland buffers and stormwater basin slopes will be planted with native, non-invasive species. Approximately 12.7 acres of the site is protected by a conservation easement which will remain in place into perpetuity. The conservation easement may provide suitable habitat both during and after construction of the urbanized development.

This will provide long-term protection of any sensitive ecological resources that may exist proximate to the existing wetlands and within the conservation easement. In addition, stands of existing trees will remain, areas of open space and stormwater treatment will provide space for wildlife habitat, and slopes will be revegetated with native species.

15. Historic Properties

Describe any historic structures, archeological sites, and/or traditional cultural properties on or proximate 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 Statewide Historic Inventory Portal¹⁴ was queried, and there are no identified historic or architectural properties documented within the Project Site. The City of Minnetrista also does not identify any sites or structures of historical significance on the Project Site, and the Site is not listed in the National Register of Historic Places¹⁵.

Within one mile of the Project Site, there are twelve historic properties, listed in Table 20. None of the properties listed in Table 20 will be directly impacted by the Project.

The Office of the State Archaeologist’s (OSA) public viewer¹⁶ was queried and six (6) sites are known to exist near the Project Site.

Table 21. Historic Properties within 1 Mile of Project Site

Historic Inventory #	Property Type	Address	National Register Listed or Eligible
HE-SBC-00006	Building	8670 Kennedy Memorial Dr.	No
HE-SBC-00001	Building	8624 Kennedy Memorial Dr.	Yes
XX-RRD-GNR040	Structure	St. Paul Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway Company/Great Northern Railway Company: Hutchinson Branch Line	No
HE-SBC-00002	Building	xxxx Highland Rd.	No
HE-MTC-00014	Building	xxxx Highland Dr.	No
XX-ROD-00151	Structure	TH 28 in Beardsley to TH 100 in St. Louis Park	No
HE-MTC-00061	Structure	Bridge over Six Mile Creek	No
HE-MTC-00009	Building	8100 Highway 7	No
HE-MTC-00011	Building	4705 Grimm Rd.	No
HE-MTC-00013	Building	7650-70 Highway 7	No
CR-LKT-00001	Building	7220 Grimm Rd.	Yes
HE-MTC-00015	Building	7701 Halstead Dr.	No

Source: Minnesota Statewide Historic Inventory, SHPO, <https://mnship.gisdata.mn.gov/public-map>

¹⁴ “Minnesota Statewide Historic Inventory,” MN SHPO, accessed December 15, 2025, <https://mnship.gisdata.mn.gov/public-map>

¹⁵ “National Register of Historic Places” – National Park Service, U.S Department of the Interior, accessed December 15, 2025, <https://www.nps.gov/maps/full.html?mapId=7ad17c9-b808-4ff8-a2f9-a99909164466>

¹⁶ “Office of the State Archaeologist Portal – Public Map,” Minnesota Department of Administration, State Archaeologist, accessed July 15, 2025, <https://osaportal.gisdata.mn.gov/public-map>

16. 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 transition of the Project Site from agricultural uses to a residential development will impact the visual appearance of the site. The Project is consistent with the City of Minnetrista's Comprehensive Plan that guides the Project Site as an Urban Reserve Area, planned for increased intensity and urbanization. While the development will change the views of the site, it is planned for and anticipated as part of the City's vision for the future. There are no known scenic views or vistas on or near the Project Site.

However, the Project Site is adjacent to the Carver Park Reserve which includes a meandering trail that generally runs parallel to the shared property line. The northern border of the Carver Park Reserve is wooded, however, it is possible that given the topography in the area trail users will be able to see some structures and roof tops. While this viewshed will be different, it will be buffered through setbacks and vegetation within the park. To protect the wooded buffer within the park, lot lines should be clearly marked to minimize potential encroachment from the private yards into the public park land.

During the construction process, appropriate screening of truck entrances, garbage enclosures, and other development features that may adversely impact adjacent residential areas will be required. Post construction, any proposed exterior/site lighting associated with the Project must meet requirements established by City ordinance.

There are no known scenic views or vistas on or near the Project Site.

17. 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. Discuss effects to air quality including any sensitive receptors, human health or applicable regulatory criteria. Include a discussion of any methods used assess the project's effect on air quality and the results of that assessment. Identify pollution control equipment and other measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects from stationary source emissions.

The Project will not generate stationary source emissions exceeding the mandatory EAW thresholds specified in Minnesota Rules Part 4410.4300, Subp. 15, nor will it require an air permit from the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA). Per Item 18, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from this Project are not expected to have significant environmental effects. The Project's air emissions will be typical of those of residential developments, potentially including sources like natural gas and oil-powered appliances and equipment, fertilizer use, and heating and cooling systems. These emissions generally fall under Conditionally Insignificant Activities and Conditionally Exempt Stationary Sources according to Minnesota Rules Part 7007.1300.

- 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.

The Proposed Project will develop the site for residential uses. Motor vehicle emissions will be generated from vehicles traveling to and from the development site, and from construction equipment to perform the construction activities. An estimated 1,700 additional average daily trips are expected to and from the site on TH 7 following full build-out of the site. Following full project site development, vehicle related emissions including carbon monoxide levels are anticipated to rise slightly due to the increase in the number of trips to and from the site. During construction and post-construction, it will be recommended to contractors that trucks and equipment should not idle while not in use or if parked on site.

- 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 17a). 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 Project is not anticipated to produce significant dust or odors during construction, material export, or operation. Any minor odors generated during construction will be typical of those associated with residential development, such as exhaust from diesel or gasoline-powered equipment.

Grading, construction, and material export activities will temporarily generate dust. To mitigate this, BMPs such as dust control by using watering trucks or other methods as agreed to with the City to protect the adjacent neighborhoods will be implemented. The nearby existing residential neighborhoods will be the nearest receptors of dust and odors, which should be monitored throughout the construction process by the Proposer. Odors generated during construction will be mitigated by maintenance of the equipment according to the manufacturer's specifications.

18. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions/Carbon Footprint

- a. **GHG Quantification:** For all proposed projects, provide quantification and discussion of project GHG emissions. Include additional rows in the tables as necessary to provide project-specific emission sources. Describe the methods used to quantify emissions. If calculation methods are not readily available to quantify GHG emissions for a source, describe the process used to come to that conclusion and any GHG emission sources not included in the total calculation.

The projected greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are provided on an average annual basis using the CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e) and include a best estimate of average annual emissions over the life of the proposed Project. Emissions were estimated using the US Environmental Protection Agency's Simplified GHG Emissions Calculator (SGEC)¹⁷, the EIE's Energy Consumption Survey

¹⁷ "Simplified GHG Emissions Calculator," United States Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www.epa.gov/climateleadership/simplified-ghg-emissions-calculator>

Dashboard¹⁸, the EPS’s Advancing Sustainable Materials Fact Sheet¹⁹, and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency’s (MPCA) annually published Select Committee on Recycling and the Environment (SCORE) report²⁰. Estimates are summarized in Tables 22 and 23 by project phase and source type. Direct emissions refer to those under the ownership or control of the reporting company, classified as Scope 1. Indirect emissions stem from sources controlled by other entities but are influenced by the reporting company, like off-site electricity generation. These are classified as Scope 2 or Scope 3.

Table 22. Construction Emissions

Category	Scope	Type of Emission	Emission Sub-type	Emission	Project-related CO ₂ e Emissions (tons/year)
Direct	1	Combustion - Diesel	Mobile Construction Equipment	N ₂ O, CH ₄	4,303
Direct	1	Combustion - Diesel	Passenger Cars	N ₂ O, CH ₄	10,051
TOTAL					14,354

Table 23. Operational Emissions

Category	Scope	Type of Emission	Emission Sub-type	Emission	Project-related CO ₂ e Emissions (tons/year)
Indirect	2	Off-Site Electricity Production	Grid-Based	CO ₂ , N ₂ O, CH ₄	1,791
Indirect	3	Off-Site Waste Management	Area	CO ₂ , CH ₄	318
TOTAL					2,109

The emissions in Tables 22 and 23 are reported in CO₂ short tons (English units), per EQB guidance. Worksheets for each source using the SGEC are provided in Appendix C. Scope 1 emissions calculations reflect an estimate of emissions generated over one year of construction. Approximately 15 pieces of mobile diesel equipment will be on-site and operate at 144 gallons each per day. Scope 1 emissions also assume that there will be approximately 15 workers who commute an average of 10 miles to the site. Scope 2 and 3 emission calculations assume that the Project Site will feature approximately 422 residential units that utilize off-site electricity production and waste management at levels that are comparable to other residential developments within the State of Minnesota. The Project will utilize energy within the MROW (West) eGRID subregion, which generates energy with 35% coal, 38% wind, 8% nuclear, 13% gas, 4% hydro, and about 1% solar sources.

¹⁸ “Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS) Dashboard – Site electricity consumption per household,” US Energy Information Administration, [https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/cbf6875974554a74823232f84f563253?src=%E2%80%B9%20Consumption%20%20%20%20%20Residential%20Energy%20Consumption%20Survey%20\(RECS\)-b1](https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/cbf6875974554a74823232f84f563253?src=%E2%80%B9%20Consumption%20%20%20%20%20Residential%20Energy%20Consumption%20Survey%20(RECS)-b1)

¹⁹ “Advancing Sustainable Materials Management: 2018 Fact Sheet,” Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2021-01/documents/2018_ff_fact_sheet_dec_2020_fnl_508.pdf

²⁰ “2022 SCORE Report,” Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, <https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/mpca.data.services/viz/2022SCOREReport/2022SCOREreport>

b. GHG Assessment

i. Describe any mitigation considered to reduce the project's GHG emissions.

The following are potential design strategies and sustainability measures that are under consideration for the proposed development to reduce emissions:

- Use energy efficient appliances, equipment, and lighting
- Energy efficient and electricity-reliant HVAC systems
- Energy efficient and low embodied carbon (LEC) building materials
- Implement waste best management practices (BPMs) and to recycle and compost appropriate material when applicable
- On-site landscaping will absorb water
- Additional native landscaping will be planted to improve local air quality, absorb greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce local urban heat island effects
- Buildings will be constructed with rooftop-ready infrastructure for solar power generation
- Provide electric vehicle ready charging infrastructure

Implementation of the above strategies will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis based on code requirements, feasibility, availability of materials, schedule, and tenant considerations.

ii. Describe and quantify reductions from selected mitigation, if proposed to reduce the project's GHG emissions. Explain why the selected mitigation was preferred.

The potential mitigation listed in Item 18.b.i. was selected to comply with best management practices for new construction and reduce GHG emissions where practicable during operations.

iii. Quantify the proposed projects predicted net lifetime GHG emissions (total tons/ # of years) and how those predicted emissions may affect achievement of the Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act goals and/or other more stringent state or local GHG reduction goals.

The project does not have an estimated lifetime. It is estimated that the project will emit a total of 248,990 CO_{2e} metric tons over the next 50 years. The proposer will evaluate implementing the sustainability measures listed in Item 18.b.i. to reduce operational emissions to the extent practicable. The proposed project will be built in compliance with state regulations and city building codes.

$$\text{Construction Emissions} * \text{Years of Construction} + \text{Operational Emissions} * 50 \text{ Years} = \text{Estimated Cumulative 50 Year Emissions}$$

$$14,354 * 10 + 2,109 * 50 = 248,990 \text{ CO}_2\text{e}$$

The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act set goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% between 2005 and 2050 while maintaining reliable and affordable energy. In 2023, the state Legislature updated these goals to reflect the state's Climate Action Framework which includes reducing greenhouse gas emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2005 baseline and achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. Development of the Project Site will perpetuate reliance on

personal vehicles. The emissions generated from Development will increase GHG emissions if mitigation is not incorporated into a project. The Proposer should consider incorporating mitigation strategies into the Project such as those listed in 18.a.i. and others which may include green building technologies, low-maintenance landscaping with native plantings, options for electric vehicle charging, grey water reuse for irrigation to mitigate for increased emissions.

19. 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.

A temporary increase in noise level will occur during each construction phase and the noise level intensity will vary based on the type of construction equipment used. Typical noise levels associated with different types of equipment are provided in Table 24. Sensitive noise receptors near the Project Site include existing residences that are as close as 200 feet from the project site. To minimize the potential effects of noise pollution, construction volumes and work hours will be limited to those established by the City of Minnetrista’s ordinances, which will be identified during the land use permitting process. Construction hours will be limited to daytime hours, with additional restrictions to comply with all local and state rules and ordinances. During construction of the Project, there will be additional noise generated beyond existing conditions.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) establishes noise standards that must be followed (Minnesota Rules Chapter 7030). Table 24 is a summary of the statutory noise limit standards for residential (NAC1) areas.

Table 24. Statutory Noise Limit Standards

Use	Daytime (7 am – 10 pm)		Nighttime (10 pm – 7 am)	
	L ₁₀ *	L ₅₀ **	L ₁₀	L ₅₀
Residential (NAC1)	65 dBA	60 dBA	55 dBA	50 dBA

Source: Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (2015). A Guide to Noise Control in Minnesota. <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/p-gen6-01.pdf>

*L₁₀ calculation is the noise level that is exceeded for 10% of an hour.

**L₅₀ calculation is the noise level exceeded for 50% of an hour.

The Project is required to operate in compliance with Minnesota Noise Standards. If noise impacts are determined to be above the state standards, potential contributions will be assessed to pinpoint primary sources and determine optimal methods for noise reduction.

Post-construction, the site will likely generate an increase in noise over existing conditions but will be similar to the levels generated by the residential developments to the east and west of the Project Site.

20. Transportation

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

The Project Site is located south of TH 7, generally west of Oak Road, east of Grimm Rd, and north of the Laketown Township/Carver County border. The existing land uses are agricultural and undeveloped.

The proposed development consists of approximately 357 to 422 residential units, each with off-street parking. Roadways connecting the development will include space for on-street parking.

A Traffic Study was completed for the Proposed Project by Transportation Collaborative & Consultants in March 2026, and the full report is provided in Appendix E. Table 25 provides the estimated a.m. / p.m. peak hour and average daily traffic generated by the Project. The estimate was completed using the *Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition* and accounts for 357 total residential units, as well as a sensitivity test up to 422 units to determine the impact of a higher density development on traffic. Upon completion of the proposed development, the Project is estimated to generate 236 to 256 trips during the a.m. peak hour, 306 to 321 trips during the p.m. peak hour, and 3,094 to 3,410 daily trips. Note that the a.m. and p.m. peak hours represent 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 to 5:30 p.m.

Table 25. Trip Generation Summary

ITE Code	Land Use	Dwelling Units	Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
				In	Out	In	Out
Proposed Development							
210	Single-Family Homes	296	2,692	56	151	171	104
215	Townhomes	61	402	7	22	18	13
TOTAL		357	3,094	63	173	189	117
				236		306	
Sensitivity Test							
210	Single-Family Homes	253	2,300	48	129	146	89
215	Townhomes	169	1,110	20	59	49	37
TOTAL		422	3,410	68	188	195	126
				256		321	
Sensitivity Test Change in Trips (+/-)			+316	+5	+15	+6	+9

The City of Minnetrista is not within the regional transit authority service area. However, there are several bus stops located northeast of the City along CSAH 19. There is also a Metro Transit Park-and-Ride located in the neighboring City of Mound that provides service to downtown Minneapolis. The City is also served by Transit Link, a dial-a-ride service that provides connections throughout the seven-county metropolitan area. Minnetrista residents also have access to the Metro Vanpool program, which provides financial assistance for vanpools to-and-from work destinations. As the area continues to develop, there may be opportunities to expand bus routes, but none are planned for near the development at this time.

As noted, a multi-use path is planned along TH 7 as part of the Hennepin County Bikeway System that provides connections to Carver Park Reserve to the south and Lake Minnetonka Regional Park to the east. If possible, a trail within the required TH 7 right-of-way could provide connectivity to adjacent facilities.

- 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

To understand potential impacts associated with the proposed Project, year 2030 No Build and Build conditions were reviewed from an intersection capacity perspective. The analysis included evaluation of five (5) existing intersections with proximity to the Project, and two intersection design scenarios for access to the Project.

The analysis shows that existing capacity of the study intersections operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the typical weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours for both the 2030 No Build and Build scenarios. The study notes that the westbound approach of TH 7 at Kings Point Road / Victoria Drive (CR 11) is approaching the LOS D / E threshold during the p.m. peak hour for both the No Build and Build scenarios. With or without the Project, the study notes that reconfiguration of this intersection will eventually be needed. As part of the MnDOT *Hwy 7 Study - Hopkins to St. Bonifacius*, a multilane roundabout at Kings Point Road/Victoria Drive (CR 11) was originally planned, and reconfiguration to the roundabout design provides operational benefits to the corridor.

Given the original reconfiguration plans, the multilane Kings Point Road roundabout design was assumed to be constructed as part of the 2030 Build analysis. As shown on the Concept Plan, two intersections are proposed as part of the Project and two design scenarios for each proposed intersection were evaluated within the traffic study. As described in the study, the proposed intersections planned to serve the Project were evaluated under two design scenarios, 1) full access, and 2) right-in-right-out (RI/RO). The study showed that if the roundabout at TH 7 and Kings/Point Road/Victoria Drive is constructed that, regardless of the Project's intersection designs, all intersections evaluated will operate at LOS C or better.

The Traffic Study recommends some minor mitigative infrastructure improvements, which are identified in Item 20.c.

Note that at the time of the Traffic Study, the segment of Victoria Drive (CR 11) between TH 7 and Hwy 5 was closed for reconstruction; this closure had a significant impact on traffic volumes/travel patterns along TH 7. As a result, no new traffic counts were completed as part of the Traffic Study.

However, MnDOT is currently conducting the *Hwy 7 Study - Hopkins to St. Bonifacius*, which includes new traffic data prior to any roadway closures. The MnDOT study recommends improvements along TH 7 that may affect the Project Site, including:

- 3/4 Intersection at Highland Road
- Multilane roundabout at Kings Point Road / Victoria Drive (CR 11)

- Possible multi-use trail along the entire segment if it can be accommodated within the existing right-of-way
- Potential for a median barrier between intersections

Construction of TH 7 improvements are currently planned for 2029.

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

Given that the existing transportation network is expected to operate acceptably with the new development trips, minimal mitigation is needed to address Project-related transportation effects. The following recommendations were provided:

- Locate signage and landscaping to avoid creating any sight distance issues; intersection sight-distance should be confirmed at the proposed site access locations.
- Install internal intersection traffic controls (i.e., stop signs) in collaboration with the City engineer.
- Provide multimodal connections throughout the Project Site to ensure connectivity with existing and proposed facilities adjacent to the site; a multimodal facility should be provided along at least one (1) side of each roadway within the proposed development, where feasible. At a minimum, preserve right-of-way along the south side of TH 7 within the project limits to accommodate a future multi-use trail consistent with the TH 7 Study.
- Review truck maneuverability to limit potential internal circulation conflicts.
- Align the east access across from the existing private access on the north side of TH 7 or consider relocating the private access to align with the proposed east access; this consideration is only needed if full- or three-quarter access is planned for the east access.
- Further discussion with MnDOT should occur to review the Project's access design scenarios to determine the appropriate configuration and implementation timeline. The Project's central access is recommended to be full-access side-street stop controlled with an eastbound right-turn lane, and dedicated left- and right-turn lanes on the side-street approach. The Project's east access is recommended to be right-in/right-out side-street stop controlled with an eastbound right-turn lane.

The sensitivity test found the resultant impact of the additional units to be minimal, and thus the conclusions and recommendations are the same for the low and high end of the unit range evaluated.

21. Cumulative Potential Effects

- 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.

Any environmental impacts must comply with all Federal, State, and local rules and regulations and appropriate permits must be obtained. Required mitigation measures and permit conditions must be followed. Potential impacts outside the permitting process have been properly evaluated as part of this EAW. Therefore, there are no cumulative impacts from the Proposed Project anticipated provided proper mitigation is followed.

- 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.

The Project Site is surrounded primarily by agricultural uses, many areas of which are guided urban reserve or for commercial development in the future. There are no other known immediate development plans, but development in the area is likely in the twenty-year timeframe. Any project in the surrounding area which meets mandatory environmental review thresholds will be required to conduct its own environmental review process.

- 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.

The Project Site is within the designated growth area for the City of Minnetrista with future development on surrounding parcels anticipated over the next several decades. The City has planned for this growth and expansion through its adopted 2040 Comprehensive Plan and will continue to review and address its land use and infrastructure systems when new development is proposed within the expansion areas. Since the proposed Project is consistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the potential impacts to land use and infrastructure were evaluated as part of the planning process. There are no known immediate development plans for adjacent parcels. Given that the surrounding area is within the City's identified growth area, future projects may exceed mandatory thresholds to conduct environmental review and will be required to complete the process prior to land use approvals are granted. Given the extensive study completed by the City's comprehensive planning process and the information contained within this EAW analysis, there are no known impacts that are not addressed through recommended mitigation within this review.

22. 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.

No additional environmental effects have been identified.

**FINDINGS OF FACT
AND
RECORD OF DECISION**

MIXED RESIDENTIAL SOUTH AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

City of Minnetrista
Hennepin County, MN

June 15, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	ADMINISTRATIVE BACKGROUND.....	2
II.	RESPONSE TO COMMENTS	2
	a. Agency/Organization Comments and Responses.....	3
III.	FINDINGS OF FACT.....	8
	a. Project Description.....	8
	b. Corrections to the EAW.....	8
IV.	DECISION REGARDING NEED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	11
	a. Type, Extent and Reversibility of Impacts.....	11
	b. Cumulative Potential Effects of Related or Anticipated Future Projects	11
	c. Extent to which Environmental Effects are Subject to Mitigation by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority ...	11
	d. Extent to which Environmental Effects can be Anticipated and Controlled as a Result of Other Environmental Studies	13
V.	RECORD OF DECISION.....	13

ATTACHMENT 1. COMMENTS RECEIVED

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS, FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

MIXED RESIDENTIAL SOUTH AREA – ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSEMENT WORKSHEET

CITY OF MINNETRISTA HENNEPIN COUNTY, MINNESOTA

I. ADMINISTRATIVE BACKGROUND

The City of Minnetrista (“City”) is the Responsible Governmental Unit for this project, and M/I Homes of Minneapolis, LLC (“M/I Homes”) is the Project Proposer. An Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) has been prepared for this project (“Proposed Project”) in accordance with Minnesota Rules Chapter 4410. The EAW was developed to assess the potential impacts of the project and other circumstances to determine if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed.

The EAW was filed with the Minnesota EQB and circulated for review and comments to the required EAW distribution list. A “Notice of Availability” for the initial EAW was published in the *EQB Monitor* on April 14, 2026. A Notice of Availability was also published on the City’s website. This notice provided information about the statutorily required public comment process that is used in determining the need for an EIS for the Proposed Project.

All comments received during the EAW comment period were considered in determining the potential for significant environmental impacts. Comments received during the comment period can be found in Attachment 1 of this document.

II. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The public review and comment period for the Mixed Residential South Area Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) began on April 14, 2026, and was closed on May 14, 2026. The following responses were prepared to address questions and comments received during the public review and comment period.

The following agencies provided comment letters, organized alphabetically:

Hennepin County Environment & Energy
Metropolitan Council
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)

A copy of each comment letter is included within Attachment 1. Consistent with state environmental rules, responses have been prepared below for all substantive comments received during the comment period.

a. Agency/Organization Comments and Responses

Agency	Commenter	Date	Topic/Item	Summary of Comments	Response
Hennepin County Energy & Environment	Kris Guentzel, Land & Water Supervisor	5/12/2026	Item 12. Water Resources - Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The residential development is located on a parcel(s) that had a previous Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) violation that was addressed via a replacement plan, including 4:1 mitigation of impacted wetlands acres. The development should maintain restored wetland area and value resulting from the restoration plan and as outlined in the Deed of Restrictions and Covenants on the deed title. The EAW notes that WCA review and approval is still anticipated, and the replacement plan should be included in materials submitted for review to the Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) alongside other WCA application materials. Copy Stacey Lijewski at TEP discussions to represent Hennepin County. 	Comment noted. Item 12.b.iv.a) Wetland Impacts section has been updated to include language regarding the background of the previous wetland replacement, and the requirement to maintain the area as per the Deed of Restrictions and Covenants on the deed title. As the LGU for WCA, the City will include Stacy Lijewski in future TEP discussions.
Metropolitan Council	Angela Torres, Senior Manager	5/13/2026	General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff find this EAW to be incomplete. Consequently, we are unable to determine at this time whether the project conforms with regional system plans and whether an EIS may be needed. As the RGU, if the City finds the missing information is not critical to the EIS need decision, in its record of decision, the City can describe the missing information and how it will be obtained and used. The City can also withdraw and republish the EAW with the missing data or issue a supplemental EAW to address the missing data. 	Comment noted. This statement is referencing Council reviewer Kelly's request for additional analysis of the Project's compatibility and adjacency with the Carver Park Reserve. The Draft EAW included reference to Carver Park Reserve in Item 10. Land Use, Item. 14 Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, and Sensitive Ecological Resources (Rare Features), and Item 20. Transportation. The EAW has been corrected to incorporate the requested analysis. The City has determined that the corrected EAW adequately assesses the compatibility of the proposed Project with the Carver Park Reserve and that mitigation can be appropriately addressed through the permitting process. The Proposer also met with Three Rivers Park District for coordination prior to beginning concept planning.
	Colin Kelly		Item 10. Land Use, Item 16. Visual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are two existing or planned units of the Regional Parks and Trails System in the vicinity of the proposed development. Carver Park Reserve is adjacent and south of the proposed development. This nearly 2,800-acre park reserve is open to the public and is managed by Three Rivers Park District. Hiking, horseback riding, and mountain biking trails exist in this northeastern-most portion of the park reserve. Park reserve visitors and its natural environment could be impacted by this residential development. 	Comment noted. The final EAW has been corrected to include additional details and description to Item 10.ii. regarding the Carver Park Reserve.

Agency	Commenter	Date	Topic/Item	Summary of Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing and planned segments of the Baker-Carver Regional Trail are also in the vicinity of the proposed development, approximately 0.4-miles to the southeast. The regional trail is unlikely to be adversely affected by the proposed development. 	<p>Comment noted. The Baker-Carver Regional Trail has been added to the list of nearby trails in Item 10.i.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EAW acknowledges Carver Park Reserve in Section 10. Land Use (page 16). However, Carver Park Reserve is not referenced in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 10b, which requires proposers to “discuss the project’s compatibility with nearby land uses, zoning, and plans listed in item 9a [sic] above, concentrating on implications for environmental effects”; Section 10c, which requires proposers to “identify measures incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate any potential incompatibility as discussed in item 10b above and any risk potential”; nor Section 16. Visual, which requires proposers to “Discuss the potential visual effects from the project. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate visual effects.” 	<p>Comments noted. The EAW has been corrected to include additional analysis regarding compatibility of the Project with the adjacent Carver Park Reserve, visual impact and potential mitigation strategies to be considered as part of the land use permitting process.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2050 Regional Parks and Trails Policy Plan states that “the Met Council will review local comprehensive plan amendments and environmental documents to ensure that Regional Parks and Trails System locations and facilities are protected from land uses or projects that... are likely to have a substantial impact on the system. Substantial... impacts on the Regional Parks and Trails System may include... Projects that impair the use and enjoyment of the system unit due to excessive visual, noise, air pollution, or water pollution” (System Protection, Action 1: Local comprehensive plans; pg. 92). Council Parks staff advise the proposer to provide the Met Council with supplemental information that adds narrative to the Land Use and Visual sections that address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project’s compatibility” with the existing component of the Regional Parks and Trails System, Carver Park Reserve, immediately to the south (Section 10b); to “identify measures... to mitigate any potential incompatibility...” (Section 10b); and to “discuss the potential visual effects from the project. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate visual effects.” (Section 16). 	<p>Comments noted. See corrected EAW.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further, M/I Homes of Minneapolis, LLC (proposer) and the City of Minnetrista (RGU) should coordinate with Three Rivers Park District to ensure there are no adverse impacts to Carver Park Reserve as a result of the proposed development, or that any impacts are appropriately mitigated, through the use of vegetative screening or via other methods. The EAW does not include any record of correspondence with Three Rivers Park District. 	<p>Comment noted. Item 10.c. indicates required coordination between the Proposer, City and Three Rivers Park District as part of the PUD and plat process. The Project Proposer also met with Three Rivers Park District prior to starting concept planning, and again recently to discuss a proposed trail system. Additionally, Item 9 lists required permits that require the Project Proposer to comply with the requirements of the land use and permitting process.</p>

Agency	Commenter	Date	Topic/Item	Summary of Comments	Response
	Mackenzie Young-Walters		Item 7. Climate Adaptations & Resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The discussion of projected climate trends and associated adaptations is adequate. The project proposer should consider low salt design and chloride management plans as an adaptation to the projected increased freeze/thaw cycles associated with warming winters. 	Comment noted. Incorporation of chloride management strategies to reduce use of chlorides has been added to Table 4.
	Shawn James		Item 10. Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive plan amendment is required prior to development of the proposed project. Please include the Metropolitan Council in Table 7. Permits and Approvals for comprehensive plan amendment authorization. While application and approval need to occur first through the City of Minnetrista, the Metropolitan Council is required to authorize the amendment before it can be enacted by the City. In addition to the land use amendment, a portion of the proposed project will require Metropolitan Urban Service Area (MUSA) expansion and a community designation change from Diversified Rural to Suburban Edge. 	Comment noted. The EAW has been corrected to add Metropolitan Council's approval of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Table 7 and text regarding MUSA expansion and community designation change to Item. 10.c.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As of January 1, 2026, communities are expected to plan for land uses that advance their overall net residential density toward the requirement under Imagine 2050, which was adopted as policy by the Met Council in 2025. Under Imagine 2050, areas within the Suburban Edge community designation are required to plan for a citywide minimum net residential density of 3.5 units per acre. 	Comment noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate, concurrent comprehensive plan amendment is under review that shows the Residential Low-Medium land use with a density of 3.5-6.0 units/acre. The proposed project will need to meet this density range if this comprehensive plan amendment is authorized. 	Comment noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Table 10 and Appendix A Figure 3, the pond outlots are shown as netted out in the density calculations. Please note that stormwater ponds cannot be netted out unless publicly owned and maintained. Additionally, the concept plan shows density calculated across the entire project site since the entire area is proposed as residential low-medium land use. Please ensure that the single-family homes and the townhomes independently conform to the density range allowed by the land use designation, rather than averaging the two housing types to conform with the land use's permitted density range. 	Comments noted. The density range provided in Table 10 of the EAW accounts for the pond outlots to either be publicly owned (and therefore netted out of the density calculations) as demonstrated by the high end of the density range at 3.5 DU/acre, or for the pond outlots to be entirely privately owned (and therefore included in the acreage for density calculations) as demonstrated by the low end of the density range at 3.0 DU/acre. While we do not agree with the assertion that residential uses must independently conform with the density range required per land use designation, the concept plan as presented does meet the density requirements for the individual residential uses.

Agency	Commenter	Date	Topic/Item	Summary of Comments	Response
	Todd Graham		Item 10. Land Use - Forecasts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EAW subject development includes 61 attached and 296 single-family detached home lots; or 357 units total. This site was previously considered as urban reserve land. The subject development along with other known, proposed developments will advance Minnetrista beyond 3,800 households (Met Council's forecast for 2040). Met Council staff advise a discussion to align forecast expectations for the 2050 planning cycle. 	Comments noted. The City will evaluate the need for a forecast adjustment during its 2050 Comprehensive Plan process.
	Olivia Boerschinger		Item 10. Land Use - Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minnetrista's current 2040 comprehensive plan currently guides enough land to address its current affordable housing need allocation, which is 318 units. At guided densities that support the development of affordable housing (minimum 6 units per acre for units affordable between 51-80% AMI and minimum 12 units an acre for units at or below 50% AMI), the City's Plan identifies enough acreage to support 353 units. Please be advised that any future forecast increase during the 2021-2030 decade may increase the City's affordable housing need allocation. 	Comment noted.
	Roger Janzig		Item 12. Water Resources – Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Metropolitan Disposal System has adequate capacity for this project location. A comprehensive plan amendment will be required. In addition to the EAW's noted updates to land use and adding to the current 2030 MUSA/staging, the City's comprehensive sewer plan regarding metershed M436 should also be updated to include the proposed sewer extensions and project area. If an amendment is authorized, a sanitary sewer extension permit application with the MPCA will be required before construction may begin. 	Comment noted. Text regarding the required amendment to the City's comprehensive sewer plan has been added to Item 10.c. The MPCA sanitary sewer extension permit is noted in Table 7.
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency	Chris Green	5/13/2026	Item 9. Permits & Approvals Required – Table 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include Hennepin County in table. 	Comment noted. The EAW has been corrected to add Hennepin County to the Table.
			Item 7. Climate Adaptation & Resilience – Table 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could include potential for increased freeze/thaw cycles and chloride management strategies to reduce use of chlorides With increased impervious area, more chloride will be used for winter roads. Designing with snow storage and icy areas in mind may help reduce chloride use. 	Comments noted. The EAW has been corrected to add the recommended considerations and adaptations to Table 4.
			Item 12. Water Resources – Table 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include the TMDL status for the impaired waters. There are TMDLs for nutrients in Parley and Halsted's Bay and a mercury TMDL for Halsted's Bay. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sixmile Creek does not have a TMDL for nutrients. Reference which impaired waters list was used. The most current is 2024. 	Comment noted. Reference to the 2024 impaired waters list has been added to the final corrected EAW. TMDLs have been noted in Item 12.a.i. Six Mile Creek (AUID 07010206-551) is included in the 2024 impaired waters list for nutrients.
			Item 12. Water Resources - Wastewater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater - recommending water softeners that do not use salt could reduce chlorides going to the WWTP, which would reduce chlorides in streams. Table 14, Estimated Sanitary Sewer Flow Rate, indicates a total area of 62 acres, while the concept plan in Figure 3 indicates a lotted area of 90.48 acres. The area of the housing units should be clarified. 	Comment noted. The EAW has been corrected to include the recommended adaptation in Table 4. Comments noted. Because the SAC typical sewer flow per unit results in a higher estimated flow rate for the

Agency	Commenter	Date	Topic/Item	Summary of Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Met Council Sewer Access Charge (SAC) system typically estimates sewer flow on a per home basis. Each home being 1 SAC unit with a flow of 274 gallons per day per home. Table 14 may underestimate the potential flow from the development. 	<p>development, Table 14 has been updated to reflect calculation based on 422 units and a daily flow rate of 274 gallons/unit/day.</p>

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

a. Project Description

The Proposed Project, Mixed Residential South Area, is a residential development in the City of Minnetrista, Minnesota. The development will be built on approximately 163 acres and will be developed with 357 to 422 detached single-family and attached townhome residential units, outdoor community gathering spaces, stormwater management areas, and curvilinear roads. The Project is proposed to be phased over a 5-to-10-year period to respond to market demand with initial site work planned to begin in 2027.

b. Corrections to the EAW

- Table 4 is amended to include the following:
 - Project Design considerations, risks, and adaptations:
 - *There is potential for increased freeze/thaw cycles, and water softeners that use salt increases chlorides in wastewater treatment plants and thereby streams.*
 - *Project design should design with snow storage and icy conditions in mind, consider incorporating strategies to reduce the use of chlorides, and consider using water softeners that do not use salt to reduce chlorides.*
- *Table 7. Permits and Approvals is amended to include the following:*

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
Metropolitan Council	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	To be applied for

- **Item 10. Land Use**

- Item 10.a.i.
 - Added Baker-Carver Regional Trail to list of nearby parks and trails.
 - Added:

Additionally, the Project Site shares its southern border with the Carver Park Reserve which is a part of the Metropolitan Council’s Regional Park system, is managed by Three Rivers Park District, and is open to the public. The Carver Park Reserve is comprised of approximately 2,800-acres and is predominantly natural areas, surface waters, open spaces and trails. There are hiking, horseback riding, and mountain biking trails near the proposed Project Site, in this northeastern-most portion of the park reserve. Both the 2040 and 2050 Regional Parks and Trails Policy Plans identify the Carver Park Reserve; however, no expansion of the park area, regional trail or search corridors within or adjacent to the Project Site are identified within the policy plans.
- Item 10.b., added

The Project Site shares its southerly border with the Carver Park Reserve, which is predominantly passive park uses including an internal trail network, wooded areas, surface

waters and open space. New single-family lots are proposed to abut the shared property line extending from the southeasterly corner of the Project Site to the west approximately 1,800 feet. The proposed lots terminate where the wetland areas expand and protected natural areas are proposed on the west end of the site (See Figure 3. Concept Plan). The Figures show that within the park the shared border is wooded and there appears to be an internal trail which meanders but generally runs parallel to the shared property line. The trail is setback between approximately 85 feet on the west end of the Project Site and up to 150 feet as the trail heads east towards CSAH 7. As shown in Figure 2, topography along the shared border is rolling. The proposed single family lot development in this area has the potential to impact the wooded areas and vegetation in the park if lot lines are not clearly identified or marked. Additionally, trail users may see rooftops and homes along this border, which is currently unobstructed since the Project Site is undeveloped. Residential uses adjacent to parks are generally compatible, however, certain mitigation may be beneficial to protect the wooded areas within the park and the park boundary to ensure private lots do not encroach on the park land.

- Item 10.c., added:

The City's comprehensive sewer plan must also be updated regarding metershed M436 to include the proposed sewer extensions and project area. In addition to the land use amendment, the Project will require MUSA expansion and a community designation change from Diversified Rural to Suburban Edge.

As part of the PUD and plat process, the City will require the Project Proposer to address the shared property line with the Carver Park Reserve to ensure that setbacks are maintained and wooded areas within the park are not disturbed. Potential mitigation should be coordinated with Three Rivers Park District and may include marking the park border with signage or a combination of strategies. The Project Proposer has met with Three Rivers Park District prior to starting concept planning, and again recently to discuss a proposed trail system.

- **Item 12. Water Resources**

- Item 12.a.i., added/edited:

Minnehaha/Six Mile Creek, Minnetonka-Halsteds Bay, and Parley Lake are classified as impaired waters according to Minnesota's 2024 Impaired Waters List. Minnehaha/Six Mile Creek (AUID 07010206-551) from Mud Lake to Lake Minnetonka is listed as impaired is listed as impaired for aquatic life due to the presence of nutrients. Minnetonka-Halsteds Bay (AUID 27-0133-09) is listed as impaired for aquatic recreation due to the presence of nutrients and for aquatic consumption due to the presence of mercury in fish tissue. Parley Lake (AUID 10-0042-00) is listed as impaired for aquatic recreation due to the presence of nutrients.

A Notice of Decision (NOD) for a wetland delineation was issued on October 21, 2025, and is included in Appendix D.

- Item 12.b.i.1), added/edited:

The City of Minnetrista’s Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Plan identifies assumed wastewater generation by land use, while Metropolitan Council’s Sewer Access Charge (SAC) system estimates sewer flow on a per unit basis. Table 14 conservatively estimates the total gallons per day (gpd) produced by the Project based on the high unit count and assumed daily flow rates per SAC, for single-family detached and attached units. Per the City’s Sanitary Sewer Plan, a peak flow factor of 4.0 should be applied when sizing pipe or determining lift station capacity.

Table 14. Estimated Sanitary Sewer Flow Rate

Land Use	Units	Daily Flow Rate (Gallons/Unit/Day)	Total Gallons per Day (gpd)
Single-family attached and detached residential	422	274	115,628

- Item 12.b.iv., added/edited:

The Project Site is located on parcels that had a previous Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) violation that was addressed via a replacement plan, including 4:1 mitigation of impacted wetland areas. The development should maintain the restored wetland area and value resulting from the restoration plan and as outlined in the Deed of Restrictions and Covenants on the deed title. Based on the Concept Plan, approximately 0.6 acres of wetland impact are anticipated due to road crossings and storm water treatment facilities. Any wetland or buffer impact must comply with all wetland replacement or mitigation rules and regulations established by the City, WCA, and MCWD, and a replacement plan should be included in materials submitted for review to the Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) alongside other required WCA application materials.

- **Item 16. Visual**

- Added:

However, the Project Site is adjacent to the Carver Park Reserve which includes a meandering trail that generally runs parallel to the shared property line. The northern border of the Carver Park Reserve is wooded, however, it is possible that given the topography in the area trail users will be able to see some structures and roof tops. While this viewshed will be different, it will be buffered through setbacks and vegetation within the park. To protect the wooded buffer within the park, lot lines should be clearly marked to minimize potential encroachment from the private yards into the public park land.

IV. DECISION REGARDING NEED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Minnesota Rule 4410.1700 provides that an environmental impact statement shall be ordered for projects that have the potential for significant environmental effects. In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the following factors shall be considered:

a. Type, Extent and Reversibility of Impacts

The City of Minnetrista finds that the analysis completed for the EAW is adequate to determine whether the Project has the potential for significant environmental impacts.

The EAW described the type and extent of impacts anticipated to result from the Proposed Project. This document provides any corrections, changes, clarifications and new information since the EAW was published, and summarizes the dominant and recurring issues within the EAW. The proposed design for the Project includes features to mitigate the identified impacts.

As described in the EAW and within the corrections stated herein, continued coordination with between the City, Proposer, and Three Rivers Park District will be required to address the shared property line of the Project Site with Carver Park Reserve to ensure that setbacks are maintained and wooded areas within the park are not disturbed. Mitigation should be coordinated with Three Rivers Park District. In addition, further discussion between the City, Proposer, and MnDOT should occur to coordinate timing and design of the Project’s access design scenarios with MnDOT’s planned improvements to TH 7.

b. Cumulative Potential Effects of Related or Anticipated Future Projects

No cumulative effects were identified during the comment period. The cumulative impacts identified in the EAW, in conjunction with EAW corrections noted herein, were evaluated and determined that if the identified mitigative steps are implemented and all permitting processes are followed that there are no anticipated cumulative environmental impacts as a result of the Proposed Project.

c. Extent to which Environmental Effects are Subject to Mitigation by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority

The mitigation of environmental impacts will be designed and implemented in coordination with the applicable regulatory agencies. All mitigation efforts will be subject to the plan approval and permitting processes. Permits and approvals that have been obtained, or those that may be required prior to construction, are identified in Table 1.

Table 1. Permits and Approvals Required

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
Federal		
US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Section 404 Clean Waters Act – Wetland Permit	To be applied for, if required
	MPCA 401 Certification, if required	
State		
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Construction Permit	To be applied for

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)	To be applied for
	Sanitary Sewer Extension Permit	To be applied for
	401 Water Quality Certification	To be applied for
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	MN Natural Heritage Database Review	Complete
	Dewatering permit	To be applied for, if needed
Minnesota Department of Health (MDH)	Water main plan review and water supply connection	To be applied for
	Well abandonment	To be applied for
Minnesota Department of Transportation	Access Permit	To be applied for
	Right-of-Way Permit	To be applied for
	Utility Crossing Permit	To be applied for
	Drainage permit	To be applied for
Metropolitan Council	Sewer Extension Permit Review & Approval	To be applied for
	Sewer Facility Connection Permit	To be applied for
	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	To be applied for
Local		
Hennepin County	Wetlands/Surface Water Permitting	To be applied for, if needed
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District (MCWD)	Stormwater Management Permit	To be applied for
City of Minnetrista	Comprehensive Plan Amendment	To be applied for
	Rezoning (PUD)	To be applied for
	Preliminary and Final Plat	To be applied for
	Building Permits	To be applied for
	Road/access permits	To be applied for
	Sign permits	To be applied for
	Development Agreement	To be applied for
	WCA Review and Approval	To be applied for, if applicable
	WCA Replacement Plan	To be applied for, if applicable

d. Extent to which Environmental Effects can be Anticipated and Controlled as a Result of Other Environmental Studies

The City of Minnetrista finds:

1. The Proposed Project is reasonably similar to other residential development projects in the City of Minnetrista and surrounding area. Other projects of similar scope, accompanied by similar land use, natural resources, surface water, traffic studies, and associated mitigation, have, in general, successfully mitigated potential environmental impacts.
2. The EAW, in conjunction with this document, contains or references the known studies that provide information or guidance regarding environmental effects that can be anticipated and controlled.
3. No EIS that addresses a similarly sized project is known to be available in the City of Minnetrista or the surrounding area.
4. In light of the results of the environmental review and permitting processes for similar projects, the City of Minnetrista finds that the environmental effects of the project can be adequately anticipated and controlled.

Based on the original EAW, comments received from agencies and individuals, the responses to comments, and the criteria above, the City of Minnetrista finds that the Mixed Residential South Area development does not have the potential for significant environmental effects and does not require the preparation of an EIS.

V. RECORD OF DECISION

Based on the EAW, the Response to Comments and the Findings of Fact, the City of Minnetrista concludes the following:

1. All requirements for environmental review of the Proposed Project have been met.
2. The EAW and the development processes related to the Proposed Project have generated information which is adequate to determine whether the Proposed Project has the potential for significant environmental effects.
3. Areas where potential environmental effects have been identified, the City of Minnetrista has included proper mitigative responses to be included within the final design of the Proposed Project. Mitigation will be required to be provided where impacts are expected to result from project construction, operation, or maintenance. Mitigative measures will be required to be incorporated into the Proposed Project design and have been or will be coordinated with state and federal agencies during the applicable permit process.
4. Based on the criteria in Minnesota Rules part 4410.1700, the Proposed Project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects.
5. An Environmental Impact Statement is not required for the proposed Mixed Residential South Area development in Minnetrista, Minnesota.

RESOLUTION NO. 69-26

CITY OF MINNETRISTA

**RESOLUTION DETERMINING NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF THE NEED
FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE MIXED
RESIDENTIAL SOUTH AREA EAW**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) Rules, Chapter 4410, part 4410.1000, Subpart 3, the City of Minnetrista as the responsible governmental unit completed an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for approximately 163 acres as identified in the Mixed Residential South Area EAW; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Minnesota EQB Rules, Chapter 4410, and as a result of common ownership and connected actions, the project meets the thresholds for an EAW for mixed residential projects; and

WHEREAS, copies of the EAW were distributed to all persons and agencies on the official EQB mailing list on April 14, 2026; and

WHEREAS, notice of the availability of the EAW for public review for a 30-day comment period was published in the *EQB Monitor* and on the City of Minnetrista's website on April 14, 2026; and

WHEREAS, the preparation of the Mixed Residential South Area EAW and comments received on the EAW have generated information adequate to determine whether the proposed project has the potential for significant environmental impacts; and

WHEREAS, the Mixed Residential South Area development is expected to comply with all the City of Minnetrista and review agency standards; and

WHEREAS, based on the criteria established in Minnesota Rules 4410.1700, the project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects; and

WHEREAS, based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions, the project does not have the potential for significant environmental impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Minnetrista, Hennepin County, Minnesota as follows:

That it should and hereby does make a negative declaration on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement for the Mixed Residential South Area EAW.

This resolution was adopted by the City Council of the City of Minnetrista on the 15th day of June, 2026 by a vote of ___ Ayes and ___ Nays.

Lisa Whalen, Mayor

ATTEST:

Ann Meyerhoff, City Clerk
(SEAL)