

Attachment A

Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island Project EAW

Comments Received- Public Comment Period

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: amy anderson <anderson.amy1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 7:33 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

We would support this as avid river boaters.
Thank you

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Randy Birk <birkr@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2020 4:56 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: EAW Pool 2 Where exactly on Pool 2 ?

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

So where exactly do they want to put this island on pool2 ? Also will this affect hunting on pool 2 for waterfowl ? How will this affect the fishing on pool 2 ? Will this Island be public hunting grounds for deer ? Or hunting for waterfowl ? If this is going to affect waterfowl hunting on pool 2 I think that needs to be let known to the public , since there are many people who enjoy pool 2 for waterfowl hunting .

Sent from my iPhone

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Christine Costello <CCostello@cottagegrovemn.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 12:09 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Cc: Ryan Burfeind; Ben Boike; Jennifer Levitt
Subject: Protective Island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Ms. Metzker,

The City of Cottage Grove has reviewed the EAW for Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island Project. The City has no specific comments overall it appears that effects to environmental constraints will either be temporary, or in some cases, beneficial. Only a few temporary minor adverse effects were noted but we do not see any concerns with the biological effects identified in the EA. Additionally, in terms of impacting water and groundwater quality, the project doesn't propose to appropriate any groundwater, nor does there appear to be any potential threats to nearby wells. The most significant concerns deal with surface water quality, with a temporary potential for suspension of fine particles during project construction but it appears there are proposed measures to reduce that impact.

Thank you for our opportunity to review.

Christine Costello

Economic Development Director

City of Cottage Grove

Direct: 651-458-2824 | ccostello@cottagegrovemn.gov

General: 651-458-2800 | www.cottagegrovemn.gov

12800 Ravine Parkway South, Cottage Grove, MN 55016



Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Jonathan Deyo <deyo.jonathan@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2020 4:20 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

As a resident of Hastings I think this is a great idea for the river. I would like to see this in my city.

where is fill coming from?-q from mark frazer 11-10-20

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Tate Gahnz <tgahnz@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 17, 2020 5:27 AM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Sounds cool

October 26, 2020

Chad Konickson
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Branch Chief
180 Fifth Street East, Suite 700
St. Paul, MN 55101-1678

Jonathan Sobiech
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Deputy Chief, Regional Planning and
Environment Division North
180 Fifth Street East, Suite 700
St. Paul, MN 55101-1678

RE: Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island Project
Mississippi River, Dakota County, Minnesota
Section 401 Water Quality Certification Waiver

Dear Chad Konickson and Jonathan Sobiech:

This 401 Water Quality Certification Waiver decision (Certification Waiver) is made by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) under authority of Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, or CWA (33 USC 1251 et seq.), Minn. Stat. chs. 115 and 116 and Minn. R. chs. 7001.1400-1470, 7050, 7052, and 7053. The MPCA has examined the application and other information furnished by the applicant, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for the permanent dredge and discharge of fill material into 38 acres of the Mississippi River for the Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island project.

Decision:

The MPCA waives its Section 401 authority to certify the referenced project application. This action does not eliminate, waive, or vary the applicant's responsibility of complying with all applicable MPCA statutes and rules, including those regarding water quality standards.

Disclaimer:

A Section 401 Certification Waiver does not release or limit the applicant from obtaining all necessary federal, state, and local permits, nor does it limit more restrictive requirements set through any such program. It does not eliminate, waive, or vary the applicant's obligation to comply with all other laws and state water statutes and rules through the construction, installation, and operation of the project. This letter does not release the applicant from any liability, penalty, or duty imposed by Minnesota or federal statutes, regulations, rules, or local ordinances, and it does not convey a property right or an exclusive privilege.

This MPCA decision is made, in part, on the applicant's representations that environmental review under the Minnesota Environmental Quality Board's Rules, Minn. R. ch. 4410, is not needed for the project or, alternatively, that all necessary environmental reviews and related decisions have been completed. If environmental review for this project is needed and has not been completed, the MPCA does not have legal authority to issue a Certification Waiver. In that situation, the MPCA reserves the right to make a Section 401 Certification decision when the environmental review process is completed.

Chad Konickson
Jonathan Sobiech
Page 2
October 26, 2020

The MPCA reserves the right to revisit or revoke the Certification Waiver due to new or additional information, updated information, changes in technology, or any other changes that could render the project as incompatible with Minnesota's water quality standards. If you have any questions regarding this Certification Waiver, please contact Jim Brist at jim.brist@state.mn.us.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Anna M. Hotz". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Anna" and last name "Hotz" clearly distinguishable.

Anna Hotz
Supervisor
Agency Rules Unit
Resource Management and Assistance Division

AH/JB:ds

cc: Dave Pfeifer, EPA
Dana Rzeznik, EPA
Dawn Marsh, USFWS
Sarah Quamme, USFWS
Tom Hovey, DNR
Steve Colvin, DNR
Trevor Cyphers, USACE
Kim Laing, MPCA

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: brian huberty <bhuberty@outlook.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 17, 2020 7:26 AM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: protective island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Hi MN DNR and USACE,

Comments:

Fully understand the scope and nature of the project.

- 1) you should add the current MN DNR NWI map of the area to your list of figures.
 - 2) USACE should also be using the NWI wetland designations in their discussion. Ironically, you use the USDA NRCS soil map descriptions but not the federal standard which is NWI. This is a bit of an oversight. Additionally, since the state recently updated the NWI maps for the state, there are additional descriptions such as Eggers/Reed and the functional assessments (HGM lite) that have been added to the MN NWI. Adding these maps would provide better clarity to the impact statement. Afterall, you are going from a mono deep water habitat to a multiple wetland and deep water system which provides many benefits.
 - 3) Most importantly, visually, the upside down, angled 'V' will be viewed as man-made. It might be wise to use an upside down 'Y' design with bends in the legs of the 'Y' to visually match the landscape of the river better as seen from the aerial view. And it will provide better habitat. Keep in mind waterfowl may use this more if they feel protected with natural features vs manmade features. Keep in mind, this structure will be viewed by millions of people as they look out their airplane windows into the approach for MSP. It should be interpreted as a natural island vs an arrow pointing towards MSP. After all, some people may think the FAA put this 'pointer' in for the pilots so they do not get lost going into MSP. 😊
 - 4) You also need to add some figures/animations to show what it may look like in the future from both a bird's eye view and the water view.
 - 5) I did not see any discussion of potential ice damming on the structure give this area is prone to this kind of damage. Hence another reason why the levee is eroding.
 - 6) Since this area is in the approach paths to MSP, the discussion should also include potential bird habitat that may interfere with approaching jet liners. It should be relatively minor but the studies by the NPS with avian radar units recently just below the Hastings Lock and Dam could be included in your list of references.
- Brian Huberty

November 12, 2020

Kathy Metzker
Land Use Hydrologist
Environmental Review Unit
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, MN 55155

Re: Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island Project Environmental Assessment Worksheet

Dear Kathy Metzker:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island project (Project) located in the city of Hastings, Dakota County, Minnesota. The Project consists of construction of an offshore protective island. 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 by email at Karen.kromar@state.mn.us or by telephone at 651-757-2508.

Sincerely,

Karen Kromar

Karen Kromar
Project Manager
Environmental Review Unit
Resource Management and Assistance Division

KK:bt

cc: Dan Card, MPCA, St. Paul

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: TERRANCE LOWRIE <tlowrie1961@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 3:36 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

This plan appears to have been very thought out. Will there be any hunting allowed on the island? My feeling on this would be no. I am totally in agreement with the construction and go ahead with the project.



November 5, 2020

Kathy Metzker, Project Manager

MN DNR

500 Lafayette Road - Box 25

St. Paul, MN 55155-4025

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the Lock and Dam Pool 2 Embankment Protective Island project. County Physical Development Staff reviewed the document and offer the following comments for consideration.

Mississippi River Greenway – Minimize impacts to users

The Mississippi River Greenway is a popular recreational trail that runs on top of the levy for the dam. We request that if trail closures will be needed due to construction, that they be minimized to limit disruption to trail users. Any impacts or closures of public trails should be coordinated with Dakota County and City of Hastings.

Natural Resources and Aesthetics

- The embankment protective island project will be highly visible to trail users along the Mississippi River Greenway. Please consider using a design that will look more natural and aesthetically pleasing than the concept that was distributed, avoiding straight lines and unnatural structures to the extent possible.
- Dakota County staff would like to provide input on the species that are being considered to plant on the island and adjacent wetland, and we request a list of the species that are under consideration. If possible, we would like to see wild rice considered for this site as wild rice is found further west in Spring Lake and may be desirable at this location as well.
- In addition, to address problems with turtle predation we suggest that turtle nesting habitat be considered for the island restoration.

Thank you for considering Dakota County's comments.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Steve Mielke", written over a horizontal line.

Steven C. Mielke, Director

Physical Development Division

cc: Commissioner Mike Slavik, District 1

Matt Smith, County Manager

Physical Development Division

P 952-891-7000 F 952-891-7031 W www.dakotacounty.us

A Dakota County Western Service Center • 14955 Galaxie Ave. • Apple Valley • MN 55124

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Scott Norling <norlings@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 3:30 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective Island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

It would be nice if some of the island beach areas were accessible via recreational boats for beaching.

Thank you,
Scott

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Daniel S. Pfannenstein <DPfannenstein@coldspringusa.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 2:22 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective Island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

Good afternoon,

I am writing this response in regards to the "Protective Island" project that is to be placed upstream of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Lock & Dam Pool 2 embankment.

I work for a company that specializes in quarrying material for shoreline protection and material used for Jetty (Armor Stone) along the gulf coast.

We have various quarries around the US that allows us to provide granite or limestone for these applications.

Granite is a highly durable material that will last decades even centuries in these type of scenarios.

I would be happy to provide more information if the project team feels our material and or services would be valuable to the development of this project.

Please feel free to contact me either via e-mail or phone. My contact information is included in the e-mail signature below.

Thank you for your time.

DANIEL PFANNENSTEIN | Regional Sales Manager

Coldspring | Quarry Sales

17482 Granite West Road | Cold Spring, MN 56320-4578

T: 800-551-7502 | D: 320-685-4615 | M: 320-290-9285 | F: 320-685-8490

www.coldspringusa.com | dpfannenstein@coldspringusa.com

Follow us on [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)

This communication is intended only for the recipient(s) named above, may be confidential and/or legally privileged, and must be treated as such in accordance with state and federal laws. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use of this communication, or any of its contents, is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please return it to the sender and delete the message from your computer system.

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Patrick O. Regan <poregan14@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 3, 2020 6:37 AM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Cc: Mattingly Michael C.; Craig Neddersen; McConnell IDM Hospitality Brandon; Greg Stotko; Eric Weber
Subject: Protective Island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

As the developer of the Confluence Hotel project at 200 West 2nd Street in the former Hudson Manufacturing Plant in downtown Hastings, I am excited to see this island construction project come to fruition. As we prepare to open our Regional Destination facility in 2021, I would consider the construction of this island to be a positive amenity from a sightseeing attraction as it is being constructed over three seasons. I would also consider it a long term amenity for our guests and many other regional park users. This 35-40 acre accessible island will enhance the experience for our Canoe and Kayak enthusiast as well, giving them another landing area within the Mississippi River to explore and enjoy. We plan to have a River Outfitter with Bike, canoe and kayak rentals available located in our 100,000 square foot facility. We are building a 69 room boutique hotel, 20 apartments, and a restaurant, bar, and 350-400 seat Event Center as a Historic Preservation Redevelopment in the 115 year old factory. We will feature expansive outdoor seating, dining, Public Park and programming spaces on our 4-5 acre site. A river island amenity such as this will serve to enhance the experience and possibly extend the stays for many of our guests. We also have a direct interest in seeing the present levee protected long term by this River Island project. The bike trail which runs across this leve is one of our primary attractions for potential guests.

Good luck with this exciting project.

Best Regards,

Patrick O. Regan
Confluence Development
651-437-9421
Poregan14@hotmail.com
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: carlasain@aol.com
To: [MN Review, Environmental \(DNR\)](#)
Subject: Project Island
Date: Sunday, October 18, 2020 11:08:55 PM

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

I believe in this project. It would be a great enhancement for the community, while also using natural resources to accomplish the project. I hope it would be open to the public once it is established.

Sent from my Metro by T-Mobile 4G

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Christopher Smith <christopher.smith@fieldecology.com>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 1:24 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective island -- Smith Comments

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

To Whom It May Concern,

Below are my public comments on the EAW:

- 1) The EAW fails to acknowledge / address the discovery of Blanchard's Cricket Frogs (*Acris blanchardi*) within the project area. This state endangered species has been identified in various locations within the project area. These data have been submitted to MnDNR. Please contact Erica Hoaglund, MNDNR Nongame.
- 2) The project should be required to use wildlife-friendly erosion control materials (i.e., natural-fiber blanket, etc.). In the past the USACE has used plastic-netted blankets, which poses a significant wildlife entanglement risk and adds microplastics to the environment.
- 3) EAW fails to acknowledge / consult on the rusty-patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*). An effect determination should be made. This species frequently forages in sandy areas where spotted knapweed and other flowering weeds occur.

-Chris

--

Christopher E. Smith, M.Sc., CWB®
FieldEcology.com
@FieldEcology

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: rowellemeyer@netscape.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2020 12:57 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Comment on environmental assessment worksheet for Lock and Dam Pool 2 embankment

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

My comment: Will exposing dredged, potentially toxic materials, buried under the constantly moving river silt

be environmentally sound? Will dredge loads from various depths be tested, evaluated and mitigated?

I am writing to share my concern about potential negative environmental impact from the Lock and Dam Pool 2

embankment project.

Years ago, before environmental standards, my family cruised the Mississippi on our runabout boat.

Traveling past the Pigs Eye, the South Paul rendering plant, and the 3M Cottage Grove plant areas was not pleasant,

We viewed brown materials floating down river out from a small stream below the 3M site.

The smells from all of them were really bad.

In 1972, as part of a UW-RF micro-biology graduate class, we toured Pig Eye waste treatment plant.

I don't recall talk of heavy metal deposit removal as part of the waste cleanup process.

Given the location of two petroleum refineries, and the Rosemount metal smelter, has consideration been given

to creation of an area based on large deposits of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and heavy metals?

Sincerely,

Robert Wellemeyer
365 Summit Point Court
Hastings, MN 55033-1639

651-485-2966

Metzker, Kathleen (DNR)

From: Andrew Wester <1andrewwester@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 12, 2020 5:50 PM
To: MN_Review, Environmental (DNR)
Subject: Protective Island

This message may be from an external email source.

Do not select links or open attachments unless verified. Report all suspicious emails to Minnesota IT Services Security Operations Center.

I would love to see more waterfowl hunting opportunities on a protective island upstream from the lock and dam #2. I think this a great idea in which all users of the river will benefit.... Assuming it will be an add on of the spring lake wma!

NOVEMBER 12, 2020



To: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources

**From: Friends of Pool 2
P O Box 284
Newport, MN 55055**

**Attn: Kathy Metzker, Project Manager
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road, Box 25
St. Paul, MN 55155-4025**

CC: United States Army Corps of Engineers (trevor.w.cyphers@usace.army.mil)

Re: Comments and Questions Regarding USACE Protective Island proposal near Lock and Dam #2

Our nonprofit organization respectfully submits the following response to the MN DNR's request for public comments regarding the above referenced project.

Introduction:

Why we care. The mission of Friends of Pool 2, a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization, includes advocating for all river users on the Mississippi River. We currently represent the interests of more than 1000 recreational and commercial river users, river-related businesses, marinas, and riverfront property owners, many of whom enjoy this body of water on a daily or weekly basis. We live with the river, and care passionately about water quality and continued accessibility to this treasured natural resource. The members and supporters of Friends of Pool 2 have expressed some limited feedback to us regarding this project, which we will attempt to summarize below.

Why everyone should care. Like many public issues, this one involves money. As taxpayers, we all want our taxes spent in cost-effective ways. State and Federal funding sources are limited and need to be prioritized. We believe that Minnesota residents generally support the idea of tax money being spent on local infrastructure improvements (such as this project). However, they are also interested in getting the biggest bang for their buck. Combining multiple objectives into one project can be a win-win for the agencies and citizens.

Questions and Comments:

Friends of Pool 2, on behalf of our members and supporters, offers the following questions and comments for the DNR's consideration as you evaluate this and future projects.

Brief Summary of FOP2's Questions/Comments:

1. What are the short- and long-term effects of this project?
2. We know channel dredge material is tested for contaminants, but we wonder if the fine material excavated for access and cover material has gone through a testing regimen?
3. Who will benefit from the proposed structure?
4. Could this project be expanded to benefit multiple river user groups, including fish, wildlife, and recreational users (humans)?
5. How would this project affect the immediate area above Lock and Dam #2?
6. What impact would this project have on the recreational river user in Lower Pool 2?

7. Are there other areas in Lower Pool 2 that could benefit even more from this type of structure?
8. Every river is also a watershed system, and actions taken in one section of a river will impact the entire region. Repercussions from this project may be felt throughout the region, not only in Pool 2.
9. Pool 2 is a unique urban recreational resource that deserves to be used to its full potential.
10. There has been deterioration of historic islands above the lock that deserve attention, but this project won't really address that ongoing issue.
11. We feel that it would be important to re-establish the island chain that started at historic Buck Island and ran to the long wall at L&D #2 (see Illustration A, inserted at the end of this document). Re-establishing that area would lessen the outflow from the above dike area out to the channel which causes increased sediment transfer. Also, it would provide a waiting/recreational area for recreational boaters.
12. The island complex above the Upper Guide Wall, which has washed away, was a great spot for boaters to safely wait for downriver lock throughs and provided a nice recreational area.
13. We have also heard our supporters ask, "If the Corps can build a 37-acre island in a backwater, why can't we get habitat islands built in Spring Lake."
14. We understand that this is a fully funded federal project, and that the DNR merely has review authority. However, we feel that there are some issues and suggestions here that should be shared with the USACE, and we plan to copy them on this correspondence.
15. We don't believe the Corps has done any flow studies on flow into Spring Lake since the new barrier islands were created.
16. We would like to see Friends of Pool 2 possibly join forces with the DNR, the National Park Service and various local environmental groups to make an effort to incorporate new recreational and habitat facilities into this project, or into future projects of a similar nature.

Conclusion:

The mission of Friends of Pool 2 includes advocating for all river users on the Mississippi River. As mentioned above, we currently represent the interests of more than 1000 recreational and commercial river users, river-related businesses, marinas, and riverfront property owners, all with intimate knowledge of the river in Pool 2 and adjacent Pools. Our supporters spend much of their time in close contact with the river, and care deeply about environmental issues within the watershed, which they observe while interacting with the river on a daily or weekly basis. In the past, they have witnessed the negative impact of a few ill-advised policy decisions on the conditions along this mighty river. We are offering our assistance to help avoid future missteps.

We would be delighted to share our thoughts on these issues and others in a future dialogue or forum, or any time it is convenient. We have attempted to summarize in this document just a few of the questions and concerns we've heard from the members and supporters of Friends of Pool 2.

For more information about our nonprofit organization, please feel free to visit our website at www.FriendsofPool2.org. You may also contact us via our Facebook page, or directly through our email address, which is: info@FriendsofPool2.org

This document was created by the Protective Island Subcommittee for Friends of Pool 2.

Illustration A: The photo shown below documents the historic chain of islands that were once located in Lower Pool 2 just above Lock and Dam #2. They are no longer visible in the Pool. Perhaps they could be restored? This concept could impact multiple issues involving excess sediment, wind fetch, recreation, and wildlife habitat.



November 6, 2020

Kathy Metzker, EAW Project Manager
Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
500 Lafayette Road, Box 25
St. Paul, MN 55155

RE: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources - Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) – Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island Project
Metropolitan Council Review No. 22498-1
Metropolitan Council District No. 16

Dear Ms. Metzker:

The Metropolitan Council received the EAW for the Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island project in the City of Hastings and Nininger Township on October 12, 2020. The proposed project is located in the Mississippi River near the border between the City of Hastings and Nininger Township. The proposed development consists of approximately 38.8 acres to construct an offshore protective island to protect the Lock and Dam 2 embankment from erosion.

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. An EIS is not necessary for regional purposes.

We offer the following comments for your consideration.

Item 9.a.i. – Land Use (Colin Kelly, 651-602-1361) This item of the EAW acknowledges the Mississippi River Greenway Regional Trail, an existing component of the Regional Park System with a Metropolitan Council-adopted regional trail master plan, that is just downstream of the proposed project. The regional trail is managed by Dakota County, the regional park implementing agency that covers the City of Hastings, Nininger Township and all of Dakota County.

While Item 9.a.i. references some state, regional, and local parks and trails that are in or adjacent to the Mississippi River in the vicinity, the EAW should also acknowledge Grey Cloud Island Regional Park, a planned component of the Regional Park System with a Metropolitan Council-adopted regional park master plan.

Grey Cloud Island Regional Park is managed by Washington County, the regional park implementing agency for Cottage Grove and all of Washington County. Though the regional park is not yet open to the public, portions of the planned regional park have been acquired by Washington County. The planned regional park is located just south of Grey Cloud Dunes Scientific and Natural Area and just north of Spring Lake Islands Wildlife Management Area.

The construction staging area has the potential to temporarily impact the Mississippi River Greenway Regional Trail managed by Dakota County. Item 15 notes that “the construction

process could take multiple construction seasons...” The contractor awarded the project should coordinate its work with Dakota County so that any needed trail detours or other temporary measures can be clearly communicated and signed to the public before and during construction activities

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 Cameran J. Bailey, Principal Reviewer, at 651-602-1212.

Sincerely,



Angela R. Torres, AICP, Manager
Local Planning Assistance

CC: Tod Sherman, Development Reviews Coordinator, MnDOT - Metro Division
Wendy Wulff, Metropolitan Council District 16
Patrick Boylan, Sector Representative
Cameran J. Bailey, Principal Reviewer
Reviews Coordinator

N:\CommDev\LPA\Agencies\DNR\Letters\DNR2020 Lock and Dam 2 Protective Island Project EAW 22498-1.docx