



# Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

520 Lafayette Road North | St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194 | 651-296-6300

800-657-3864 | 651-282-5332 TTY | [www.pca.state.mn.us](http://www.pca.state.mn.us) | Equal Opportunity Employer

October 19, 2012

TO: INTERESTED PARTIES

RE: Shamrock Transfer Station Expansion Project

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has approved the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order for a Negative Declaration on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Shamrock Transfer Station Expansion Project, Anoka County. The Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order document concludes that this project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects. The decision for a Negative Declaration completes the state environmental review process under the revised Environmental Quality Board rules, Minn. R. ch. 4410. Final governmental decisions on the granting of permits or approvals for the project may now be made.

These documents can be reviewed at the following locations: the MPCA offices in St. Paul and the Minneapolis Public Library at 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis. The document can be viewed on our MPCA website at <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/news/eaw/index.html>. Requests for copies of these documents may be made by contacting the St. Paul office at 651-757-2101.

We want to express our appreciation for comment letters submitted on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet. Comments and responses have been incorporated into the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order and have been considered by MPCA staff during the permit process for the proposed project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Craig Affeldt".

Craig Affeldt  
Supervisor, Environmental Review Unit  
St. Paul Office  
Resource Management and Assistance Division

CA:mbo

**STATE OF MINNESOTA  
MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE DECISION  
ON THE NEED FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED  
SHAMROCK RECYCLING AND TRANSFER STATION EXPANSION  
CITY OF BLAINE  
ANOKA COUNTY, MINNESOTA**

**FINDINGS OF FACT  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW  
AND ORDER**

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

Pursuant to Minn. R. 4410.1000 - 4410.1600, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff has prepared an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the proposed Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Expansion project (Project). Based on the MPCA staff environmental review, the EAW, comments and information received during the comment period, and other information in the record of the MPCA, the MPCA hereby makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order.

**Project Description**

**Existing Facility and Proposed Project**

1. The Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station (Facility) is an existing recycling and solid waste transfer facility located near the intersection of 99<sup>th</sup> Court and Naples Street NE, Blaine, Minnesota. The Facility has been operating since 2002.
2. The existing operations consist of a 20,000 square foot transfer station with automated processing equipment used to separate out recyclable materials from incoming construction and demolition (C&D) wastes. Recovered materials are stockpiled prior to being delivered to various recycling markets. Residual wastes are transferred to an approved disposal facility. A majority of the waste management operations (unloading, sorting, and material handling) are done within the enclosed Facility building. The surrounding outdoor areas are used for material storage and loading for transfer off the site.
3. The transfer building is an unheated building with a 29-foot 4-inch clearance height and is constructed with architectural concrete panels with automated overhead doors for vehicle access. The transfer station building also has a reinforced concrete tipping floor. Additionally, there is approximately 300 square feet of heated office space in the southeast corner of the building that includes sanitary facilities and storage areas. The Facility also includes an 18,500 square foot office and truck maintenance shop, which is located just south of the transfer station building. The buildings are surrounded by bituminous paving and curbing, which drain to stormwater management ponds. The stormwater management ponds then drain into the on-site wetlands, which ultimately drain off the site on the southwest corner of the Shamrock property.
4. The Facility currently is limited by its MPCA Solid Waste Permit No. SW-592 (PER 002), to a capacity of 500 tons per day (TPD) of C&D waste.

5. Shamrock is proposing to expand the types of material that it is permitted to process to include mixed municipal solid waste (MSW) and source separated recyclables (SSR). The MSW and SSR would be collected from surrounding communities.
6. Shamrock is also proposing to increase its permitted capacity from 500 to 700 TPD. Shamrock is expecting to process approximately 250 TPD of C&D waste, 250 TPD of MSW, 100 TPD of SSR, and 100 TPD of yard waste.
7. Shamrock will continue to use its existing 20,000 square foot transfer station building and the surrounding outdoor storage areas for the new material. However, the proposed Project includes the removal of the Facility's existing automated C&D waste processing equipment to allow for space to process MSW and SSR material. Post-Project, the Facility would continue to accept C&D waste, recyclable materials, non-hazardous industrial wastes, white goods, and yard waste, but the waste would be processed manually.
8. The proposed Project also includes the addition of an outbound weigh-scale near the southeast corner of the processing building. This change is being made to improve traffic flow at the Facility and to better accommodate the transfer trailers leaving the site. The Project also includes the demolition of the office space inside the southeast corner of the transfer building to allow more space on the tipping floor. A three to five-foot deep load-out pit would also be added in the middle of the tipping floor to allow for the top-loading of transfer trailers.
9. After the Project is implemented, transfer trailers would back into the load-out pit via the center overhead door (Door 4), which is located on the south side of the building. The load-out pit would divide the tipping floor into two halves, with the western half being designated for C&D material management and the eastern half designated for MSW, non-hazardous industrial waste, and SSR management. The C&D waste will be received through doors 2 and 3. MSW and SSR would be delivered through doors 5 and 6. The SSR materials will be temporarily stored in an indoor bunker located on the MSW tipping floor side of the building, or outdoors, in enclosed transfer trailers, prior to being sent off site. The transfer trailers are covered so that they will not be in contact with any precipitation. The recyclable C&D materials will be recovered manually on the tipping floor or sent to an off-site recycling facility as markets allow.
10. The removal of the Facility's existing C&D waste processing equipment and the transition to the new Facility layout will occur over time to minimize disruptions to the ongoing facility operations. Shamrock will initially operate under the existing Facility configuration and transition in phases to the new design.

### **Permitting History**

11. The Facility received its original Conditional Use Permit (CUP) from the city of Blaine in 2001.
12. The Facility received its Construction and Demolition Processing License from Anoka County in 2001.

13. The Facility received a Final Site Drainage approval and a Wetland Alteration Permit from the Rice Creek Watershed District on June 17, 2002.
14. The Facility received MPCA Solid Waste Permit (SW-592) on September 12, 2002, and began operation in the fall of 2002. The permit authorized Shamrock to accept and process 500 tons per day of C&D waste.
15. The MPCA received an application from Shamrock on July 10, 2012, for reissuance and modification of the Facility's solid waste permit. The application requested authorization to increase the Facility's total permitted processing capacity from 500 to 700 TPD. The application also requested authorization to accept MSW and SSR. The revised solid waste permit would continue to authorize the Facility to accept and process C&D waste, as is allowed by the current permit.
16. On September 4, 2012, the MPCA public noticed the Facility's draft Solid Waste Permit No. SW-592 (PER 003). The MPCA also provided a press release about the proposed Project to media outlets in Anoka County. The public comment period for the solid waste permit ended on October 3, 2012. During the 30-day comment period, the MPCA received no comments on the draft permit.

#### **Previous Environmental Review**

17. The MPCA has not prepared an EAW or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for this Facility in the past.

#### **Procedural History**

18. Pursuant to Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 17. G, an EAW was prepared by MPCA staff on the proposed Project. Pursuant to Minn. R. 4410.1500, the EAW was distributed to the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) mailing list and other interested parties on August 27, 2012.
19. The MPCA notified the public of the availability of the EAW for public comment. The notice of the availability of the EAW was published in the *EQB Monitor* on September 3, 2012, and the EAW was made available for review on the MPCA website at <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/news/eaw/index.html>. A news release was provided to media in Anoka County, as well as other interested parties, on September 5, 2012.
20. The public comment period for the EAW began on September 3, 2012, and ended on October 3, 2012. During the 30-day comment period, the MPCA received four comment letters from governmental units (i.e., Minnesota Historical Society, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, and the Metropolitan Council) and no letters from citizens (Appendix A).
21. The MPCA prepared a written response to the comment letters received during the 30-day public comment period. The responses to the comment letters are included as Appendix A to these findings.

### **Criteria for Determining the Potential for Significant Environmental Effects**

22. Under Minn. R. 4410.1700, the MPCA must order an EIS for projects that have the potential for significant environmental effects. In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the MPCA must compare the impacts that may be reasonably expected to occur from the project with the criteria set forth in Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. These criteria are:
- A. the type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects;
  - B. cumulative potential effects. The RGU shall consider the following factors: whether the cumulative potential effect is significant; whether the contribution from the project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect; the degree to which the project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effect; and the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project;
  - C. the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority. The RGU may rely only on mitigation measures that are specific and that can be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the project; and
  - D. the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs.

### **The MPCA Findings with Respect to Each of These Criteria Are Set Forth Below**

#### **Type, Extent, and Reversibility of Environmental Effects**

23. The first criterion that the MPCA must consider when determining if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects is the "type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects" Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. A. The MPCA findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.
24. The types of impacts that may reasonably be expected to occur from the Project include the following:
- vehicle-related air emissions
  - dust
  - noise
  - odor
  - litter
25. With respect to the extent and reversibility of impacts that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project, the MPCA makes the following findings.

#### Vehicle-related air emissions

26. The proposed Project would result in some additional air emissions in the immediate Facility area due to the approximately 20 additional vehicles delivering materials to the Facility each day (i.e., increasing from 55 to 75). According to the Minnesota Department of Transportation traffic map, the intersection of Naples Street and 99th Court has an annual average daily traffic count of 4,750. The Project would result in a maximum daily traffic increase of 100 vehicles per day. This is equivalent to a maximum increase of two percent. However, given the relatively small increase in traffic, the air pollution added from these vehicles is not expected to significantly change existing air quality. In addition, these vehicles are already on the road and presumably this Facility would result in a decrease in total vehicle-miles driven, since the purpose of the transfer station is to aggregate loads from a large number of smaller vehicles into a smaller number of larger vehicles.
27. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related to vehicle-related air emissions. The impacts on air quality that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.
28. The MPCA finds that the Project, as it is proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent, and reversibility of impacts related to vehicle-related air emissions that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

#### Dust

29. The proposed Project has the potential to create dust from the additional waste material received. Impacts from dust will be prevented or mitigated by housing waste transfer activities inside the transfer building and by closing the doors to the building when waste is not expected to be received. Access roads to the Facility and the main roads and parking areas around the transfer building are paved to minimize dust emissions.
30. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related to dust emissions. The impacts on air quality that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.
31. The MPCA finds that the Project, as it is proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent, and reversibility of impacts related to dust emissions that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

### Noise

32. The proposed Project will generate additional noise from truck traffic and from the additional waste processing. Most of the waste transferring activities will take place inside the transfer building with the doors closed in order to minimize noise levels outside of the Facility. Truck traffic generated by the Facility will contribute to the noise impacts. However, since the increase in the number of vehicles is only approximately 20 per day, the noise from truck traffic would be intermittent and not likely to cause or contribute to potential exceedances of Minnesota noise standards. Therefore, impacts from noise due to the Project are not expected to be significant.
33. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related to noise. The impacts of noise that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.
34. The MPCA finds that the Project, as it is proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent, and reversibility of impacts related to noise that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

### Odor

35. The proposed Project would result in odors inside the transfer station building. In the MPCA staff's experience, odors generated by a transfer station are significantly decreased just outside the transfer building and are not of major concern off the site. To minimize odors in the area around the Facility, putrescible waste will be handled inside the transfer building. Under the Solid Waste Management Rules, the proposed Facility is required to operate with the doors closed when waste is not expected to be received. This procedure will help prevent impacts from odors in the surrounding area. The property is zoned I-2 Heavy Industrial property and has been used as a C&D recycling and transfer station since 2002. The surrounding properties are zoned I-1 light industrial and airport zoning.
36. Odors from the Facility would continue to be minimized by the use of good housekeeping practices. The Facility will only be allowed to store MSW on site for a maximum period of three days in order to minimize odors generation.
37. The tipping floor in the transfer building is required to be cleaned at least every seven days under MPCA transfer station operating rules in order to minimize odor.
38. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address concerns related to odor. The impacts on the environment, due to odor that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.

39. The MPCA finds that the Project, as it is proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent, and reversibility of impacts related to odor that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

#### Litter

40. The proposed Project has the potential to generate litter. Litter generation will be mitigated by conducting the MSW and SSR transfer activities inside the Facility. The Facility site is inspected and cleaned on a daily basis to ensure that litter does not become a nuisance. In addition, haul vehicles leaving the site will be covered to prevent blowing waste during transport.
41. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related to litter. The impacts on litter that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.
42. The MPCA finds that the Project, as it is proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent, and reversibility of impacts related to litter that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

#### **Cumulative Potential Effects**

43. The second criterion that the MPCA must consider when determining if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects is the "cumulative potential effects." In making this determination, the MPCA must consider "whether the cumulative potential effect is significant; whether the contribution from the project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect; the degree to which the project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effects; and the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project." Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7.B. The MPCA findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.
44. The EAW, public comments, and MPCA follow-up evaluation did not disclose any related or anticipated future projects that may interact with this Project in such a way as to result in significant cumulative potential environmental effects.
45. Based on information on the Project obtained from EAW data submittals, permit application processes, public comments, and a site visit by MPCA staff on August 7, 2012, and presented in the EAW, the MPCA did not identify and does not anticipate significant cumulative effects from this Project.
46. The MPCA finds that the Project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects due to potential cumulative effects.



### **The Extent to Which the Environmental Effects Are Subject to Mitigation by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority**

47. The third criterion that the MPCA must consider when determining if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects is "the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority." Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. C. The MPCA findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.

48. The following permits or approvals will be required for the Project:

<b>Unit of Government</b>	<b>Permit or Approval Required</b>
City of Blaine	Conditional Use Permit
Anoka County	MSW Transfer Station License
MPCA	Solid Waste Permit

49. The above-listed permits include general and specific requirements for mitigation of environmental effects of the Project. Specific reporting and inspection requirements will allow ongoing monitoring of the operation of the Facility and enforcement action can be taken to correct any deficiencies that are identified. The MPCA finds that the environmental effects of the Project are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.

### **The Extent to Which Environmental Effects can be Anticipated and Controlled as a Result of Other Available Environmental Studies Undertaken by Public Agencies or the Project Proposer, Including Other EISs**

50. The fourth criterion that the MPCA must consider is "the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs." Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. D. The MPCA findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.

51. The following documents were reviewed by MPCA staff as part of the environmental impact analysis for the proposed Project.

- the EAW data submittal from the applicant to the MPCA
- the solid waste permit application submitted by the applicant to the MPCA
- the draft solid waste permit for the Project

52. In addition, the MPCA also relied on other information provided by the Project proposer, persons commenting on the EAW, staff experience, and other available information obtained by staff including previous environmental impact assessment documents for similar facilities.

53. There are no elements of the Project that pose the potential for significant environmental effects that cannot be addressed in the Project design and permit development processes, or by local plans and ordinances.

54. Based on the environmental review, previous environmental studies, and MPCA staff expertise and experience on similar projects, the MPCA finds that the environmental effects of the Project that are reasonably expected to occur can be anticipated and controlled.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

55. The MPCA has jurisdiction in determining the need for an EIS for this Project. The EAW, the permit development process, and the evidence in the record are adequate to support a reasoned decision regarding the potential significant environmental effects that are reasonably expected to occur from this Project.
56. Areas where the potential for significant environmental effects may have existed have been identified and appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project design and permits. The Project is expected to comply with all MPCA standards.
57. Based on a comparison of the impacts that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project with the criteria established in Minn. R. 4410.1700 subp. 7, the Project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects.
58. An EIS is not required.
59. Any findings that might properly be termed conclusions and any conclusions that might properly be termed findings are hereby adopted as such.

#### ORDER

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency determines that there are no potential significant environmental effects reasonably expected to occur from the Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Expansion Project and that there is no need for an Environmental Impact Statement.

#### IT IS SO ORDERED

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner John Linc Stine  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

10/18/12  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
Shamrock Transfer Station Expansion Project  
Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)**

**COMMENT LETTERS RECEIVED**

1. Tod Sherman, Minnesota Department of Transportation. E-mail received September 11, 2012.
2. Melissa Doperaiski, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. E-mail received October 1, 2012.
3. Mary Ann Heidemann, Minnesota Historical Society. Letter received October 2, 2012
4. LisaBeth Barajas, Metropolitan Council. E-mail received October 3, 2012.

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE EAW**

1. Comment by Tod Sherman, Planning Supervisor, Minnesota Department of Transportation. E-mail received September 11, 2012.

Comment 1-1: No comment.

Response: No response required.

2. Comment by Melissa Doperaiski, Regional Environmental Assessment Ecologist, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. E-mail received October 1, 2012.

Comment 2-1: No comment.

Response: No response required.

3. Comment by Mary Ann Heidemann, Manager, Governmental Programs and Compliance, Minnesota Historical Society. Letter received October 2, 2012.

Comment 3-1: There are no properties listed on the National or State Registers of Historic Places, and no known or suspected archaeological properties in the area that will be affected by this project.

Response: No response required.

4. Comment by LisaBeth Barajas, Acting Manager of Local Planning Assistance, Metropolitan Council. E-mail received October 3, 2012.

Comment 4-1: The staff review finds that the EAW is complete with respect to regional concerns and raises no major issues of consistency with Council policies.

Response: No response required.

**Comment 4-2:** Development and review of any project environmental documents, such as an EAW, and any permits associated with this project should acknowledge that the Drinking Water Supply Management Area for the City of Lexington is located less than a mile southeast of this site.

**Response:** MPCA solid waste permit staff has been notified of the Council's request.

**Osborn, Mary (MPCA)**

---

**From:** Sherman, Tod (DOT)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 11, 2012 8:02 AM  
**To:** Sommer, Steve (MPCA)  
**Subject:** Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Expansion Report

Steve:

Thank You for submitting the Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Expansion Project to MnDOT. We have reviewed EAW and have no comment since it will have minimal impact on MnDOT right-of-way. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks, Tod

Tod Sherman, Planning Supervisor  
Mn/DOT Metro District  
1500 W. County Road B-2  
Roseville, MN 55113  
(651) 234-7794  
[tod.sherman@state.mn.us](mailto:tod.sherman@state.mn.us)

**Osborn, Mary (MPCA)**

---

**From:** Doperalski, Melissa (DNR)  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2012 10:01 AM  
**To:** Sommer, Steve (MPCA)  
**Subject:** Re: Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Expansion Project - DNR comments

The Department of Natural Resources has reviewed the Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station expansion project. We have no comments for the project.

Thank you,  
Melissa

**Melissa Doperalski**  
**Regional Environmental Assessment Ecologist**  
**Department of Natural Resources, Central Region**  
1200 Warner Road  
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55106  
651.259.5738  
[melissa.doperalski@state.mn.us](mailto:melissa.doperalski@state.mn.us)



STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

RECEIVED  
OCT 2 2012

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

September 27, 2012

Mr. Craig Affeldt  
Environmental Review Unit  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
520 Lafayette Road North  
St. Paul, MN 55155-4194

RE: EAW – Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Expansion Project  
T31 R23 S27 NE-NE, Blaine, Anoka County  
SHPO Number: 2012-2873

Dear Mr. Affeldt:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above project. It has been reviewed pursuant to the responsibilities given the Minnesota Historical Society by the Minnesota Historic Sites Act and the Minnesota Field Archaeology Act.

Based on our review of the project information, we conclude that there are **no properties** listed in the National or State Registers of Historic Places, and no known or suspected archaeological properties in the area that will be affected by this project.

Please note that this comment letter does not address the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and 36CFR800, Procedures of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for the protection of historic properties. If this project is considered for federal assistance, or requires a federal permit or license, it should be submitted to our office by the responsible federal agency.

Please contact our Compliance Section at (651) 259-3455 if you have any questions regarding our review of this project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mary Ann Heidemann'.

Mary Ann Heidemann, Manager  
Government Programs and Compliance



October 3, 2012

Mr. Steve Sommer  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
520 Lafayette Road North  
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194

Re: Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)  
City of Blaine  
Metropolitan Council Review File No. 21029-1  
Metropolitan Council District 10 (John Đoàn)

Dear Mr. Sommer:

The Metropolitan Council received the EAW for the Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station project on September 5, 2012. The proposed project is located on a 12-acre industrial site near the intersection of 99<sup>th</sup> Court and Naples Street NE in the City of Blaine. The facility currently accepts construction and demolition waste, recyclable materials, non-hazardous industrial wastes, appliances, and yard waste. The project proposes to expand the types of material that are permitted to be processed at the facility to include mixed municipal solid waste and single-stream recyclables, and to increase the permitted capacity from 500 to 700 tons per day.

The staff review finds that the EAW is complete and accurate with respect to regional concerns and raises no major issues of consistency with Council policies. An EIS is not necessary for regional purposes. However, staff offers the following comments for your consideration.

***Item 13 – Water Use***

Development and review of any project environmental documents, such as an EAW, and any permits associated with this project should acknowledge that the Drinking Water Supply Management Area (DWSMA) for the City of Lexington is located less than a mile southeast of this site. The attached figure (JPG) illustrates the location of the project site (red outline) in comparison to Lexington's DWSMA (green polygon).

This concludes the Council's review of the EAW. The Council will take no formal action on the EAW. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Jim Larsen PE, Principal Reviewer, at 651-602-1159.

Sincerely,

LisaBeth Barajas, Acting Manager  
Local Planning Assistance

***Attachment***

CC: John Đoàn, Metropolitan Council District 10  
Judy Sventek, MCES Water Resources Assessment Manager  
Cheryl Olsen, Reviews Coordinator

*N:\CommDev\LPA\Agencies\MPCA\Letters\MPCA 2012 EAW Shamrock Recycling and Transfer Station 21029-1.doc*

[www.metrocouncil.org](http://www.metrocouncil.org)



