

**CITY OF LINO LAKES
ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD MEETING**

Wednesday, November 30, 2022

6:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

Please be courteous and turn off all electronic devices during the meeting.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 5th, 2022 Meeting and October 26th, 2022 Meeting
5. OPEN MIKE
6. ACTION ITEMS
 - A. Emerald Ash Borer Injection Program
7. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. Ash Removal Plan for Winter 2022-2023
8. UPDATES
 - A. General Updates
 - B. Recycling Updates
9. ADJOURN

Meeting guidelines on reverse side.

City of Lino Lakes Environmental Board

MEETING GUIDELINES

Open Mike – The purpose of a Board Meeting is to accomplish the business of the city. When presenting at a meeting please remember to be respectful and follow these guidelines:

- Please address the meeting chair.
- State your name and address for the record.
- Please observe a 4-minute limit.
- The topic must relate to city business.
- Open Mike is for items not on the agenda.
- A spokesperson must represent a group of five or more – groups will have 8 minutes.
- The Presiding Officer may limit duplicative presentations.
- Remember, the meeting is to discuss city business only.

Public Hearing – Held as a separate item of business on the agenda. The public hearing segment is your opportunity to tell the Board how you feel about issues scheduled to be heard. Typically, a hearing follows these steps:

- The Presiding Officer (Chair or Vice-Chair) will announce the proposal to be reviewed and ask for the staff report. The presiding Officer shall maintain strict order and etiquette at all meetings.
- Staff will present their report on the proposal.
- Board members will then ask City Staff questions about the proposal.
- The Presiding Officer will then open up the public hearing for anyone present who wishes to comment on the proposal. This is the time for the public to make comments or ask questions about the proposal.
Comments should be limited to four (4) minutes unless further time is granted by the Presiding Officer. All comments should be directed to the Board as a body and not to any individual Board Member or City Staff Member unless permission is granted by the Presiding Officer. No person shall be permitted to enter into any discussion, either directly or through a member of the Board without the permission of the Presiding Officer.
- After everyone in the audience wishing to speak has given his/her comments, the Presiding Officer shall close the public hearing.
- The Board will then discuss the proposal. No further public comments are allowed.
- The Board will then make a recommendation(s) and/or a decision.

When you are called upon for your comments, please step to the microphone at the podium and state your name and address for the record.

Occasionally, the Board may continue a hearing to another meeting before taking action.

Meeting Etiquette

The Environmental Board must preserve order and decorum while the meeting is in session. A resident shall not, by conversation or otherwise, delay or interrupt the proceedings or the business of the Board, nor disturb any resident or Board Member while speaking or refuse to obey the orders of the Board.

**CITY OF LINO LAKES
ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD MEETING**

DATE: October 5, 2022
TIME STARTED: 6:30 P.M.
TIME ENDED: 8:08 P.M.
MEMBERS PRESENT: John Sullivan, Jonathan Parsons, Ella McNulty, Cassie Cavegn, Lindsey Buchmeier, Jonathan Parsons
STAFF PRESENT: Michael Grochala, Katie Larson, Andy Nelson, Julie Whitney

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL:

Chair Sullivan called the Lino Lakes Environmental Board meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on October 5, 2022.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Sullivan noted that item #7, updates, would be removed and called for a motion to approve the updated agenda. Ms. Buchmeier moved to approve the minutes. Ms. Holmes seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. McNulty made a MOTION to approve the August 31, 2022 meeting minutes. Motion was supported by Ms. Cavegn. Motion carried 6 – 0.

V. OPEN MIKE

Chair Sullivan opened and closed Open Mike at 6:32 pm.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Robinson Sod Farm Environmental Assessment Work Sheet, Record of Decision

Mr. Grochala, Community Development Director, presented the staff report. He stated that the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) was approved for distribution by the City Council in August of 2022. The

document was also filed with the Environmental Quality Board and circulated for comments to parties on the required distribution list. A notice of availability was also published in the EQB Monitor as required by law. Additionally, notices were sent to property owners within 600 feet of the proposed project area.

Allison Harwood with WSB provided an overview of the EAW process. She explained that while the threshold number of homes that necessitates an EAW had been met, the threshold that would necessitate an EIS had not been met. The proposed project includes less homes than the threshold of 1,000 attached homes or 1,500 unattached homes.

Ms. Harwood noted that the EAW evaluated the Yield Plan, which was the more dense/impactful of the two project scenarios provided by the developer. The PUD Concept Plan was the less dense of the two project scenarios.

Ms. Harwood detailed the government agencies and members of the public who had been provided an opportunity to comment on the EAW as required by state law. The city received four comment letters from government agencies and fifteen emails from members of the public. She noted that none of the comments received suggested the need for an EIS.

Ms. Harwood provided an overview of the comments received and the responses to these comments. General themes of the comments received included land use, water resources, ecological resources/habitat, contamination, and traffic impacts including impacts related to connecting Carl Street. She also noted that there were comments received that were unrelated to the EAW, such as impacts to the Air Park, property values, school classroom size and funding, and infrastructure maintenance.

Ms. Harwood then explained the criteria used to determine if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects. These criteria include: type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects; cumulative potential effects; the extent to which environmental effects are subject to ongoing public regulatory authority; and the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies.

Ms. Harwood then stated that based on the criteria established by Minnesota Rule, the potential for significant environmental impact does not exist.

Mr. Grochala stated that while the comment period for the EAW had closed, this meeting provided an opportunity for staff, the developer, and consultants to respond to questions and clarification points from the Environmental Board and members of the public in attendance.

Ms. Holmes and Mr. Sullivan asked what additional information an EIS would provide.

Ms. Harwood responded that an example of this additional information would be if information on an endangered species was not provided within the timelines established by the EAW process, this information would be provided during the EIS process. She added that there were no indications that the full information had not been provided during the EAW, noting that she had never seen an EAW progress to an EIS for a residential development. She also stated that additional information would be provided for the proposed project through the normal review process.

Mr. Sullivan asked if additional insurance would be required for homes in the development due to the floodplain areas on the site.

Mr. Grochala explained the process for modeling and requirement for compensatory mitigation of any floodplain impacts during development, noting that it was not unusual for projects in Lino Lakes.

Mr. Sullivan asked if any of the proposed homes would have basements.

Mr. Grochala responded that the single family homes would have basements, the townhomes would be slab-on-grade. He also explained the separation requirements between groundwater and low floor elevations of the buildings.

Mr. Sullivan approved of the storm water reuse, adding that he'd like to see more reuse incorporated into projects in the city.

Mr. Grochala stated that the city would be requesting storm water from the ponds be used to irrigate open space areas in the proposed development. He mentioned that the Watermark development was an example of storm water reuse being incorporated on a large scale.

Mr. Sullivan asked for clarification on the topic of storm water ponds being drained before excavation of sediment as a measure to protect Blanding's turtles, specifically asking how often the ponds are dredged. He also mentioned that the Board are supporters of Blanding's turtles and asked for clarification on who would be checking the site for turtles prior to and during construction.

Ms. Harwood explained how the DNR recommendations, requirements, and species-specific protection plans are incorporated into development plans.

Mr. Grochala added that dredging the ponds occurs perhaps once every forty years, depending on the pond. Ponds that are potentially used by Blanding's turtles will be drawn down by September 15th to allow the turtles to seek other

habitat prior to any dredging for pond maintenance.

Mr. Sullivan mentioned that the well on site would be capped. He asked if the well water was ever tested, and if the well water was different than the aquifer. He had concerns related to water contamination associated with the sod operation.

Mr. Grochala responded that the well would be tapped into an aquifer, noting that this well water would not be tested with the same frequency as the municipal water supply. He added that the well capping requirement was a measure to reduce the potential for contamination of aquifers.

Mr. Sullivan asked for specifics on the origin and quality of the water currently running through the ditches on the site.

Mr. Grochala provided details about the water that reaches the project site.

Ms. Harwood added that with the development, the public and many of the private drainage features will remain in place.

Ms. Holmes commented positively on the overall thoroughness of the EAW. She asked if the cumulative impacts of this development and other development in the area, such as the Natures Refuge project, had been considered. She also mentioned concerns for wildlife.

Ms. Harwood responded that the most noteworthy cumulative impacts for residential developments are related to infrastructure, such as water infrastructure and traffic impacts. She added that these impacts are accounted for both in long-range planning documents like the Comprehensive Plan, and through the project-specific traffic study. She also stated that the DNR would like to see a species survey, not necessarily due to species already found on the site, but for species that have been documented within a one-mile radius of the proposed project. Wildlife impacts would also be mitigated through the native plant buffers around storm water features and in open space areas.

Mr. Grochala stated that there will be a significant landscaping component included with the development, which would be an improvement upon the current turf grass sod from a wildlife perspective.

Mr. Sullivan asked what is done with the soil that is removed for contamination remediation.

Ms. Harwood responded that soil that meets MPCA standards will likely be reused on site. Soil that does not meet residential use requirements will likely be landfilled.

Mr. Sullivan asked if staff could provide info on salt used for water softeners in a future newsletter.

Ms. Harwood noted that the MPCA had resources on this topic available on their website.

Mr. Grochala added that the city will be providing more information on chloride use reduction in the future as part of the city's MS4 storm water requirements. He also detailed additional measures that city staff were undertaking to reduce salt use.

Ms. Cavegn stated that soil contamination seemed likely being that the site has been a sod farm for a long time. She asked for clarification about the results of the soil testing and if it was sufficient given the site's history.

Ms. Harwood responded that a Phase 1 site assessment had been completed, then detailed what was included in this type of assessment.

Ian Peterson, the developer, provided details on the soil testing that had been performed on the site for a Phase 2 site assessment. He stated that there were areas of concern identified related to a helicopter crash in 2016, and around the storage buildings. Soils in these areas would likely have to be disposed of offsite.

Ms. Cavegn asked for the density of samples taken per area.

Mr. Peterson responded that he didn't have a number of samples taken on hand, but noted that sampling crews were on site on four occasions, sampling for two or three days at a time.

Mr. Parsons commented positively on the thoroughness of the EAW. He stated that the 2040 Comprehensive Plan was a good tool for gauging potential future conditions, such as traffic levels, but asked if there was information that could be provided to the public now to give a more short-range/immediate future assessment of traffic impacts.

Mr. Grochala responded that the current traffic study performed for the site was robust and included analysis of a projection to 2025 and a projection to 2040. These projections included impacts related to the proposed development, and to expected background traffic from the surrounding area.

Mr. Sullivan opened the discussion to members of the public.

Mr. Grochala stated that there will be additional opportunities for public comment should the project move forward.

Randy Rennaker, resident at 379 Carl Street in Lino Lakes, asked the

following questions:

Regarding section 4.2.8, comment #14

He asked if the accumulation of fertilizers and chemicals in the soil would be something that an EIS would address. He noted that a number of the neighboring property owners are cancer survivors. With the land's history of agriculture, we don't know the full extent of the chemicals and fertilizers in the soil. The concern is that construction would result in dust, airborne particles, and carcinogens that would then drift into surrounding neighborhoods. He noted that a primary function of any city is to provide for the health and safety of its residents. Why would we not take the additional step of requiring an EIS for a project of this magnitude? He stated that it's simply the right thing to do.

Mr. Sullivan stated that the need for an EIS is if the EAW doesn't adequately provide the information required.

Mr. Grochala responded that agricultural areas being developed into residential is typical.

Mr. Peterson stated that when the Phase 2 site assessment is submitted, the concerns related to soil contamination will be satisfied. He added that the soils will all have to meet residential standard in order to construct the site. Soils near the helicopter crash site and storage barn do not meet the requirements and will be hauled to the landfill.

Regarding the Traffic Study

Mr. Rennaker asked if the traffic study took into consideration the existing traffic from the Century Farm development that will be using the Carl Street connection.

Mr. Grochala responded that yes, the traffic study does take into account surrounding area trip generation.

Regarding the helicopter crash site

Kevin Dunrud, resident at 314 Carl Street, detailed his familiarity with the helicopter crash site. He stated that its way out of line to compare contamination from the crash site with the contamination from what has been put on the sod fields. He added that the crash site was spread over a large area and wondered how much of the site would be cleaned up.

Regarding general comments about the content of the EAW

Mr. Rennaker attributed the following quote to Mr. Grochala. "There was not a lot of research within the comments."

Mr. Rennaker stated that he wanted it to be on record that they didn't have a full thirty days to comment. Some of the residents did not receive their mailing from the city until August 23rd and the comment period ended on September 15th. Because of this, they didn't have the full period to do their due diligence in performing their research.

Bonnie Bigler, resident at 346 Carl Street, regarding response 4.2.7, asked about the private ditches and what portion of the ditches will remain the same. She also asked what would happen to the drainage ditch heading south to the Air Park if Carl Street were connected.

Ms. Harwood responded that drainage issues would be reviewed by Rice Creek Watershed District during the development review process, adding that impacts to drainage will be mitigated in accordance with the Watershed District's rules and requirements.

Mr. Sullivan added that under the current conditions water leaves the site with no treatment and with the development this water would receive treatment prior to leaving the site.

Mr. Grochala confirmed that any impacts to water bodies will have to be addressed.

Ms. Bigler asked, regarding response 4.2.8 on private wells, she has concerns that the city will not be paying for replacement wells. She added that many people on Carl Street and in the Air Park have private wells.

Mr. Grochala responded that the development is not expected to impact local private wells because the municipal water that would serve the development would be coming from wells further south in the city.

Ms. Bigler asked about the timeline for the new water treatment plant in the city.

Mr. Grochala responded that the proposed water treatment plant is still in the design phase, with a potential 2023-2024 build date.

Randy Rennaker stated that his father, who lives on the Blaine side of Sunset Avenue, was compensated by the City of Blaine for extending his well due to water level dropping.

Tammy Dunrud, resident at 314 Carl Street, asked if the foundations of existing homes in the vicinity of the project would be impacted by changes to groundwater levels.

Ms. Cavegn asked if it was correct that water discharged from a site after a proposed development can't exceed current levels.

Mr. Grochala responded that rate is controlled leaving the site and the groundwater elevation can't be raised due to a project.

Ms. Cavegn stated that the foundations of existing homes wouldn't be impacted by the project because the discharge rates will be remaining the same.

Mr. Grochala added that a house built in 2003 would probably be meeting that separation requirement as well.

David Ramsden, resident at 302 Carl Street, asked what soil model would be used, stating that there are two levels there, which may have been impacted by the ditch that was put in.

Mr. Sullivan asked if this question or comment pertained to the responses to the EAW.

Mr. Ramsden responded that it was not.

Mr. Grochala provided some detail on how the water levels are modeled.

Scott Zbikowski, resident at 7765 Clydesdale Circle in Lino Lakes, stated that he was disappointed in the Planning Commission and the developers for considering putting a connection in Carl Street that would put that much additional traffic on this rural street. He also stated that a larger traffic study should be done, noting the lack of pedestrian-friendly features on surrounding roads.

Mr. Grochala noted that there is an extensive traffic analysis in the EAW that provides the information needed to make a sound engineering decision.

Ms. Cavegn asked what information an EIS would provide that we don't currently have.

Ms. Harwood clarified that if there was missing information that should have been provided in the EAW or that won't be provided during the normal development review process, that's when an EIS would be conducted. In this case, the staff recommendation is that the information that we have and information that will be forthcoming during the review process is adequate to make a decision regarding any potential environmental impacts.

Ms. Cavegn asked what steps would be taken to ensure that airborne particulate matter would not be a concern for the surrounding area. She also asked what information the Phase 2 assessment would provide related to soil contamination.

Ms. Harwood responded that the PCA rules and standards on dust management and erosion control and standards for residential soils would mitigate these concerns. She also explained the practices that would be implemented during construction to mitigate these issues.

Ms. Holmes made a MOTION to recommend adoption of the Record of Decision and a negative declaration on the need for an EIS for the Robinson Sod Farm to be forwarded to the City Council. Motion was supported by Ms. McNulty. Motion carried 6-0.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Sullivan asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Holmes made a motion to

adjourn the meeting at 8:08 p.m. Motion was supported Mr. Schwartz.

Ms. Holmes made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:08 p.m. Motion was supported by Mr. Schwartz. Motion carried 6 – 0.

Respectfully submitted by
Julie Whitney, Community Development Administrative Assistant

DRAFT

**CITY OF LINO LAKES
ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD MEETING**

DATE:	October 26, 2022
TIME STARTED:	6:30 p.m.
TIME ENDED:	7:31 p.m.
MEMBERS PRESENT:	Ella McNulty, Lindsay Buchmeier, John Sullivan, Shawn Holmes Jonathan Parsons, Alex Schwartz
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Cassie Cavegn
STAFF PRESENT:	Michael Grochala, Andrew Nelson

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairman John Sullivan called the Environmental meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on October 26, 2022 and requested roll call.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

5. OPEN MIKE

Mr. Sullivan declared open Mike at 6:34 p.m. There was no one present for Open Mike therefore it was closed at 6:34 p.m.

6. ACTION ITEMS

A. City Code Chapter 1011. Storm water, Erosion and Sediment Control Update

This code regulates development activities that disturbs land and generates the need for storm water management. The City is required to be in conformance with this code. Mr. Grochala proposed an ordinance amendment to bring our code requirements into conformance with the permit and WMO standards.

Mr. Schwartz addressed clerical errors in the report which Mr. Grochala stated would be corrected.

Mr. Parsons stated under flood plain they crossed out 100 year and replaced with regional flood. He requested clarification for the meaning of regional flood discharge. Mr. Grochala will follow up with the Board.

Chair Sullivan called for a motion to accept the update.

Motion was made by Ms. Holmes and supported by Mr. Schwartz. Motion carried 6 – 0.

B. Draft Chloride Reduction Ordinance

Mr. Grochala presented the draft for the Chloride Reduction Ordinance. The City's General Permit for Separate Storm Sewer System requires the City to adopt a regulatory ordinance that requires proper salt storage at commercial, institutional and non-NPDES permitted industrial facilities. At a minimum the ordinance must designate salt storage areas to be covered, storage for impervious surfaces and implementation of practices to reduce exposure when transferring material in salt storage areas. Mr. Grochala covered the impacts of fluoride found in the salt and how it affects different areas of infrastructure, water, plants and wildlife. Mr. Grochala requested feedback from the Board for implementation.

The Board would like more information on container size, if any of the businesses have storage in place and if so what does that look like. Mr. Grochala will be sending out a survey via email or mail to the Lino Lakes businesses to receive their input. He will also get clarification on sand vs sand/salt storage.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Project Updates - None

8. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Buchmeier made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:31 p.m. Motion was seconded by Ms. Holmes. Motion carried 6 -0.

Respectfully submitted,
Julie Whitney, Community Development Administrative Assistant

ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD AGENDA ITEM 6A

STAFF ORIGINATOR: Andy Nelson

MEETING DATE: November 30th, 2022

REQUEST: Recommendation to City Council regarding Emerald Ash Borer Injection Program

TOPIC: Emerald Ash Borer Injection Program

BACKGROUND:

Emerald ash borer (*Agrilus planipennis*, EAB) is a non-native invasive beetle that is causing widespread ash tree mortality in much of the eastern half of the United States. Lino Lakes is within the heavily infested area in the metro. In the next few years, the vast majority of ash trees in the city will be killed, removed, or treated with insecticides.

The city response to EAB with respect to public trees includes removals of boulevard ash trees, replacement of these trees with a diverse mix of species, and insecticide injections that allow us to stagger removals over time. Options for homeowners with privately owned ash trees include removal or treatment with insecticides.

The city contracted with Rainbow Tree Care in 2021 and 2022 to provide discounted ash injections for city boulevard trees and private trees for interested homeowners.

	2021	Cost	2022	Cost
Private trees	163	\$15,956.55	194	\$19,160.84
Public boulevard trees	102	\$8,093.25	100	\$7,087.50
Total:	265	\$24,049.80	294	\$26,248.34

Program Benefits:

1. Discounted rate for injections of city and private trees.
2. Offers a dependable treatment service that keeps trees healthy. For public trees, this benefits public safety and the safety of our work crews performing removals. For private trees, homeowners will retain the benefits that these trees are providing.
3. Distributes a postcard to all residents informing them about EAB, the benefits of injections, and providing a clear option for injections with contact information.

4. Establishes a website/landing page where residents can sign up for free appointments/consultations and find more information about EAB.
5. Provides the City with mapping and data for all trees injected (public and private) to assist in our EAB response planning.

The Environmental Board supported the creation of this program on October 28th, 2020.

The City Council approved the program on December 7th, 2020.

The initial two years of the EAB injection program have been successful. To ensure that we can hit our treatment goals for public trees while also providing a clear pathway for residents to get private trees treated at a discounted rate, staff recommends that this program continue for another two years. This will require staff requesting bids from companies to provide the services and establishing a new contract, pending City Council approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation to the City Council on whether to continue the Emerald ash borer injection program for City and private trees.

**ENVIRONMENTAL BOARD
AGENDA ITEM 7A**

STAFF ORIGINATOR: Andy Nelson

MEETING DATE: November 30th, 2022

REQUEST: Discussion only

TOPIC: Ash Tree Removal Plan Winter 2022-2023

Background

The City response to EAB includes removals of boulevard ash trees, replacement of these trees with a diverse mix of species, and insecticide injections that allow us to stagger removals over time. There are currently approximately 200 boulevard ash trees remaining.

There are 37 boulevard ash trees scheduled for removal this winter. 23 of these trees will be removed by the Parks crew, and 14 will be contracted removals. After this round of removals, there will be approximately 160 boulevard ash trees remaining. We will continue treating half of the remaining trees each year to keep them healthy to promote safe removals in the future.

Staff will provide details on the removal locations at the meeting.

Requested Environmental Board Direction

None required. Discussion only.