Request for City Council Committee Action from the Department of Community Planning and Economic Development - Planning Division

Date: September 28, 2006

To: Council Member Gary Schiff, Chair, Zoning & Planning Committee and Members of the Committee

Referral to: Zoning and Planning Committee

Subject: Determination of the need for an Environmental Impact Statement and the adequacy of the EAW for the proposed 602 First Street North Renovation.

Recommendation:

The Committee make the following findings not requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for this Project:

1. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet, the "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document, and related documentation for the 602 First Street North Renovation were prepared in compliance with the procedures of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act and Minn. Rules, Parts 4410.1000 to 4410.1700 (1993).

2. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet, the "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document, and related documentation for the project have satisfactorily addressed all of the issues for which existing information could have been reasonably obtained.

3. The project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based upon the above findings and the evaluation of the following four criteria (per Minn. Rules, Parts 4410.1700 Subp. 7):
   - Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects.
   - Cumulative effects of related or anticipated future projects.
   - Extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.
   - Extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, or of environmental reviews previously prepared on similar projects.

4. The finding by the City that the EAW is adequate and no EIS is required provides no endorsement, approval or right to develop the proposal by the City and cannot be relied upon as an indication of such approval. This finding allows the proposer to formally initiate the City's process for considering the specific discretionary and ministerial permissions necessary for

redevelopment, and for the City in this process, informed by the record of the EAW, to identify and encourage the elements for compatible redevelopment, and assure their implementation at this important site.

Consequently, the City makes a negative declaration and does not require the development of an Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

Previous Directives: None

Prepared by: Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner Approved by: Jason Wittenberg, Supervisor, Planning – Development Services Presenters in Committee: Rebecca Farrar, Senior Planner

Reviews

• Permanent Review Committee (PRC):	Approval ___ Date _____
• Policy Review Group (PRG):	Approval ___ Date _____

Financial Impact

- No financial impact

Community Impact

- Neighborhood Notification - See attached "Findings" Exhibit C
- City Goals - Not applicable, this process and decision is mandated by the EQB rules
- Comprehensive Plan - Not applicable
- Zoning Code - Not applicable
- End of 60/120-day decision period – Not applicable. EQB Rules 4410.1700 DECISION ON NEED FOR EIS. Subp. 2. Decision-making process. The decision on the need for an EIS shall be made in compliance with one of the following time schedules:
  A. if the decision is to be made by a board, council, or other body which meets only on a periodic basis, the decision shall be made between three and 30 days after the close of the review period;
- Other - -Not Applicable see Recommended Finding number 4

Supporting Information

See the attached draft “Findings of Fact and Record of Decision” on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet for the 602 First Street North Renovation.

Draft FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECORD OF DECISION

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET
For the 602 First Street North Renovation

Location: The address of the site is 602 First Street North, the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota.

Responsible Governmental Unit: City of Minneapolis

	Responsible Governmental Unit
	City of Minneapolis
Contact Person	Rebecca Farrar
Title	Senior Planner
Address	Planning Division
	Community Planning & Economic Development Department
	City of Minneapolis
	210 City Hall
	350 South 5th Street
City, state, ZIP	Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone	612-673-3594
Fax	612-673-2728
E-mail	Rebecca.Farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

	Proposer
	Barbara and Siah Armajani
Contact person	Sishir Chang
Title	Consultant - Rothweiler Group
Address	303 Ridgewood Ave S.
City, state, ZIP	Minneapolis, MN 55403
Phone	612-871-6943
Fax	612-871-0143
E-mail	sishir@rgwired.com

Final action (refer to Exhibit E): Based on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet, the "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision," and related documentation for the above project, the City of Minneapolis concluded the following on October 6, 2006:

1. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet, this "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document, and related documentation for the 602 First Street North Renovation were prepared in compliance with the procedures of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act and Minn. Rules, Parts 4410.1000 to 4410.1700 (1993).

2. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet, this "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document, and related documentation for the project have satisfactorily addressed all of the issues for which existing information could have been reasonably obtained.

3. The project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based upon the above findings and the evaluation of the following four criteria (per Minn. Rules, Parts 4410.1700 Subp. 7):
   - Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects.
   - Cumulative effects of related or anticipated future projects.
   - Extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.
   - Extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, or of environmental reviews previously prepared on similar projects.

4. The finding by the City that the EAW is adequate and no EIS is required provides no endorsement, approval or right to develop the proposal by the City and cannot be relied upon as an indication of such approval. This finding allows the proposer to formally initiate the City's process for considering the specific discretionary and ministerial permissions necessary for redevelopment, and for the City in this process, informed by the record of the EAW, to identify and encourage the elements for compatible redevelopment, and assure their implementation at this important site.

Consequently, the City makes a Negative Declaration and does not require the development of an Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

I. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND RECORD OF DECISION

The City of Minneapolis prepared a Mandatory Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the 602 First Street North Renovation according to the Environmental Review Rules of the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) under Rule 4410.4300 Subpart 31, Historical Places. The project entails the renovation of an existing one-story, warehouse into a residence and studio by adding a second story and rear addition along with re-cladding the front, side and rear facades. The building is located within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and the Minneapolis Warehouse

Historic District, both of which are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Exhibit A includes the project summary, and Exhibit B includes the Record of Decision.

II. EAW NOTIFICATION AND DISTRIBUTION

On July 27, 2006, the City caused the EAW to be published and distributed to the official EQB mailing list and to the project mailing list. The EQB published notice of availability in the *EQB Monitor* on July 31, 2006. Exhibit C includes the public notification record and these mailing lists.

III. COMMENT PERIOD, PUBLIC MEETING, AND RECORD OF DECISION

Exhibit D includes the 4 comment letters received. The Zoning and Planning Committee of the Minneapolis City Council considered the EAW and the draft of this "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document during its September 28, 2006, meeting. Notification of this public meeting was distributed via the City's standard notification methods and to the official list of registered organizations (refer to Exhibit C).

IV. SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES TO THESE COMMENTS

The City received four written comments during the public comment period from the following:

1. Minnesota Department of Transportation, August 2, 2006
2. Metropolitan Council, August 11, 2006
3. Minneapolis Department of Natural Resources, August 22, 2006
4. Minnesota Historical Society, August 30, 2006

The following section provides a summary of these comments and responses to them.

The complete comments are available for review in Exhibit D.

1. Minnesota Department of Transportation

Comment: No comments as the proposed project should have little or no impact on Mn/DOT's highway system.

Response: Noted for the record.

2. Metropolitan Council

Comment: The project raises no major issues of consistency with Council policies.

Response: Noted for the record

3. Minneapolis Department of Natural Resources

Comment: No substantive comments. Noted that project is within the Critical Area.

Response: Noted for the record

4. Minnesota Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Office

Comment: The building is non-contributing to the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District due to the fact that its date of construction (1936) is after the period of historic significance for the district.

Response: Noted for the record.

Comment: The building's status with regard to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District is not clear. SHPO does not agree with the basis for the determination that a building built during the period of significance for a district is non-contributing because it is not directly associated with the central theme of the district. The extension of the period of significance of the St. Anthony Falls Historic District to 1941 as discussed in the EAW applies only to the area of the district directly around the falls and not this portion of North First Street. Therefore, it was concluded that for the purposes of this review, the building can be properly considered to be a non-contributing element of both districts.

Response: Noted for the record.

Comment: The primary concern is not with the partial removal of the property but with the new design. Staff would suggest that the proposed front façade design (as shown in Appendix 13 in the EAW) specifically the scale, proportions, and overall character, be modified to better relate to the historic qualities of North First Street.

Response: The proposed design shall be reviewed by the Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission. HPC Staff has received a copy of the SHPO comment letter.

V. ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE EAW

The most important environmental issue identified in the EAW was the impact of the project's design on the character of the national and local historic districts that are the site

of the project. This impact will be directly assessed through the City's HPC approval process.

VI. COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects and whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is needed, the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board rules (4410.1700 Subp. 6 & 7) require the responsible governmental unit, the City in this case, to compare the impacts that may be reasonably expected to occur from the project with four criteria by which potential impacts must be evaluated. The following is that comparison:

A. Type, Extent, and Reversibility of Environmental Effects

The significant environmental effect identified in the EAW is the project's inconsistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation as noted by SHPO. The extent and mitigation of this conflict, if mitigation is possible, will be considered by the HPC review process, and including a possible appeal to the City Council.

B. Cumulative Effects of Related or Anticipated Future Projects

The specific design elements of this proposal may be mitigated during the City's HPC and Land Use Approval Review Process. No other project is related to this project.

C. Extent to Which the Environmental Effects are Subject to Mitigation by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority

The City has discretionary authority through its HPC and Land Use Approval Review Process, and ministerial authority through the permit approvals required for this project, to address, mitigate or avoid the environmental effects identified in the EAW.

D. Extent to which Environmental Effects Can be Anticipated and Controlled as a Result of other Environmental Studies Undertaken by Public Agencies or the Project Proposer, or of Environmental Reviews Previously Prepared on Similar Projects.

The rehabilitation of the structure and use as a single-family residence with a studio in this area follows many precedents, and is a known event with known effects.

VII. DECISION ON THE NEED FOR AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Based on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet, the "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision," and related documentation for this project, the City of Minneapolis, the responsible governmental unit (RGU) for this environmental review, concludes the following:

1. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet, this "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document, and related documentation for the 602 First Street North Renovation were prepared in compliance with the procedures of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act and Minn. Rules, Parts 4410.1000 to 4410.1700 (1993).

2. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet, this "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" document, and related documentation for the project have satisfactorily addressed all of the issues for which existing information could have been reasonably obtained.

3. The project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based upon the above findings and the evaluation of the following four criteria (per Minn. Rules, Parts 4410.1700 Subp. 7):
   - Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects.
   - Cumulative effects of related or anticipated future projects.
   - Extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority.
   - Extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, or of environmental reviews previously prepared on similar projects.

4. The finding by the City that the EAW is adequate and no EIS is required provides no endorsement, approval or right to develop the proposal by the City and cannot be relied upon as an indication of such approval. This finding allows the proposer to formally initiate the City's process for considering the specific discretionary and ministerial permissions necessary for redevelopment, and for the City in this process, informed by the record of the EAW, to identify and encourage the elements for compatible redevelopment, and assure their implementation at this important site.

Consequently, the City makes a Negative Declaration and does not require the development of an Environmental Impact Statement for the project.

Exhibits:

A. Project Description
B. Record of Decision
C. Public notification record
D. Comment letters
E. Council/Mayor action

EXHIBIT A

Project Description

The project entails the renovation of an existing one-story, warehouse into a residence and studio by adding a second story and rear addition along with re-cladding the front, side and rear facades. The building is located within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District.

EXHIBIT B

Environmental Review Record for the 602 First Street North Renovation Environmental Assessment Worksheet

CHRONOLOGY IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROCEDURES OF THE MINNESOTA ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

DATE	ITEM
7/27/06	City staff distributes EAW to official EQB mailing list and Project List.
7/31/06	Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) publishes notice of availability in *EQB Monitor*. 30-day comment period commences.
8/30/06	End of EAW public comment period.
9/28/06	Zoning and Planning Committee (Z & P) of the City Council considers the "Findings of Fact and Record of Decision" report, provides recommendation to the City Council. City Council approves Z & P Committee recommendation and makes a finding of Negative Declaration: the EAW is adequate and no EIS is necessary. Mayor approves Council action regarding EAW City publishes notice of Council/Mayor decision in Finance and Commerce. Moratorium on issuance of final permits lifted. City publishes and distributes Notice of Decision and availability of final "Findings" report to Official EQB List and the Project List EQB publishes Notice of Decision in *EQB Monitor*.

EXHIBIT C

Public Notification Record

The following describes the public notification process of the Planning Division for the 602 First Street North Renovation EAW:

1. The City maintains an updated list based on the EQB Contact List. The Planning Division also distributes copies of the EAW to elected and appointed officials, City staff and others who have expressed interest in the project.

2. A notice of the availability of the 602 First Street North Renovation EAW, the dates of the comment period, and the process for receiving a copy of the EAW and/or providing comment was published in the EQB Monitor on July 31, 2006, and provided to the City's Communications/Public Affairs office for notice and distribution.

3. The Planning Division distributed the Notice of Decision with information regarding the final "Findings" document to the EQB Contact List and the project list.

4. The EQB published the Notice of Decision in the *EQB Monitor*.

Attached:
EQB Contact List
602 First Street North Renovation Project List

EXHIBIT D

Comments Received on the 602 First Street North Renovation EAW

Following are the written comments received on the EAW for this Project

EXHIBIT E

Council /Mayor Action

(to be added after publication in Finance & Commerce)

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

Note to preparers: This form is available at http://www.eqb.state.mn.us. *EAW Guidelines* will be available in Spring 1999 at the web site. The Environmental Assessment Worksheet provides information about a project that may have the potential for significant environmental effects. The EAW is prepared by the Responsible Governmental Unit or its agents to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement should be prepared. The project proposer must supply any reasonably accessible data for — but should not complete — the final worksheet. If a complete answer does not fit in the space allotted, attach additional sheets as necessary. The complete question as well as the answer must be included if the EAW is prepared electronically.
Note to reviewers: Comments must be submitted to the RGU during the 30-day comment period following notice of the EAW in the *EQB Monitor*. Comments should address the accuracy and completeness of information, potential impacts that warrant further investigation and the need for an EIS.

1. Project title 602 First St. N Renovation

2. Proposer Barbara and Siah Armajani
Contact person Sishir Chang
Title Consultant - Rothweiler Group
Address 303 Ridgewood Ave S.
Phone 612-871-6943
Fax 612-871-0143
E-mail sishir@rgwired.com

3. RGU City of Minneapolis
Contact person Rebecca Farrar
Title Senior Planner
Address Planning Division
Community Planning and Economic Development Department
City of Minneapolis
210 City Hall
350 S. 5th Street
City, state, ZIP Minneapolis, MN 55415
Phone 612-673-3594
Fax 612-673-2526
E-mail rebecca.farrar@ci.minneapolis.mn.us

4. Reason for EAW preparation (check one):

EIS scoping	**X Mandatory EAW**	**Citizen petition**
RGU discretion	**Proposer volunteered**	

If EAW or EIS is mandatory give EQB rule category subpart number and subpart name:
4410.4300 subpart 31 - Historical places

The project site is in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District Sub district A North First Street Warehouses and also the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District, both of which districts are listed on the National Register of Historic Places and designated locally. The existing building is a non-contributing structure in both districts. The existing structure is an agglomeration of two structures built in 1936 and 1950 with another addition built in the 1970's. See attached quadrangle map (Appendix 3).

5. Project location

County: Hennepin
City/Township: Minneapolis
Section: 22 **Township:** 29 **Range:** 24

The address of the site is 602 First St. N, Minneapolis MN, 55401

Attach each of the following to the EAW:

- **County map showing the general location of the project.** See Appendix 2
- **U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale map indicating project boundaries (photocopy acceptable).** See Appendix 3.
- **Site plan showing all significant project and natural features.** See Appendix 4: drawing C1.1.

6. Description

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

The project entails the renovation of an existing one-story, warehouse into a residence and studio by adding a second story and rear addition along with re-cladding the front, side and rear facades. The building is located within the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District.

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. 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 property located at 602 First St. N in Minneapolis is currently a warehouse structure that is being utilized as an art studio and office. No retail sales are taking place in the structure at this time. The lot is approximately 60.2 ft. x 94.4 ft. and is approximately located in the middle of the north side of the block on First St. N between Fourth Ave. N and Eighth Ave. N. The front façade facing First St. N appears to be at or beyond the lot line while the east elevation (the elevation actually faces southeast due to the angle of the street grid) faces a

public alley and is also located at or beyond the lot line. The rear elevation faces a parking lot and follows the angle of the property line; the setback ranges from 14.5 ft. to 15 ft. The north elevation is a double party wall shared with the adjacent 606 First St. N property. The existing building has one main floor of 6,022 sq. ft. and an approximately 300 sq. ft. basement. It has a brick front façade, CMU side façade, and a shed addition in the rear which is clad in vinyl siding. See attached existing site plan.

The trigger for the mandatory EAW is the partial destruction of the building located within two historic districts listed on the National Register. It is the City staff's conclusion, with the assistance of the Collaborative Design Group, that the building is a non-contributing structure in both districts. This conclusion was based on the assessment that even though it was built during the period of significance for St. Anthony Falls, it is non-contributing to the SAFHD because it does not fit the significant themes of the district. The HPC will review the new construction for compatibility with the districts. The proposed project involves the renovation of the existing structure and the addition of a second story that will be utilized as a single residence to be homesteaded by the owner. The existing rear shed addition will be removed and a new addition built to accommodate new interior parking for one vehicle, an elevator, and a staircase. There will also be an entry vestibule in the rear. The second story will cover the extent of the remaining existing structure as well as the new addition on the first floor. The new addition to be constructed at the rear of the building would be 1,104 sq. ft. in size, the new entry vestibule would be 48 sq. ft. and the second floor addition would total 6,389 sq. ft. The front and side elevations of the building will continue to follow the existing line of the building. The rear elevation of the building will be parallel to the front lot line and set back from the existing rear lot line ranging from 16 ft. in the NW corner to 5.33 ft. in the NE corner. The entry vestibule is proposed to be square in shape and would extend out from the rear elevation approximately 7 ft. The entry vestibule would be set back 7 ft. from the rear property line at its NW corner and 5.5 ft. at the NE corner. The parapet height of the new second floor is approximately 38.63 ft. above grade in the SE corner of the building, 40.33 ft. above grade in the SW corner and 41.33 ft. above grade at the rear elevation. The rear entry vestibule is slightly taller than the rest of the building and is tower like in appearance. It is 44.32 ft. above grade (refer to Attached drawings Appendix 4 dwg C1.1, Appendix 8 dwg D1.1, and Appendix 9 dwg A1.1).

The front facade will be remodeled with the existing windows filled in and new windows cut into the first floor. There will be a recessed entryway centered on the front façade. On the first and second floor of the front façade the proposed windows are roughly 4 ft. wide by 8 ft. tall. These windows also continue on the second floor on the east façade. On the side elevation adjacent to the alley the first story window openings (approximately 4 ft.x4 ft.) will be replaced with new thermally efficient panes. The windows will have black metal frames and mullions. On the east elevation there will be one recessed door opening for an emergency exit along with a garage door for access to interior parking. On the rear elevation there will be a loading dock door along with a 3 ft. pedestrian door for egress, while there is a 4 ft. double door on the east side of the entry vestibule that is the primary entrance to the second floor (refer to Attachment Appendix 11 dwg A6.1 and Appendix 12 dwg A6.2).

The exterior finish on the front façade will be done in a buff colored brick with cast stone accents; the side and rear elevations will be done in taupe colored stucco. The brick banding along with a brick cornice and metal cap flashing will emphasize the horizontal layering of the building. Brick piers around the windows subdivide the façade vertically (refer to Attachment Appendix 14 Colored Front Elevation, Appendix 15 Colored Side Elevation, and Appendix 15 Colored Rear Elevation).

Conventional construction techniques will be used to build the project. Depending on permitting, demolition of the loading dock and roof could occur this year. Because the building is located within two National Register Historic District's state statute requires that demolition in part or whole of a building within such district is required to go through the EAW process.

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 project will allow an additional housing opportunity in downtown Minneapolis.

d. Are future stages of this development including development on any outlots planned or likely to happen? __Yes _X_No
If yes, briefly describe future stages, relationship to present project, timeline and plans for environmental review.

e. Is this project a subsequent stage of an earlier project? __Yes _X_No
If yes, briefly describe the past development, timeline and any past environmental review.

7. Project magnitude data
Total project acreage 6,886 sq. ft. or 0.16 acres
Number of residential units: unattached 0; **attached** 1 ;**maximum units per building** 1
Commercial, industrial or institutional building area (gross floor space): total square feet 12,755 sq. ft.

Indicate areas of specific uses (in square feet):

Office 6,397 sq. ft.	Manufacturing 0
Retail 0	Other industrial 0
Warehouse 0	Institutional 0
Light industrial 0	Agricultural 0
Other commercial (specify) 0	

Building height: 38 ft., 7 1/2 inches (42 feet to the top of the parapet)
If over 2 stories, compare to heights of nearby buildings.

To the west there is a 2-story structure with no windows which is attached to a six-story structure. To the north there is a narrow parking lot, a 2 story shed-like building (converted to housing), and 2 ½ story townhomes beyond. To the east there is an alley with a 4-story

condominium building. Across the street to the south there is a 4-story condominium building.

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
City of Minneapolis		
Heritage Preservation Commission	HPC Certificate of Appropriateness	To be applied for
Public Works	Preliminary Development Review	Applied for and to be reapplied for
	Encroachment permit	To be applied for
Planning Commission	Site Plan Review and Variances	To be applied for
Regulatory Services	Building Permit	To be applied for

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.

The building has been used as a design studio for the last 10 years; prior to that the building was a storage and transfer facility. Adjacent land has been primarily redeveloped into housing with some office and commercial space. There are no anticipated environmental conflicts as part of the project.

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

	Before	After
Types 1-8 wetlands	0	0
Wooded/forest	0	0
Brush/Grassland	0	0
Cropland	0	0
Lawn/landscaping	0.016	0.006
Impervious surfaces	0.137	0.147

Other (gravel)	0	0
TOTAL	0.153	0.153

If Before and after totals are not equal, explain why:

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.

The project site can be characterized as an established and fully developed industrial area since the mid 1800's and is almost completely taken up by an existing built structure with gravel and a few shrubs. There are no wildlife resources or habitats on the site.

b. Are any state-listed (endangered, threatened or special concern) 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 _X_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:
Describe measures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts.

No, none on the actual site.

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 _X_No
If yes, identify water resource affected and give the DNR Protected Waters Inventory number(s) if the water resources affected are on the PWI: . Describe alternatives considered and proposed mitigation measures to minimize impacts.

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 _X_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.

There is an existing public water connection that will continue to be used.

14. Water-related land use management district. 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? _X_Yes __No
If yes, identify the district and discuss project compatibility with district land use restrictions.

The project is located within the State designated Mississippi River Critical Area Corridor. Executive Order 79-19 establishing this Critical Area was signed and published in the Minnesota State Register in 1979. The order provided requirements and guidelines for preparing plans and regulations for the Corridor. The City of Minneapolis prepared such a plan and has established in its Zoning Ordinance Article VIII MR Mississippi River Critical Area Overlay District to implement its approved Critical Area Plan. The boundaries of this Overlay Distinct are as designated for the Critical Area in Executive Order 79-19. During 2003, the City developed amendments to its approved plan, and has begun the process of DNR review of the proposed amendments.

15. Water surface use. Will the project change the number or type of watercraft on any water body? __Yes _X_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 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.

The existing rear shed addition on the site will be demolished along with part of the existing roof, and a new addition constructed. After demolition, some very limited excavation of the site at the northeast corner will be necessary. The bedrock elevation is around 800 feet above mean sea level, with bedrock ranging from 36 ft below grade at the southeast corner to 32 ft below grade at the northeast corner of site. The proposed addition will have interior parking. In areas where the excavation extends close to the street or curbing, some temporary shoring may be required. Approximately 90% of the existing site is impervious surface completely consisting of the existing building. The renovation will increase that to 95% of the site. The building will have a flat roof and roof drains will sheet drain over the decorative rock mulch pervious surface at the rear of the building to the City of Minneapolis storm sewer (See attachment Appendix 8 drawing D1.1, C1 and C2).

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.

The site currently is 90% impervious due to the existing building on site. The quantity of site runoff will be slightly increased since the building footprint is proposed to be enlarged to

95% of the site. The quality of the runoff will likely remain the same, as all parking will be enclosed.

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.

Storm water runoff will sheet drain over the pervious rock mulch surface to the City of Minneapolis storm sewer.

18. Water quality: wastewaters

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

Estimated sanitary wastewater produced on the site from residential and commercial uses is 274 gallons per day, based upon estimated water consumption. The development is not expected to produce any wastewater that requires special treatment.

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.

Sanitary wastewater will be directed to the City of Minneapolis sanitary sewer system.

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.

Wastes will be discharged to the Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Plant.

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.

The project will not require disposal of liquid animal manure.

19. Geologic hazards and soil conditions

a. Approximate depth (in feet) to ground water: 15 ft. average

To bedrock: 35 ft. 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.

There are no geological hazards on the site.

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

The soil on the site is a sandy soil that could be considered an SCS hydrologic soil group A soil. Group A soils have a very high infiltration rate in the order of 0.5 inches per hour.

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.

Demolition for the project will create construction waste. The waste will be removed to an appropriate construction landfill. After occupancy, it is estimated that the residential unit will generate approximately 52 pounds of solid waste per week, and an annual solid waste generation of 2,704 pounds.

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 groundwater. 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 materials will be used on site.

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.

None.

21. Traffic.
Parking spaces added 1.
Existing spaces (if project involves expansion) 1.

Estimated total average daily traffic generated: 1 car.

Estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated (if known) and time of occurrence.
Not known

Provide an estimate of the impact on traffic congestion on 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.

Since only one vehicle is to be used on the site, there is no anticipated impact on the traffic congestion.

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.**

    No anticipated impact on air quality levels.

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) and any greenhouse gases (such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide) and ozone-depleting chemicals (chloro-fluorocarbons, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons or sulfur hexafluoride). Also describe any proposed pollution prevention techniques and proposed air pollution control devices. Describe the impacts on air quality.**

    The heating and cooling systems for the building have not been designed, however, due to the limited size of the systems, no significant impacts are anticipated.

24. **Odors, noise and dust. Will the project generate odors, noise or dust during construction or during operation? _X_ 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.)

    a. Odors: The construction and occupancy of the project is not expected to generate objectionable odors. The building will be an artist design studio with a residence above.

    b. Construction noise: The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances regulates both the hours of operation for construction equipment and allowable noise levels. Construction of the Project will comply with these requirements.

    c. Operational noise: The Minneapolis Code of Ordinances and the MPCA regulate mechanical noise associated with building operation. The occupancy of the Project will comply with these requirements.

d. Demolition and construction dust: During demolition and construction, contractors will follow best management practices to reduce dust emissions. During demolition, this will include wetting down the building and debris with hoses as necessary.

e. Fugitive dust emissions after occupancy: Once occupied, the project is not expected to generate fugitive dust emissions.

25. Nearby resources. Are any of the following resources on or in proximity to the site?
Archaeological, historical or architectural resources? X Yes __No
Prime or unique farmlands or land within an agricultural preserve? __Yes X No
Designated parks, recreation areas or trails? X Yes __No
Scenic views and vistas? X Yes __No
Other unique resources? __Yes X No
If yes, describe the resource and identify any project-related impacts on the resource. Describe any measures to minimize or avoid adverse impacts.

a. Archeological Resources: There are no known or identified archeological resources on the site that will be affected.

b. Historic resources:

Collaborative Design Group prepared an historic analysis for the project (refer to Appendix 1). The following is a synopsis of that analysis: The building is located within the boundaries of two National Register Historic Districts: the St. Anthony Falls Historic District (SAFHD) and the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District (MWHD). The SAFHD, originally created in 1971, only identified buildings of "special significance." The structure at 602 1st Street North was not identified. The SAFHD was re-evaluated in 1977 and again in 1988 using the single unifying theme of water power. The results of the 1977 study were published in *St. Anthony Falls Rediscovered* (1980). This comprehensive re-evaluation of the district identified buildings that possessed "historical or architectural significance." The structure at 602 1st Street North was not identified.

The MWHD, created in 1989, lists 602 1st Street North as non-contributing, with a construction date of 1936.

Using the 1936 construction date the building is clearly outside the dates of significance for the MWHD which are 1865-1930. The SAFHD dates of significance were originally 1858-1930 and later revised in 1992 to be 1858-1941 due to the significant milling activity that occurred after 1930 that was centered on water power. The revision of the SAFHD included a recommendation that the boundaries be significantly redefined using the thematic context of the waterpower area directly adjacent to the falls. This action would have cut out the 1st Street North section (that was already listed in the MWHD) as it did not fall under the proposed thematic context for the district. Additionally, Jeffrey A. Hess, the historian who developed the revised context and dates, concluded that there were really five (5) thematic contexts/neighborhoods within the

existing district. One of the thematic contexts, the North First Street Warehouse Area, was described as "consisting primarily of massive brick warehouses built for jobbers of agricultural implements during the period of 1880-1910".[1] 602 1st Street North, having been constructed in 1936, again falls outside the thematic context developed by Hess in 1991. Ultimately the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) did not take action to reduce the size of the district due to procedural issues; however the additional research provided a more finite lens under which buildings within the district could be reviewed.

For the purposes of evaluating the date of construction of the building located at 602 1st Street North the following resources were consulted.

A. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps: 1912, 1951 (updates 1942)
B. Minneapolis City Building Permits 1888-1968
C. National Register Nomination forms, correspondence, continuation sheets and other material in SHPO files for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District and the Minneapolis Warehouse Historic District
D. Minnesota Historical Society Visual Resource Database
E. City of Minneapolis City Directories: 1922-1936, 1940, 1955, 1960
F. "Concrete Block", Arkansas Historic Preservation Program
G. Saint Anthony Falls Rediscovered, ed., James Berman (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Riverfront Development Coordination Board, 1980).
H. Onsite investigation of building construction

The following is a summary of information found in the above referenced resources.

- The City of Minneapolis building permits indicate a brick warehouse was built at 602 1st Street North in 1888.
- The 1912 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show 602 1st Street North as vacant land. Likely the brick warehouse was razed prior to the 1912 Sanborn survey.
- A building appears in a 1921 aerial photograph of the area showing a narrow gable roof building with a white/light colored (brick or wood) façade.
- The City Directory's from 1930 through 1935 list 602 -04 1st Street North as vacant.
- The 1936 Directory lists 602 1st Street North as "Central Freightliners". This date also coincides with the 1936 "20x86 concrete addition and alteration" listed on the City building permit index. A site review of the building confirmed that the structure is a concrete block. However, three issues must be noted:
    1. The current building measures approximately 60 ft. x 86 ft. (plus loading dock/shed at rear) and the entire perimeter wall is concrete block. There is a clay tile demising wall that divides the building into roughly 1/3rd - 2/3rds. That wall appears to date from the 1930s.
    2. The individual concrete blocks used on the perimeter walls measure approximately 8" x 8" x 16". This more modern size (versus the 8" x 8" x 24" stone faced) began more regular use in the late 1920s.
    3. After review of the building and despite a multi-pitched roof, the structure does not appear to have been constructed in stages, but rather all at once.

[1] Hess, Jeffrey with Scott Anfinson, Additional Information: St Anthony Falls Historic District, September 1991, p3, located in SHPO Files under St Anthony Falls Historic District.

4. The face brick is reddish-brown, simple, uniform, and appears to have been laid all at the same time. There is no indication that the façade was constructed in stages.
5. 1951 Sanborn map indicates the presence of a 60' x 80' (approximately) block building at 602 1st Street North labeled "Cheese Warehouse".
6. The 1963 Sanborn shows the same size building at 602 1st Street North and formerly vacant lot directly to the west now contains a 2 story concrete block building (built in 1958 according to the Map).

Given the physical evidence of the building having a uniform perimeter wall constructed out of an 8" x 8" x 16" concrete masonry unit (in more regular use in the 1920s and 30s) and a uniform face brick façade, Collaborative Design Group concluded that it is highly unlikely that the building was built before the 1936 date indicated on the building permit application. The existing documentation for the SAFHD does not give the building a contributing or non-contributing status. However, of the evaluations and re-evaluations of the SAFHD, none of them identified 602 1st Street North as possessing historical or architectural significance. Furthermore, the building does not fit within the dates of the established thematic context for the area. Additionally, Collaborative Design Group concurred with the findings of the National Register nomination form for the MWHD that states the building is a non-contributing element, as the date of construction falls outside of the dates of significance established for the district. As such, the Collaborative Design Group recommends the City find that the building is also non-contributing to the St. Anthony Falls Historic District.

In addition to being listed on the National Register of Historic Places and being designated as a State Historic District by statute, the St Anthony Falls Historic District has also been designated as an historic district by the State of Minnesota, which has enabled the governing bodies of the subdivisions of the state in which state designated historic districts are located with the power to create an historic district board or commission for the purpose of providing architectural control of these areas. The Minneapolis Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) has adopted design guidelines for the District and general design guidelines for historic properties. All plans for projects in the District must be reviewed by the HPC and receive a Certificate of Appropriateness before a structure can be demolished or altered.

The general regulations for the "First Street Warehouses" within the district are contained in the St. Anthony Falls Historic District Guidelines (June 1980). This area is bounded by 2nd St. N to the South, West River Pkwy to the North, 4th Ave. N. to the East and 8th Ave. N. to the West. The guidelines are as follows (in italics). Following each guideline are the comments from the Rothweiler Group as regards the project's consistency with the guideline. It will be the responsibility of the HPC and the City to decide the project's consistency with the guidelines:

1. *Infill construction shall be visually compatible with historic structures within the sub-area with regard to siting, height, proportions of facade, walls of continuity, rhythm of projections, directional emphasis, materials, nature of openings, texture, roof shapes, details, and color.*

City staff's conclusion is that the scale and proportions of the front entrance facing the street are not compatible with the scale and proportions of entries on other buildings within the sub area. HPC will address the matter during the review of the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The design for the project will comply with the architectural guidelines established for the St. Anthony Falls Historic District in the following ways: (Refer to Attachment Appendix 13 Colored Front Elevation, Appendix 14 Colored Side Elevation and Appendix 15 Colored Rear Elevation).

a. *Siting: The new buildings shall be constructed with principal facades in the same plane as the facades of adjacent buildings. Structures shall extend the full width of the lot. New construction shall continue the visual wall formed by the existing buildings.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The project's main façade is in line with the existing buildings.

b. *Height: New buildings shall be four to six stories high.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The project is two stories but is approximately 39 ft. above grade on the front façade and is roughly close to adjacent buildings and buildings along the same block. Refer to Appendix 11 dwg A6.1

c. *Rhythm of Projections: There shall be no major projections on the principal facades.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: There are none.

d. *Directional Emphasis: New buildings shall have a generally vertical emphasis, at least above the first floor.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The front façade provides vertical emphasis with vertical brick piers defining bays.

e. *Materials: New buildings shall be constructed of brick or shall have a brick veneer.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The front façade is buff colored brick that laps around the side elevations similar to existing buildings. The side and rear facades are stucco similar to the side elevation of the existing building while there is no brick on the rear elevation of the existing building. Refer to Appendix 13 Colored Front Elevation.

   The side elevation is actually concrete block. Moreover, stucco is not a material that complies with the design guidelines for the district and in

modern times, its modern use in the district is typically as an accent material or as a primary material on extremely small area that were historically a material other than brick. The use of stucco as a primary cladding material on multiple elevations of the building does not comply with the design guidelines for "Materials" which require brick.

f. *Nature of Openings: Openings should appear in a consistent and repeated pattern across the principal facades. Window openings should be approximately 1-1/2 to 2-1/2 times as tall as they are wide. Doors and windows should be set toward the front of the openings but should not be flush with the masonry surface.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The windows are 2 times as tall as they are wide and are set back 4" from the masonry surface. See attached drawings Appendix 13 Colored Front Elevation, Appendix 14 Colored Side Elevation and Appendix 15 Colored Rear Elevation.

   The first floor windows on the side elevation and the upper story windows on the rear tower are wider than they are tall, thus they do not comply with the guidelines for windows, which require windows to be 1½ to 2½ times as tall as they are wide.

g. *Roof Shapes: New buildings should have flat or nearly flat roofs.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The project's roof is primarily flat and slopes to the rear for drainage.

h. *Details: New buildings should have some emphasis given to the upper termination of the building. Surface treatment should divide the building into vertical bays. Where other surface treatment is used, it should reflect details from other buildings in the area.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: On the front façade there is horizontal banding of brick that delineates the upper termination of the building along with metal cap flashing. This matches existing buildings in the district. There are vertical brick piers that divide the front façade into bays. See attached drawings Appendix 13 Colored Front Elevation, Appendix 14 Colored Side Elevation and Appendix 15 Colored Rear Elevation.

i. *Color: The primary surfaces of new buildings should be deep red, brown or buff. Trim should be in subdued earth tones or flat black.*

   Comment from the Rothweiler Group: The brick used is buff similar in color and texture to the Chaska Common brick used throughout the district and on adjacent structures like the MN Opera Offices building and Colonial Warehouse. The metallic trim on windows, gutters and doors is flat black

painted metal. The side and rear of the building is taupe colored stucco that matches the stucco and cast stone used on other buildings in the district. See attached drawings Appendix 13 Colored Front Elevation, Appendix 14 Colored Side Elevation and Appendix 15 Colored Rear Elevation.

All plans for projects in the District must be reviewed by the HPC and receive a Certificate of Appropriateness for the site and District before a structure can be demolished, construction can begin and City zoning reviews can be initiated.

c. Designated parks, recreation areas or trails: The project site is within the Grand Rounds Scenic Byway Downtown Riverfront District as designated by the Minneapolis Parks and Recreation Board and the US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration National Scenic Byways Program. There are no anticipated impacts to this district.

d. Scenic views and vistas: The project will introduce a new element into the vista along First St. N. The height of the building will be approximately 42 feet at its tallest point (including the parapet) keeping it within the context of neighboring buildings which range from 2 to 6 stories. The significance of the impact in the context of the project will be assessed as part of the necessary and discretionary reviews of the intensity, massing, height and design by the City's Heritage Preservation Commission, City Planning Commission, and City Council as described herein.

e. Number of Similar Buildings: To assess the potential impact of the project on the existing development pattern 25 existing buildings 1 to 1.5 stories in height have been identified in a designated Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the historic analysis. The APE is bounded by 4th Ave. North on the east to the Star Tribune Printing Press on the west, The Mississippi River to the north and Washington Ave. to the south. See Appendix 17 for an architectural evaluation of each of the buildings.

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

a. Comprehensive Plan

According to the *Minneapolis Downtown 2010 Plan*, this property is located in a downtown neighborhood as found on the concept plan map. In addition, according to *The Minneapolis Plan*, the site is located in the designated Upper River Major Housing Site. According to the Principles and Polices outlined in both of these plans, the following apply to this proposal:

- Promote street-level design of buildings that contribute to downtown's vitality and security encouraging individual entrances to street-level building tenants, windows and architectural detailing (Downtown Physical Setting Policy 1).
- Promote retail and other interesting uses at street level in order to reinforce the linking function of streets and to create vitality. These uses should be encouraged at the street level throughout downtown and required where the continuity of retail is important (Downtown Physical Setting Policy 2).
- Preserve, restore and reuse historic buildings and sites in downtown (Downtown Physical Setting Policy 16).
- Promote housing development that supports a variety of housing types at Major Housing Sites throughout the city (Marketplaces: Neighborhoods Policy 4.17).

The project includes the addition of a dwelling unit in a designated Major Housing Site and the rehabilitation of a building located in two historic districts. Based on the project description it is reasonable to conclude that the project is consistent with the policies both the *Minneapolis Downtown 2010 Plan* and *The Minneapolis Plan.*

b. Zoning Code

The site is located in the C3A, Commercial Activity Center zoning district. The site is also located in the MR Mississippi River Overlay District, the DH Downtown Height Overlay District and the DP, Downtown Parking Overlay District. In the C3A zoning district the lot area for a dwelling unit, as part of a mixed-use building, is 400 sq. ft. per dwelling, the maximum height requirement is 4 stories or 56 feet, whichever is less and the maximum floor area ratio is 2.7. Based on the project description it is reasonable to conclude that the project will not exceed these requirements.

Changing the use of the building to residential imposes setback requirements along the rear and interior side property lines when there are windows facing such property line. Based on the project description variances of the rear and interior side yards will be required. In addition, any addition to a building over 1,000 sq. ft. requires site plan review if the addition faces a public street. The project will require site plan review. Concerns regarding the consistency and compatibility of the project with the City of Minneapolis' zoning and land use regulations and the City of Minneapolis' comprehensive plan will be discussed at a public hearing before the City Planning Commission.

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 _X_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.)

29. Cumulative impacts. Minnesota Rule part 4410.1700, subpart 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).*

This EAW analyzes cumulative impacts under each question.

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.

No anticipated impacts.

31. Summary of issues. *Do not complete this section if the EAW is being done for EIS scoping; instead, address relevant issues in the draft Scoping Decision document, which must accompany the EAW.* 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 significant issues for this EAW are those relating to the scale and design of the proposal, and its relation to the plans, guidelines and regulations discussed in Section 27.

RGU CERTIFICATION. The Environmental Quality Board will only accept SIGNED Environmental Assessment Worksheets for public notice in the EQB Monitor.
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 Minnesota Rules, parts 4410.0200, subparts 9b and 60, respectively.
- Copies of this EAW are being sent to the entire EQB distribution list.

Signature: Rebecca Farrar

Printed Name: Rebecca Farrar

Title: Senior Planner

Date: July 27th, 2006

Environmental Assessment Worksheet was prepared by the staff of the Environmental Quality Board at the Administration Department. For additional information, worksheets or for *EAW*

Guidelines, contact: Environmental Quality Board, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155, 651-296-8253, or http://www.eqb.state.mn.us

List of Appendices:

- Appendix 1 Historical Analysis
- Appendix 2 Hennepin County Map showing location of project.
- Appendix 3 US Geological Survey
- Appendix 4 Project Site Plan, drawing C1.1
- Appendix 4.1 Existing Site Drainage drawing C1
- Appendix 4.2 New Site Drainage drawing C2
- Appendix 5 Aerial Photo
- Appendix 6 Parcels Map
- Appendix 7 Zoning Map
- Appendix 8 Demolition Plan drawing D1.1
- Appendix 9 First Floor Plan drawing A1.1
- Appendix 10 Second Floor Plan drawing A2.1
- Appendix 11 Building Elevation drawing A6.1
- Appendix 12 Building Elevations drawing A6.2
- Appendix 13 Colored Front Elevation
- Appendix 14 Colored Side Elevation
- Appendix 15 Colored Rear Elevation
- Appendix 16 Site Photos
- Appendix 17 Individual Building Architectural Evaluation