

Attachment A

From: [Frantz, Kate \(DNR\)](#)
To: [Warzecha, Cynthia \(DNR\)](#)
Subject: FW: Lock and Dam 1 Scour repair
Date: Tuesday, July 21, 2015 11:20:53 AM

From: Scheffing, Karen (DOT)
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2015 1:33 PM
To: Frantz, Kate (DNR)
Cc: steven.j.clark@usace.army.mil; Andrusko, Andrew (DOT); Sherman, Tod (DOT); Corbett, Michael J (DOT)
Subject: Lock and Dam 1 Scour repair

Dear Ms. Frantz

MnDOT has reviewed the EAW for the Lock and Dame Scour repair project and has no comments at this time. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thanks
Karen

Karen Scheffing
Principal Planner
Minnesota Department of Transportation
1500 W County Road B2
Roseville MN 55113
651-234-7784

From: [David J Jaeger](#)
To: [*Review, Environmental \(DNR\)](#)
Subject: Lock and Dam 1, Scour Repair Project
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 1:54:22 PM

With this message, Hennepin County indicates that we have no comments to submit regarding the EAW for the above noted project. The county appreciates the chance to review this document and hopes the project goes smoothly.

Best regards, Dave.

David Jaeger

Planning, Policy and Land Management | Hennepin County Public Works
701 Fourth Ave. South, Suite 700, MC L606 | Minneapolis, MN | 55415-1842
direct: 612-348-5714 | cell: 763-478-7319
david.jaeger@hennepin.us

Disclaimer: Information in this message or an attachment may be government data and thereby subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minnesota Statutes, Chapter 13, may be subject to attorney-client or work product privilege, may be confidential, privileged, proprietary, or otherwise protected, and the unauthorized review, copying, retransmission, or other use or disclosure of the information is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, please immediately notify the sender of the transmission error and then promptly delete this message from your computer system.

From: [Konrad Schmidt](#)
To: [*Review, Environmental \(DNR\)](#)
Subject: Lock and Dam 1
Date: Monday, July 20, 2015 9:27:22 AM
Attachments: [US LD1.docx](#)

I'm a retired Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Non-game Fish Biologist and have conducted many surveys in the tailwaters of the US Lock and Dam 1 including the proposed scour repair area. The approximate one mile reach downstream of the lock and dam holds the greatest species diversity of the entire navigation pool including many fish species listed as Threatened (TH), Special Concern (SC), and Species in the Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN). Please see the attached species list. The EAW makes many assumptions the repairs will cause minimal impacts on aquatic resources. This may be true, but before construction begins the scour pool and reach downstream to the tail of the island should be surveyed for fish, mussels, and mudpuppies. Fish and mudpuppy surveys can be completed in less than one week and I offer my expertise in a volunteer capacity to assist with these efforts. Mike Davis and Bernard Sietman (MDNR Mussel Biologists) could provide an estimate of time required to complete a mussel survey.

I urge we at least consider to definitively determine the aquatic resources at risk. Furthermore, the data will be invaluable for long term monitoring of this extremely diverse reach.

Sincerely,

Konrad Schmidt
1663 Iowa Ave
St. Paul, MN 55106
651-776-3468
ssminnow@usfamily.net

Visit my fish photo gallery: <http://gallery.nanfa.org/v/members/ssminnow/>

Mississippi River Fish Survey Data downstream of US Lock&Dam 1 (River Miles 846-847)

Species List and Number of Records

<i>Ameiurus melas</i>	1	<i>Notropis atherinoides</i>	37
<i>Amia calva</i>	6	<i>Notropis blennius</i>	3
<i>Anguilla rostrata (SC)</i>	4	<i>Notropis hudsonius</i>	2
<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>	17	<i>Notropis stramineus</i>	7
<i>Carpiodes carpio</i>	16	<i>Notropis texanus</i>	1
<i>Carpiodes cyprinus</i>	33	<i>Notropis volucellus</i>	8
<i>Carpiodes velifer</i>	10	<i>Notropis wickliffi</i>	11
<i>Catostomus commersonii</i>	9	<i>Noturus flavus</i>	2
<i>Cycleptus elongatus (SC)</i>	19	<i>Perca flavescens</i>	2
<i>Cyprinella spiloptera</i>	22	<i>Percina caprodes</i>	26
<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	26	<i>Percina maculata</i>	10
<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>	12	<i>Percina phoxocephala</i>	13
<i>Esox lucius</i>	15	<i>Percina shumardi</i>	15
<i>Esox masquinongy</i>	3	<i>Percopsis omiscomaycus</i>	3
<i>Etheostoma exile</i>	1	<i>Pimephales notatus</i>	5
<i>Etheostoma nigrum</i>	9	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>	6
<i>Hiodon alosoides</i>	4	<i>Pimephales vigilax</i>	7
<i>Hiodon tergisus</i>	11	<i>Polyodon spathula (TH)</i>	4
<i>Hypentelium nigricans</i>	3	<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>	3
<i>Ichthyomyzon unicuspis</i>	1	<i>Pomoxis nigromaculatus</i>	9
<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>	13	<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i>	1
<i>Ictiobus bubalus</i>	24	<i>Sander canadensis</i>	12
<i>Ictiobus cyprinellus</i>	13	<i>Sander vitreus</i>	20
<i>Ictiobus niger (TH)</i>	1	<i>Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus (SGCN)</i>	1
<i>Labidesthes sicculus</i>	1	<i>Semotilus atromaculatus</i>	1
<i>Lepisosteus osseus</i>	1		
<i>Lepisosteus platostomus</i>	5		
<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>	6		
<i>Lepomis gibbosus</i>	2		
<i>Lepomis humilis</i>	1		
<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>	13		
<i>Lota lota</i>	1		
<i>Luxilus cornutus</i>	3		
<i>Macrhybopsis hyostoma (SGCN)</i>	5		
<i>Macrhybopsis storeriana</i>	3		
<i>Micropterus dolomieu</i>	28		
<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	8		
<i>Morone chrysops</i>	16		
<i>Moxostoma anisurum</i>	19		
<i>Moxostoma carinatum (SGCN)</i>	11		
<i>Moxostoma erythrurum</i>	20		
<i>Moxostoma macrolepidotum</i>	32		
<i>Moxostoma valenciennesi (SGCN)</i>	9		



Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

520 Lafayette Road North | St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194 | 651-296-6300

800-657-3864 | 651-282-5332 TTY | www.pca.state.mn.us | Equal Opportunity Employer

July 22, 2015

Ms. Kate Frantz, Planning Director
Environmental Review Unit
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road, Box 25
St. Paul, MN 55155

Re: Lock and Dam 1 Scour Repair Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Dear Ms. Frantz:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the Lock and Dam 1 Scour Repair project (Project) located in Hennepin and Ramsey counties, Minnesota. Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff has reviewed the EAW and have no comments at this time.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this Project. **Please provide the notice of decision on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement.** Please be aware that this letter does not constitute approval by the MPCA of any or all elements of the Project for the purpose of pending or future permit action(s) by the MPCA. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Project proposer to secure any required permits and to comply with any requisite permit conditions. If you have any questions concerning our review of this EAW please contact me at 651-757-2482.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kevin Kain", is positioned below the "Sincerely," text.

Kevin Kain
Planner Principal
Environmental Review Unit
Resource Management and Assistance Division

KK:bt

cc: Dan Card, MPCA, St. Paul

July 22, 2015

Kate Frantz
Planning Director, Environmental Review Unit
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road North, Box 25
St. Paul, MN 55155

RE: Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW)
Lock and Dam 1 Scour Repair Project
Cities of Minneapolis and Saint Paul, Hennepin and Ramsey Counties, Minnesota
Metropolitan Council Review No. 21431-1
Metropolitan Council Districts 8 and 14

Dear Ms. Frantz:

The Metropolitan Council received the EAW for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Lock and Dam 1 Scour Repair Project (Project) on June 22, 2015. The proposed Project would distribute approximately 14,300 cubic yards of rock in multiple lifts along the width of the dam, from immediately downstream of the dam spillway to 150 feet downstream to repair current and prevent future scouring and insure the structural integrity of the dam.

The staff review finds that the EAW is complete and accurate with respect to regional concerns and does not raise major issues of consistency with Council policies. The proposed Project is in close proximity to Minnehaha Falls Regional Park on the Minneapolis (west) side of the River, and Hidden Falls – Crosby Farm Regional Park on the Saint Paul (east) side, as acknowledged in the EAW. An EIS may be not necessary for regional purposes, but the following comments are offered for your consideration in that regard.

Item 13.c. – Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, and Sensitive Ecological Resources (rare features)
(Jim Larsen, 651-602-1159)

The EAW indicates that the northern un-vegetated portion of the large predominantly bedrock island in the middle of the River channel below the dam is proposed to be utilized as a staging area for placement of rock rip rap on the River bottom. It also states that about 4300 cubic yards of the total amount of fill planned to be distributed below the dam would be smaller than gravel-sized material, and that up to approximately 200 cubic yards of the total amount of fill material could be sand or smaller-sized particles. While this is a very small percentage of the total amount of fill material proposed to be placed within the River channel, it is a significant amount of material that could be carried a short distance by River currents during the placement process and deposited along the southeastern perimeter of the bedrock island.

The EAW states: “[T]he placement of rock may suspend some fine sediment, but effects would be minor and temporary. This resuspension of sediment would occur in a mixing zone within the area of rock placement. This mixing zone is expected to be confined to a small area within and just below the fill area, *not to extend below the downstream end of the island* (emphasis added). This impact would be temporary and only during construction which is expected to take three to four weeks.” According to EAW Figure 2, the eastern perimeter along the entire southern half of the island constitutes a “wildlife exclusion area” where Higgins’ eye and other state-protected mussels have been placed in a long-term effort to re-establish a self-sustaining population in Upper Pool 2. Council staff is very

concerned that the re-suspended sediment would be expected to be transported and redeposited by River currents, along a pathway on the west side of the River channel along the east-facing side of the island – directly over the wildlife exclusion area. Three to four weeks of resuspension of existing fine sediment below the dam in addition to potentially 200 cubic yards of new fine sediment could lead to complete burial of protected mussels in the identified wildlife exclusion area – an unacceptable situation.

Council staff suggests that two modifications be considered for the planned Project. At present, the use of a silt curtain is not proposed “because it is generally ineffective to place them across the current and the amount of suspended sediment from the project is expected to be minimal.” First, we propose that a silt curtain be required for placement *parallel* to River flow – tying it into the island shore at approximately mid-island and upstream of the wildlife exclusion area, extending into the River and along the outside of the perimeter of the wildlife exclusion area to a termination point in the River below where sediment will impact the mussel beds. This action should minimize the direct deposition of any increase in sediment load as a result of the Project. Second we recommend that consideration be given to facilitation of elimination of flow over the dam into the ‘work area’ below the dam for the duration of the Project to minimize the resuspension of sediment while rip rap is being transported and until the larger aggregate is fully placed. Lowering Pool 1 by diversion of the majority of River flow through the Ford hydropower facility and/or Lock and Dam 1 facilities could possibly facilitate this condition. Directing the majority of River flows along the eastern and western River banks would minimize sediment impacts along the southeast perimeter of the island from River flow originating from flow over the dam.

This concludes the Council’s review of the EAW. The Council will not take formal action on the EAW. If you have any questions or need further information, please contact Jim Larsen PE, Principal Reviewer, at 651-602-1159.

Sincerely,



LisaBeth Barajas, Manager
Local Planning Assistance

CC: Steve O’Brien, MHFA
Tod Sherman, Development Reviews Coordinator, MnDOT - Metro Division
Cara Letofsky, Metropolitan Council District 8
John Commers, Metropolitan Council District 14
Patrick Boylan, Sector Representative
Michael Larson, Sector Representative
Raya Esmacili, Reviews Coordinator