

June 12, 2026

VIA EMAIL

To: Interested parties

RE: Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility in Albion Township, Wright County.

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has approved the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order for a Negative Declaration (FOF) on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility (Project). The FOF 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 Environmental Quality Board (EQB) rules, Minn. R. ch. 4410. Final governmental decisions on permits or approvals for the project may now be made.

Interested parties can review the FOF and the EAW documents at the following locations: the MPCA office in Saint Paul; the Hennepin County Library at 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis; and the Great River Regional Library at 1300 West Germain Street, St. Cloud, Minnesota. Interested parties can also view the documents on MPCA's website at: <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/business-with-us/recently-completed-mPCA-reviews>. Please contact the MPCA's Saint Paul office at 651-757-2098 for copies of these documents.

Sincerely,

Katrina Kessler

This document has been electronically signed.

Katrina Kessler, P.E.
Commissioner

KK/DH:kj

Attachment

cc: See next page.

Interested parties

Page 2

June 12, 2026

cc: Jason Oberle, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachment)
Vanessa Alberto, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachment)
Michael Stansberry, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachment)
Juan Martinez, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachment)
Tribal Relations Contact, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachment)
Isaac Weston, Minnesota Indian Affairs Council (electronic) (w/attachment)
Deb Dirlam, Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota (electronic) (w/attachment)
Mike Aude, Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota (electronic) (w/attachment)
Mike Wilson, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachment)
Charles J. Lippert, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachment)
Tina Diedrick, County Commissioner (electronic) (w/attachment)
Shelly Jonas, Annandale county (electronic) (w/attachment)
Albion township (electronic) (w/attachment)
Office of State Archeologist (OSA) (electronic) (w/attachment)
State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) (electronic) (w/attachment)
Metro Council (electronic) (w/attachment)
Hennepin County Library (electronic) (w/attachment)
US Fish & Wildlife Service (electronic) (w/attachment)
US Army Corps of Engineers (electronic) (w/attachment)
Environmental Protection Agency (electronic) (w/attachment)
National Park Service (electronic) (w/attachment)
Barry Rhineberger, Wright County (electronic) (w/attachment)
Sandy Hessedal, Wright County (electronic) (w/attachment)
Luke Johnson, Wright County (electronic) (w/attachment)
Angie Saffert/Bolton & Menk (electronic) (w/attachment)
Paul Saffert/ Bolton & Menk (electronic) (w/attachment)
Kelly Hinnenkamp, City of Annandale (electronic) (w/attachment)
Water program, BWSR (electronic) (w/attachment)
Melissa King, BWSR (electronic) (w/attachment)
Brandley Harrington, DNR (electronic) (w/attachment)
Mat Pendleton, DNR (electronic) (w/attachment)
Jill Townley, DNR (electronic) (w/attachment)
James Clark, DNR (electronic) (w/attachment)
Jackie Dionne, DOC (electronic) (w/attachment)
Chase Christopherson, DOC (electronic) (w/attachment)
Forest Eidbo, DOC (electronic) (w/attachment)
Jolynn Shopteese, MDA (electronic) (w/attachment)
Stephan Roos, MDA (electronic) (w/attachment)
Jim Ostlie, MDA (electronic) (w/attachment)
Health Review, MDH (electronic) (w/attachment)
Ravyn Gibbs, MDH (electronic) (w/attachment)
Katherine Lind, MNDOT (electronic) (w/attachment)
Levi Brown, MNDOT (electronic) (w/attachment)
Jenna Ness, PUC (electronic) (w/attachment)
Anna Hotz, MPCA (w/attachment)
Brian Timerson, MPCA (w/attachment)
Katrina Hapka, MPCA (w/attachment)
Shannon Kesner, MPCA (w/attachment)

Interested parties

Page 3

June 12, 2026

cc: Amanda Wold, MPCA (w/attachment)
Holly Mikkelson, MPCA (w/attachment)
Ben Carlson-Stehlin, MPCA (w/attachment)
Donya Dawson, MPCA (w/attachment)
Doree Husnik, MPCA (w/attachment)

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY**

**In The Matter Of The Decision
On The Need For An Environmental
Impact Statement For The Proposed
Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-
Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility
Project located in the cities of Albion Township,
Wright County, Minnesota**

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

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Minn. ch. 4410, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff prepared and distributed an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the proposed Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) (Facility) in Albion Township, Wright County, Minnesota. 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.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Project description

1. Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake Wastewater Commission (AMHWC) would like to regionalize the Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) (Facility) with the Montrose WWTF (Project).
2. The Facility receives waste from the city of Annandale, Maple Lake and Howard Lake and will expand to include wastewater from the Montrose WWTF.
3. The Project will provide expanded treatment capacity for municipal wastewater. Improvements include expansion of aeration basins, construction of a blower building, and construction of a new stormwater pond.
4. The Project will expand the existing average wet weather design flow (AWWDF) from 1.184 million gallons per day (MGD) to 2.49 MGD.
5. The Facility will be located at 1759 Country Road 7 NW, Maple Lake, MN 55358 (Site).
6. The Project's purpose is to regionalize to more economically meet the newest National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) limits for the Annandale and Montrose WWTFs.
7. The Project is authorized by the AMHWC and the cities of Montrose and Waverly.
8. A NPDES/SDS Wastewater Permit Modification application was submitted to the MPCA and deemed complete April 7, 2026. Additional permits as reflected in Section C are required for the Project.

Procedural history

9. An EAW is a brief document designed to provide the basic facts necessary for the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU) to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required for a proposed Project or to initiate the scoping process for an EIS (Minn. R. 4410.0200, subp. 24). The MPCA is the RGU for this Project.
10. Minn. R 4410.4300, subp. 1 requires preparation of an EAW for the Project because the expansion or modification of an existing municipal or domestic wastewater treatment facility that results in an increase by 50 percent or more and by at least 200,000 gallons per day of the facility's average wet weather design flow capacity, which exceeds the threshold identified in Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 18(C).
11. The MPCA provided public notice of the Project as follows:
 - The Environmental Quality Board (EQB) published the Notice of Availability of the EAW for public comment in the EQB Monitor on April 7, 2026, as required by Minn. R. 4410.1500.
 - The MPCA published the EAW for review on the MPCA website at:
<https://mpca.commentinput.com/comment/search>.
 - The MPCA provided a news release to media contacts in in the Twin Cities metro region, central Minnesota, including St. Cloud, and smaller regional papers, radio stations, and TV stations on April 7, 2026.
12. During the 30-day comment period on the EAW ending on May 7, 2026, the MPCA received no comments from community members or stakeholders.
13. On May 12, 2026, the MPCA requested and granted approval from the EQB for a 15-day extension of the decision-making process on the need for an EIS for the Project in accordance with Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 2(B).

The four criteria for determining the potential for significant environmental effects

14. The MPCA must base its decision on the need for an EIS on the information gathered during the EAW process and the comments received on the EAW (Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 3). The MPCA must order an EIS for projects that have potential for significant environmental effects (Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 1). 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. The four criteria are:
 - A. 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.
- D. The extent to which the 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

A. Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects

- 15. 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.
- 16. The types of impacts that the MPCA anticipates may reasonably be expected to occur from the Project include the following:
 - Water quality impacts related to surface water and stormwater runoff;
 - Water quality impacts related to groundwater;
 - Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.
- 17. With respect to the extent and reversibility of impacts that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project, the MPCA makes the following Findings.

Water quality impacts related to surface water and stormwater runoff

- 18. The Facility will discharge effluent to the North Fork of the Crow River. The discharge location for the existing WWTFs and expanded Facility is the same and the location will not change.
- 19. The NPDES/SDS Permit Modification would ensure the wastewater from the Facility can be discharged so the quality of surface waters, wetlands, and groundwater is protected. The MPCA is the permitting authority for the NPDES/SDS Permit Modification.
- 20. The NPDES/SDS Permit will regulate the discharge of pollutants allowed for the Project. The NPDES/SDS Permit establishes effluent limitations to ensure that water quality standards and designated uses of the immediate and downstream receiving waters are protected.
- 21. The MPCA does not expect the Facility to exceed effluent limits. However, if the Facility has an exceedance or other noncompliance with its NPDES/SDS Permit, AMHWC must take corrective actions to improve operations as required by the NPDES/SDS Permit.
- 22. AMHWC must demonstrate that its discharge has satisfied conditions in Minnesota’s antidegradation rules (Minn. R. 7050.0250 through Minn. R. 7050.0335), which ensure the highest possible quality in surface waters of the state. The Project will implement the best technology in

practice and treatment. The MPCA has made a preliminary determination that the Project will satisfy antidegradation standards in Minn. R. 7050.0265.

23. The Site has an existing stormwater pond. Best management practices (BMPs) including a soil erosion plan and silt fencing will be employed during construction to prevent runoff. The contractor for the Project will use BMPs to prevent erosion on-site during construction.
24. The Montrose WWTF receives domestic wastewater from the communities of Waverly and Montrose as well as a mobile home park.
25. The Facility receives both domestic and industrial wastewater. Two Significant Industrial Users (SIUs) are connected in the distribution system, and the Facility has SIU agreements in place to limit flows and loadings to the Facility.
26. The Facility treats wastewater through screening and grit removal, activated sludge, final clarifiers, tertiary filtration (under construction separate from the proposed Project), Ultra Violet (UV) disinfection, and reaeration. The activated sludge process will be expanded through this Project by adding an additional aeration basin.
27. With the addition of wastewater from the Montrose WWTF, the Facility will treat additional flow and loadings. The aeration basin capacity will expand, and a new blower building constructed.
28. The North Fork of the Crow River is impaired for E. coli, turbidity, dissolved oxygen, fish and aquatic macroinvertebrate bioassessments, mercury, total phosphorus, and total suspended solids.
29. The Project will provide overall improved water quality to the North Fork of the Crow River downstream of the existing Montrose WWTF surface discharge. The receiving stream will see an increase in the volume of water discharged but a decrease or no change in cumulative water pollutant loadings.
30. The Facility will treat the wastewater to a better quality than is currently being discharged from the Montrose WWTF. The effluent limits will restrict phosphorus discharge from the Facility.
31. Recent climate trends and projections for Minnesota show temperatures are becoming warmer and are expected to continue warming, while precipitation trends have shown drier conditions over the past several decades with a slight increase projected in future precipitation.
32. These changes may influence surface water levels, seasonal flow variability, and nutrient dynamics, which may in turn affect how treated effluent is diluted and transported.
33. Since the Facility will produce higher quality effluent with more stringent nutrient controls, the improved treatment will help mitigate potential climate-related stressors on the receiving waterbody.
34. A stormwater pond will be constructed on-site through this Project which will control the volume and rate at which the stormwater will leave the Site.
35. The Project will not include any connection to or changes in any water supply or appropriation of any surface water, including dewatering.

36. There will be no physical or hydrologic alteration of any surface waters such as a lake, pond, wetland, stream, or drainage ditch with the Project.
37. WWTFs are receivers of Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). They receive PFAS daily from a variety of industrial, commercial, and residential sources.
38. Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) has been sampling PFAS at community water systems (CWS) across Minnesota since 2021, and has, to date, sampled about 98% of those systems.
39. The CWS nearest to the Facility serves the city of Maple Lake. The city of Maple Lake, which uses groundwater as their primary drinking water source, has had no detections of PFAS greater than either Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) or MDH's Health Based Values (HBVs).
40. Effluent from the Facility will discharge to the North Fork of the Crow River, a Class 2Bg water. There are eight surface waters downstream of the discharge location, including a Class 1C, 2Bdg portion of the Mississippi River approximately 50 river miles downstream.
41. The MPCA is currently developing an NPDES/SDS permitting strategy for PFAS, separate from the Class 1 PFAS WQS implementation strategy. No monitoring is required in the existing NPDES/SDS Permit but monitoring for one or more PFAS compounds may be applied in future NPDES/SDS Permit reissuances.
42. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record are adequate to assess potential impacts of water quality relating to surface water and stormwater runoff that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.
43. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to water quality of surface water and stormwater runoff, which are reasonably expected to occur.

Water quality impacts related to groundwater

44. The Project is not within a MDH wellhead protection area. Two wells are within 1,000 feet (ft) of the Site.
45. The NPDES/SDS Permit would ensure the wastewater discharged from the Facility protects the quality of surface waters, wetlands, and groundwater.
46. Although the MPCA does not expect adverse impacts to groundwater quality, if they were to occur, according to the NPDES/SDS Permit requirements, AMHWC would be required to modify the operations and management of the Facility.
47. There are no known geologic features such as sinkholes within the Site. Karst soil is not present on-site. Topsoil will not be brought in for work. Any soil from the aeration tank excavation will be used on-site as needed.
48. Construction work for the Project is not expected to impact the groundwater as it is 100 ft below the ground surface (bgs). The approximate depth to bedrock is 200 ft minimum, 250 ft average.

49. The Project will not include any connection to or changes in any water supply or appropriation of any groundwater, including dewatering.
50. It is possible dewatering will be needed during construction. If dewatering in volumes exceed 10,000 gpd or 1 million gpy, then a DNR Water Appropriation Permit will be required, and the contractor needs to obtain that permit prior to construction and to incorporate any pollution control measures necessary to protect groundwater and prevent sediment from being discharged into the North Fork of the Crow River.
51. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record are adequate to assess potential impacts of water quality in groundwater that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.
52. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to water quality in groundwater, which are reasonably expected to occur.

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions

53. The MPCA considered GHG emission sources within the scope of the Project.
54. The Project will directly release GHG emissions, which can widely disperse within the atmosphere, and which vary both in terms of their global warming potential and their persistence in the atmosphere.
55. To provide a common unit of measure, the MPCA uses the individual global warming potential of methane and nitrous oxide to convert to carbon dioxide equivalency (CO₂e).
56. Using EPA emission factors, Scope 1 Construction Sources, Scope 1 Mobile Equipment Combustion, Scope 1 Stationary Equipment Combustion, Scope 1 Land Use Conversion, Scope 1 Non-Combustion Processes, Scope 2 Market-based and Location-based Off-site Electricity, Scope 3 Area Off-site waste management, the Project will release 23.84 metric tons (MT) of CO₂e during construction over the course of two years. The Project will release 1,310.02 MT per year of CO₂e during construction and operation. Adding the Project's emissions to the Facility's emissions, there would be a cumulative total of 4,858.82 MT CO₂e per year.
57. The construction phase accounts for material inputs, transportation of those materials, employee commuting, use of construction equipment, land use changes associated with construction, and construction-related waste. The operational phase includes building and wastewater treatment energy consumption.
58. Project improvements considered for the GHG emissions calculation include constructing a separate blower building at 4,000 square ft², adding aeration basin capacity and anoxic tanks, installing additional diffusers and blowers, modifying piping to meet nitrogen limits, and vacuum truck receiving pit.
59. The GHG emission sources of these improvements include material inputs, transportation of material inputs, employee commuting, construction equipment, land use change, construction waste, and building energy consumption.

60. Treatment of wastewater on-site was included as an operational emission in these calculations. This was determined by the calculator by entering the population that the Facility will serve. The population was determined for the cities by using data found on the U.S. Census Bureau's data website.
61. When the Project's emissions are added to the Facility's emissions, there is a cumulative total of 148,384.62 MT CO₂e emitted over a 30-year lifetime. Some of these emissions may be mitigated or offset by practices that can remove carbon from the atmosphere and sequester it.
62. Other mitigation measures can reduce indirect GHG emissions due to energy usage and other activities. Most of these mitigation efforts will depend on municipal policy and end-user efforts and are therefore not a part of the current Project.
63. During construction, contract laborers will be encouraged to carpool and BMPs such as engine anti-idling will be implemented to minimize additional GHG output.
64. Pumps and blowers used on-site will be equipped with variable frequency drives that will allow the operators to turn down the equipment which decreases the electrical draw when full power is not required.
65. A new pretreatment screen with more efficient washer/compactor may be purchased which will help reduce the fine screenings sent to the landfill. This will reduce the volume sent to the landfill and the weight on the road from the garbage truck.
66. The Project includes land application of biosolids, which offers environmental benefits such as nutrient recycling and soil enhancement.
67. Although the Minnesota Climate Calculator does not currently provide a method for estimating emissions from land application, this pathway is considered beneficial and preferable to landfilling. Only a small fraction of inert solids is landfilled, minimizing associated emissions.
68. BMPs will be utilized in the planning and construction phases of the Project to remain in keeping with state and local GHG reduction goals.
69. There are no Minnesota or National Ambient Air Quality Standards for GHGs.
70. Currently, there are no federal or Minnesota thresholds of GHG significance for determining impacts of GHG emissions from an individual project on global climate change.
71. In the absence of a threshold of GHG significance, the MPCA looks to existing regulation. Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 15(B), establishes a mandatory category requiring preparation of an EAW for stationary source facilities generating 100,000 tpy of GHGs. The purpose of an EAW is to assess environmental effects associated with a proposed project to aid in the determination of whether an EIS is needed. On the premise of GHG emissions, environmental review regulations establish 100,000 tpy as a "trigger" to prepare an EAW to aid in determining potential significant environmental effects. A reasonable conclusion is that the Project's total GHG emissions below 100,000 tpy are not significant.

72. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record are adequate to assess potential greenhouse gas emission impacts that are reasonably expected to occur to and from the Project.
73. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to greenhouse gas emission, which are reasonably expected to occur.

B. Cumulative potential effects

74. 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.
75. 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.

Cumulative effects – summary

76. Based on the analysis of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the watershed and summarized throughout this EAW, the Project is not expected to contribute to adverse cumulative impacts.
77. The Project regionalizes two WWTFs to meet the newest NPDES/SDS limits for the expanded Facility.
78. The discharge location for the existing two WWTFs and the expanded Facility is in the same location and will not alter the discharge to the North Fork of the Crow River.
79. The Project will help meet Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) standards associated with nutrient loads to the receiving water.
80. Water quality of surface water and groundwater may be degraded should Montrose WWTF continue to discharge without improvements through this Project.
81. The Project would create a net improvement to the cumulative water quality conditions.
82. Therefore, the MPCA finds that the Project is not expected to contribute significantly to adverse cumulative potential effects on surface water or groundwater.
83. Global climate change results from the total accumulation of GHG emissions in the earth’s atmosphere, as well as other man-made and natural factors. The GHG composition of the earth’s atmosphere is changing and causing the planet’s climate to change.

84. While it may be possible to model the effects of the incremental GHG emissions associated with the Project (e.g., a social cost of carbon estimate based on a modeling framework that considers the social cost of each marginal ton of CO₂e), as a matter of empirical observation, it would be impossible to “see” the effects signal observationally amidst the internal noise of the global climate system. In other words, the available models might be used, and the results of those models might be extrapolated to give MPCA some idea of physical impacts caused by the amount of GHGs emitted from the Project. However, significant uncertainty would remain, especially as to when and where the physical impacts might occur.
85. It is not within the current state of the science to provide an analysis of the impact that the Project related GHG emissions will have on the environment.
86. It is impossible to know whether and when reliable data regarding Project GHG emissions’ impact on the environment will become available, and any study of cumulative impacts of GHGs would necessarily go well beyond evaluating the impacts solely from the Project.
87. The information on Project impacts might be developed from any such GHG/climate modeling cannot be reasonably obtained as required for an EAW Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 2(A).
88. There are no Minnesota or National Ambient Air Quality Standards for GHGs.
89. Therefore, the MPCA finds that the Project is not expected to contribute significantly to adverse cumulative potential effects on greenhouse gas emissions.
90. Based on information on the Project obtained from presented in the EAW, and consideration of potential effects due to related or expected future projects, the MPCA does not expect significant cumulative effects from this Project.
91. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects related to cumulative potential effects that are reasonably expected to occur.

C. The extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority

92. 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. 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." Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7(C). The MPCA findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.

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

Unit of Government	Permit or approval required
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)	NPDES/SDS General Construction Stormwater Permit (Will be submitted if needed)
	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) Individual Wastewater Permit Modification (Submitted)

Unit of Government	Permit or approval required
	Effluent Limits and Antidegradation Report Review (Review complete)
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Water Appropriation Permit and Construction Dewatering (Will be submitted if needed)
Wright County	Building Permit (Will be submitted)
Albion Township	Building Permit (Will be submitted)

Below are numbered paragraphs describing each permit listed above, including special conditions.

94. **Construction Stormwater Permit.** A NPDES/SDS Construction Stormwater Permit (CSW permit) is required when a project disturbs one acre or more of soil. The CSW permit requires the use of best management practices to prevent erosion and to keep eroded sediment from leaving the construction site and requires projects that create one acre or more of new impervious surface to provide permanent treatment of stormwater runoff. The project proposer must have a SWPPP that provides details of the specific measures to be implemented.
95. **NPDES/SDS Wastewater Permit.** A NPDES/SDS Wastewater Permit is required if construction groundwater dewatering discharge is contaminated and not routed through the plant but directly discharged. The purpose of the permit is to identify conditions under which industrial stormwater can be discharged so that the quality of surface waters, wetlands, and groundwater is protected. The permit requires a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that provides details of best management practices to be implemented.
96. **Effluent Limits and Antidegradation Review.** An Effluent Limits and Antidegradation Review is required when a permit application is made for a regulated activity that is anticipated to result in a net increase in loading or other causes of degradation waters of the state. Antidegradation rules exist to protect, maintain and achieve high quality surface water by protecting the existing uses and water quality. Antidegradation requirements are implemented through the issuance and enforcement of NPDES permits and other control documents issued by the MPCA which regulate surface water pollution.
97. **Water Appropriation Permit and Construction Dewatering.** The Water Appropriation Permit is required for all users withdrawing more than 10,000 gallons of water per day or one million gallons per year. The purpose of the permit program is to ensure water resources are managed so that adequate supply is provided to long-range seasonal requirements for domestic, agricultural, fish and wildlife, recreational, power, navigational, and quality control. The DNR administers this permit and requires monthly usage monitoring and annual reporting to ensure that surrounding communities' and industries' water supplies will not be affected by draw-down of the aquifer. Minn. Stat. § 103G.261 establishes domestic water use as the highest priority of the state's water when supplies are limited.
98. **Building Permit.** A Building Permit is an authorization from the County Planning and Zoning Office required for most new construction, additions, remodeling, or structural changes to property in unincorporated areas. It ensures that projects meet safety codes and zoning ordinances.

99. The above-listed permits include general and specific requirements for mitigation of environmental effects of the Project. The MPCA finds that the environmental effects of the Project are subject to mitigation, as explained in these Findings and the EAW, by ongoing public regulatory authority.

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

100. 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.
101. Although not exhaustive, the MPCA reviewed the following documents as part of the environmental impact analysis for the proposed Project:
- Data presented in the EAW.
 - Permits and environmental review of similar projects.
102. The MPCA also relies on information provided by Albion Township, persons commenting on the EAW, staff experience, and other available information obtained by staff.
103. The environmental effects of the Project have been addressed by the design and permit development processes, and by ensuring conformance with regional and local plans. No elements of the Project pose the potential for significant environmental effects that are not addressed or mitigated by the requirements of the permits listed above or in the EAW.
104. Based on the environmental review, previous environmental studies by public agencies or the project proposer, and 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

105. 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.
106. The MPCA identified areas for potential significant environmental effects. The Project design and permits ensure Albion Township will take appropriate mitigation measures to address significant effects. The MPCA expects the Project to comply with all environmental rules, regulations, and standards.
107. 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.
108. An EIS is not required for the proposed Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility Project.
109. 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 Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility Project and that there is no need for an Environmental Impact Statement.

IT IS SO ORDERED

June 12, 2026

Date signed

Katrina Kessler

This document has been electronically signed.

Katrina Kessler, P. E.
Commissioner
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Appendix C

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Annandale-Maple Lake-Howard Lake-Montrose-Waverly Wastewater Treatment Facility Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)

Errata sheet

1. Table 9 of the EAW should not have included an Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 Permit. The corrected table is below.

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 these final decisions are prohibited until all appropriate environmental review has been completed. See Minn. R., Ch. 4410.3100.*

Unit of Government	Type of Application	Status
Wright County	Building Permit	To be submitted
Albion Township	Building Permit	To be submitted
MPCA	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System (NPDES/SDS) Wastewater Permit Modification	Submitted
MPCA	Effluent Limits and Antidegradation Review	Final Report Submitted
MPCA	NPDES/SDS General Construction Stormwater Permit	To be submitted if needed
DNR	Water Appropriation and Construction Dewatering	To be submitted if needed