



ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET (EAW)

MANKATO MOTORSPORTS PARK

City of Eagle Lake, MN

Proposed development of a 3-mile high performance driving track and associated infrastructure including car condos, track clubhouse, entertainment center, and hotel.

February 2020

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

Table of Contents

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Project Title..... | 1 |
| 2 | Proposer | 1 |
| 3 | RGU | 1 |
| 4 | Reason for EAW Preparation | 1 |
| 5 | Project Location..... | 1 |
| 6 | Project Description | 2 |
| 7 | Cover Types | 5 |
| 8 | Permits & Approvals Required | 6 |
| 9 | Land Use | 7 |
| 10 | Geology, Soils, & Topography/Land Forms | 9 |
| 11 | Water Resources..... | 12 |
| 12 | Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes..... | 18 |
| 13 | Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, & Sensitive Ecological Resources (Rare Features) | 20 |
| 14 | Historic Properties | 22 |
| 15 | Visual..... | 23 |
| 16 | Air..... | 24 |
| 17 | Noise | 25 |
| 18 | Transportation..... | 28 |
| 19 | Cumulative Potential Effects | 30 |
| 20 | Other Potential Environmental Effects | 32 |
| | RGU CERTIFICATION..... | 32 |

Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Mankato Motorsports Park Structures | 3 |
| Table 1: Project Magnitude..... | 4 |
| Table 2: Cover Types (acres) | 5 |
| Table 3. Required Permits & Approvals..... | 6 |
| Table 4: NRCS Soil Classifications of Study Area..... | 9 |
| Table 5: Delineated Wetlands Within Study Area | 16 |
| Table 6. MPCA State Noise Standards* | 25 |
| Table 7: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels at 50 Feet..... | 28 |

Table 8: AADT 29

Appendices

Appendix A: Figures

Appendix B: Wetland Delineation Report

Appendix C: Environmental Review Correspondence

Appendix D: Noise Analysis Report

Appendix E: Traffic Study

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|-----------|--|
| AADT | Annual Average Daily Traffic |
| BMP | Best Management Practices |
| Co Hwy | County Highway |
| CR | County Road |
| CSAH | County State Aid Highway |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| DLI | Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry |
| DNR | Department of Natural Resources |
| BWSR | Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources |
| EAW | Environmental Assessment Worksheet |
| LGU | Local Government Unit |
| MDH | Minnesota Department of Health |
| MGS | Minnesota Geologic Survey |
| MN | State of Minnesota |
| MnDNR | Minnesota Department of Natural Resources |
| MnDOT | Minnesota Department of Transportation |
| MPCA | Minnesota Pollution Control Agency |
| MPCA WIMN | Minnesota Pollution Control Agencies What's in My Neighborhood website |
| NHIS | Natural Heritage Information System |
| NPDES | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System |
| NRCS | National Resource Conservation Service |
| NRHP | National Register of Historic Places |
| OHWL | Ordinary High Water Level |
| PWI | Public Waters Inventory |
| RGU | Responsible Governmental Unit |
| R/W | Right-of-Way |
| SHPO | State Historic Preservation Office |
| SWPPP | Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan |
| TH | Trunk Highway |
| TMDL | Total Maximum Daily Load |
| USACE | United States Army Corps of Engineers |
| USDA | United States Department of Agriculture |

WCA

Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act

1 Project Title

Mankato Motorsports Park

2 Proposer

Organization: Bradford Development
Contact person: Brad Bass
Title: President
Address: 501 N Riverfront Dr
City, State, ZIP: Mankato, MN 56001
Phone: 507-388-0644
Email: autumn@hickorytech.net

3 RGU

Organization: City of Eagle Lake, MN
Contact person: Jennifer Bromeland
Title: City Administrator
Address: 705 Parkway Avenue, PO Box 159
City, State, ZIP: Eagle Lake, MN 56024
Phone: 507-257-3218
Email: jbromeland@eaglelakemn.com

4 Reason for EAW Preparation

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>Required:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> EIS Scoping</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory EAW MS 4410-4300, Subpart 36 (Land Use Conversion)</p> | <p>Discretionary:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Citizen petition</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RGU discretion</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Proposer initiated</p> |
|---|---|

5 Project Location

County Blue Earth
City/Township Eagle Lake

| PLS Location (¼, ¼, Section, Township, Range): | Section | Township | Range |
|--|---------|----------|-------|
| NE ¼, SW ¼ | 7 | 108N | 25W |
| S ½, NE ¼ | 7 | 108N | 25W |
| E ½, SE ¼ | 7 | 108N | 25W |
| N ½, SE ¼ | 7 | 108N | 25W |
| SE ¼, NW ¼ | 7 | 108N | 25W |

| | |
|--|---|
| Watershed (82 major watershed scale): | Le Sueur River (32) Using NAD 83, UTM Zones 15T and 15U (Easting, Northing) in meters: Northeast corner 430556.459, 4891956.933 Southeast corner 430543.066, 4890779.848 |
| GPS Coordinates: | (Furthest west) Southwest corner 429560.922, 4891129.551 (Furthest north) Northwest corner 429907.648, 4891964.374 |
| Tax Parcel Number: | R121007326003, R391007200003, R391007400006, R391007400010 |

6 Project Description

a. EQB Monitor Description

Provide the brief project summary to be published in the EQB Monitor, (approximately 50 words).

The proposed Mankato Motorsports Park will convert approximately 230 acres of agricultural land to a 3-mile track for high-performance vehicles. The Mankato Motorsports Park will construct a bituminous track with concrete edging, run-off areas, sound walls, and berms. Other construction includes car condos, hotel, entertainment center, a track clubhouse, and associated bituminous parking lots.

b. Complete Description

Give a complete description of the proposed project and related new construction, including infrastructure needs. If the project is an expansion include a description of the existing facility. Emphasize: 1) construction, operation methods and features that will cause physical manipulation of the environment or will produce wastes, 2) modifications to existing equipment or industrial processes, 3) significant demolition, removal or remodeling of existing structures, and 4) timing and duration of construction activities.

Project Description (Including Context/Need)

The project will construct the Mankato Motorsports Park in the City of Eagle Lake. The location is north of Highway 14 and east of Eagle Lake South (**Figures 1 and 2, Appendix A**). The parcel to be developed is 230 acres in size (**Figures 3 and 4A**). Park amenities and specific information are discussed below.

Track Description

The driving track will be approximately 3 miles in length. The track will be available for public participation for driving events, including performance driving schools, teen driving school, and exotic car rentals. The driving track is not a racetrack. The track is intended for individuals to drive at their desired pace in order to experience the optimal performance of their automobiles on a safe and professionally designed driving course.

The park will be open seasonally from April through October (weather dependent), Sunday through Saturday. Operations will occur during daylight hours and most events will end by 5pm. The track will not be used at night and the track will not be lit.

Park Amenities/Components

Along with the track, a track clubhouse, a hotel, an entertainment center, and multi-unit car condos are to be constructed. All building elements are in the southern portion of the study area, with associated

parking lots. The car condos will be multi-unit residential buildings containing eight individual units. Car condos include a garage unit and seasonal living areas. The car condos are located south of the clubhouse, and west of the hotel and entertainment center (19,200 square feet total). The entertainment center will be a golf entertainment complex with a restaurant. All structures, other than car condos, have associated parking lots (**Figures 4A and 4B, Appendix A**).

Table 1. Mankato Motorsports Park Structures

| Name | Description | Square Footage and/or Building Dimensions |
|----------------------|--|---|
| Car Condos | 48 individual units (multi-unit residential buildings) in Phase I; total build-out of 96 units. | 1,000 to 2,000 per unit |
| Clubhouse | For track member and guest use during driving events and for leisure following events. Spaces for classrooms, spectator locations, sports shop, food services, and suites. | 140' x 70' |
| Hotel | 70-unit hotel. | 19,200 combined |
| Entertainment Center | Golf entertainment complex with restaurant. | |
| Totals | | 189,700 |

Site Access

Access to the site will be facilitated from a connection to 216th Street/CSAH 27. The complex entrance will require the construction of an entrance road, continuing along 216th Street which currently extends for approximately 580 feet west from the intersection with CSAH 27/CR 17 (**Figures 3 and 4A, Appendix A**).

Construction Methods

There are no unusual aspects of the site or the project design which would require unique or unproven construction methods. Therefore, construction activities and associated potential for impacts are anticipated to be typical for this type of project. Construction activities will include construction of the elements described above. Heavy equipment on site during construction activities will include dozers, backhoes, front loaders, pavers, scrapers, dump trucks, and other earth moving equipment. Trucks will utilize the adjacent state and county highways to access the site. All vehicles exiting the site must adhere to NPDES permitting that restricts ‘trackout’ of any soil.

Relative to soils and topography, soils which are unusable will be reused where possible. Soils will also be cut to accommodate construction of stormwater detention ponds. Excavation for stormwater detention ponds will occur early in the project to potentially provide fill material and to address drainage runoff during construction. Construction may require some removal of trees and other vegetation. Efforts to minimize impacts will be made during the design and construction phases.

All necessary permitting will be obtained prior to the start of construction. Construction BMPs will be followed regarding noise, erosion and dust control, and other potential temporary impacts. See **Items 16c and 17** for a complete discussion.

Modification to Existing Equipment

Not applicable.

Demolition, Removal or Remodeling of Existing Structures

Existing structures will not be demolished. A single residence and detached garage are located within the parcel to be developed and will be maintained for use by facility and track staff. The existing driveway will be relocated and will not cross the driving track. No other existing structures occur on the project site.

Timing and Duration of Construction Activities

Total duration of the majority of the project components will be one construction season, including the track, noise abatement features, clubhouse, car condos, and associated parking areas. The hotel and golf entertainment center will be constructed when a developer purchases or leases the property. Construction will begin in areas where no wetland resources will be impacted. Any areas impacting wetlands will begin once permits have been granted.

Construction is anticipated to begin in fall of 2020 and be complete in summer 2021.

c. Project Magnitude

Table 1: Project Magnitude

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Project Acreage | 230 acres |
| Linear project length | N/A |
| Number and type of residential units | 96 - 105 units (car condos); 70 units (hotel) |
| Commercial building area (in square feet) | 29,000 sf (clubhouse and entertainment) |
| Industrial building area (in square feet) | N/A |
| Institutional building area (in square feet) | N/A |
| Other uses – specify (in square feet) | N/A |
| Structure height(s) | 2-3 stories |

d. Project Purpose

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 provide owners of high-performance cars and sports cars the opportunity to drive their cars on an enclosed track. The Mankato Motorsports Park will offer performance driving programs, commonly known as a high-performance driving experience, or high-performance driving school. The track can also accommodate charity or private events, and police and

emergency services training. The clubhouse will provide classroom training space. The project is not being carried out by a government unit.

e. Future Development

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.

f. Previous Development

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 Cover Types

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

Project construction and/or disturbance limits were used to define the study area footprint in **Table 2**, below. The existing conditions are depicted in **Figure 3, Appendix A. Figures 4A and 4B, Appendix A**, illustrate impervious surface onsite.

Table 2: Cover Types (acres)

| | Before | After | | Before | After |
|--------------------|--------|-------|--|------------|------------|
| Wetlands | 11.9 | 7.2 | Impervious surface* | 0 | 10.8 |
| Deep water/streams | 0 | 0 | Stormwater Pond | 0 | 3.0 |
| Wooded/forest | 20.8 | 20.8 | Single family residence/lot | 9.2 | 9.2 |
| Brush/Grassland | 0 | 0 | Track** | 0 | 22 |
| Cropland | 188.1 | 0 | Car condos, clubhouse, hotel & entertainment center*** | 0 | 4.4 |
| Lawn/landscaping | 0 | 152.6 | | | |
| | | | TOTAL | 230 | 230 |

*Impervious surface calculations include all pavement elements associated with project construction *not* including the track (access road, car condo, clubhouse, hotel pavement areas).

** Track calculations include the track pavement, paved runoff areas, and circuit.

***Calculation includes only building areas for these elements.

The total impervious surface created by the project is 37.2 acres including pavement and buildings.

8 Permits & Approvals Required

List all known local, state and federal permits, approvals, certifications 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.

Permits and Approvals

All known permits at state, federal, and local levels necessitated by the project are listed in **Table 3**, below.

Table 3. Required Permits & Approvals

| Government Agency | Type and/or Name of Document | Status |
|---|---|-----------------|
| MN Department of Natural Resources | Natural Heritage Information System Review for Rare Features | Complete |
| MN Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Storm Water Permit | To be submitted |
| MN Department of Labor and Industry (DLI) | Building Service and Storm Drainage System Review | To be submitted |
| United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) | Section 404 Wetlands Permit | To be submitted |
| | Section 401 Certification | To be submitted |
| State Historic Preservation Office | NRHP Section 106 Coordination via USACE | To be submitted |
| Blue Earth County | Well Sealing Notification | To be submitted |
| City of Eagle Lake (LGU) | Utility Connection Permit | To be submitted |
| | Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) Notification | To be submitted |
| | Grading Permit | To be submitted |
| | Building Permit | To be submitted |

9 Land Use

a. Existing Land Use

Description

Existing land use of the site as well as areas adjacent to and near the site, including parks, trails, prime or unique farmlands.

The parcel for the proposed Mankato Motorsports Park is currently in agricultural use (see **Figure 3, Appendix A**). According to the NRCS USDA Web Soil Survey mapping application, the study area is mostly Prime Farmland or Prime Farmland if drained, with a smaller portion listed as Farmland of Statewide Importance.¹

The Sakatah Singing Hills State Trail is located nearly 0.65 miles north of the study area (**Figure 5, Appendix A**). The nearest parks are located to the southwest of the study area approximately 0.5 miles, with Frazee Park and Eagle Lake Community Gardens being the nearest (**Figure 5, Appendix A**). Further to the southwest is Eagle Lake City Park, approximately 0.90 miles.

Local Plans

Describe planned land use as identified in comprehensive plan (if available) and any other applicable plan for land use, water, or resources management by a local, regional, state, or federal agency.

According to Blue Earth Counties' Comprehensive Plan, it is implied that some zoning or interim uses may change, particularly near urban areas such as Eagle Lake:

"The County will review the urban fringe overlay districts. The district's boundaries around the City of Mankato, the City of Eagle Lake, and the City of Madison Lake could be amended following consultation with the city's representative(s) and a public input process. Each city's growth needs, and future utility service areas will be considered. Future Growth boundaries around the other municipalities shall be a coordinated effort between the County and its municipalities. Future amendments will include review from MnDOT, MAPO, Townships, and other primary stakeholders as deemed appropriate... The County will assess all permitted and conditional uses in all zoning districts. When necessary, amendments to the Ordinance shall be made (pg. 99-100)."²

¹ NRCS USDA Web Soil Survey website: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed April 2019.

² Blue Earth County Land Use Plan, available at: <https://www.blueearthcountymn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4148/Approved-Land-Use-Plan---2018->. Accessed March 2019.

Zoning

Zoning, including special districts or overlays such as shoreland, floodplain, wild and scenic rivers, critical area, agricultural preserves, etc.

The property to be developed is currently zoned as Agriculture and is within the City of Eagle Lake.³ It is located east of Eagle Lake South (Lake ID 07006002), which is classified by the MnDNR Basin Shoreland Classification as a Natural Environment Lake.⁴ This means that structures and sewage systems must be set back at least 150 feet from the ordinary high water level (OHWL). The OHWL is shown on **Figure 3**. Per Blue Earth County's Shoreland Ordinance, shoreland is land located within 1,000 feet from the OHWL of a lake.⁵

b. Project Compatibility

Discuss the project's compatibility with nearby land uses, zoning, and plans listed in Item 9a above, concentrating on implications for environmental effects.

The study area is currently zoned as Agriculture and will be rezoned. The project's proposed land use is not for intensive occupation such as a large-scale residential development, therefore limited water and sanitary sewer utilization is warranted. Per the Blue Earth County Land Use Plan, the County will assess permitted and conditional uses in zoned districts, making amendments as necessary in cities such as Eagle Lake.

c. Project Incompatibility

Identify measures incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate any potential incompatibility as discussed in Item 9b above.

Please refer to Response 9b.

³ Le Ray Township Zoning Map, available at: <http://www.co.blue-earth.mn.us/DocumentCenter/View/78/leray?bidId>, accessed March 2019.

⁴ MnDNR Basin Shoreland Classification. Electronic resource: https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/watermgmt_section/shoreland/basins_shoreland_classifications.pdf, accessed December 2019.

⁵ Blue Earth County Website Shoreland, available at: <http://www.co.blue-earth.mn.us/365/Shoreland>, accessed December 2019.

10 Geology, Soils, & Topography/Land Forms

a. Geology

Describe the geology underlying the project area and identify and map any susceptible geologic features such as sinkholes, shallow limestone formations, unconfined/shallow aquifers, or karst conditions. Discuss any limitations of these features for the project and any effects the project could have on these features. Identify any project designs or mitigation measures to address effects to geologic features.

The study area is within the Des Moines lobe glacial drift. According to the Blue Earth County Geological Atlas (1991), glacial drift deposits range in thickness from slightly less than 150 feet to over 300 feet. No geological site hazards to groundwater are known to occur within the study area. Sinkholes, unconfined/shallow aquifers, or shallow limestone bedrock are not known to exist within the study area. The study area is within covered karst lands, area underlain by carbonate bedrock but with more than 100 feet of sediment cover. Active karst lands, areas underlain by carbonate bedrock with less than 50 feet of sediment cover, are known to exist to the west of the study area near the Minnesota River valley and to the south associated with the Le Sueur River. Local wells near the study area were drilled to a maximum depth of 232 feet, with none reaching bedrock.

b. Soils & Topography

Describe the soils on the site, giving NRCS (SCS) classifications and descriptions, including limitations of soils. Describe topography, any special site conditions relating to erosion potential, soil stability or other soils limitations, such as steep slopes, highly permeable soils. Provide estimated volume and acreage of soil excavation and/or grading. Discuss impacts from project activities (distinguish between construction and operational activities) related to soils and topography. Identify measures during and after project construction to address soil limitations including stabilization, soil corrections or other measures. Erosion/sedimentation control related to stormwater runoff should be addressed in response to Item 11.b.ii.

There are 11 soil classification types located within the Study Area, listed in **Table 4**. The area surrounding the Study Area contains largely similar soil types, though not all are redundant. See **Figure 6** and **Soils Map Index** in **Appendix A** for a depiction of soils.

Table 4: NRCS Soil Classifications of Study Area

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Hydrologic Soil Group | Wind Erodibility Group | K Factor, Whole Soil |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 94B | Terril Loam, 2 to 6% slopes | B | 6 | 0.28 |
| 106B | Lester Loam, 2 to 6% slopes | B | 6 | 0.28 |
| 106C | Lester Loam, 6 to 10% slopes | B | 6 | 0.28 |
| 109 | Cordova Clay Loam, 0 to 2% slopes | C/D | 6 | 0.28 |
| 110 | Marna Silty Clay Loam, 0 to 2% slopes | C/D | 4 | 0.32 |

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Hydrologic Soil Group | Wind Erodibility Group | K Factor, Whole Soil |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| 114 | Glencoe Silty Clay Loam, 0 to 1% slopes | B/D | 6 | 0.28 |
| 211 | Lura Silty Clay, 0 to 1% slopes | C/D | 4 | 0.28 |
| 230 | Guckeen Silty Clay Loam, 1 to 3% slopes | C | 4 | 0.28 |
| 239 | Le Sueur Loam, 1 to 3% slopes | B/D | 6 | 0.28 |
| 525 | Muskego Soils, 0 to 1% slopes | C/D | 2 | - |
| 1032 | Lake Beaches | - | 2 | 0.15 |

Parent material for Study Area soils is largely fine-loamy till, with smaller contributions by glacial lake deposits (including sediments deposited by slope wash, water movement of sediments deposited over till, and clay). These sediments overlay fine-loamy till, beach sand over loamy till, and organic material.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) of the US Department of Agriculture classifies soils into hydrologic soil groups, A – D. Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms. NRCS definitions by hydrologic soil group are below.

- Group A – Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands.
- Group B – Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture.
- Group C – Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture.
- Group D – Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays with high swelling potential, soils with a permanent high-water table, soils with a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and shallow soils over nearly impervious material.
- If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned to dual classes.

Table 4 shows there are several hydrologic soil groups in the Study Area. Soils in the C or C/D category may require additional artificial drainage measures.

Erodibility of soils within the Study Area is also noted in **Table 4**. For Wind Erodibility Group, those soils that are most susceptible to wind erosion have a rating of 1 while those that are least susceptible have a rating of 8. Within the Study Area, the majority of soils are rating 4 or above, indicating moderate wind

erodibility. The K Factor, Whole Soil, rating is based upon the percentages of silt, sand, and organic matter within a given soil structure, modified by the presence of rock fragments. Values range from 0.02 to 0.69, with higher values indicating greater susceptibility of soils to sheet and rill erosion by water. The majority of soils within the Study Area are rated 0.28, indicating minimal water erosion susceptibility of these soils.

As required by the NPDES permit, construction BMPs will be followed for the project, including but not limited to:

- Construction phasing where possible to limit the amount of exposed soils.
- Soil stabilization in areas where construction activities are halted for 14 days or more.
- Stabilize exposed soils within 24 hours where the portion of the site drains to a public water.

See **Item 11b** for an expanded discussion of NPDES permitting requirements.

The study area is largely flat, with the northern end of the study area at a slightly higher elevation than the southern end. The western edge of the study area, adjacent to the Eagle Lake shoreline, is slightly lower than the surrounding landscape.

11 Water Resources

a. Surface Water & Groundwater Features

Describe surface water and groundwater features on or near the site.

Surface Water

Describe lakes, streams, wetlands, intermittent channels, and county/judicial ditches. Include any special designations such as public waters, trout stream/lake, wildlife lakes, migratory waterfowl feeding/resting lake, and outstanding resource value water. Include water quality impairments or special designations listed on the current MPCA 303d Impaired Waters List that are within 1 mile of the project. Include DNR Public Waters Inventory number(s), if any.

Public Waters – One Mile Search Area

A surface water map is provided as **Figure 7, Appendix A**. The figure depicts surface waters within one mile of the study area. One water resource identified in the course of the wetland delineation, Tributary 3, is an Unnamed Creek (AUID 07020011-606). It is a 218-mile-long stream segment (Eagle Lake to Unnamed creek) and is part of the Le Sueur River watershed in Blue Earth County. Its impaired use is AQL, with the new impairment of InvertBio. A stream runs through Eagle Lake southeast, terminating south of Highway 14, intersecting with Tributary 3. This Unassessed stream (AUID 07020011-999) is not listed as impaired.

Eagle Lake (south) is west of the study area (AUID 07-0060-02) and is not an impaired public water. Eagle Lake (north), however, is located approximately 0.8 miles northwest of the study area and is impaired for AQR (AUID 07-0060-01). An unnamed lake (AUID 07-0037-00) is located south of study area, approximately 0.3 miles, and is not listed as impaired.

Wetlands

No wetlands within the parcel are listed on the Public Waters Inventory or as an Impaired Lake or Stream. National Wetland Inventory (NWI) wetlands existing within the Study Area, but will not be impacted by any construction or other activities by the project as proposed.

Wetland Delineation

A wetland investigation and delineation were completed for the project in June 2019 (**Appendix B**). Descriptions of delineated wetlands in the vicinity of the study area are described in **Table 5** and displayed in **Figure 8, Appendix A**. The delineation followed methods described in the *United States Army Corps of Engineers Delineation Manual* (January 1987). Wetlands identified were classified using “Wetland Plant and Plant Communities of Minnesota and Wisconsin.”

The delineation included a field review which identified 18 wetlands, three tributaries, and the OHWL of Eagle Lake within the study area. The identified wetlands, tributaries, and OHWL within the Study Area are labeled on **Figure 8**. See **Appendix B** for the Wetland Delineation Report in its entirety.

Ground Water

Describe aquifers, springs, seeps. Include: 1) depth to groundwater; 2) if project is within a MDH wellhead protection area; 3) identification of any onsite and/or nearby wells, including unique numbers and well logs if available. If there are no wells known on site or nearby, explain the methodology used to determine this.

1) Depth to Groundwater

One well is located within the study area (535759) with depth of water measured at 120 feet. Eight domestic wells, one industrial well, and one public supply well are located within one-half mile of the study area. The depth of water ranged from 78 to 120 feet below the surface, the average was 89.9 feet below the surface (one domestic well did not have static water level recorded).

2) MDH Wellhead Protection Area

The study area is not within an MDH wellhead protection area nor drinking water supply management area.

3) Any Onsite and/or Nearby Wells

The County Well Index maintained by the MDH was reviewed for locating recorded wells. Onsite and/or nearby wells are depicted on **Figure 9, Appendix A**. A domestic use well (552630) is located within the northwestern portion of the study area that draws from the Prairie du Chien – Oneota (OPOD) aquifer with a SWL of 85 feet below the ground surface and a total depth of 232 feet. Two wells (452648 and 644444) are located to the southeast of the study area. Both wells draw from the Quaternary Buried Artesian Aquifer (QBAA), have SWLs around 80 feet and depths around 130 feet; one is domestic and the other is industrial use. A well (471790) to the east of the study area is domestic, draws from the Prairie du Chien Group (OPDC) aquifer, has a SWL of 85 feet, and a total depth of 254 feet. A well (750396) to the northeast of the study area is domestic, draws from the QBAA, has a SWL of 120 feet, and a total depth of 148 feet. All these wells are active.

One active well exists within the study area (535759). It is a domestic use well, installed in 1995, that draws from the Quaternary Buried Unconfined Aquifer (QBUA) with a static water level (SWL) of 120 feet below the ground surface and a total depth of 132 feet. This well will be maintained. The unverified well (507077) is incorrectly mapped by the County Well Index GIS layer, and has a listed address of 729 Front St N, Mankato.

b. Project Effects & Mitigations

Describe effects from project activities on water resources and measures to minimize or mitigate the effects in Item b.i. through Item b.iv. below.

Wastewater

For each of the following, describe the sources, quantities and composition of all sanitary, municipal/domestic and industrial wastewater produced or treated at the site.

- 1) *If the wastewater discharge is to a publicly owned treatment facility, identify any pretreatment measures and the ability of the facility to handle the added water and waste loadings, including any effects on, or required expansion of, municipal wastewater infrastructure.*

The proposed project will generate residential wastewater. The City of Eagle Lake will be extending sanitary sewer to the study area for all wastewater discharge at the developer's expense. The sanitary sewer lines constructed within the Study Area will be sized for all currently proposed project elements, along with potential proposed expansions (i.e. commercial areas). The wastewater from Eagle Lake is served by the City of Mankato's Wastewater Treatment Plant, which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed project and no additional pretreatment measures will be required.

- 2) *If the wastewater discharge is to a subsurface sewage treatment systems (SSTS), describe the system used, the design flow, and suitability of site conditions for such a system.*

N/A

- 3) *If the wastewater discharge is to surface water, identify the wastewater treatment methods and identify discharge points and proposed effluent limitations to mitigate impacts. Discuss any effects to surface or groundwater from wastewater discharges.*

N/A

Stormwater

Describe the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff at the site prior to and post construction. Include the routes and receiving water bodies for runoff from the site (major downstream water bodies as well as the immediate receiving waters). Discuss any environmental effects from stormwater discharges. Describe stormwater pollution prevention plans including temporary and permanent runoff controls and potential BMP site locations to manage or treat stormwater runoff. Identify specific erosion control, sedimentation control or stabilization measures to address soil limitations during and after project construction.

Stormwater Quantity and Quality

In general, projects that increase impervious surfaces will correspondingly increase the stormwater runoff and potential for associated impacts. Within the study area there is currently no impervious surface as the parcel is currently in agriculture. The proposed project will create a total of 37.2 acres of impervious surface. This calculation includes the track pavement, paved areas associated with building elements, and proposed buildings (car condos, clubhouse, hotel, entertainment center). **Figures 4A and 4B, Appendix A**, illustrate impervious surface onsite.

Water quality, rate control, and volume control will be addressed, as the additional impervious surface added to the study area is over 1 acre. Development will meet all state and local water quality measures prior to discharging any stormwater into adjacent wetlands, lakes or streams. Measures include, but not limited to, stormwater retention ponds, bioretention swales, raingardens and other stormwater control features further discussed below. Stormwater management features will be located west and east of the

proposed building complex development in the southern portion of the site. Other stormwater management features for the track will be determined during the final track design. Stormwater features will be expanded with the construction of additional project elements to ensure required stormwater controls are met. **Figure 10, Appendix A**, illustrates a preliminary drainage concept for the project and identifies locations where stormwater will be discharged after it is treated. Discharge locations include Eagle Lake to the west; a small stream and wetland just west of car condos; and a ditch southeast of the car condos, adjacent to the proposed hotel location.

All applicable stormwater permits will be obtained prior to project construction (see **Table 3**). The local Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) as required under the NPDES construction permit will be incorporated into and made part of the construction documents. It will document temporary and permanent stormwater control measures consistent with NPDES requirements. Additional control measures to be used for permanent stormwater control will include permanent outlet protection. No stormwater will be discharged into sensitive or impaired receiving waters.

Stormwater Controls

The project will require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction permit as administered by the MPCA. The NPDES permit requires a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will define best management practices (BMPs) which will be used during construction activities. The specific BMP program will be determined through final design activities, but it is anticipated to include some combination of the following:

- Siltation fences, bio-rolls, wood-chip cover;
- Temporary outlet protection;
- Temporary ponding where appropriate/feasible;
- Limiting exposed areas where feasible through construction phasing and other measures;
- Timely placement of permanent cover including topsoil, seed and mulch, and sod or hydro-seeding.

Water Appropriation

Describe if the project proposes to appropriate surface or groundwater (including dewatering). Describe the source, quantity, duration, use and purpose of the water use and if a DNR water appropriation permit is required. Describe any well abandonment. If connecting to an existing municipal water supply, identify the wells to be used as a water source and any effects on, or required expansion of, municipal water infrastructure. Discuss environmental effects from water appropriation, including an assessment of the water resources available for appropriation. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects from the water appropriation.

It is not anticipated that the project will require dewatering activities. A MnDNR Water Appropriations permit would be obtained prior to construction if it is determined that dewatering activities are required.

The project will connect to the City of Eagle Lake's water supply, which will not require an expansion due to the proposed project.

Surface Waters

Describe any anticipated physical effects or alterations to wetland features such as draining, filling, permanent inundation, dredging and vegetative removal. Discuss direct and indirect environmental effects from physical modification of wetlands, including the anticipated effects that any proposed wetland alterations may have to the host watershed. Identify measures to avoid (e.g., available alternatives that were considered), minimize, or mitigate environmental effects to wetlands. Discuss whether any required compensatory wetland mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts will occur in the same minor or major watershed, and identify those probable locations.

Wetlands

A total of 18 wetlands, one tributary, and the OHWL of Eagle Lake were identified during a field delineation in June of 2019 (**Figure 8, Appendix A & Appendix B**). No wetlands within the parcel are listed on the National Wetland Inventory, Public Waters Inventory, or listed as an Impaired Lake or Stream. **Table 5** lists the identified wetland acreage and the proposed permanent impact to some wetlands for the Mankato Motorsports Park project.

Table 5: Delineated Wetlands Within Study Area

| Ditch/ Basin Number | Wetland Circ. 39 Type/Eggers and Reed | Ditch/Basin Size (acres) | Proposed Permanent Impact (acres) |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| W4 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| W6 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| W8a | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| W8b | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| W12 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| W14 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| W15 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.38 | 0.38 |
| W18 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.43 | 0.43 |
| W19 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| W22 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.65 | 0.65 |
| W26 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| W28 | 1/Seasonally Flooded Basin (Farmed) | 0.13 | 0.13 |
| W32 | 3/Shallow Marsh (man-made) | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| W34 | 2/Fresh (wet) Meadow & Shallow Marsh | 1.94 | None |
| W34 | 3/Fresh (wet) Meadow & Shallow Marsh | 0.04 | None |
| W36 | 2/Fresh (wet) Meadow & Shallow Marsh | 1.30 | None |
| W36 | 3/Fresh (wet) Meadow & Shallow Marsh | 1.14 | None |
| W37 | 3/Shallow Marsh | 2.78 | None |
| Tributary 1 | N/A | - | None |

| Ditch/ Basin Number | Wetland Circ. 39 Type/Eggers and Reed | Ditch/Basin Size (acres) | Proposed Permanent Impact (acres) |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Total Wetland Acres | | 11.89 | 4.69 |

Of the 18 wetlands identified, 13 will be impacted by the proposed project. All impacts will be permanent and will entail grading and/or filling.

Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation of Wetland Impacts

Proposed wetland impacts were a factor that ultimately influenced track design and layout, along with shoreline and cultural resource considerations. Adherence to the shoreline 150-foot setback from the OHWL of Eagle Lake impacted the ultimate project layout, as did the shoreland zone.

The location of wetlands within the Study Area also impacted the ultimate layout chosen for the project. Much of the wetlands within the study area are farmed wetlands (Type 1), with the exception of W34 and W36 which are Type 2 fresh (wet) meadow and Type 3 shallow marsh wetlands, and W37 which is a Type 3 shallow marsh. These high-quality, natural wetland resources will be avoided. Given their location in an agricultural field, the farmed (Type 1) wetlands do not provide the same benefits of wildlife habitat as those wetlands located in less disturbed contexts (i.e. within the shoreline of Eagle Lake or in wooded areas). Additionally, the Type 3 shallow marsh that will be affected (W32) by the proposed project is a manmade water feature associated with the residence to be removed currently within the Study Area.

Wetlands in Minnesota are protected by Federal and State law. Appropriate wetland permits will be obtained prior to project construction. Mitigation of the proposed 4.69 acres of wetland impacts will be achieved through Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) permitting procedures, along with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). All impacts will be mitigated at a 2:1 ratio, per permitting requirements for natural wetlands. A total of 9.38 credits will be required for the project.

Other Surface Waters

Describe any anticipated physical effects or alterations to surface water features (lakes, streams, ponds, intermittent channels, county/judicial ditches) such as draining, filling, permanent inundation, dredging, diking, stream diversion, impoundment, aquatic plant removal and riparian alteration. Discuss direct and indirect environmental effects from physical modification of water features. Identify measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects to surface water features, including in-water Best Management Practices that are proposed to avoid or minimize turbidity/sedimentation while physically altering the water features. Discuss how the project will change the number or type of watercraft on any water body, including current and projected watercraft usage.

Surface water features other than wetlands as described in **Item 11b**, above, will not be directly or indirectly affected by physical modification.

12 Contamination/Hazardous Materials/Wastes

a. Pre-project Site Conditions

Describe existing contamination or potential environmental hazards on or in close proximity to the project site such as soil or ground water contamination, abandoned dumps, closed landfills, existing or abandoned storage tanks, and hazardous liquid or gas pipelines. Discuss any potential environmental effects from pre-project site conditions that would be caused or exacerbated by project construction and operation. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from existing contamination or potential environmental hazards. Include development of a Contingency Plan or Response Action Plan.

A search of the MPCA's What's in My Neighborhood (MPCA WIMN) database did not identify any sites within 500-feet of the study area with potential contamination spots and environmental hazards due to past site uses (see **Figure 11, Appendix A**). The nearest sites with potential contamination or environmental hazards are nearly 1,000 feet from the study area. The nearest site is a small quantity hazardous waste generator (MN S000163766) located approximately 850 feet to the southwest. A former disposal site (SA0007206-Eagle Lake Dump) is located approximately 900 feet to the southwest; it was closed in 1973. A tank site (TS0006307) is located to the southwest approximately 1,000 feet to the southwest.

b. Project Related Generation/Storage of Solid Wastes

Describe solid wastes generated/stored during construction and/or operation of the project. Indicate method of disposal. Discuss potential environmental effects from solid waste handling, storage and disposal. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the generation/storage of solid waste including source reduction and recycling.

Solid waste is a common occurrence on construction projects. Solid waste generated during the project may include concrete or bituminous pavement, or construction building materials. All excavation of said material will be confined to the construction limits. Material will be disposed of in accordance with state and federal requirements.

During construction it will be the contractor's responsibility to ensure that solid waste generated during the operation is disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations.

c. Project Related Use/Storage of Hazardous Materials

Describe chemicals/hazardous materials used/stored during construction and/or operation of the project including method of storage. Indicate the number, location and size of any above or below ground tanks to store petroleum or other materials. Discuss potential environmental effects from accidental spill or release of hazardous materials. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the use/storage of chemicals/hazardous materials including source reduction and recycling. Include development of a spill prevention plan.

Chemicals/hazardous materials anticipated to be present on-site during the construction include petroleum products such as gasoline and other engine fluids for maintaining construction equipment. No other materials are expected to be present. No above or below ground storage tanks are planned for use during the construction projects. Any hazardous materials used during construction will be stored in leak-proof containers and locked away while not in use. The field engineer/inspector will be responsible for ensuring safe handling of any hazardous materials during the proposed construction. All unused materials will be removed, and if needed, disposed of consistent with applicable environmental regulations.

If a spill or chemical/hazardous material should occur during or after the construction process the Minnesota Duty Officer will be notified as necessary. Any contaminated spills or leaks that occur during construction are the responsibility of the contractor and would be responded to according to the MPCA containment and remedial action procedures.

During operation, hazardous materials may be used on site, such as diesel fuels and cleaners. Any hazardous materials will have BMPs implemented to ensure proper usage and storage during operations, including inspecting outside areas for the presence of spill/released diesel fuel, complete any corrective action necessary to respond to spills/releases. Best Management Practices regarding other hazardous materials and cleaners shall include proper housekeeping, eliminating and reducing exposure, scheduled inspections, training, and preventative maintenance.

d. Project Related Generation/Storage of Hazardous Wastes

Describe hazardous wastes generated/stored during construction and/or operation of the project. Indicate method of disposal. Discuss potential environmental effects from hazardous waste handling, storage, and disposal. Identify measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects from the generation/storage of hazardous waste including source reduction and recycling.

Please see Items 12b and 12c.

13 Fish, Wildlife, Plant Communities, & Sensitive Ecological Resources (Rare Features)

a. Resources/Habitats/Vegetation

Describe fish and wildlife resources as well as habitats and vegetation on or near the site.

The project is set within an agricultural context with some rural residential land uses within Le Ray Township. Much of the study area has been altered and compromised over the years by continual crop production and does not provide significant habitat for wildlife. 18 wetlands, three tributaries, and the OHWL of Eagle Lake were identified during a wetland delineation inventory (see **Figure 8, Appendix A, Appendix B, & Item 11** of this EAW).

All unavoidable disturbed wetland impacts will be mitigated consistently with applicable federal, state, and local requirements, as discussed in EAW **Item 11**.

b. Rare Features

*Describe rare features such as state-listed (endangered, threatened or special concern) species, native plant communities, Minnesota County Biological Survey Sites of Biodiversity Significance, and other sensitive ecological resources on or within close proximity to the site. Provide the license agreement number (LA-____) and/or correspondence number (ERDB **20190147**) from which the data were obtained and attach the Natural Heritage letter from the DNR. Indicate if any additional habitat or species survey work has been conducted within the site and describe the results.*

A Natural Heritage Information System (NHIS) search was requested by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR). The NHIS search did not identify rare features in the vicinity of the project (ERDB 20190147). The MnDNR does not believe the proposed project will negatively affect any known occurrences of rare features. **Appendix C** contains a letter from the MnDNR concurring on this finding of no affect.

The MnDNR also maintains a list of townships within Minnesota that contain documented Northern Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) maternity roost trees and/or hibernacula.⁶ NLEB is a federally listed threatened species by the United State Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). As of April 1, 2019, there were no identified NLEB trees or hibernacula within Blue Earth County. The nearest recorded NLEB listed area (hibernaculum) is approximately 5 miles northwest of the project area in Kasota/Oshawa/Traverse, Le Sueur County (T110N, R26W). No critical habitats were identified in the Study Area location.⁷ NLEB have been noted throughout Minnesota. NLEBs use forested and wooded habitat in the summer months (April to August) and swarm to wooded areas in the fall (August and September). In the winter (October

⁶ 2019. Townships Containing Documented Northern Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) Maternity Roost Trees and/or Hibernacula Entrances in Minnesota. MnDNR website. Electronic resource: http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/ereview/minnesota_nleb_township_list_and_map.pdf, accessed February 2020.

⁷ 2020. I

to March) NLEBs use hibernaculum. Any tree clearing required for project construction is recommended during winter months.

Project construction takes place in what has been an active agricultural field for many years. Wildlife may dwell in vegetated portions of the Study Area, but these areas will not be affected by the project as proposed.

c. Project Effects

Discuss how the identified fish, wildlife, plant communities, rare features and ecosystems may be affected by the project. Include a discussion on introduction and spread of invasive species from the project construction and operation. Separately discuss effects to known threatened and endangered species.

No state-listed threatened, endangered, or species of special concern or rare features were identified within one-mile of the study area, therefore impacts to these communities are not anticipated (see **Figure 12, Appendix A**).

The project is not anticipated to have the potential to spread or introduce invasive species. The contractor will be required to control the state listed noxious weeds.⁸ The contractor will follow BMPs to control and appropriately manage any invasive species. Removed soil will remain on site and will not be transported to other areas. Construction vehicles that may come into contact with invasive species will be checked and washed on site prior to leaving the work area to minimize any spread of invasive species. Reseeding and landscaping material will be free of invasive plants or plant parts. The project will also minimize disturbance of the surrounding roadside and vegetation.

d. Control Measures

Identify measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to fish, wildlife, plant communities, and sensitive ecological resources.

Measures to minimize any potential impact during construction will be applied through BMPs to appropriately control sediment and minimize impacts to water quality and wetlands during construction.

⁸ 2019. Minnesota Noxious Weed List. Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) website. Electronic webpage: <https://www.mda.state.mn.us/plants-insects/minnesota-noxious-weed-list>, accessed December 2019.

14 Historic Properties

Describe any historic structures, archeological sites, and/or traditional cultural properties on or in close proximity to the site. Include: 1) historic designations, 2) known artifact areas, and 3) architectural features. Attach letter received from the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Discuss any anticipated effects to historic properties during project construction and operation. Identify measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects to historic properties.

A file search of State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) was conducted to identify all known archaeological, historical, architectural, or traditional cultural properties that have potential to be impacted. Nine previously known archaeological sites were identified within one mile of the study area, with one site located partially within the study area. No records of existing resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were identified within the study area.

A Phase I Archaeological Survey of the study area was conducted by Bolton & Menk, Inc., in the summer of 2019.⁹ A total of five new precontact archaeological sites (lithic scatters) were identified in the course of the survey. Two sites appear to be potentially significant and are planned for avoidance. The US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is reviewing the report and will hold consultation with SHPO per its duties under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

⁹ 2020. Jammi Ladwig and Austin Jenkins. *Phase I Archaeological Survey for the Proposed Mankato Motor Sports Facility Development in Eagle Lake, Blue Earth County, Minnesota*. Submitted to US Army Corps of Engineers.

15 Visual

Describe any scenic views or vistas on or near the project site. Describe any project related visual effects such as vapor plumes or glare from intense lights. Discuss the potential visual effects from the project. Identify any measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate visual effects.

The project site is located in the City of Eagle Lake, northeast of the downtown area. The project is within an agricultural setting, with a highway (US-14) traveling along the southwestern boundary. A tree line borders Eagle Lake, west of the project site. A rural two-lane roadway travels along the eastern boundary. The parcel is currently an agricultural field with a rolling topography. There are 12 rural residences located within one-half mile of the site, north of Highway 14. There are no known scenic views or vistas on or near the project site.

Temporary visual effects are anticipated during the construction phase of the project, including construction vehicles, equipment, and construction materials. These temporary impacts would be noticeable to drivers traveling on the existing surrounding roadway and to residents living within the area.

The project will convert agricultural fields to a recreational destination. Earthen berms will be constructed that will be approximately 10 feet in height with a 10-foot top, and a 3:1 slope. Berms will line the entirety of the northern/northwestern and eastern track extents. Additionally, portions of the southeastern and southwestern site will include berms, west of the car condos and north of the golf entertainment complex.

Nearby residences will see the screening berms lining the site perimeter. Vehicles travelling on Highway 14 will see car condos along with the entertainment center, hotel, and screening berms. The driving track will likely only be visible from the west along Highway 14. Berms will provide visual and noise abatement.

16 Air

a. Stationary Source Emissions

Describe the type, sources, quantities and compositions of any emissions from stationary sources such as boilers or exhaust stacks. Include any hazardous air pollutants, criteria pollutants, and any greenhouse gases. Discuss effects to air quality including any sensitive receptors, human health or applicable regulatory criteria. Include a discussion of any methods used assess the project's effect on air quality and the results of that assessment. Identify pollution control equipment and other measures that will be taken to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects from stationary source emissions.

The buildings will be fitted with modern air exchanges and ventilation that meet all MPCA, Department of Health and other regulatory agency requirements.

No significant impacts from stationary source emissions are anticipated. The project is not located in a nonattainment/maintenance status area and therefore no conformity requirements apply.

b. Vehicle Emissions

Describe the effect of the project's traffic generation on air emissions. Discuss the project's vehicle-related emissions effect on air quality. Identify measures (e.g. traffic operational improvements, diesel idling minimization plan) that will be taken to minimize or mitigate vehicle-related emissions.

Sources of vehicle emissions associated with the project include club cars using the track as well as vehicles travelling to and from the motorsports park. Emissions from these vehicles will be byproducts of gasoline and/or diesel combustion. More detailed traffic information is provided in **Item 18**.

During construction, BMPs such as engine anti-idling will be implemented. No significant or permanent impacts from vehicle emissions are anticipated.

c. Dust & Odors

Describe sources, characteristics, duration, quantities, and intensity of dust and odors generated during project construction and operation. (Fugitive dust may be discussed under item 16a). Discuss the effect of dust and odors in the vicinity of the project including nearby sensitive receptors and quality of life. Identify measures that will be taken to minimize or mitigate the effects of dust and odors.

Dust common to construction and earth moving practices is expected (in the form of fugitive dust) during periods of dry weather. Dust will be visually monitored and recorded in conjunction with the NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit inspections. Appropriate dust control best management practices (such as soil wetting, misting/water vapor, and hydraulic additives) will be implemented (upon inspection or public complaint) by the contractor as necessary to control dust from leaving the project site during all phases of construction. Specific dust control BMPs will be determined based on severity,

weather conditions (i.e. wind speed), and current site conditions. The track, parking lots, and access routes will be paved, and areas adjacent to the track will be vegetated, therefore dust is not anticipated to be an issue.

Odors associated with the project are anticipated to be minimal and will include vehicle exhaust, residential properties (car condos), the clubhouse, hotel, and entertainment center. Odor is not anticipated to be a significant issue for the proposed project.

17 Noise

Describe sources, characteristics, duration, quantities, and intensity of noise generated during project construction and operation. Discuss the effect of noise in the vicinity of the project including 1) existing noise levels/sources in the area, 2) nearby sensitive receptors, 3) conformance to state noise standards, and 4) quality of life. Identify measures that will be taken to minimize or mitigate the effects of noise.

The Mankato Motorsports Track Club plans to build a facility on what is currently agricultural property in Eagle Lake, Minnesota. The parcel is bordered to the west by the shoreline of south lobe of Eagle Lake, to the east by 604th Avenue (CR 27), to the north by 220th Lane, and to the south by US Highway 14 and the extension of 216th Street. Downtown Eagle Lake and associated residential developments are located south of US Highway 14. A noise analysis was conducted in accordance with MPCA requirements. See **Appendix D** for the complete noise analysis report.

Regulatory Framework

Minnesota state noise standards are under the direction of the MPCA. **Table 6** (below) provides a listing of the A-weighted decibels (dBA) standard for the state.

Table 6. MPCA State Noise Standards*

| Land Use | Day (7am – 10pm) dBA | | Night (10pm – 7am) dBA | |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Residential | L ₁₀ of 65 | L ₅₀ of 60 | L ₁₀ of 55 | L ₅₀ of 50 |
| Commercial | L ₁₀ of 70 | L ₅₀ of 65 | L ₁₀ of 70 | L ₅₀ of 65 |
| Industrial | L ₁₀ of 80 | L ₅₀ of 75 | L ₁₀ of 80 | L ₅₀ of 75 |

*Per the MPCA's "A Guide to Noise Control in Minnesota" (2015)

L₁₀ is the sound level in decibels (dBA) over ten percent (six minutes), while L₅₀ is over fifty percent (30 minutes), of an hour. Given that the facility does not anticipate nighttime use, the applicable standards for the proposed project's impact on local residences are the daytime L₁₀ of 65 dBA and L₅₀ of 60 dBA

Project Impact Assessment Methodology

A noise impact analysis was prepared for the project (see **Appendix D**). The impacts of the project were evaluated using the MINNOISEV31 traffic noise model. The model predicts noise level impacts from roadways based on the number and types of vehicles, and includes parameters such as travel speed,

distance, and type of ground cover between the roadway and the receiver. It also allows for the modeling of the different types of barriers (natural or manmade) have on received noise.

The model assumed the following:

- Number of vehicles per hour is 500. This is based on information from the developer that the maximum number of vehicles expected on the tract at any one time is 20 operating up to 50 minutes per hour, with a lap time of 2 minutes.
- The noise from the track is represented in the model by noise from 13 relatively straight sections of the track where cars could be expected to be traveling near top speed at their loudest noise levels.
- Terrain between the track and receptors is represented by modeled barriers or berms.
- Rows of buildings were evaluated as solid barriers with a building height of 20 feet.

Noise monitoring was conducted at Brainerd International Raceway (BIR) during a Performance Driving School event to assist in determining the potential noise impact of the proposed Mankato Motorsports Park track. A comparison of the data gathered during this monitoring and the MINNOISEV31 modeled results found that these results are within 2.5 dBA of the measured results at BIR. Roadway noise models within 3 dBA of measured data are normally considered to be in good agreement. These findings indicate the noise modeling methodology for the proposed track will be accurate given model parameters.

Existing noise levels within the study area were monitored at three noise monitoring (M) locations (see **Appendix D**). The minimum L_{10} value was 36.8 dBA and the maximum was 72.5 dBA, while the minimum L_{50} value was 35.5 dBA and the maximum was 65 dBA. Location M1, south of Highway 14, receives noise from the four-lane roadway, and the measured noise level at this location, assumed to be the background noise level, is higher than the State standard. Measured noise levels at monitoring location were then used to model the background noise at five receptor (R) locations. The measured noise level at M1 is assumed to be the background noise level at R1, and is already above the State noise standard at L_{eq} of 68.7 dBA.

Results and Findings

Without additional mitigation measures (berms, buildings, barriers), the modeled noise results demonstrate that the impact from vehicle noise up to a vehicle emission rate of 83.7 dBA at 50 feet is within MPCA's noise standards for the State, if all 20 vehicles operate at this level. The configuration of the 20 vehicles can include the following and still be in compliance with the State noise standards without any noise abatement: 5 vehicles have an emission rate of 83.8 dBA at 50 feet, 10 vehicles have an emission rate of 79.3 dBA at 50 feet, and 5 vehicles have an emission rate of 87.6 dBA at 50 feet or when 2 vehicles have an emission rate of 86.2 dBA at 50 feet, 16 vehicles have an emission rate of 81.7 dBA at 50 feet, and 2 vehicles have an emission rate of 90.1 dBA at 50 feet.

Noise modeling results with the proposed buildings, barriers, and berms indicate that impacts are compliant with the State noise standards up to a vehicle emission rate of 87.8 dBA, with all vehicles operating at this level. The configuration of the 20 vehicles can include the following and still be in compliance with the State noise standards: vehicles have an emission rate of 87.9 dBA at 50 feet, 10

vehicles have an emission rate of 83.4 dBA at 50 feet, and 5 vehicles have an emission rate of 91.8 dBA at 50 feet, or when 2 vehicles have an emission rate of 90.2 dBA at 50 feet, 16 vehicles have an emission rate of 85.7 dBA at 50 feet, and 2 vehicles have an emission rate of 94.1 dBA at 50 feet. See **Appendix D** for data tables and full discussion of noise modeling results.

The noise impact analysis shows that the track can operate in compliance with Minnesota noise standards given the emission levels of most of the vehicles that are expected to operate at the track. In addition to the noise mitigation measures such as barriers, buildings, and berms discussed above, the developer will implement a noise compliance assurance plan.

Track Noise Impact Compliance Plan

A noise compliance plan will be implemented by Bradford Development at the proposed Mankato Motorsports Park track to ensure continued adherence to State noise standards. The plan is expected to include the following:

- Testing of emission levels of individual vehicles at monitoring locations at a distance of 50 feet.
- Monitoring of noise levels at nearby residences, on multiple event days to ensure a broad array of track and meteorological conditions are represented.
- Driver education will be provided to ensure track users understand noise requirements at the track prior to arrival.
- Muffler systems that are temporary and quickly mounted for non-compliant vehicles, and otherwise non-compliant vehicles will not be allowed at track events.

Vehicle emissions allowed at the facility will be determined through monitoring of noise at events given differential combinations of vehicles emissions in compliance with State noise standards. The modeling shows that two vehicles operating at vehicle emission levels of 94.1 dBA at 50 feet with 18 other cars on the track operating at various emission levels can be compliant with the State noise standards. Those vehicles found to be non-compliant even with temporary muffler systems will not be allowed at track events.

Using a combination of noise mitigation with barriers, berms, and structures, along with the control of maximum noise levels from the cars expected to operate on the track, the proposed Mankato Motorsports Park track can operate within the State noise rules.

Construction Noise

During construction, it is unavoidable that noise levels will increase in the immediate area surrounding the project site. The actual noise levels on and adjacent to the site will vary considerably depending on the numbers and types of equipment being operated at any given time. **Table 7** (below) shows peak noise levels monitored at 50 feet from various types of construction equipment. This equipment is primarily associated with site grading/site preparation, which is generally the construction phase associated with the greatest noise levels.

Table 7: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels at 50 Feet

| Equipment | Manufacturers Sampled | Total Number of Models in Sample | Peak Noise Level (dBA*) | |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| | | | Range | Average |
| Backhoes | 5 | 6 | 74-92 | 83 |
| Front Loaders | 5 | 30 | 75-96 | 85 |
| Dozers | 8 | 41 | 65-95 | 85 |
| Graders | 3 | 15 | 72-92 | 84 |
| Scrapers | 2 | 27 | 76-98 | 87 |
| Pile Drivers | N/A | N/A | 95-105 | 101 |

* units of "A-weighted decibels"

Source: United States Environmental Protection Agency and Federal Highway Administration

Construction activities will be temporary in duration. The contractor will be required to comply with applicable local ordinance requirements regarding noise. Construction equipment will be required to have factory installed mufflers or their equivalents in good working order during the life of the construction contracts. It is anticipated that construction activities will take place during the less noise-sensitive daylight hours. Pile driving will not be required for this project, nor will jack-hammering or concrete sawing. The loudest construction activities will largely take place on a given portion of the site at one time. The total duration of the majority of the project components will be one construction season, including the track, noise abatement features, clubhouse, six car condos, and associated parking areas. Additional car condos will be constructed as sold, and the hotel and golf entertainment center will be constructed when a developer purchases or leases the property.

18 Transportation

a. Project-Related Traffic

Describe traffic-related aspects of project construction and operation. Include: 1) existing and proposed additional parking spaces, 2) estimated total average daily traffic generated, 3) estimated maximum peak hour traffic generated and time of occurrence, 4) indicate source of trip generation rates used in the estimates, and 5) availability of transit and/or other alternative transportation modes.

1) Existing and Proposed Parking

The parcel is currently in agricultural crop production, with residential parking available at the one existing single-family home. The proposed project will construct parking lots associated with the proposed built amenities. Approximate parking spaces are presented in **Figure 4B**, and based on standard parking allocation of one stall per hotel units (rooms), and one stall per two employees. The track clubhouse will include 139 spaces, and a proposed parking lot for the entertainment center and

hotel will provide an additional 336 spaces for the hotel and entertainment center. Additional parking will be available at the car condos totaling 96 units, with approximately two vehicle spaces per unit.

2) Estimated Average Daily Traffic Generated

The annual average daily traffic (AADT) for the no-build and build scenarios are provided in **Table 8** below. Trips were generated under the build analysis for the clubhouse, hotel, and golf entertainment complex. Other traffic patterns from events, such as car condo use, were not analyzed as this traffic is anticipated to come and go throughout the day, similar to a golf club, with no significant peaks, or will arrive via shared transportation such as busing, so the impacts to the surrounding roadway network would be minor compared to the educational, golf entertainment complex and restaurant uses. For the build scenario, this is in anticipation of the restaurant, performance driving school, hotel, clubhouse, and golf entertainment complex in use.

Table 8: AADT

| Location | No-Build | | Build | |
|---------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2020 | 2040 | 2020 | 2040 |
| CR 27 & CR 17 | 950 | 1,225 | 2,400 | 2,600 |
| TH 14 & CR 27 | 15,300 | 19,800 | 16,300 | 21,000 |

3) Estimated Maximum Peak Hour Traffic

The track will be used throughout the day, similar to a golf club, with no significant peaks in the amount of traffic. Worst case scenario peak AM and PM hours traffic generated is 193 in the AM, and 373 in the PM.

4) Source of Trip Generation Rate

Trip generation procedures from ITE Trip Generation Manual: 10th Edition.

5) Availability of Transit/Alternative Transportation Modes

Greater Mankato Transit offers bus service to Eagle Lake six days per week. This bus only services those areas of Eagle Lake south of Trunk Highway (TH) 14, however. Non-motorized traffic would need to cross TH 14 at Parkway Ave/Marble Rd, an intersection without pedestrian facilities, in order to access the Mankato Motorsports Park site.

b. Potential Congestion

Discuss the effect 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. 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. Use the format and procedures described in the Minnesota Department of Transportation’s Access Management Manual, Chapter 5 (available at: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/accessmanagement/resources.html>) or a similar local guidance,

A traffic impact study was completed for the proposed project, see **Appendix E**. Traffic operations were evaluated under 2020 build / no-build and 2040 build / no-build. A summary of the traffic impact study is found below.

The proposed access location, traffic control, and intersection geometry were analyzed to identify any proposed changes that may be needed for the project as proposed. The access location to Mankato Motorsports Park is proposed at the intersection of CR 17 and CR 27. The traffic impact study recommends that this location remain as proposed as it would not add an additional intersection to the county road, and prevents overlapping left turns and associated safety concerns. Based on MnDOT Access Management Manual and AADT, a southbound right turn lane is warranted at the access location (CR 17 and CR 27) based on the 2040 projection, but queuing and delay operations demonstrate that it is not necessary. Southbound delay and queues are anticipated to be minimal through 2040, even with the proposed site development.

From the MnDOT Road Design Manual (2000) “on 2-lane, rural highways...left turn lanes should be provided when the access is to a public road, an industrial tract or a commercial center.” For the proposed project, a dedicated northbound left turn lane is required at the intersection of CR 17 and CR 27. An eastbound right turn lane on CR 17 at CR 27 could also be considered, but is not required. Queuing and delay remain acceptable given the aforementioned addition and no additional turn lanes are recommended. The existing side street stop traffic control at the intersection remains acceptable with the added northbound left turn lane and no change is recommended.

The traffic impact study determined that there are no anticipated impacts to TH 14 and that the intersection of TH 14 and CR 27 continues to operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) A with or without the proposed development.

19 Cumulative Potential Effects

a. Geographic Scales & Timeframes

Describe the geographic scales and timeframes of the project related environmental effects that could combine with other environmental effects resulting in cumulative potential effects.

The majority of the Mankato Motorsports Park components are to be constructed in a single construction season, including the track, noise abatement structures, clubhouse, six car condo buildings, and associated parking lots. Additional car condo buildings (six additional) will be constructed as sold, and the hotel and golf entertainment center will be constructed when a developer purchases or leases the property. The timing of the construction of these future components will coincide when any permitting is complete, such as wetland permitting. No known future development will occur within the parcel. According to Blue Earth Counties’ Comprehensive Plan, it is implied that some zoning or interim uses may change, particularly near urban areas such as Eagle Lake. Changes to City boundaries and zoned uses could have unforeseen future environmental effects.

The City of Eagle Lake will be extending sanitary sewer and water lines to the study area at the developer’s expense. The wastewater from Eagle Lake is served by the City of Mankato’s Wastewater Treatment Plant. Natural resources such as wetlands have the potential to be affected by this action. Any mitigation of potential wetland impacts will be achieved through State permitting methods as required.

Noise from the proposed Mankato Motorsports Park will continue to be monitored per the noise compliance assurance plan. Noise monitoring at events and of individual vehicles will be compared to State standards to identify necessary restrictions on track operations.

Project related environmental effects are discussed thoroughly in the preceding sections of this document. There are no additional anticipated cumulative potential impacts.

b. Future Projects

Describe any reasonably foreseeable future projects (for which a basis of expectation has been laid) that may interact with environmental effects of the proposed project within the geographic scales and timeframes identified above.

There are no reasonably foreseeable future projects that may interact with environmental effects of the proposed Mankato Motorsports Park project.

c. Discussion/Summary of Cumulative Potential Effects

Discuss 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.

There are no additional cumulative potential effects for the proposed project beyond those stated in **Item 19a**. Significant cumulative potential environmental effects are not anticipated.

20 Other Potential Environmental Effects

If the project may cause any additional environmental effects not addressed by items 1 to 19, describe the effects here, discuss the how the environment will be affected, and identify measures that will be taken to minimize and mitigate these effects.

No additional potential environmental effects have been identified.

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 9c and 60, respectively.
- Copies of this EAW are being sent to the entire EQB distribution list.

Signature Justin A. Broneland Date 2/24/20
Title City Administrator
City of Eagle Lake