

# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

**Note to preparers:** This form and EAW Guidelines are available at the Environmental Quality Board's website at: <http://www.eqb.state.mn.us/EnvRevGuidanceDocuments.htm>. 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. 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:** Carlos Avery Brooder Shed Project
2. **Proposer:** Minnesota Department of Natural Resources  
Division of Fish and Wildlife

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Proposer Name:                       | Minnesota Department of Natural Resources |
| Proposer Association or Corporation: | Division of Fish and Wildlife             |
| Contact person:                      | Dan Rhode                                 |
| Title:                               | Wildlife Area Manager                     |
| Address:                             | 5463 West Broadway                        |
| City, state, ZIP:                    | Forest Lake, MN 55025                     |
| Phone:                               | 651-296-5290                              |
| Fax:                                 | 651-296-5202                              |
| E-mail:                              | dan.rhode@state.mn.us                     |

3. **RGU:** Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Ecological and Water Resources

|                   |                                  |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Contact person:   | Jamie Schrenzel                  |
| Title:            | EAW Project Manager              |
| Address:          | 500 Lafayette Road               |
| City, state, ZIP: | St. Paul, MN, 55155-4025         |
| Phone:            | 651-259-5115                     |
| Fax:              | 651-297-1500                     |
| E-mail:           | environmentalrev.dnr@state.mn.us |

Include phrase "Carlos Avery EAW" in the subject line.

4. **Reason for EAW preparation** (check one)  
 EIS scoping  Mandatory EAW  Citizen petition  RGU discretion  Proposer volunteered

If EAW or EIS is mandatory give EQB rule category subpart number: 4410.4300 Subpart 31; and subpart name: Historic Places

5. **Project location** County: Anoka City/Township: Columbus, MN  
NW ¼ Se ¼ Section 6 Township 32N Range 22W  
**GPS Coordinates** N 45.28905 E -93.12882  
**Tax Parcel Number** 06-32-22-42-0002

**Attach each of the following to the EAW:**

- County map showing the general location of the project;
- U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale map indicating project boundaries (photocopy acceptable);
- Site plan showing all significant project and natural features
  - Figure 1. Location of the Carlos Avery Game Farm Brooder Sheds – USGS Coon Lake Beach and Linwood Quadrangles
  - Figure 2. County Map of General Project Location
  - Attachment A. Excerpt from Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Area Brooder House Stabilization Drawings
  - Attachment B. Swallow Nesting Information Sheet

## 6. Description

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

Four 1930's era brooder sheds located within the National Register of Historic Places – listed Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Area Headquarters will be demolished by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). One building will be repaired. Each building consists of a concrete slab, 10 steel-framed pens, and a wood-framed shelter.

- 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.

The Carlos Avery Brooder Shed Project will include the removal of four brooder sheds from the Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Area (WMA) and the repair and stabilization of one brooder shed for mitigation for impacts to the Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Headquarters. The Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Headquarters is listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and may be referenced by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Number 2009-1929. This project will begin by rehabilitating one of the five existing brooder sheds. Then four brooder sheds will be demolished.

A rehabilitated brooder shed will be maintained on site as a representative example of the historic purpose of the brooder sheds for the propagation of game birds by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR). This rehabilitation will be accomplished by washing exterior surfaces and replacing any damaged components of the building by salvaging parts from the other buildings where those parts are in better condition. Some examples of salvaged materials would include siding, cleanout doors, entry doors, windows, hinges, inside brooder boxes, and other parts as necessary. The portion of the roof with asphalt shingles will be replaced. The portion of the roof that is corrugated metal and fiberglass panels will be cleaned and washed, with sections replaced as needed. All construction work during the rehabilitation portion of this project will be completed with hand tools. No heavy equipment will be used. All brush and tree limbs will be cut back eight feet from the building to allow for building repair and maintenance and to prevent future damage from contact by woody vegetation. This portion of the project is anticipated to take approximately two weeks and is planned for the summer of 2012.

Once the rehabilitation of the one brooder shed is complete, four remaining brooder sheds will be demolished. The buildings are painted with a lead-based paint. Prior to demolition, the exterior painted surfaces will be stabilized using a non-hardening paint stabilizer. Demolition activities will be conducted by Carlos Avery staff. A backhoe will be used to remove roofs and walls. All metal will be placed in 30-yard dumpsters to be recycled. It is estimated that two dumpsters will be needed for recyclable metal. All non-metal parts will be placed in dumpsters and hauled to a construction debris landfill. Three dumpsters are estimated to be needed for construction debris waste. Only the above ground portions of the brooder sheds will be removed. The concrete foundations will remain and will be used for storage of outside equipment. Any soil disturbance will be minor. The demolition portion of the project is anticipated to take approximately one week and is planned for the summer of 2012.

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

The purpose of this project is to demolish brooder sheds, which have not been used for their intended purpose since 1988. The DNR assessed the brooder sheds and determined that they cannot be modified or repurposed to serve other uses at Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Area. In addition, Carlos Avery WMA has been paying a yearly maintenance fee for these five buildings because they appear on state building inventory lists. However, the buildings are no longer receiving any regular maintenance and have been deteriorating. Carlos Avery WMA staff plan to remove these buildings to save the WMA and the taxpaying public the costs associated with keeping buildings in place that are not providing a function.

Given that the buildings are located within the Carlos Avery Game Farm Historic District, the DNR had discussions with the SHPO as to the nature of this building abatement project. The outcome of these discussions is that one of the brooder sheds will be repaired and stabilized to represent the historic game farm which used to operate at the WMA.

The DNR will contract work associated with repairing the one building, and will be asking the contractor to salvage materials that are needed for repairs from the four buildings that will subsequently be removed. After the repair is completed, the above-grade portions of the four other brooder sheds will be demolished and properly disposed of. The concrete floor slabs, which are at the same level as the surrounding grade, will be left and available for storage space.

This project was deemed necessary due to the slowly deteriorating condition of the buildings, the inability to find other uses for the buildings, other than for unprotected cold storage, and as a means for the state to remove the expenses associated with having these buildings on its inventory list. Beneficiaries will include taxpayers, because WMA funds will be better managed. Visitors to the Carlos Avery WMA may also benefit from understanding the historic value of the restored brooder shed.

d. Are future stages of this development including development on any other property planned or likely to happen?  Yes  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  No

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

#### 7. Project magnitude data

Total project acreage: 0.7 acres

Number of residential units: 0 unattached 0 attached maximum units per building

Commercial, industrial or institutional building area (gross floor space): total square feet (see below).

Indicate areas of specific uses (in square feet):

Office: 0

Manufacturing: 0

Retail: 0

Other industrial: 0

Warehouse: 0

Institutional: 0

Light industrial: 0

Agricultural: 0

Other commercial (specify): (See below).

Building height: 8 feet

If over 2 stories, compare to heights of nearby buildings.

Five brooder sheds at approximately 1,132 square feet each are located in the project area. Four will be removed and one will be repaired.

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. *All of these final decisions are prohibited until all appropriate*

environmental review has been completed. See Minnesota Rules, Chapter 4410.3100.

| <u>Unit of government</u>           | <u>Type of application</u>     | <u>Status</u> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| MN Department of Labor and Industry | Building and Electrical Permit | Pending       |

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 surrounding land use is associated with the Carlos Avery WMA. This project is part of the maintenance of the Carlos Avery Wildlife Management site buildings as described above. No apparent conflicts exist with environmental matters. The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (PCA) maintains the website "What's in My Neighborhood" at the following webpage: <http://www.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/data/whats-in-my-neighborhood/index.html>. The website was reviewed for any above or below ground tanks. The DNR Area Wildlife Manager for the site was also contacted. No tanks or contamination exist currently at in the vicinity of the project area. Seven tanks were previously underground about 500 feet south of the proposed project. The tanks were used for storing diesel, gasoline, and fuel oil for the purpose of powering generators for the Carlos Avery facilities. When electrical power was supplied to the site, the tanks were no longer needed. All tanks were removed between 1989 and 1992. During removal of one tank, soil contamination from diesel was detected around the fill pipe. Thermal treatments were completed January 12, 1990. No groundwater contamination was noted, and no contaminated soils were recorded as remaining. The site closure date was recorded as November 8, 1991. The brooder shed project will not affect this area.

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

|                    | <b>Before</b> | <b>After</b> |                     | <b>Before</b> | <b>After</b> |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Types 1-8 wetlands | 0             | 0            | Lawn/landscaping    | 0.56          | 0.57         |
| Wooded/forest      | 0             | 0            | Impervious surfaces | 0.13          | 0.13         |
| Brush/Grassland    | 0.01          | 0            | Stormwater Pond     | 0             | 0            |
| Cropland           | 0             | 0            | Other (describe)    | 0             | 0            |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       | <b>0.7</b>    | <b>0.7</b>   |                     |               |              |

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 is located in the Carlos Avery WMA, containing approximately 23,000 acres consisting of about two thirds wetlands and one third uplands. The WMA is managed primarily for deer, waterfowl, and turkeys. There are 20 pools where water is actively managed to produce habitat for waterfowl. The area also includes approximately 4,500 acres posted as a Wildlife Sanctuary. Wildlife viewing includes wetland, prairie, and forest wildlife. Wildlife hunted in the area includes deer, bear, small game, forest game birds, pheasant, waterfowl, doves, and turkeys. The project area is located in an upland portion of the Carlos Avery WMA in an area with lawn and concrete land cover.

Swallows were found nesting in a brooder shed during the summer of 2011. Active swallow nests are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Swallows were not found present this year to date. If they successfully build any nests during the breeding season, construction schedule and practices would need to be adjusted to avoid impacting nests during breeding season. Alternatively, a permit would be required for any nest disturbance from the

DNR and the USFWS. Measures for discouraging swallow nesting can be used and are included on the attached flyer (see Attachment B) for bridge construction. Similar measures would apply for this type of demolition, repair and stabilization project.

b. Are any state-listed (endangered, threatened or special concern) species, rare plant communities or other sensitive ecological resources on or near the site?  Yes  No

If yes, describe the resource and how it would be affected by the project. Describe any measures that will be taken to minimize or avoid adverse impacts. Provide the license agreement number (LA-\_\_\_\_) and/or Division of Ecological Resources contact number (ERDB 20110406) from which the data were obtained and attach the response letter from the DNR Division of Ecological Resources. Indicate if any additional survey work has been conducted within the site and describe the results.

Rare species present in the vicinity of the project area include the state-listed threatened Blanding's turtle, and the cross-leaved milkwort, a state-listed endangered plant. The DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources Endangered Species Review Coordinator was consulted and it was determined that due to the nature and location of the proposed project, negative effects to state-listed species are not anticipated. No additional survey work was completed to gather data for this project.

12. **Physical impacts on water resources.** Will the project involve the physical or hydrologic alteration — dredging, filling, stream diversion, outfall structure, diking, and impoundment — of any surface waters such as a lake, pond, wetland, stream or drainage ditch?  Yes  No

If yes, identify water resource affected and give the DNR Public 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  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.

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?  Yes  No

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

The project area is located within the delineated 100-year Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain. No soil removal is proposed for this project. Removal of the four brooder sheds would provide slightly more floodplain capacity.

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

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

16. **Erosion and sedimentation.** Give the acreage to be graded or excavated and the cubic yards of soil to be moved:

acres 0 ; cubic yards 0 . 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.

No soil is proposed to be moved other than negligible movement from equipment tires. The project is located in upland area and no erosion and sedimentation control measures are proposed. No impact is

expected.

**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.

No change in the quantity and quality of site runoff is expected. The impervious surface acreage will remain the same and no soil movement is proposed.

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

The DNR Watershed Assessment Tool and Geographic Information System data layers were reviewed for this project area. Public Water Inventory Maps were also reviewed. Public Water 2-511P, known as Avery Pond, is located approximately 220 feet from the project area. Site runoff would generally flow in the north to northeast direction within the minor watershed named South Branch Sunrise River. The major watershed for this area is the St. Croix River – Stillwater Watershed. No impacts due to runoff are anticipated for this project.

**18. Water quality: wastewaters**

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

No wastewater is produced by these buildings. The buildings are small, with no water or sewer connections.

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

Not applicable.

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

Construction personnel will use existing facilities located at nearby DNR offices.

**19. Geologic hazards and soil conditions**

- a. Approximate depth (in feet) to ground water: approximately 4 feet minimum; approximately 5 feet average;  
to bedrock: approximately 300 feet minimum; approximately 400 feet average.  
Describe any of the following geologic site hazards to ground water and also identify them on the site map: sinkholes, shallow limestone formations or karst conditions. Describe measures to avoid or minimize environmental problems due to any of these hazards.

There are no known geologic site hazards.

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

The project is located in the Anoka Sand Plain. The project area is located in upland, sandy soils. Proposed activities may include the presence of a small generator, demolition equipment, and vehicles such as cars or



trucks. A small risk exists of groundwater contamination due to equipment or vehicle leaks. Mitigation for possible spills includes refueling all vehicles offsite.

**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.

Solid waste resulting from demolition will be disposed of in 30-yard dumpsters. All metal will be placed in dumpsters to be recycled. Approximately two recycled material dumpsters will be needed. All non-metal waste will be placed in dumpsters and hauled to a construction debris landfill. Approximately three dumpsters will be needed for non-recycled waste.

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.

Lead paint is currently on the four buildings to be disposed of. Prior to demolition, the exterior painted surfaces will be stabilized using a non hardening paint stabilizer. Demolition materials will be disposed of in dumpsters and sent to a demolition landfill or recycled as appropriate.

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.

Not applicable.

**21. Traffic.** Parking spaces added:

Existing spaces (if project involves expansion): NA

Estimated total average daily traffic generated: Approximately one to three additional vehicles will be present during repair and demolition activities. Currently, enough parking spaces are present in nearby parking lot to hold these vehicles and the normal parking volume. Contractors and employees may also park along a road adjacent to the project area that is closed to the public.

Estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated and time of occurrence:

Additional vehicles would be present during daylight hours, likely from approximately 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM with possible occasional work in the early evening. Vehicles would be present for approximately three weeks.

Indicate source of trip generation rates used in the estimates.

*If the peak hour traffic generated exceeds 250 vehicles or the total daily trips exceeds 2,500, a traffic impact study must be prepared as part of the EAW. Using the format and procedures described in the Minnesota Department of Transportation's Traffic Impact Study Guidance (available at: <http://www.oim.dot.state.mn.us/access/pdfs/Chapter%205.pdf>) or a similar local guidance, provide an estimate of the impact on traffic congestion on affected roads and describe any traffic improvements necessary. The analysis must discuss the project's impact on the regional transportation system.*

Not applicable.

**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.

No significant impacts are anticipated from the relatively minor vehicle use at the project area (see Item 21). Impacts would be minor and temporary.

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.

Contractors may use a small generator during project activities. Impacts would be minor and temporary.

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

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

Building repair and demolition activities would temporarily cause noise during daylight hours from approximately 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM for a total of approximately three weeks. This may temporarily affect the experience of visitors to the Carlos Avery WMA or nearby Wildlife Science Center, a wildlife research and educational facility located within the WMA. Building repair noises such as hammering, and demolition noises such backhoe use, may temporarily affect nearby wildlife in the Carlos Avery WMA or in captivity at the Wildlife Science Center. No mitigation is proposed because affects are expected to be minor and temporary. No substantial odors or dust are expected from project activities.

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

Archaeological, historical or architectural resources?  Yes  No

Prime or unique farmlands or land within an agricultural preserve?  Yes  No

Designated parks, recreation areas or trails?  Yes  No

Scenic views and vistas?  Yes  No

Other unique resources?  Yes  No

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

The structures proposed to be restored and removed, have been identified as elements contributing to the NRHS – listed Carlos Avery Game Farm. The DNR Division of Fish and Wildlife Cultural Resources Program submitted a cultural resource assessment, titled “Brooder Shed Removal at the Carlos Avery Game Farm” to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) regarding the historic value of the buildings and proposing mitigation for removal of brooder sheds. The assessment explains that the Game Farm complex, which currently houses the Carlos Avery WMA headquarters, was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1991. The structures were once used for the propagation and “hardening” of game birds destined for the replenishment of dwindling populations throughout the state. The DNR no longer raises game birds for introduction to the wild. When placed in operation in the 1937, the Carlos Avery Game Farm was one of the largest, most modern, and best equipped game farms in the nation (Anderson 1990). Originally focused on the propagation of quail, the Carlos Avery installation has been involved in rearing and re-introducing Chukar partridges, ring-necked pheasants, Canada geese, and trumpeter swans. By the early 1980s, however, efforts to maintain game bird populations had begun to focus on habitat preservation rather than captive breeding and re-introduction, and the game bird propagation program was discontinued.

The DNR cultural resource assessment concluded the following:



The undertaking has little potential to encounter significant intact archaeological deposits;

The undertaking would adversely affect the NRHP-listed Carlos Avery Game Farm;

There are no viable alternative uses for the brooder sheds.

The retention and stabilization of a single brooder shed would be the most appropriate strategy for mitigating the adverse effects to the NRHP property.

The SHPO responded to the assessment submitted by the DNR, agreeing that retaining one brooder shed in place as an example of the property type would be the most effective and practical mitigation approach. The SHPO agreed with stabilization and repair plans included in the cultural resource assessment and stated that building repair and stabilization should be completed in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards of Rehabilitation.

The SHPO requested that all five brooder sheds be recorded prior to demolition, using the Minnesota Historic Property Record Level II Guidelines. A sign identifying the repaired building as a brooder shed, noting date of construction and indicating that it was constructed with Works Progress Administration funding was also requested. The brooder sheds have been documented to the level suggested by the SHPO. The recommended signage will also be included in the scope of work for the repair project.

The project is located within the Carlos Avery WMA, which is a designated recreational area. Designation as a WMA is compatible with recreational uses including hunting, trapping, observation, interpretation, and understanding wildlife populations and habitats. Visitors may be temporarily affected by construction noise. Effects will be minor and temporary. Therefore, no mitigation or minimization measures are proposed.

The Wildlife Science Center is a unique resource in the vicinity of the project. The Wildlife Science Center is a wildlife research facility and educational center located adjacent to the Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Headquarters. The facility houses wildlife including wolves, foxes, lynx, and raptors. Visitors to the facility may be temporarily affected by construction noise. Captive wildlife at the facility may also be temporarily affected by construction noise. Effects will be minor and temporary in nature. Therefore, no mitigation or minimization measures are proposed.

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

27. **Compatibility with plans and land use regulations.** Is the project subject to an adopted local comprehensive plan, land use plan or regulation, or other applicable land use, water, or resource management plan of a local, regional, state or federal agency?  Yes  No.  
If yes, describe the plan, discuss its compatibility with the project and explain how any conflicts will be resolved. If no, explain.

The project is subject to the Carlos Avery Wildlife Management Area Master Plan (Plan). The Plan, published in 1977, describes the primary goal of the management area as preservation, development, and management of wetland habitat for the production of waterfowl. The plan also describes the history of the WMA, including the bird propagation program. Though the Carlos Avery WMA Headquarters site was not listed on the NRHP at the time the Plan was written, the Plan does emphasize the importance of historical knowledge to natural resource management. Retaining one brooder shed to encourage understanding of historic natural resource management practices corresponds well with the goals described in the Carlos Avery WMA Master Plan.

The project is also within the NRHP-listed Carlos Avery Game Farm Complex Historic District. See Item

25 for a description of the assessment completed by the DNR, coordination with the SHPO and mitigation for effects to the Historic District.

28. **Impact on infrastructure and public services.** Will new or expanded utilities, roads, other infrastructure or public services be required to serve the project?  Yes  No.

If yes, describe the new or additional infrastructure or services needed. (Note: any infrastructure that is a connected action with respect to the project must be assessed in the EAW; see *EAW Guidelines* for details.)

29. **Cumulative potential effects.** 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 potential effects. (Such future projects would be those that are actually planned or for which a basis of expectation has been laid.)

Describe the nature of the cumulative potential effects and summarize any other available information relevant to determining whether there is potential for significant environmental effects due to these cumulative effects (*or discuss each cumulative potential effect under appropriate item(s) elsewhere on this form*).

Contact was made with the Carlos Avery WMA area manager. No other impacts are proposed to the geographic area identified as the NRHP-listed Carlos Avery Game Farm Complex Historic District that would contribute to the historic effect from this project, resulting in cumulative potential effects.

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 other environmental impacts are expected.

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.

Buildings in the project area should be assessed for nesting migratory birds as discussed in Item 11. There are no other additional issues or effects identified in the EAW that may require further investigation before project construction can occur. No additional mitigation measures, other than those described in the EAW, are being considered or anticipated.

**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  Date 6/8/12  
Title 

**Environmental Assessment Worksheet** was prepared by the staff of the Environmental Quality Board at the Minnesota Department of Administration, Office of Geographic and Demographic Analysis. For additional information, worksheets or for *EAW Guidelines*, contact: Environmental Quality Board, 658 Cedar St., St. Paul, MN 55155, 651-201-2492, or <http://www.eqb.state.mn.us>