

EQB Advisory Panel

Meeting Summary

October 10, 2017

9:00 am - 12:00 pm

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

Present Members: Willis Mattison, Jason Aagenes, Lucas Sjostrom (on the phone), Michele Ross, Carissa Slotterback, Timothy Nelson, Andi Moffatt (on the phone), Kate Fairman (substitute for Randall Doneen), David Zoll, Josh Fitzpatrick, James Atkinson

EQB Staff: Will Seufert, Courtney Ahlers-Nelson, Denise Wilson.

Management Analysis & Development (MAD) Staff: Henriët Hendriks

Welcome and introductions

Henriët opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

Panel members introduced themselves.

Meeting overview

Henriët asked the panel members if they had comments or feedback on the September meeting notes. No comments were provided.

Denise and Henriët provided background to the panel on today's review of summary notes from previous meetings. Henriët noted that while EQB staff is looking for panel consensus, the panel early on also indicated that consensus is important but should not be a roadblock to moving forward.

Small group review of panel consensus for topic areas discussed to-date

In two small groups, panel members reviewed the summary notes from the previous months according to the following questions:

1. Do the sections "Advisory Panel Consensus" and "Opposing Views" adequately reflect the outcome of the panel discussions around each monthly topic?
 - If not, why not?
 - Quick language changes?
 - More discussion needed?
 - Document and move on?
2. For the Mandatory Categories discussion:

- Is there consensus on any of the remaining 7 proposed mandatory categories?

Large-group report-out

The small groups shared their notes and feedback with the large group. Panel members made wording changes and suggestions for additional language to the summary notes which were documented on large posters (see document “ERAP Summary Feb-October with panel feedback”). Panel members provided feedback on the summary notes from the months April-July. The panel indicated it needed more time to discuss the August summary notes on Human Health Considerations in Environmental Review. Within the meeting’s timeframe, the panel was not able to start discussing the September notes on Meaningful Engagement in Environmental Review.

Further panel discussion on monthly topics

Climate Change Considerations in Environmental Review (April and May)

The panel noted that there are two separate questions regarding greenhouse gasses (GHG):

1. What is the role of GHG for projects to get into the environmental review process?
2. Once a project is in environmental review, what role does GHG analysis/climate change analysis play?

The panel further noted:

- Guidance is needed on:
 - EAW *and* EIS
 - Category threshold *and* EAW form
- Panel suggestion to a possible future technical panel:
 - By addressing recommendation/options 3(a) through 3(e) under the May Summary Notes, the panel will capture GHG/climate change in EAW; after updating the guidance, can the threshold be eliminated?

Mandatory Categories

- The panel suggests that [a future] technical panel look at:
 - Ecologically sensitive land versus other land; take into consideration type of land (ecological assessment)
 - Cumulative impacts of projects

Permitting and Environmental Review

- Design of environmental review; more developed project early on
 - But what is the role of alternatives; less opportunity for change if project is more developed early on
- The panel notes that there seems to be a disconnect between #3 under Advisory Panel Consensus (the role of local plans) and EQB staff recommendations [note from MAD: This might be resolved with the panel-suggested wording change]

Human Health Considerations in Environmental Review

- Discussion around whether health is explicitly incorporated in EIS.
- No consensus around #1 under Advisory Panel Consensus?

Public comment

Commenter 1: I appreciate that the panel takes a broader view of environmental review; more holistic understanding. When it comes to the relationship between plans, permits, and environmental review, each process has a different purpose, which needs to be laid out more explicitly before moving to recommendations.

Panel timeline

Denise asked the panel for feedback on topics for the last three panel meetings. Panel members agreed to finish the discussion of the remaining summary notes during the November meeting and stick to the topics as proposed by EQB staff.

The meeting ended at noon.