

Panel Meeting	February 2017	March 2017	April 2017	May 2017
Discussion Topic	Panel Visions of Success; See February Panel Agenda .	Leveraging Differences and Planning for Future Meetings; See March Panel Agenda .	Climate Change Considerations in Environmental Review; See April Panel Agenda .	Climate Change Considerations in Environmental Review; See May Panel Agenda
EQB Problem Statements			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How GHG calculations and/or a broader climate change analysis contribute to ER has not been established.• The MN ER process does not include GHG calculations and/or a broader climate change analysis as part of the ER process for all projects.• There is one mandatory EAW category based on a GHG threshold.• There is not consistency among RGUs, project proposers and citizens to produce GHG calculations and/or a broader climate change analysis and more educational materials are needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How GHG calculations and/or a broader climate change analysis contribute to ER has not been established.• The MN ER process does not include GHG calculations and/or a broader climate change analysis as part of the ER process for all projects.• There is one mandatory EAW category based on a GHG threshold.• There is not consistency among RGUs, project proposers and citizens to produce GHG calculations and/or a broader climate change analysis and more educational materials are needed.
Advisory Panel Consensus – includes recommendations, and options for next steps provided by the Panel <i>This section is a summary of the agreement captured in the monthly meeting minutes.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See February Meeting Minutes.• Established that consensus is important for the Panel to make “recommendations,” but that achieving consensus should not be a roadblock.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See March Meeting Minutes.• Panel would like guidance from EQB on how much they could change in ER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See April Meeting Minutes and Supporting Document <p>What do GHG calculations tell us?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. GHG emissions calculations inform decision makers and the public when used in ER.2. GHG calculations in ER can be used to:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Propose or evaluate project alternativesb) Propose or evaluate environmental impact mitigation measuresc) Track local, state and federal GHG and climate change goals <p>What does a climate change analysis tell us?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Consensus that a broader climate change analysis is part of the cumulative potential effects analysis of ER.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See May Meeting Minutes and Supporting Document <p>Recommendations for EAW Air Pollution category (which uses GHGs as a threshold)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Panel agrees GHG should be used as the threshold and some form of the EAW Air Pollution category should remain in rule.<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Subset felt that the threshold be lowered to 25,000 tons/year of GHG.b) Another subset wanted EQB to gather more data before changing the threshold.2. Panel agrees that the category should not be connected to a federal air permitting program.3. Panel agrees that the GHG calculation should be broadened to include:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Emission during construction and operation of the projectb) Energy consumptionc) Carbon sequestrationd) Mitigation measures <p>Adding GHG and climate change questions to the EAW Form?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. Panel agrees there should be GHG calculation and climate change analysis question on the EAW Form.
Opposing Views – includes recommendations and options for next steps provided by dissenting Panel members				<p>Recommendations for EAW Air Pollution category (which uses GHGs as a threshold)?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. There should be no GHG threshold mandatory threshold; EQB should eliminate the EAW Air Pollution category <p>Adding GHG and climate change questions to the EAW Form?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. EQB should not add a separate GHG and Climate change question to the EAW Form.3. EQB needs more science or policy makers should decide whether GHG and climate change questions should be added to the EAW Form.
ER Staff Actionable Next Steps/Preliminary Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Build a one-year Panel agenda that enables the group to talk about the areas identified on the “Visions of Success” table.• Develop year-long “Advisory Panel Agenda” developed from the Panel’s “Visions of Success.”	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide guidance on tools to enable programmatic change and success for the Panel.• Develop “EQB ER Tools for Change” document created because of the March discussion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conversation continued in May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• NEXT STEP - EQB staff will assemble technical staff from other agencies, RGUs and agency leadership/policy leads to complete the following:1. Determine whether GHG emissions are reasonably calculated for each EAW and EIS category.<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) Identify EAW and EIS categories or project types that likely have a lesser or greater difficulty in calculating GHG emissions, and mitigation and adaptation strategies, and make recommendations for each group of projects.b) Develop an approach and guidance for completing an appropriate GHG analysis for all EAW and EIS categories.2. For determining whether a project triggers the GHG Air Pollution EAW category, identify how to determine the estimated amount of GHG that will be emitted so that all proposed projects are evaluated for EAW applicability under that category.3. Develop guidance for how to examine a proposed project’s potential GHG impacts. For example, develop guidance for how to address the additional impacts on air quality, water, wildlife and the potential cumulative effects on the EAW Form, as well as identifying mitigation and adaptation measures.4. Develop a list of best management practices and mitigation opportunities to reduce overall GHG emissions.5. Develop guidance for how to address the social cost of carbon in EISs.

Panel Meeting	June 2017	July 2017
Discussion Topic	Mandatory Categories for Environmental Review; See June Panel Agenda. <ul style="list-style-type: none">Panel members completed a survey prior to the June meeting indicating whether the EAW and EIS mandatory categories should be modified, eliminated or if the threshold should be raised or lowered. See results.	Permitting and Environmental Review; See July Panel Agenda.
Problem Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Existing mandatory categories need to be reviewed and potentially updated (rule change) to:<ul style="list-style-type: none">Add new categories that reflect emerging environmental concerns;Eliminate outdated categories orModify existing categories by raising or lowering thresholds.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">There is confusion about the relationship between permitting and ER.EQB needs to understand where in the intersection of federal, state and local permitting ER there are redundancies and identify changes.EQB needs to understand where citizens, project proposers and RGUs need ER process improvements.
Advisory Panel Consensus – includes recommendations, options for next steps provided by the Panel <i>This section is a summary of the monthly meeting minutes.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">See June Meeting Minutes and Supporting Document.11 different mandatory categories (EAWs and EISs) were discussed at the meeting. See where there was Panel consensus below and what broader themes emerged from the survey results. <p>Panel agrees the following mandatory categories need to be reviewed and updated (rule change):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">MR 4410.4300, subp.11 – Metallic mineral mining and processing (EAW) – EAW before supplemental EIS when changes to the project occur. The original EIS might still be valid. This may be a process change, rather than a change to the EAW category.MR 4410.4300, subp.12 – Nonmetallic mineral mining (EAW) – Part B of 4410.4300, subp.12 - Current trigger is nebulous—RGUs (state and local) agree. Should consider “penetrating the water table” as a threshold and Panel members thought this better captures the potential impact.MR 4410.4300, subp.19 and 4410.4400, subp.14 – Residential development (EAW and EIS) – The math problem (as opposed to the threshold) is overly difficult. Develop a mandatory category tool to calculate whether trigger is met. This may be a process change, rather than a change to the EAW category.MR 4410.4300, subp.24 – Water appropriations and impoundments (EAW) – Part A of 4410.4300, subp.24 - “one source of water” seems problematic; should there be a reference with “one aquifer?” Also, clarify thresholds for GWMA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">See July Meeting Minutes and Supporting Document. <p>Relationship between permitting and ER.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Panel agrees that permitting and ER serve different purposes.<ol style="list-style-type: none">Panel suggests that one way to align ER and permitting is to scope an EAW. <p>Where can the relationship between federal or state or local approvals/permitting process and state ER process be improved and how?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Panel agrees that the federal and state permitting and ER processes can be improved by working early to coordinate all parties and for all parties to recognize the early work.<ol style="list-style-type: none">Panel agrees that a solution is to bring all parties working on permitting and ER together early to coordinate processes.Panel suggests that when local plans are developed according to state statute, “accepted”, or “approved” by the state, that that information and/or process used to develop the local government should replace the state ER process. <p>What can be improved about the state ER process on citizens, project proposers, RGUs and tribal governments?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Panel agrees that better public/civic engagement in the ER process and in RGU decisions is needed.<ol style="list-style-type: none">Panel suggests that citizens and other parties should be brought into in the ER process early.
Opposing Views – includes recommendations provided by dissenting Panel members		
ER Staff Actionable Next Steps/Preliminary Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">NEXT STEP - During the Mandatory Category Rulemaking the above mandatory categories will be reviewed and considered in the current scope.PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION - Process and policy rulemaking, in addition to Mandatory Category Rulemaking, may need to be done.PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION - Ask interagency rulemaking team and Tech. Reps. to review changes and propose rule changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION - Revisit in November ERAP Meeting:<ol style="list-style-type: none">Develop a process for bringing permitting and ER parties together earlier in the ER process.Scoping EAWs – allows for RGUs and project proposers to be more precise in the ER, but could also bring the public into the ER process sooner.Alternatives process – allowing other state processes, such as the development of plans, to substitute for portions of the ER process.Create “off-ramps” and “exclusions” for RGUs to use at their discretion so that redundancies in permitting and ER can be reduced.

Panel Meeting	August 2017	September 2017
Discussion Topic	Human Health Considerations in Environmental Review; See August Panel Agenda .	Meaningful Engagement in Environmental Review; See September Panel Agenda
Problem Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The MN ER process does not include physical, social and mental health considerations.• There is not consistency among RGUs, project proposers and citizens on how to incorporate human health considerations into MN ER process.• There is not consistency among RGUs, project proposers and citizens on how to conduct a health impact (HIA) assessment as a part of the MN ER process.• EQB has been asked to incorporate HIAs into the EAW and EIS processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The MN ER process does not allow for meaningful engagement.• EQB needs to understand what enables meaningful engagement and how to change the ER process.
Advisory Panel Consensus – includes recommendations, options for next steps provided by the Panel <i>This section is a summary of the monthly meeting minutes.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See August Meeting Minutes and Supporting Document. <p><i>Are human health impacts part of ER?</i></p> <p>1. Panel agrees that human health impacts are not directly or consistently addressed through all forms of ER.</p> <p><i>Recommendations for incorporating human health impacts in ER.</i></p> <p>2. Panel consensus on the need to provide more guidance on how to incorporate human health impacts into ER. Guidance should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) How to complete the EAW Form with greater human health impacts considered in each questionb) How to use EAWs as a screening tool for HIAsc) How to scope health into EISs, including scoping HIAs at the same timed) How to use other methods to better integrate a health perspective into ER <p>3. Some Panel members commented on getting greater stakeholder involvement in ER and health perspectives would be better incorporated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• See September Meeting Minutes and Supporting Document. NOTE: Not Yet Approved By Panel <p><i>Meaningful engagement – what works?</i></p> <p>1. Panel agrees that the following conditions enable meaningful engagement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Time and timing of meetings:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Timing is key○ Ensure early input (in the project timeline)○ Regular open meetings• Meeting location:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Go to where people are○ Culturally appropriate space• Who is present:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Having expertise in room (who can act), knowing who is there○ Talk to each other/neighbors○ Skilled independent facilitator• Other meeting process/format conditions:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Variety of ways to provide input○ Well defined process up front○ Not “check-the-box” for proposers/RGUs• Type of exchange:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Education components (by proposer/city)○ Listening component○ Commitment to be open/listen○ Face-to-face contact• Clarity/transparency around meeting topic, what is at stake, what decisions are made:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Clear identification of stakeholders early on• Relationship between parties involved in process:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Participants are convinced they can make difference, but also know limitations○ No upfront assumption about community needs/concerns
Opposing Views – includes recommendations provided by dissenting Panel member	<p><i>Recommendations for incorporating human health impacts in ER.</i></p> <p>1. Need for objective peer review—standing committee of experts to review ER documents for human health impacts. This could be done at the scoping step for EISs.</p>	
ER Staff Actionable Next Steps/Preliminary Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• NEXT STEP - EQB staff will work with MDH to consider: <p>1. How project proposers and RGUs could complete the EAW Form with greater consideration of human health impacts. This could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Suggestions for how to modify the questions on the EAW Form; and/orb) Developing guidance to better answer the questions on the EAW Form <p>2. Guidance for how RGUs may use the EAW as a screening tool for an HIA or scoping an HIA into an EIS</p> <p>3. Whether there are any other tools or best management practices RGUs and project proposers should consider in developing EAWs and EISs and/or their stakeholder processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION – Consider including a question about civic engagement on the EAW Form. Ask that project proposers and RGUs describes which parties are impacted by the project and how they will be included in the environmental review process.• PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION – Consider creating a guidance document for how to introduce civic engagement best practices in the Environmental Review Program.

Panel Meeting	October 2017	November 2017	December 2017
Discussion Topic			
Problem Statement			
Advisory Panel Consensus – includes recommendations, options for next steps provided by the Panel <i>This section is a summary of the monthly meeting minutes.</i>			
Opposing Views – includes recommendations provided by dissenting Panel member			
ER Staff Actionable Next Steps/Preliminary Recommendations			