

January 14, 2005

TO: INTERESTED PARTIES

RE: Delano Northwest Interceptor

Enclosed is the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the proposed Delano Northwest Interceptor, Wright County. The EAW was prepared by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) and is being distributed for a 30-day review and comment period pursuant to the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) rules. The comment period will begin the day the EAW availability notice is published in the EQB Monitor, which will likely occur in the January 17, 2005, issue.

Comments received on the EAW will be used by the MPCA in evaluating the potential for significant environmental effects from this project and deciding on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

A final decision on the need for an EIS will be made by the MPCA Commissioner after the end of the comment period. If a request for an EIS is received during the comment period, or if the Commissioner recommends the preparation of an EIS, the MPCA Citizens' Board (Board) will make the final decision. The final EIS need decision will also be made by the Board if so requested by the project proposer, other interested parties or MPCA staff and if this request is agreed to by one or more members of the Board or the MPCA Commissioner. The Board meets once a month, usually the fourth Tuesday of each month, at the MPCA office in St. Paul. Meetings are open to the public and interested persons may offer testimony on Board agenda items. A listing of Board members is available on request by calling (651) 296-7306.

Please note that comment letters submitted to the MPCA do become public documents and will be part of the official public record for this project.

If you have any questions on the EAW, please contact Kelly Garvey of my staff at (651) 296-7796.

Sincerely,

Beth G. Lockwood
Supervisor, Environmental Review Unit
Environmental Review and Operations Section
Regional Division

BGL:mln

Enclosure

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

Note to reviewers: The Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) provides information about a project that may have the potential for significant environmental effects. This EAW was prepared by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA), acting as the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU), to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be prepared. The project proposer supplied reasonably accessible data for, but did not complete the final worksheet. Comments on the EAW must be submitted to the MPCA during the 30-day comment period which begins with notice of the availability of the EAW in the *Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) Monitor*. Comments on the EAW should address the accuracy and completeness of information, potential impacts that are reasonably expected to occur that warrant further investigation, and the need for an EIS. A copy of the EAW may be obtained from the MPCA by calling (651) 296-7398. An electronic version of the completed EAW is available at the MPCA Web site <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/news/eaw/index.html#open-eaw>.

1. Project Title: <u>Delano Northwest Interceptor</u>	
2. Proposer: <u>City of Delano</u>	3. RGU: <u>Minnesota Pollution Control Agency</u>
Contact Person <u>Phil Kern</u>	Contact Person <u>Kelly Garvey</u>
and Title <u>City Administrator</u>	and Title <u>Project Manager</u>
Address <u>City Hall, 234 - 2nd Street North</u>	Address <u>520 Lafayette Road North</u>
<u>P.O. Box 108, Delano Minnesota 55328</u>	<u>St. Paul, Minnesota 55155</u>
Phone <u>(763) 972-0550</u>	Phone <u>(651) 296-7796</u>
Fax <u>(763) 972-6174</u>	Fax <u>(651) 296-7782</u>
4. Reason for EAW Preparation:	
EIS Mandatory <input type="checkbox"/>	Citizen RGU Proposer
Scoping <input type="checkbox"/>	EAW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Discretion <input type="checkbox"/> Volunteered <input type="checkbox"/>
If EAW or EIS is mandatory give EQB rule category subpart number and name:	
<u>Minn. R. 4410.4300, Subp. 18.A, Wastewater Systems</u>	
5. Project Location:	
County <u>Wright</u>	City/Twp <u>Delano & Franklin Township</u>
<u>1/4</u> <u>1/4</u> Section <u>1, 2, 3, 10, 11</u> Township <u>118N</u> Range <u>25W</u>	

Figures:

- Figure 1 - County map showing the general location of the project;
- Figure 2 - United States Geological Survey quadrangle map showing the proposed interceptor route;
- Figure 3 - Aerial photograph showing the proposed interceptor route and significant project and natural features;
- Figure 4 - Approximate service area boundary;
- Figure 5 - Wetland areas;

Attachments:

- Attachment 1 - Letter received from Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR); and
- Attachment 2 - Letter received from State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Email and archeological reconnaissance study excerpts.

6. Description:

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

The city of Delano (City) is proposing to construct a new sanitary sewer interceptor from its existing Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) to serve future growth areas located west and northwest of town. The new interceptor is approximately 2.4 miles in length and will provide a flow capacity of up to six million gallons per day.

- b. Give a complete description of the proposed project and related new construction. Attach additional sheets as necessary. Emphasize construction, operation methods and features that will cause physical manipulation of the environment or will produce wastes. Include modifications to existing equipment or industrial processes and significant demolition, removal or remodeling of existing structures. Indicate the timing and duration of construction activities.

General Project Description

The City is proposing to construct a new sanitary sewer interceptor from its existing WWTP to serve future growth areas located west and northwest of town (see Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4). The City's WWTP, originally constructed in 1987, has been expanded to increase treatment capacity to accommodate future flows conveyed by the new interceptor. Treated wastewater is discharged to the South Fork of the Crow River under an existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) wastewater discharge permit issued by the MPCA. The proposed interceptor is approximately 2.4 miles in length and will provide a flow capacity of up to 6 million gallons per day. The proposed interceptor will consist of polyvinyl chloride gravity flow sewer pipe ranging in size from 18 to 24 inches in diameter and numerous concrete manholes. A lift station and short section of forcemain will be constructed at the downstream end of the interceptor near the WWTP to lift sewage flow and direct it to an existing gravity line entering the WWTP.

The interceptor would be constructed within utility easements to be obtained from individual property owners along the east-west segment of the route and within or adjacent to an existing transmission line easement along the north-south segment. It is anticipated at this time that a 50-foot wide permanent easement and an additional 25 to 50 foot temporary construction easement would be required to install the pipeline. The City is currently in the process of obtaining the necessary utility easements for the project.

Construction Methods

Construction methods include trench excavation, boring and jacking, pipe and manhole installation, backfilling, and site restoration. The interceptor will be constructed at depths varying between 10 and 40 feet, with the most of the pipe (75 percent of length) at depths between 10 and 20 feet. The majority of the pipe will be installed by open cut trench construction methods, with some special trench support (trench boxes, temporary sheeting, etc.) required in deeper cut sections. Soil material will be excavated and backfilled using hydraulic backhoes, bulldozers, and loaders. Pipe crossings under the Crow River, County Road 17, Highway 12, and the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway Company (BNSF) railroad tracks will be bored or jacked, a total distance of 550 feet.

In areas where high ground water levels may be encountered, temporary dewatering will be required to facilitate pipeline installation. Upon completion of the installation work and prior to use, the entire length of sewer line will be leak tested.

Potential Environmental Effects

Due to the nature of the project, the impacts will be temporary and overall environmental effects will be minimal. The pipeline will be jacked under the Crow River, thus, there will be no direct impacts to the riverbanks or channel bed. Areas within the construction corridor disturbed by the trench excavation activities, including wetland areas, would be fully restored upon installation of the pipe, matching pre-construction ground contours. The topsoil layer will be excavated, stockpiled, and placed back on the surface of the trench upon completion of pipe installation and backfilling process. Other than the minor loss of trees near the river crossing, no changes to existing land use or cover types is anticipated.

Secondary development that would be served by the new interceptor would be regulated in accordance with current City zoning and land use requirements. Developers are required to obtain all permits needed to comply with existing regulations to hook into the proposed interceptor. When new development is proposed, it may be subject to environmental review depending on the scope of the proposed projects. These projects are reviewed under current City review processes and appropriate mitigation measures will be taken to address potential environmental effects associated with new projects.

Construction Schedule

Construction of the proposed interceptor is scheduled to begin in May 2005 and be completed by November 2005.

c. Explain the project purpose; if the project will be carried out by a governmental unit, explain the need for the project and identify its beneficiaries.

The purpose of the interceptor is to provide municipal sanitary sewer service to future growth and development areas of the city in accordance with the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Project beneficiaries include property owners, who will receive improved sanitary sewer service, and the City, which will have improved sewer system capacity and provide service to accommodate future growth areas identified in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The extension of the interceptor will provide some existing residences the opportunity to connect to city sewer, and will avoid construction of numerous septic systems as new development occurs in these areas.

d. Are future stages of this development including development on any outlots planned or likely to happen?

Yes No

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

The interceptor is designed to provide trunk sewer connections to serve future growth areas. The area to be served by the new interceptor is shown in Figure 4 and includes approximately 5 square miles (3,200 acres). Individual development projects that may ultimately discharge to the interceptor will be responsible for their own environmental review when they are proposed. The review process to evaluate potential environmental impacts and cumulative/secondary impacts resulting from development in the service area is discussed in Item 29. As discussed in Item 29, a nondegradation review regarding stormwater impacts enabled by wastewater service expansion has already been completed for the City, and the City has adopted the MPCA model stormwater ordinance and received a favorable review from the MPCA.

e. Is this project a subsequent stage of an earlier project? Yes No

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

The project is not a subsequent stage of an earlier project. However, it is related to the recently completed expansion of the Delano WWTP, which was addressed in an earlier EAW. The treatment plant upgrades and EAW contemplated the eventual installation and use of new trunk sewer extensions addressed in the EAW. The EAW was prepared by the MPCA and distributed for public review and comment on January 17, 2003. Findings of Fact and Negative Declaration on the need for an EIS was distributed by the MPCA on April 11, 2003.

7. Project Magnitude Data

Total Project Area (acres) 21.6 acres* or Length (miles) 2.4 miles
 Number of Residential Units: Unattached NA Attached NA maximum units per building NA
 Commercial/Industrial/Institutional Building Area (gross floor space): total square feet NA
 Indicate area of specific uses (in square feet):

Office	<u>NA</u>	Manufacturing	<u>NA</u>
Retail	<u>NA</u>	Other Industrial	<u>NA</u>
Warehouse	<u>NA</u>	Institutional	<u>NA</u>
Light Industrial	<u>NA</u>	Agricultural	<u>NA</u>
Other Commercial (specify)	<u>NA</u>		
Building height	<u>NA</u>	If over 2 stories, compare to heights of nearby buildings	<u>NA</u>

*Total project area is estimated based on a typical 75-foot wide construction corridor.

8. Permits and Approvals Required. List all known local, state and federal permits, approvals and financial assistance for the project. Include modifications of any existing permits, governmental review of plans, and all direct and indirect forms of public financial assistance including bond guarantees, Tax Increment Financing and infrastructure.

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Section 404 Wetland Permit	To be applied for
MPCA	NPDES General Stormwater Discharge Permit for Construction Activities	To be applied for
MPCA	Sewer Extension Permit	To be applied for
DNR	License to Cross Public Waters (i.e., river crossing)	Completed - License issued October 22, 2004
DNR	Water Appropriation Permit (may be needed for dewatering)	To be applied for if necessary
Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT)	Utility Crossing Permit	Pending - Permit application submitted September 9, 2004; permit has been prepared and will be issued upon receipt of surety bond
City of Delano/Wright Soil and Water Conservation District	Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act - Certificate of Exemption	To be applied for
Wright County	Utility Permits	To be applied for
Franklin Township	Detour Permit	To be applied for

As discussed in Item 12, the interceptor alignment was designed to avoid wetlands to the extent practical. Wetland impacts will be temporary during construction activities and revegetation plans will be used to restore the wetlands following construction such that no long-term impacts will occur (no net loss). In terms of permits for these activities, utility construction is eligible for authorization by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers under a Section 404 Letter of Permission A. Under the State of Minnesota's Wetland Conservation Act, utility construction activities that do not create significant impacts (i.e., less than 1/2 acre) are exempt from wetland replacement requirements and therefore, it is expected that a Certificate of Exemption will be issued for the project.

Other non-governmental permits and approvals required include permission from the BNSF for the pipeline crossing under the railroad tracks. Application for this approval was submitted in August 2004 and was approved on October 20, 2004. Coordination and/or permission are also needed from Xcel Energy for the construction of the interceptor within or adjacent to the existing transmission line easements held by Xcel.

- 9. Land Use.** Describe current and recent past land use and development on the site and on adjacent lands. Discuss project compatibility with adjacent and nearby land uses. Indicate whether any potential conflicts involve environmental matters. Identify any potential environmental hazards due to past site uses, such as soil contamination or abandoned storage tanks, or proximity to nearby hazardous liquid or gas pipelines.

Current land use consists of open space, floodplain, and forested areas along the eastern portions of the interceptor route near the Crow River. On either side of Highway 12, the land use is currently commercial/business. Land uses along the western portions of the interceptor route consist of agriculture, open space, and wetland areas.

The MPCA's database was searched for potential contaminated sites or environmental hazards located within the general project area. The database includes properties that have already been investigated and cleaned up, those currently enrolled in cleanup programs, properties that were suspected to be contaminated, but after investigation turned out to be clean, and other sites of interest. Four regulated sites have been identified in the general project area, with three of the sites located near the proposed interceptor route. The three sites are summarized below:

Delano Dump (ID No. 2692)

This is an old dump site located on the west side of County Road 17 across from the Delano WWTP. The site is listed in the MPCA database as an "Unpermitted Dump" site. No other information was readily available regarding this site. The dump site is located north of the interceptor route and there are no anticipated adverse environmental affects expected.

Litfin Site (ID No. 6033)

This site is located at 7130 Ebersole Avenue Southeast (east side Ebersole; just north of Highway 12/Ebersole intersection) where an automotive recycling facility exists. The site is listed in the MPCA database as a "RCRA Investigation & Cleanup" site. These include sites where Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) hazardous waste generators had an actual or potential release requiring investigation and/or cleanup. No other information is readily available regarding this site. The proposed interceptor route follows the northern edge of the Litfin site east of Ebersole Avenue. On the west side of Ebersole, the interceptor route is within the roadway right-of-way across the road from the Litfin site. The interceptor route is along the edge of the Litfin site and will not disturb any existing auto recycling operations. The interceptor construction is not expected to cause any significant adverse environmental affects.

Randy’s Sanitation (ID No. 5376)

This site is located at 4351 Highway 12 (west side of Highway 12; just north of Highway 12/Ebersole intersection). The site is listed in the MPCA database as a “Permitted Solid Waste” site. Randy’s Sanitation, Inc. provides waste management and recycling services to residents, businesses, contractors, and municipal customers throughout the greater Minneapolis metro area and surrounding counties. The proposed interceptor route follows the south edge of this property. Based on conversations with company officials, other than a public drop off and collection site for used appliances and electronic equipment, no solid waste has been or is currently stored or disposed of on site. The company was issued a MPCA Permit in 2001 to construct a transfer station to handle municipal solid waste.

A search of the MPCA’s Leaking Aboveground/Underground Storage Tank Sites database was also conducted for Delano and the surrounding area to identify leaks of petroleum based products from storage tank systems reported to the MPCA. Nineteen Leaking Underground Storage Tanks sites were identified in the database. None of the sites are located near the proposed interceptor route.

Based on the findings above, there is no known potential for significant environmental affects associates with contaminated soil or ground water, abandoned or leaking storage tanks, pipelines, or existing land uses along the interceptor route.

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

Numbers below are based on a typical 75-foot wide construction corridor.

	Before	After		Before	After
Types 1-8 wetlands	5.5	5.5	Lawn/landscaping	3.4	3.4
Wooded/forest	1.4	0	Impervious Surfaces	0.6	0.6
Brush/grassland	8.6	10.0	Other (river, gravel)	0.2	0.2
Cropland	1.9	1.9			
			TOTAL	21.6	21.6

Other than the loss of trees near the river crossing, no changes to existing cover types is anticipated as a result of the project.

11. Fish, Wildlife, and Ecologically Sensitive Resources.

a. Identify fish and wildlife resources and habitats on or near the site and describe how they would be affected by the project. Describe any measures to be taken to minimize or avoid impacts.

Fish and wildlife habitats on or near the interceptor route include the South Fork Crow River, floodplain forests immediately adjacent to the river and wetlands along the alignment. Measures taken to avoid and minimize wetland impacts and impacts to the Crow River are discussed under Item 12. Measures to minimize impacts to the floodplain forest include crossing the area where it is narrow as well as pipeline installation by jacking under the river channel. Although there will be temporary impacts and a loss of trees, abundant wooded areas along the river corridor will continue to provide wildlife habitat for birds, deer, and other animals found in the area. In other areas along the interceptor route, wildlife species will be temporarily disrupted and may relocate to adjacent areas and reroute their travel during construction of the interceptor.

- b. Are any state (endangered or threatened) species, rare plant communities or other sensitive ecological resources such as native prairie habitat, colonial waterbird nesting colonies or regionally rare plant communities on or near the site? Yes No

If yes, describe the resource and how it would be affected by the project. Indicate if a site survey of the resources has been conducted and describe the results. If the DNR Natural Heritage and Nongame Research program has been contacted give the correspondence reference number. ERDB 20050192
Describe measures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts.

A review of the Minnesota Natural Heritage Information System database was requested from the DNR to determine if any rare plant communities or animal species, unique resources, or other significant natural features are known to occur along or near the proposed interceptor route. As stated in a letter from the DNR dated September 10, 2004, (see Appendix A), results of the database search indicated that five rare features consisting of Trumpeter Swans (two occurrences), Maple-Basswood Forest (two occurrences), and Tamarack Swamp were known to occur within the vicinity of the project area. However, these rare features are located several sections away from the interceptor construction corridor and would not be directly affected by the project. In addition, visual inspections along the alignment route, as well as review of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps, confirms that none of the affected wetlands are tamarack swamps.

The DNR concludes based on the nature and location of the proposed project, the known occurrences of rare features identified by the search would not be affected. There are several special concern mussel species known to inhabit the South Fork of the Crow River. The proposed project should include careful erosion control and post-construction restoration plans to minimize potential impacts.

- 12. Physical Impacts on Water Resources.** Will the project involve the physical or hydrologic alteration (dredging, filling, stream diversion, outfall structure, diking, and impoundment) of any surface waters such as a lake, pond, wetland, stream or drainage ditch? Yes No
If yes, identify water resource affected. Describe alternatives considered and proposed mitigation measures to minimize impacts. Give the DNR Protected Waters Inventory (PWI) number(s) if the water resources affected are on the PWI.

Although the interceptor will be installed within wetland areas as discussed below, the impacts will be temporary with no direct physical or hydrological alteration of these basins. The trench will be backfilled with the same material that is excavated out and disturbed areas restored to pre-existing conditions resulting in no net loss of wetland area.

The proposed interceptor route crosses the South Fork Crow River and several wetland areas (the only DNR Protected Water along the alignment is the South Fork Crow River). Approximate wetland areas located along the interceptor route as identified on NWI maps are shown on Figure 5 and include two Type 1/Type 3, three Type 3, and one Type 6 wetlands. Efforts to avoid and minimize impacts at the river crossing include jacking under the channel bed as a low impact technique and crossing at a location where wetlands are narrow (Wetland A). On the west side of Highway 12, wetland avoidance and minimization consists of aligning the interceptor to the west side of Wetland D, the east side of Wetland E, and following an existing power line easement through Wetlands B, C and F. Based on the proposed interceptor route, it is estimated that construction will temporarily impact 5.5 acres of wetland. Mitigation to control these impacts consist of following the requirements under the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Letter of Permission A where excavated materials will be returned to the original location following completion of the construction activity, and affected areas restored to pre-project conditions.

There will be no change in the grades pre- and post-installation. Anti-seepage collars or clay barriers will be installed to prevent the interceptor and the gravel bedding material from acting as a sub-surface drain. The topsoil layer will be excavated, stockpiled, and placed back on the surface of the trench upon completion of pipe installation and backfilling process. Where the current wetland vegetation is dominated by Reed Canary grass, no further seeding will be done unless the wetland seed bank in the replaced topsoil does not sprout. Where native wetland vegetation communities currently dominate, the appropriate Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) seed mix will be specified for use in the plans and specifications as part of the restoration effort.

The interceptor will be jacked under the Crow River so there will be no direct impacts to the riverbanks or channel bed. This activity will be conducted in accordance with the provisions set forth in the DNR Utility Crossing License issued to the City on October 22, 2004.

- 13. Water Use.** Will the project involve installation or abandonment of any water wells, connection to or changes in any public water supply or appropriation of any ground or surface water (including dewatering)? Yes No

If yes, as applicable, give location and purpose of any new wells; public supply affected, changes to be made, and water quantities to be used; the source, duration, quantity and purpose of any appropriations; and unique well numbers and DNR appropriation permit numbers, if known. Identify any existing and new wells on the site map. If there are no wells known on site, explain methodology used to determine.

Installation of the interceptor may require temporary dewatering to keep the trench excavations dry. This may involve the installation of temporary dewatering wells, well points, or dewatering sumps along the interceptor trench. The extent of dewatering will be influenced by water levels in the Crow River, which affects the ground water table in the project area. The DNR regulates water appropriation and necessary permits for dewatering will be obtained by the appropriate party when required. Discharge of clean water from dewatering activities will be directed away from the trench to stabilized vegetated areas, rivers/wetlands, drainage ditches, or existing storm sewer systems.

A well search was completed for the project area and about 25 wells were found within one-half mile of the proposed interceptor alignment. A vast majority of these wells were screened to take water from depths greater than 80 feet, which is roughly twice the deepest interceptor segment. In addition, well boring records indicate that most wells had clay to depths of 50 to 80 feet overlaying the water bearing portions of the wells. Based on these characteristics, impacts to existing wells are not anticipated. Even if temporary dewatering was conducted to facilitate pipeline installation, it is expected to have a minimal impact on ground water levels outside the project construction zone. If impacts to nearby wells occur during dewatering activities, temporary water service will be provided.

- 14. Water-Related Land Use Management Districts.** Does any part of the project involve a shoreland zoning district, a delineated 100-year flood plain, or a state or federally designated wild or scenic river land use district? Yes No

If yes, identify the district and discuss project compatibility with district land use restrictions.

The interceptor route crosses under the South Fork Crow River. The South Fork Crow River has been studied and its floodplain mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Flood Insurance Rate Map, Wright County, Minnesota, Community Panel Number 270534 0042 C, map revised August 18, 1992). The regulated 100-year floodplain along this stretch of the Crow River varies between elevation 918 and 919 feet. Existing floodplain regulations are administered by the City and Wright County.

Since the method of construction for the river crossing consists of jacking under the channel bed and involves no filling within the floodplain, the project complies with floodplain regulations. The alignment is also within the shoreline area where the river crossing occurs, but the project involves no structures or placement of fill that conflict with shoreland regulations.

- 15. Water Surface Use.** Will the project change the number or type of watercraft on any water body?
 Yes No

If yes, indicate the current and projected watercraft usage and discuss any potential overcrowding or conflicts with other uses.

- 16. Erosion and Sedimentation.** Give the acreage to be graded or excavated and the cubic yards of soil to be moved: 20.7* acres; 217,000 cubic yards. Describe any steep slopes or highly erodible soils and identify them on the site map. Describe any erosion and sedimentation control measures to be used during and after project construction.

*Due to jacking/boring of pipe in select locations, the area to be graded/excavated is less than the 21.6-acre total provided in Item 7.

There are no steep slopes and only limited areas of highly erodible soils along the interceptor route. These areas of highly erodible soils are confined to two areas of sloping lands on the east and west sides of Highway 12 and classified as Hayden loam (12 to 18 percent slopes, and 18 to 25 percent slopes). The proposed jacking or boring at the river crossing, two roadway crossings, and railroad crossing will not require excavation and disturbance of ground surface in these areas.

Since construction of the interceptor will disturb more than one acre of land, a permit application for coverage under Minnesota NPDES General Stormwater Discharge Permit MN R100001 for construction activities is required and will be submitted to the MPCA prior to construction. The permit application certifies that temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control plans have been prepared and implemented to prevent soil particles from being transported offsite. Temporary erosion and sediment control measures such as silt fence, staked hay bales, sediment filters and traps, erosion control matting, mulching, and crushed rock pads will be used where applicable. Soils tracked from the construction site by motor vehicles and construction equipment will be cleaned from paved roadway surfaces throughout the duration of the construction project. All disturbed areas will be restored to original contours and seeded and mulched as soon as practical after the pipe installation work has been completed. Temporary erosion and sediment control measures will be maintained during construction and will remain in place until the all disturbed areas have been stabilized and vegetation has been reestablished.

- 17. Water Quality – Surface-water Runoff.**

- a. Compare the quantity and quality of site runoff before and after the project. Describe permanent controls to manage or treat runoff. Describe any stormwater pollution prevention plans.

Construction of the interceptor will create temporary land disturbance, and as discussed under Item 16, best management practices for construction erosion control in conformance with the MPCA NPDES General Construction Stormwater Permit will be used to mitigate potential water quality impacts. For the long term, however, construction of the underground interceptor itself will not affect the quantity or quality of stormwater runoff since vegetative cover will be restored and no new impervious surfaces will be created. Secondary runoff related impacts created by development served by the interceptor are discussed under Item 29.

- b. Identify routes and receiving water bodies for runoff from the site; include major downstream water bodies as well as the immediate receiving waters. Estimate impact runoff on the quality of receiving waters.

The receiving waters for the project area are the South Fork Crow River and wetlands along the interceptor route. Since the project will not change the runoff characteristics and with the implementation of temporary erosion and sediment control measures, construction of the interceptor will have no impact on the overall water quality of receiving waters.

18. Water Quality - Wastewater.

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

The interceptor is the main conduit to convey wastewater to the Delano WWTP. The interceptor will convey wastewater from residential, commercial and industrial areas based on anticipated development in the Extraterritorial Land Use Map from the City Comprehensive Plan 2002 (see Figure 4).

- b. Describe waste treatment methods or pollution prevention efforts and give estimates of composition after treatment. Identify receiving waters, including major downstream water bodies, and estimate the discharge impact on the quality of receiving waters. If the project involves on-site sewage systems, discuss the suitability of site conditions for such systems.

Not applicable.

- c. If wastes will be discharged into a publicly owned treatment facility, identify the facility, describe any pretreatment provisions and discuss the facility's ability to handle the volume and composition of wastes, identifying any improvements necessary.

The interceptor will carry sanitary wastewaters from domestic, commercial, and industrial areas to the Delano WWTP. The proposed interceptor is designed to handle flows at full build-out of the Northwest and West Central Sewer Districts, which is not expected to occur until after 2025. The design capacity of the interceptor is six million gallons per day, this design flow is not expected to be achieved for many years. As Delano and the surrounding area grows and flows to the interceptor increase, the total inflow to the WWTP will increase and eventually reach the treatment plant capacity and the treatment plant will need to be upgraded and expanded again. Flow monitoring at the WWTP will be used to track, identify and plan for necessary plant expansions. When hydraulic or organic loading reaches 70 to 75 percent of the current design capacity, notice will be provided by facility operators regarding the need for facility planning.

Because of the small amount of industry located in Delano, the City currently does not have acceptance criteria for wastewater discharges to the City's collection system. The City recognizes that it may need to develop acceptance criteria and work with the MPCA on pretreatment programs depending on the types of industrial facilities that are built in the future.

- d. If the project requires disposal of liquid animal manure, describe disposal technique and location and discuss capacity to handle the volume and composition of manure. Identify any improvements necessary. Describe any required setbacks for land disposal systems.

Not applicable.

19. Geologic Hazards and Soil Conditions.

- a. Approximate depth (in feet) to Ground water: ~10 feet minimum; ~20-30 feet average.
Bedrock: 200 feet minimum; 250 feet average.

Describe any of the following geologic site hazards to ground water and also identify them on the site map: sinkholes, shallow limestone formations or karst conditions. Describe measures to avoid or minimize environmental problems due to any of these hazards.

Ground water depth is expected to vary seasonally and fluctuate with river levels. There are no known sinkholes, shallow limestone formations, karst conditions, or other potential geologic hazards along the proposed interceptor route that could potentially impact ground water. Pipe joints and manhole connections will be sealed appropriately for sanitary sewer construction to prevent infiltration/exfiltration. Upon completion of the interceptor installation work and prior to use, the entire length of sewer line will be leak tested.

- b. Describe the soils on the site, giving SCS classifications, if known. Discuss soil granularity and potential for ground water contamination from wastes or chemicals spread or spilled onto the soils. Discuss any mitigation measures to prevent such contamination.

As shown on the General Soil Map contained in the Wright County Soil Survey (1968), soils along the proposed interceptor route fall under the Hayden-Lester-peat association. These soils are generally described as deep, medium textured and moderately fine textured soils on strongly rolling and hilly uplands. The specific soil types present along the interceptor route as shown on the Wright County Soils Map include the following:

- Alluvial land (Al)
- Comfrey silty clay loam, depressional (Cp)
- Cordova and Webster silty clay loams (Cw)
- Glencoe silty clay loam (Gc)
- Hayden fine sandy loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, moderately eroded (HdC2)
- Hayden loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, moderately eroded (HIC2)
- Hayden loam, 12 to 18 percent slopes, moderately eroded (HID2)
- Hayden loam, 18 to 25 percent slopes (HIE)
- Hayden loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, (HIB)
- Peat and muck, deep (Pa)

These soils are mainly classified as Group B hydrologic soils, which are characterized as soils having moderate infiltration and transmission rates. As stated in Item 13, well and boring records from wells installed in the area indicate that subsurface soils are comprised mostly of clay material. Due to the nature of the project, composition of underlying soils, and the short time the trench will be open, the potential for ground water contamination during construction is extremely low. Any spills of controlled substances will be cleaned up quickly and thoroughly to protect soil and ground water resources.

20. Solid Wastes, Hazardous Wastes, Storage Tanks.

- a. Describe types, amounts and compositions of solid or hazardous wastes, including solid animal manure, sludge and ash, produced during construction and operation. Identify method and location of disposal. For projects generating municipal solid waste, indicate if there is a source separation plan; describe how the project will be modified for recycling. If hazardous waste is generated, indicate if there is a hazardous waste minimization plan and routine hazardous waste reduction assessments.

Construction and operation of the interceptor will not generate solid or hazardous waste, except for minor amounts of solid waste in the form of construction debris. Construction specifications will require construction contractors to properly dispose of construction debris at a permitted facility in accordance with Minnesota Solid Waste Rules.

- b. Identify any toxic or hazardous materials to be used or present at the site and identify measures to be used to prevent them from contaminating ground water. If the use of toxic or hazardous materials will lead to a regulated waste, discharge or emission, discuss any alternatives considered to minimize or eliminate the waste, discharge or emission.

No toxic or hazardous materials will be used during construction other than gasoline, diesel fuel, and hydraulic fluid used in vehicles and construction equipment. Fuel will be brought in to the equipment by tanker truck approximately once per day during construction. Construction documents will contain provisions for the use, and storage of fuel during construction. In particular, construction documents will identify staging and refueling areas away from wetlands, drainage ways and other sensitive areas. Any spills that might occur will be cleaned up immediately in accordance with regulatory requirements.

- c. Indicate the number, location, size and use of any above or below ground tanks to store petroleum products or other materials, except water. Describe any emergency response containment plans.

Construction of the proposed interceptor will not involve the installation of any above or below ground storage tanks.

- 21. Traffic.** Parking spaces added: 0 Existing spaces (if project involves expansion): 0
Estimated total average daily traffic generated: 0 Estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated (if known) and its timing: 0 Provide an estimate of the impact on traffic congestion affected roads and describe any traffic improvements necessary. If the project is within the Twin Cities metropolitan area, discuss its impact on the regional transportation system.

The project does not involve any traffic improvements or permanent increases in traffic. Varying numbers of vehicles will be involved in excavation and construction activities. Impacts on traffic will be minor, site-specific, and short term. The interceptor pipe will be jacked under County Road 17 and Highway 12, thus avoiding temporary closure and traffic rerouting at these roadway crossings. Necessary and appropriate traffic warning devices will be used during construction.

- 22. Vehicle-Related Air Emissions.** Estimate the effect of the project's traffic generation on air quality, including carbon monoxide levels. Discuss the effect of traffic improvements or other mitigation measures on air quality impacts. Note: If the project involves 500 or more parking spaces, consult *EAW Guidelines* about whether a detailed air quality analysis is needed.

Vehicle emissions associated with the interceptor construction and operation will not have a significant effect on air quality. During construction, varying numbers of vehicles will be involved in excavation and construction activities. These vehicles will have only short-term, negligible impacts on local air emissions.

- 23. Stationary Source Air Emissions.** Describe the type, sources, quantities and compositions of any emissions from stationary sources of air emissions such as boilers, exhaust stacks or fugitive dust sources. Include any hazardous air pollutants (consult *EAW Guidelines* for a listing), any greenhouse gases (such as carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxides), and ozone-depleting chemicals (chlorofluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons or sulfur hexafluoride). Also describe any proposed pollution prevention techniques and proposed air pollution control devices. Describe the impacts on air quality.

Not applicable.

- 24. Odors, Noise and Dust.** Will the project generate odors, noise or dust during construction or during operation? Yes No

If yes, describe sources, characteristics, duration, quantities or intensity and any proposed measures to mitigate adverse impacts. Also identify locations of nearby sensitive receptors and estimate impacts on them. Discuss potential impacts on human health or quality of life. (Note: fugitive dust generated by operations may be discussed at item 23 instead of here.)

Odors

Odors are not expected to be a problem during or after the interceptor construction. There may be some short-term, fugitive wastewater odors in the general vicinity of locations where new sewer line connections are made.

Noise

Construction vehicles and equipment will generate noise during construction of the interceptor. However, no significant impact is anticipated because of the low density of housing along the interceptor alignment, the limited number of vehicles involved in construction, and adherence to normal construction hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Noise impacts will be temporary and will be generally confined to the immediate vicinity of the project area.

Dust

Construction activities will generate localized dust from earth moving/excavation equipment. Due to the low density of housing immediately surrounding the alignment, the dust associated with construction activities is not expected to be a problem. Dust generated during construction will be minimized using dust control measures such as watering. Seeding and mulching disturbed areas will effectively control dust at the end of construction.

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

- a. Archaeological, historical, or architectural resources? Yes No
- b. Prime or unique farmlands or land within an agricultural preserve? Yes No
- c. Designated parks, recreation areas, or trails? Yes No
- d. Scenic views and vistas? Yes No
- e. Other unique resources? Yes No

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

Information was requested from the SHPO about possible archeological, historical, or architectural resources located along or near the proposed interceptor route. An email response dated September 1, 2004, (see Appendix B) indicated that SHPO's database review identified several archaeological sites and numerous historic/architecture sites in the search area. No historic/architecture sites listed in the inventory will be affected, as the proposed interceptor route is not located near any such historic structures. The archaeological reports listed in the database printout were reviewed at the SHPO office. Review of these reports found that report WR-03-04 was for a development located at T120N, R25W, Sections 31 and 32 (near Buffalo) rather than the location of T118N R25W Section 11 as referenced in the database. Reports MCH-91-01 and MCH-93-01 were found and reviewed, both of which were Minnesota Municipal and County Highway Archaeological Reconnaissance Studies (1990 and 1992 respectively). The 1990 report in particular included a review of CSAH 30 regrading project (SAP 86-630-17). This regrading project covers the area where the proposed interceptor first leaves the WWTP at the intersection of CSAH 17 and CSAH 30. Archaeological site 21WR5 is located at this intersection. However, the report notes "field observations in May 1990 confirmed previous assessments that the cemetery site has been completely destroyed." The area just northeast of the intersection has been used over the years for gravel borrow material, and a treatment plant and a pond have been constructed. Thus, a substantial amount of land surrounding the area has been disturbed. Based on these findings and due to the disturbed nature of the area near the CSAH 17/CSAH 30 intersection, construction of the proposed interceptor would not affect any known or suspected archeological, historical, or architectural resources.

26. Visual Impacts. Will the project create adverse visual impacts during construction or operation? Such as glare from intense lights, lights visible in wilderness areas and large visible plumes from cooling towers or exhaust stacks? Yes No

If yes, explain.

27. Compatibility With Plans and Land Use Regulations. Is the project subject to an adopted local comprehensive plan, land use plan or regulation, or other applicable land use, water, or resource management plan of a local, regional, state or federal agency? Yes No

If yes, describe the plan, discuss its compatibility with the project and explain how any conflicts will be resolved. If no, explain.

Growth areas to be served by the proposed interceptor are identified in the City Comprehensive Plan 2002 (See Figure 4). Thus, the new interceptor is not only compatible with the plan, but is an integral part of the plan.

- 28. Impact on Infrastructure and Public Services.** Will new or expanded utilities, roads, other infrastructure or public services be required to serve the project? Yes No
If yes, describe the new or additional infrastructure or services needed. (Note: any infrastructure that is a connected action with respect to the project must be assessed in the EAW; see *EAW Guidelines* for details.)

Although construction of the Delano Northwest Interceptor will not require additional infrastructure, future development planned for the interceptor service area will. As development occurs, new and expanded infrastructure and public services such as roadways, streets, sanitary sewers, future wastewater plant expansions, water lines, drainage systems, power lines, gas lines, schools, police and fire protection, and other related urban services will be required.

- 29. Cumulative Impacts.** Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7, item B requires that the RGU consider the “cumulative potential effects of related or anticipated future projects” when determining the need for an environmental impact statement. Identify any past, present or reasonably foreseeable future projects that may interact with the project described in this EAW in such a way as to cause cumulative impacts. Describe the nature of the cumulative impacts and summarize any other available information relevant to determining whether there is potential for significant environmental effects due to cumulative impacts (or discuss each cumulative impact under appropriate item(s) elsewhere on this form).

Construction of the proposed interceptor enables future residential, commercial, and industrial development. This development could create secondary impacts to wetlands, stormwater runoff and receiving waters, wildlife, and traffic. Some of these projects will be subject to environmental review depending on the scope of the project(s). These will be reviewed at the time of the proposals and planned mitigation measures, if necessary, identified. In addition to the environmental review process, new development will be required to obtain permits and approvals that will help control potential impacts. These include: the NPDES General Permit to Discharge Stormwater from Construction Sites, Wetland Conservation Act Permitting, and approvals according the City of Delano Subdivision and Platting Ordinance 0-03-05. This ordinance includes provisions for preliminary and final plats, stormwater management and erosion and sediment control, tree preservation standards, wetlands protection, grading and drainage and street improvements. Applicable policies from this ordinance (section 1-10 paragraphs B and C) include:

Paragraph B: *“Land to be subdivided shall be of such character that it can be used safely for building purposes without danger to health from fire, flood, or other menace. Land shall not be subdivided unless proper provisions have been made for drainage, stormwater management, wetland protection, potable water, domestic waste water, streets, and capital improvements such as parks, trails, sidewalks, recreation facilities, transportation facilities, stormwater improvements, and any other necessary improvements.”*

Paragraph C: *“The existing and proposed public improvements shall conform to and be properly related to the Comprehensive Plan, Comprehensive Sanitary Sewer Plan, Master Water Study, Stormwater Management Plan, Comprehensive Trail Plan, and the Capital Improvement Plan of the City.”*

Stormwater programs have been reviewed by MPCA staff as part of the effort for permitting and environmental review for the Delano WWTP expansion project and were found to be adequate. The City is the local government unit for the Minnesota Wetlands Conservation Act (WCA) and has provisions in Section 10 of the Subdivision and Platting Ordinance for wetland buffers that provides environmental protection beyond that required by WCA alone. Average buffer widths required by the City range from 50 feet for DNR protected waters to 16 feet for wetlands classified as Manage 3.

While development is expected ordinances are in place to plan for and mitigate potential secondary impacts.

30. Other Potential Environmental Impacts. If the project may cause any adverse environmental impacts not addressed by items 1 to 28, identify and discuss them here, along with any proposed mitigation.

Potential environmental impacts other than those already discussed in this EAW are not anticipated as a result of this project.

31. Summary of Issues. List any impacts and issues identified above that may require further investigation before the project is begun. Discuss any alternatives or mitigative measures that have been or may be considered for these impacts and issues, including those that have been or may be ordered as permit conditions.

The City will obtain all required permits and approvals identified in Item 8 prior to construction of the proposed interceptor and will comply with all terms and conditions set forth by the permitting agencies. The project is intended to provide sanitary sewer service to areas not currently served, in order to accommodate planned future growth and development. Secondary development of residential, commercial, and industrial properties must be appropriately regulated by the City and other governmental agencies as described in Item 29 to ensure that secondary development does not adversely impact the environment.

RGU CERTIFICATION.

I hereby certify that:

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

Name and Title of Signer:

**Beth G. Lockwood, Supervisor, Environmental Review Unit
Operations and Environmental Review Section
Regional Environmental Management Division**

Date:

The format of the Environmental Assessment Worksheet was prepared by the staff of the Environmental Quality Board at Minnesota Planning. For additional information, worksheets or for *EAW Guidelines*, contact: Environmental Quality Board, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155, 651-296-8253, or at their Web site <http://www.mnplan.state.mn.us>.