

Open Space dialogue notes

The Minnesota Environmental Quality Board (EQB) hosted the Environmental Congress event in Mankato, Minnesota on Tuesday, December 3, 2019. The theme of the entire event was “The Climate for Action is Changing.”

In addition to a plenary, two breakouts, and a leadership forum, attendees participated in an Open Space Technology session of the event. Open Space Technology is a participant-driven meeting format in which participants volunteer to host conversations around a particular topic, and everyone self-organizes into these conversations. Notes from all conversations are shared with all participants. Open Space meetings are often held as day-long or multi-day events with multiple discussion sessions.

The EQB piloted the use of Open Space format for a one-hour session to offer an opportunity for participants to address desired topics at the event, either to follow up on something discussed earlier in the day or discuss something not covered in the formal agenda. Due to time and space constraints, the facilitator slotted topics into available rooms until rooms were filled. There were more desired topics than rooms available, and insufficient time to combine or prioritize the topics offered during this Open Space session.

The Open Space facilitator asked participants to design their topics around a central theme – *“How can we work together to create a healthy future in a changing climate?”* The EQB compiled notes taken by conversation hosts or participants in this document.

Table of Contents

Natural Climate Solutions to reach MN emission reduction goals	2
How can we encourage intergenerational action on climate change	4
Having meaningful discussions with people you disagree with	5
Need for a nation-wide carbon tax.....	6
Building resiliency in the conventional agricultural matrix	7
How to make mass transit totally cool	8
Climate and health.....	9
Implications of Line 3 on climate	9
City-level solutions and climate action – Building resiliency	14
Diversity in Minnesota resiliency planning	15

Natural Climate Solutions to reach MN emission reduction goals

- Suggestion: watch the Greta T. video "we have been ignoring natural climate solutions. We need to protect, restore, and fund."
- Living ecosystems can store much of the carbon in the air. Currently it's only sequestering 2% of our sequestration goals, and it could/should be 30%. Photosynthesis has not been a big part of the discussion...how can we elevate it? Thinking about our natural and working lands to a meaningful level that can help to keep our warming climate to less than 2 degrees? We don't have all the answers (Meredith shared fact sheets).
- Q: How does it work? Is carbon sequestered in living plant tissue, roots, soil, etc? How does the math work? Answer: much of the carbon is stored in the plant which works great if the plant is big and long lived like a tree. In many systems, it's stored in the soil. In trees, most of the carbon is stored in the wood (the trunk). It's a huge amount of carbon. The amount of carbon stored in ash trees that could be released if/when trees die could be 25 times (?) our current auto emissions (?) - please check my stats. See a wonderful video on a youtube channel called Minute Earth. See "how much air can a tree hold?"
- Q: What are the barriers to growing the voluntary offset markets for individuals to use to offset travel? A: The prices are very low and there's a worry about market saturation. TNC and others have done some preliminary analyses about the opportunities (they are large) and barriers. The US Climate Alliance has also worked on this. Bob Patton is with them. We have a lot to learn about carbon markets. The US Climate Alliance hosted a Learning Lab to look at markets - we need to learn more about barriers (what state policies could help?) Being able to measure carbon and price it is key. Agree on what practices hold how much carbon? The market as it is right now is geared to really large projects. Other opportunities to invest in carbon storage and natural climate solutions: The MN Sustainable Growth Coalition - corporate sponsors are interested in having their brand be more visible and being partners in the private sector (even outside of being part of a market), perhaps we can create alternative ways of investing in carbon storage. Jim: people are very interested in paying for tree planting. Foundations are very interested in Natural Climate Solutions and are funding a new project to do reforestation along the north shore. We've been doing it in an ad hoc way - we need to get more organized.
- Q: Carbon sequestration can be great for mitigation, but can we talk about the multiple benefits associated with natural climate solutions? Water quality, ecosystem resilience, etc. (See the back page of the handout that discusses co-benefits). Water storage is another important benefit - how can we pick lands that "slow the flow"?
- Q: What is driving the lack of investment in our natural systems (are we too wowed by technology and are we taking them for granted)? How do we drive more of the solutions to natural? A: DOI is moving in that direction, but it's slow (experimentation takes a long time). Another answer: the majority of our climate problems are associated with technology. The majority of the carbon and methane that's in the air are from fossil fuels (75% in MN - the other 25% is land use). The accounting for natural solutions is also complicated relative to calculating reduction from technology. We should focus more on natural solutions than on artificial carbon capture and removal (artificial photosynthesis!). If we could focus 1/3 of our investments in natural solutions and 2/3 on technological solutions (currently it's 2%).
- Q: What can we be doing to think about this as a whole system as opposed to in a compartmentalized way? We need to value how amazing photosynthesis is in the same way we are "wowed" by technology.
- Q: Natural solutions also benefit mental health. Quiet and light pollution two things we don't talk about and trees can help.

- Q: People seem more interested in moving away from lawns to pollinators and rain gardens etc but there are barriers based on aesthetics and HOA rules and city ordinances. How do we change the culture?
- Focus on multiple benefits. If you talk about natural climate solutions without discussing other points you may not see the investments. Talk about increased equity (environmental justice). Also talk about the land use conflict between the solar revolution and other uses for land. Example: have both solar panels and natural sequestration. Also, watch out for the "excuse" that because we are taking carbon out of the air so we don't need to close coal plants.
- It would be great to have more examples (and maybe seed money) to encourage it. Here's an example: we get a lot of benefit out of Sustainable Forest Incentive Act in MN. \$7/acre. Creates a structural shift in land management. Make the point that we are making some investments now - they are successful, so we should do ... more, or model something similar but new, etc.
- A lot of the work BWSR does is focused on how to prioritize projects for water quality. We have lots of examples of where we've stacked the benefits from conservation programs. We hardly ever talk about carbon sequestration when we talk about other benefits.
- We don't have a good way of talking about the value (economic value) we get from those conservation practices.
- There's a woodland conservation program that works with water providers in the NE part of the state. Keeping forested land in a working land status is a key element in this. This requires a market for wood products too. We rely on the forest products industry to do managed cutting so we can restore with more resilient species
- We are going to be losing a lot of our forests (black ash, tamarack). What are we going to do to prevent or offset those losses? The prospect of losing those is daunting. Think about "pre-storing" those areas so they will continue to have trees even if the boreal forest is lost.
- City of Plymouth offers free treatment of green ash trees and free removal and replacement.
- Assisted migration of different ecotypes of trees - southern trees perform better than native varieties.
- One of the exciting things about natural climate solutions is that there's so much overlap between mitigation and adaptation. Diversifying forests is a mechanism for storing carbon and for creating more resilience in the future. This applies to agriculture as well (soil health). Just the resiliency and yield benefits and other benefits (increased water holding capacity in the face of flash drought) are great selling points for improved soil health). So you get local protections as well as a contribution to global carbon reduction.
- Thinking about MN as a leader: We have at least three biomes where we could really demonstrate most of these principles in a big way. A natural and working lands renaissance.
- It's very inspirational to see the executive order about the subcabinet. It includes language about increasing resiliency of working lands, etc. What about the rest of the story (closing the coal plants, getting the cars off the roads?). A: The executive order formalizes work that's already happening. We envision sector-based specific initiatives (ag, energy, buildings, transportation). The challenge is to create new connections? Example: Intersection of wellhead protection areas, energy production, and the distribution grid. We need to look for opportunities to think across these agency programs and to think about them in a different way.
- Another example (Shannon L.): worked in MPCA w/GHG emission in partnership with dept of commerce and getting better data about land use practices and carbon sequestration. That got them thinking about implications of state nutrient reduction strategy, which sparked thoughts about how to use the science to take it into the arena of agriculture. Report came out quantifying the

benefits of ag best practices for carbon sequestration. It started by synergy of conversations across state governments.

- An important piece is the close relationship with the universities and the base level research they are doing. In MN we often think about U of M. When we look at budget cutbacks, the MN state institutions have the diversity of presence where they can be more present in local discussions that can be customized to the location. We need to engage more diverse organizations.
- Met Council is also partnering with metro academic institutions to do things like research how to connect people with parks, how to think about waste water treatment, and more. Good connection to students and the wealth of ideas they bring.
- As a student: we had partnerships with local organizations. As a student you get a lot of benefit out of doing good real-world work and making a contribution.

How can we encourage intergenerational action on climate change

- What strengths does each have. Older has experienced climate change. Younger not as affected by past beliefs. Young – going through a grieving process. Acceptance – will see the effect for hundreds of years – resentment and hurt.
- Older: Didn't understand the problem. Older generation is feeling guilt. Willing to do all we can.
- Older: In 1972 we had a walk for Mother Earth.
- High schooler: Frustrating, but don't have the knowledge to make the change. They have the passion but not the education.
- Younger: How do we move past the stereotypes?
- High school student: We can build coalitions.
- I'm 34. She's seen passion and will of the young and the concern but passing the torch to the younger generation. She feels on the cusp. How do we engage with others to feel empowered.
- Younger person. Mentorship connects generations. Intergenerational families are good.
- Mid-40s person. No one really owns the problem. After 20 years – boom! It's a crisis. You'd think we'd have made more progress. The great dithering.
- All of us own it. Now it's impacting everyone.
- Middle age person: Love is a better motivator than fear. There are lots of celebration stories. Xcel has met its goal. We need to be in relationship to each other. We need to talk about the good path we're on.
- Younger person: a lot of times we don't have the resources to change. The elder perspective is useful: politics used to be different. Start working on intergenerational coalitions.
- Middle age: The world is a better place than it was 50 years ago.
- Lee; How do we work together intergenerationally.
- Teen: If you could pull us in...
- Middle: we all have the same daily battles we can win.
- Gwen: What would you tell your younger self.
- [Fran Wilman?]: A bunch of citizens interested in climate started a group. A student voice in high school joined the group.
- [Lee?]: You have the benefit of what we've learned about climate and sustainability.
- My mother canned all the time. We've lost that.
- Studying the stories of our successes. Youth should be demanding good civics education.
- It's so reassuring to hear that the oldsters don't know it all.

- What education are high schoolers getting now? We learned about climate change. But her parents have taught her things.
- My school is different. Strong basis of environmental education. We're both environmental activist. It's more and more becoming the normal because climate change is an existential threat.
- People are in denial about climate change.
- Anger at being treated as consumers. How do we change our perspectives?

Having meaningful discussions with people you disagree with

Why are you here?

- Family/friends
- Good skill
- I want to grow not attack
- (Fear of hard conversations because) political polarization/climate science
- Government job – working with many types of people
- *Polarization (people are tired of it)
- Local communication is key to change
- General opinion has shifted but not elected officials (about climate change)
- Farming community seeing need for change?
- Do you give up on the people opposed to you and focus on similar opinions?
- How to not shut the conversation down? Avoid personal attacks.
- Better Angels organizations (talking across differences)
- Communication with general public at job
- Conflict resolution/how to lower guards
- Methodology is key, can lead people to new conclusions
- Need to evaluate our experiences (space for it)
- Not taking offense

-
- Only 9% of people are climate deniers
 - 45% of Republicans want climate action
 - Don't argue facts and figures because it makes people dig in. Use personal anecdotes and get to know people
 - Need to persuade people to vote

-
- Ask people their opinions even if you don't expect to agree or use. It creates common ground.
 - You don't always need to share disagreement. Find common ground/respect.

Tips from Better Angels

- Be an engager
- Don't be a sniper (drop disagreement bomb and walk away)

- Gladiator – knows everything – armed with facts
 1. Clarify other person's opinion
 2. Agree with other opinion (even if it's hard)
 3. Pivot – reason to flip to share too
 4. Personalize – share about you
- Don't intend to change someone's mind

The Great Sort – book about Americans seeking homogenous community

Biggest Little Farm – inspiring movie

Hayhoe, Katherine – inspiring climatologist

Humanize

People don't change immediately, share life

Verbally affirm interest in other perspective

Ask questions – it allows people to be heard and reflect on their own actions

You're risking people taking offense when you express your opinion

How do I approach legislators on climate change?

- culture change really important/law isn't everything

How do we find things people want to do every day?

Law of Diffusion of Innovation – bell curve

Innovators – early adopters - @ 34% tipping point. We need to focus on early adopters

How can we make climate change sexy?/How can it make \$?

- Not just for government through regulation (plastic bag tax)
- Convince cool kids (leaders, etc.)
- But we have 10 years – conversations with friends not enough!
 - o But we're talking about talking with people who disagree
- We need to make conversations interesting to people
- Conversation vs. debate – different strategies

Be willing to be the example! Move past conversations only.

Use data in key moments.

Need for a nation-wide carbon tax

We need anything and everything to address climate change.

Following an organization – Citizen Climate Lobby

- H.R. 763 – to put a price on coal, oil, natural gas – would have a tax based on carbon emission. Whatever revenues that are collected would be distributed to households. Energy products brought into the USA would have a carbon tax (unless already taxed previously). Bill has 60-70 cosponsors. Has to be bipartisan.

Makes sense to pay for garbage – also pay for carbon. Canada started a carbon tax. Takes years to determine if the tax will lower carbon emissions.

Create jobs in the solar industry

27 countries have implemented carbon taxes since 2018.

Science doesn't have the appeal as it did in the past.

Will get benefits from addressing climate change.

Another group – Climate Leadership Council – addressing climate.

Building resiliency in the conventional agricultural matrix

- Watershed planning very important as implementing One Watershed One Plan. Group of farmers get together area where they define what they can locally to improve environment and income or decrease cost.
- Monetizing the price of carbon – paying people to sequester carbon and improve soil health. Soil health collation. Economic force behind CRP/CREP is huge
- Technology advancing → new tillage
- Most farmers rent more than they own
- Paying farmers to cover crops (100%) in Chesapeake Bay → state paid
- Supply and demand crops (hogs). More money made on manure than on pigs themselves. Sequester carbon and reduce inputs.
- 60% rented cropland
- Concerns about why convert good cropland to set-aside
- Prices → compare to CRP vs. crops
- Increased flooding → increased rainfall, increased drainage
- Reduced crop price, increased inputs
- Rent about the same
- Improving soil to be more sustainable and arable
- Increased CRP payments running out new farmers
- Carbon sequestration in existing crops
- Incorporate perennial crops
- What are new markets
- Citizen driven to change market
- Someone has to push this
- Food, fiber, fuel – we can all make a change; pay higher
- Couple states cultivate their brand. ME Grown, MI Grown, MN Grown – specialty crops

- Lots of programs for commodity crops, 8,000 acres hemp, for example
- Consumer driven or gut driven
- Farm Bill complex

How to make mass transit totally cool

- Mary Morse Marti (MoveMinneapolis.org)
- Move like a boss
- Behavior change – Transit Memes Facebook group
- Doing your own thing amongst others
- From a bus driver: In Morris, MN - town of 5K – have 7 busses. Shortest commute in this city – 7 miles. 17 seaters, regular stops + demand service – people call in. Elderly, college kids, disabled allows for mobility. These people are very thankful. Discounts for people \$1.25
- Need for demand service is skyrocketing.
- County human services, hospital pay for disadvantaged vouchers or provide
- *Decorate the bus for the holiday. A family and a community aspect.
- Joys of public transit
- Motor vehicle sales tax pass for transit funding
- **Needs to be faster, reliable, convenient. Be on time.
- A little sign that says your bus will be here in 3 minutes
- We need to invest in the system to make people want to ride
- Need better intracity options
- Watch Seattle – they are doing great things. Have funded transit with tax dollars
- Carfree – is not a liability. Is a good thing.
- Gen Xers
- Have snow – no windshield; you won't die driving; it makes sense especially in rural MN
- Rural shouldn't be left out of the conversation. Elderly people love it. Get out.
- Needs to be with a minimal financial investment
- Get a little exercise.
- Barrier – very slippery going to bus stop. Wider sidewalk – good sidewalks. Bike lanes and pedestrian ways – snow not always covered.
- Some people can't take a bus trip – is far too long. Doesn't work well for families.
- *Employers have a carpool day
- In a small town (6K) the preschoolers ride the bus home. It's a community.
- Have a free day on transit. Give away free passes – especially with events!
- Target give free passes to students
- Parts of electric busses are made in MN
- Transit advocacy needs to take place for the bonding bills
- Find out where the riders want to go
- People need to be exposed to something
- Use the city bus to move people at events – like earth day or...
- Ideas! Saving 2,800/year riding a bus to go to work. Don't give up the car – you can use it.
- Great for food deserts. Need to invest in where we are.

- [Oops off-topic: Grocery store van brings food to people.
 - RSDP – Morris – rural – farm brings garlic via truck that stocked the store back to distribution center
 - Some places it's dangerous to get to the bus stop especially cars, turning cars.]
- Transit voucher at stores if someone pays so much.
- Churches pay for rides

Climate and health

How do we quantify/communicate the impacts of climate on health in Minnesota?

- Difficulty of attribution: what health impacts are actually caused by/exacerbated by climate change
- how to assess “costs”

Importance of educating health professionals and the public about this. Barriers:

- not integrated into curriculum (educational programs)
- health professionals already so busy with other responsibilities
- no financial or other incentives

Problem of health care payment system – does not incentivize preventive care and environmental health

Entry points:

- Water – safe drinking water
- Children's health
- Mental health – climate anxiety
- Improving air quality via clean energy production and electrifying transportation

What can state/policy do?

- Change payment structure (or pass single payer healthcare!)
- Improve building standards
- improve access to and participation in drinking water testing

Importance of narrative – putting a face on these issues

Implications of Line 3 on climate

Concerns:

- Line 3 will produce 200 million metric tons of emissions per year, the equivalent of 50 new coal plants operating for 30 – 50 years. This is more than Minnesota's total emissions from all sectors currently, which is approximately 120-140 million metric tons a year. So no matter what Minnesota does to reduce our own state emissions – even getting to zero starting tomorrow – enabling Line 3 will increase the climate problem.

- Though these emissions will not technically count toward Minnesota's emissions totals since the tar sands oil is just passing through Minnesota, permitting the project means that these emissions will go into the air. The air doesn't care from where the emissions come. These emissions will impact Minnesota's climate as well as the climate around the world.
- Emissions enabling in other place
- Many tribes oppose – particularly oppose crossing their lands
- Air emissions are a global issues, even if not directly burned/emitted in MN
- Jobs argument – not sustainable jobs
- Safety and sustainability in current Line 3 – not many accidents thus far
- New pipelines and new construction
- Concerns about water quality and risk of impacts on water resources
- Lawsuits and updates
 - EIS being revisited based on appeals court decision
 - permits @ MPCA and DNR require valid EIS
- Preconstruction activity concern – timber
- Completed EIS possible by 12/9 or 12/10

Other thoughts expressed:

- Is there a possibility of roping other states and communities into the conversation so it is more than just Minnesota?
- Laws, systems and agency rules put in place in the 50s, 60s were designed to promote and defer to the building of pipelines and fossil fuel infrastructure. For instance, state law gives pipelines the power of eminent domain – taking private land it would like to use for the pipeline.
- Carbon taxation and impact on infrastructure projects
- EQB priority on how to factor in greenhouse gas emissions into Environmental Review process – ex. feedlot expansion case. How this happens in the future could be key in Line 3
- Another approach is looking at how the project is likely to fare in a physically changed environment
- PUC reconsider certificate of need
- Lobbying interests @ MN Legislature outpacing all others
- Little economic justification for MN
 - PUC documentation of certificate of need would provide some additional info about the original justification of decision
- Lobbying costs and ad costs get factored into cost recovery rates @ FERC
- Jobs + safety = priorities of local and county governments
 - Jobs alternatives – there are lots of infrastructure investments which would build jobs and take us in a positive direction (ex. EV charging infrastructure)
- Vision for positive future
 - removal issues
 - financial assurance requirement unknown (including ins. and decomm. fund?)
 - Relationship to Canadian government emissions goals – outreach to Canada?
 - So what is the ideal future for Line 3?
 - By Enbridge's own statements, there are 3 – 5 times more jobs created by removing the existing pipeline than building the new one.

- We need to articulate a vision for what the future looks like in 30 years when we've been wildly successful.
 - People in every part of the state have meaningful and fulfilling jobs that allow them to support a family and happy life.
 - We have clean water and air and healthcare.....

[Additional set of notes submitted by Jami Gaither:](#)

The Line 3 Open Space had about a dozen people and was pretty evenly divided between MN agency reps and citizens. Julie Goehring, MEQB Congressional District 7 Representative; Mary Otto, DOC Tribal Liaison; Helen Waquiu, MPCA Tribal Liaison; Steve Colvin, MN DNR Ecological and Water Resources Division Director; DNR Planner Nora (?); Laura Bishop, MPCA Commissioner; MPCA Educator (missed her name!), Sara Wolff, Minnesota Environmental Partnership Advocacy Director; Matteo, Sierra Club/MN350 Videographer; Robert Red Thunder, Red Lake Tribal Member; Jackie (didn't catch her info); Lindsay Anderson, Green Corps Member; and me!

Sara Wolff began the discussion with a presentation of some data she had on Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs) for MN. In 2005, we were at about 130 MMT CO₂/year and we've reduced this to about 110 MMT CO₂/year. Our 2007 goal for 2025 was to reduce by 30% - to about 90 MMT CO₂/year - and by 2030, we hoped to reduce by 45% below 2010 levels to about 65 MMT CO₂/year. Our old 2050 goal was to reduce to 80% of 2005 levels. But Walz' new Climate Change Subcabinet calls for 100% reduction by 2050, at least for our electrical production. It will be interesting to see how the group proceeds. [I've applied for a seat at the table. Put out the good energy for it!!]

Sara noted that, while we started out strong, Minnesota is no longer on track to meet goals for GHG reductions. We need to further reduce by about 7 MMT CO₂/year to hit our old 2025 goal or 13 MMT to meet our new 2025 goal of 30% reduction. That means a 40 MMT reduction by 2030 to meet the goal. She then noted that the GHG emissions for Line 3 will be 200 MMT CO₂/year. I mentioned McKibben's 2012 Do the Math article - where we learned that much of the remaining fossil fuels must remain in the ground.

I mentioned also that the only spill since 1989 on current Line 3 happened during a repair. When we look at the new lines for Keystone and DAPL, we're seeing spill after spill negating the "improvement" that new pipelines bring. Instead of the jobs for putting in a NEW Line 3, we can create ongoing employment via maintaining our currently safely operating Line 3. Safer AND more jobs.

Lindsey asked about what our current state is and Steve Colvin pointed to Laura Bishop who noted that the permits are on hold at the MPCA. The updated EIS is needed for those permits to be reconsidered. I gave a summary of the court cases where the Court of Appeals required an updated EIS. Steve Colvin noted that Enbridge has to do the analysis but the Department of Commerce does the EIS and presents it to the PUC. He also denoted the open DNR approvals pending: water appropriation permits for different purposes, utility license to cross public lands, utility license to cross public waters, listed species taking permit, a calcareous fen management program, and a public waters work permit (an

oddity for public water crossing permits). I summarized that there is currently NO Certificate of Need or Route Permit and, until the EIS is issued and re-approved as adequate, no EIS.

Someone asked about green jobs and a brief discussion ensued about the need. Someone asked about pre-construction work status and I mentioned the difficulty with understanding WHAT you are seeing in the landscape - is it Enbridge pre-construction or high line construction? Is it Enbridge pre-construction or Charlie clearing his timber to pay for his kid's college?

Current state of the EIS and when and how it will be deemed adequate were unclear. The EIS due date of the 9th (or 10th?) noted by the agency reps. Whether it was supplemental was denied - it is an "update". I noted that this is all potentially new territory as we have never done an EIS for a pipeline prior to this in Minnesota. Sara noted that the rationale from the PUC for approving Line 3 was to protect the people from disaster; building the pipeline would be a means to that end. [I'd argue now, after all the spills on new pipelines, that the current Line 3 is safer...] However, that decision was made in summer 2018 and, in October 2018, the IPCC released a report that noted an increased urgency for addressing climate, reducing to 45% of 2010 emissions by 2030. In November 2018, the US report on how climate is affecting us was a second major notice on the urgent need for considering how we make decisions in light of the climate crisis. None of this information was available when the PUC made the decision to approve Line 3.

Lindsey noted that we may need to include other states or governments to work on emissions reductions in a more global way. The health of the citizens where the oil will be burned might help involve more people in understanding the risks. She lost enthusiasm when it was mentioned that much of this oil will be exported to offshore users... noting, "China's not a democracy." [I'd argue that we're doing nothing and we supposedly have a democracy...] Colvin noted that this brings us to considering the cumulative effects of these GHG emissions. Matteo noted the argument from Canada could be that we're impeding their national interests to use their natural resources.

This led to a discussion on lobbying and a note that Enbridge accounted for more than twice the amount of the second largest lobbying source for Minnesota. I asked Steve Colvin about his comment that, "Minnesota is a pass through state" for Line 3. I asked on what basis the PUC made the decision when so many groups opposed, from the DOC to the Tribes to other intervening parties. While Steve didn't want to speak to the actions of other agencies, he noted the rationale must be noted.* Sara also noted that the laws in the US were developed long ago to give allowances to the fossil fuel industry, for example, allowance to use eminent domain to take land needed for pipelines, to create the growth of the country. We've given deference to the free flow of fossil fuels and now we are swimming upstream with a change in our circumstances. The money supporting the fossil fuel industry is also a factor for consideration.

Sara also noted that the ads being placed by Enbridge - full page ads in the Star Tribune run ~\$30K - are wrapped into the costs of getting the pipeline built!! This is assessed to the people in the area where the pipeline traverses. Per Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), these people are assessed a rate that includes the costs of these ads. So every time you see an Enbridge ad, you should be seeing it as

more money you'll be paying for these fuels. This explains why they advertise so heavily - it's on our dime in the end anyway - but what about the risks of them going out of business? Globally we are discussing divestment from and an end to dependence on fossil fuels. Could not getting Line 3 bring bankruptcy leaving Minnesota on the hook for it all? Also noted, regarding ads, Enbridge markets as a "renewable" energy supporter... but they sold off all their wind assets!!

Lindsey noted that when she Googles Line 3, Enbridge pays to be sure their link is the top site listed. This is what money can do. I noted that this same thing happened as Exxon faced court challenges recently in New York.

The discussion turned next to jobs. Julie noted the county commissioners in her part of Minnesota are focused on jobs. This is their focus for Line 3. "Safer and brings more jobs" is the message from them. We hear this all the time in Greater MN. One of the agency people talked about how government jobs are great because of the mobility and possibility. But they're in the Cities... Jobs are really in need in Greater MN.

I noted that the road to people ratio in Northern MN offers a lot of potential to capitalize on the new green economy coming my way. Julie noted that Paul Douglas recently noted he couldn't take his electric vehicle for an outstate event because he didn't have the charging possibility there. Lindsey noted that no car in her price range has the mileage range needed for her to get from where she lives to her parent's house which makes an EV an impossibility for her. Everyone else in America is dealing with these same issues.

Sara asked us to all consider what the world would look like if it was the way we imagined it to be. A world where no matter what part of the state you lived in, you could have a job that is meaningful for you and provides for your family, and no one has to breathe the fumes of pollution and our waters are clean. AOC did it. [Seriously, watch this - it gives hope.]

I talked about the question from the earlier session on what we need to let go of moving forward. I noted that the decision to stop mowing to the edge of the retention ponds also brings a solution to the goose problem because they fear predators in the foliage. And these solutions can become the snowball that we see rolling forward, leading to more and more solutions.

What's the future for Line 3? Stick more people on repairs, eventually rid ourselves of it? Sara noted that the DOC report advised no need for Line 3 and that we could even NOT build a new Line 3 AND close the existing Line 3 and STILL meet all Minnesota's needs. I noted that a bigger question is whether Enbridge is looking at bankruptcy near term as the Fossil Fuel industry dies. Will we have to clean up their mess of old and dead pipelines? If we want to talk JOBS, there are 3-5X more jobs in pipeline removal than pipeline construction. MN Taxpayers will be paying for the cleanup if we don't get our ducks in a row to hold them accountable. Why not let Enbridge pay for their own removal? Starting NOW.

Steve Colvin noted that he's not sure what financial assurance requirements are embedded in the regulations. For metallic mining, there are financial assurance requirements (though the figures are debated!). This protects against common mining bankruptcy.

Have we talked with the province from Canada that is likely also looking at their own GHG emission reduction programs? No one was familiar with their requirements but the idea of working together on these issues is a good one.

I mentioned the David Dybdahl report from Michigan on Enbridge's financial liability. I noted there are programs for Line 3 but that the details are not public as Enbridge claims they are "trade secret". One suggestion was to find whose oil they are transporting and stop supporting those businesses. Enbridge is only the mover, not the one selling the product, so we are largely unable to impact Enbridge as a company.

Laura noted timelines and said that MPCA has a responsibility and she is working with her staff on this work. MPCA's is determining timing with USACE and they need to provide a schedule to the USACE as their default is 60 days. This consultation work is in progress. Nothing final on EIS as of yet. Route permitting was noted as "not done".

One final question was to ask about carbon taxes which was a bit outside this group's bailiwick. Most agreed that all costs will eventually come back to consumers. I tried to give the CCL spin on this idea that those who spend a lot will pay more and those who spend less will gain with the standard refunds to all citizens. Had a bit of a discussion on where this would fall with MN being a pass-through state.

And finally, the feed lot that was questioned for GHG emissions was brought forward. There was speculation that this could affect the pipeline discussion as well. Laura addressed the MEQB factoring in of climate. This will be factored in on the EAW/ER. There is a larger idea of how we tackle this as climate as well, including what rule changes may be needed. This and health too will factor into the work being done by the MEQB.

City-level solutions and climate action – Building resiliency

- Sol Smart
- MERISS – permittable use
- Winona – more united, building permit section, roofing/solar permit
- Solar gardens – cities interested in pursuing, need to ensure pollinator friendly (some challenges)
- Appropriate pollinator habitat
- Utility RFP – more green, grow faster
- City of Rochester – waiting list for Lawns to Legumes (BOWSR RFP), storm water benefits and pollinator friendly
- U of M – conducting pollinator study with solar gardens; also landfill study with solar in Hastings (technical and legal constraints)
- Solar for Schools needs more interest/ third party funding
- Flood mitigation map in progress for Hennepin County
 - Where, who, funding for storm water pipe improvements in Metro
- FEMA has a lengthy process for funding of natural disasters like frost boils/damaged roads

- Cities/counties/townships do not have time to wait for funds – need to fix ASAP knowing the damage on gravel roads will reoccur in Spring
- Mitigation is laborious and expensive
- Other funding may be available through Minnesota Homeland Security and Emergency Management
- State led – one watershed plan
 - County –hazard
 - FEMA – disaster relief
 - State – disaster
- Energy efficiency
 - City buildings
 - Purchasing policy can help dictate decisions especially for new buildings (SB 2030)
- Transportation
 - Parking minimums
 - Morris public transit works great especially with dial a ride
 - EV charging spots
 - Applied for EV bus grant but denied; would be great with nearby biofuels/ethanol plants
 - Has bike lanes
 - Winona considering separated bike lanes
- State Aid Rules for state and County Roads
 - Engineering good ideas like bike lines
 - Use of the right away
 - Need to consider types of traffic measure (bike, pedestrian, semi, truck)

Diversity in Minnesota resiliency planning

- When we bring people to the table, we need to sit back and listen first. Our timeline may not be their timeline and it takes time to build trust. Don't swoop in and think you are going to rescue people. You are here to listen and build relationships. That helps to build a safe space.
- The tribes are way ahead of the game on resiliency. They have dealt with loss and change for hundreds of years. Invite them to be our teachers.
- Reach out to people who need to be included. Go to the neighborhoods, or the tribal council (if invited). Meet people where they are. Once you do have a community dialogue, maintain that relationship. The questions and answers are always evolving.
- Too often when we talk about marginalized communities, the language is "how do we include them"? That's the kid you don't want on the team. The question should be "How can they lead?" We come from a long intergenerational history of looking to the effects on 7 generations into the future.
- Don't treat tribes as homogeneous. One tribe is not the same as the next, and urban people are not the same as those on a tribe. Be okay with the possibility that they aren't ready for you or don't want to talk to you yet.
- Research is not a term that sits well with some native communities. It often hasn't served us in the past. It has been used to serve the people of privilege.
- Schedule when it works for the community. For our community, that might mean in the winter.

- History of research has historically looked like going to the tribes and extracting data—taking—and then going back to our offices and digesting it. It should be a relationship, and one that acknowledges history and context.
- Give room and space for the leadership that has already occurred in a community to be recognized and brought forward. Get someone from the community to lead the meeting and give them plenty of room to take it in a direction that is useful and culturally relevant to them.
- Look for mutual interests and opportunities to benefit one another. We have aligned interests and can leverage one another's energy. It's not about recruiting "them" to help you with your project, it is about working together on issues that are aligned.
- One thing agencies struggle with is how to engage diverse communities when you are working within rigid regulatory processes (e.g. environmental review) that weren't really designed to accommodate the kind of relationship-building that we're speaking of right now. Agencies deviate from that process at their peril. What, legislatively, could change to allow us to have better collaborative processes? We need to build demand for these changes so that it is not just agencies knocking at the door and asking for something.
- Resilience is an emergent notion within white culture, and it's hard to strip away the white, privileged context from which that comes. "Survival" might be what other communities would call it.
- Historical trauma is something that people want to talk about in native communities. It has real, epigenetic effects. Native people exist in a world created to make us extinct. So the way you use resiliency can be different, but we (or at least I) appreciate resiliency more than adaptation, which asks us to change once again to fit your world.
- "We are still here"—said by native women artists, and speaks to the resiliency native peoples have shown over many generations. Let's listen and learn from the wisdom of these people. We want instant solutions now and know the risks of delaying. But in order to weather the demands before us, we will need to learn from each other.
- Immigrants and refugees: How do we go to them as part of this conversation? We're just now being affected by these changes, but many of them have been affected by this, and worse, for much longer. Look to their leaders first and build a relationship. Be willing to be in the back and be a supporter, rather than rushing in and asserting your authority as superior to the lived experience they bring.
- Colonialism, patriarchy, capitalism all feed together to keep poor people, and marginalized people, out of positions of power. Equitable diversity needs to be the goal, not just diversity for its own sake. People of color, black, brown, queer, are the most resilient among us because they have survived despite the system being actively built against us.
- People who earn \$30,000/year give a higher percentage of their income than the 1%. It is interesting what we chose to forget as a culture. Most of this nation was built on the backs of poor people. If we are serious about being partners and ceding power, we need to make that effort and that conscious choice. There is always the "white fear" that they will do to us what we did to them.
- Look at the demographics of what is available to that community. The Somali community is very entrepreneurial. The world they know is the one they're working in; environment may not be on their minds.
- And don't communicate with people through newspapers or news releases. We don't use those. We use native Twitter or black Twitter, or black newspapers. We don't read the Star Tribune, and nobody we know does. That's not how we share information.

- Is it a question of being afraid of “them” doing to us what we did to them, or is it a question of power structures that already exist not allowing things to be done differently?
- John Stewart effect: no coverage of peaceful protests, but when there was a very small violent protest, it was nationwide coverage.
- Equity advisory committee: They should be the governing body for the institution, not an offshoot with no real authority.
- Protesting “nicely” doesn’t always get much attention. It’s only when conventions get broken that it attracts some attention.
- As a white environmental community, can we do as much to dismantle white supremacy as we think we should be doing to address climate change? We feel that we have to do things together, but that means we really have to care about what everyone else is saying. We have to acknowledge our privilege and really work to dismantle white supremacy.
- Traditional, entrenched white organizations need to either fix their issues, or disappear and let the leadership come from somewhere else.
- As a white environmentalist, every community of color that you are talking about is where the environmental effects have the most impact. And they are not even in the room to begin with.
- For a long time we have shut our eyes to where our waste actually goes and who it impacts. It’s only now when this starts to affect us, even just a little bit, that we start to realize what others have endured (or not endured) for a long time. And white people still think they can run away and avoid it.
- We have to cede power and be willing to let others lead. We cannot see ourselves as the saviors and assume that we have the answers, or even that we have the right questions.
- And it is not one issue. If you are a landowner, you care more about it than if you live in a horrible apartment. All these issues come together.
- Over 600 superfund sites are on a reservation. Talking to people you know and have a connection to has a better chance of effecting change than people without power speaking to people with power. White people should not be silent, because that is enabling white supremacy.