
Solar Siting in Agricultural Landscapes: Stakeholder Input Summary

Minnesota Department of Commerce and Minnesota Department
of Agriculture
September 16, 2019

Project Team

Erica Klein

Kris Van Amber

Enterprise Director, MAD

Ryan Church

Assistant Director

Beth Bibus

Contact Information

Telephone: 651-259-3800

Email: Management.Analysis@state.mn.us

Fax: 651-797-1311

Website: mn.gov/mmb/mad

Address:

658 Cedar Street

Centennial Office Building

Room 300

Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

Management Analysis and Development

Management Analysis and Development is Minnesota government's in-house fee-for-service management consulting group. We have 35 years of experience helping public managers increase their organizations' effectiveness and efficiency. We provide quality management consultation services to local, regional, state, and federal government agencies and public institutions.

Alternative Formats

This document can be made available in alternative formats upon request. Call 651-259-3800.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
Stakeholder activities.....	5
Stakeholder questionnaire	5
First stakeholder meeting.....	11
Second stakeholder meeting.....	12
Appendix A: Prime farmland exclusion rule	18
Appendix B: Prime farmlands definition (Code of Federal Regulations).....	19
Appendix C: Invited stakeholder organizations by stakeholder group	20
Appendix D: Stakeholder participation	22
Appendix E: Email questionnaire	24
Appendix F: June 12 meeting agenda.....	25
Appendix G: June 26 meeting agenda	26

Introduction

Solar energy generation is an important component of Minnesota’s renewable energy portfolio, and its importance is likely to increase as non-renewable energy sources are phased out. However, the relatively large physical footprint of solar facilities means that their development is more likely to raise concerns about conversion and adverse impacts to farmland, forest land, and natural lands.

The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) faced the issue of farmland conversion, and the “prime farmland exclusion rule” contained in the Power Plant Siting Act regulations, during its review of Marshall Solar Project in March 2016. The prime farmland exclusion rule prohibits siting power plants on prime farmland where the site includes a half acre per megawatt of net generating capacity, unless “there is no feasible and prudent alternative” (see rule text in Appendix A). Prime farmland is defined by federal law, and consists of soils deemed to be the best for growing crops (see text in Appendix B).

Subsequently, during a recent rule making process, the PUC charged both the Minnesota Department of Commerce (Commerce) and the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) to convene a work group as a first step to develop information and identify the interests and priorities of a wide group of stakeholders on this issue.

During the summer of 2019, Management Analysis and Development (MAD), at the request of MDA and Commerce, conducted a survey and two facilitated workshops with a workgroup of persons representing organizations with a stake in the siting process. The purpose of the meetings was to examine the issues, priorities, and preferences of the stakeholders regarding the siting of large-scale solar facilities in agricultural landscapes and identify areas of potential agreement and compromise between varying perspectives. This report summarizes that stakeholder input.

Stakeholder activities

MDA and Commerce identified organizations with a stake in the siting process, regardless of scale, to participate in stakeholder activities. In identifying stakeholders, they attempted to capture a full range of the motivations and priorities involved in site selection. Meetings were open and some participants were not on the original invitation list. The stakeholder groups included farmers' organizations, energy organizations, energy nonprofits, local governments, and academic planners.¹ Appendix C lists the specific organizations in each of these categories that were invited to participate. Appendix D lists the individual participants by activity based on returned questionnaires and sign-in sheets for meetings.

The first stakeholder activity was an email questionnaire. The next two activities were stakeholder meetings. These activities are described in more detail in the following sections.

Stakeholder questionnaire

MDA and Commerce identified stakeholders representing farmers, local governments, energy organizations, and energy nonprofits to participate in preliminary data collection for the purpose of informing stakeholder meetings. These stakeholders are listed in Appendix C. MDA sent an email questionnaire to these stakeholders, included as Appendix E. The only constraint placed on submissions was that each organization should only return one completed questionnaire. Twenty completed questionnaires were returned. Nine of the returned questionnaires were from energy organizations, three from energy nonprofits, four from farmers organizations, and four from local government entities.

MAD summarized the returned questionnaires into themes and perspectives by stakeholder group (Table 1: Questionnaire themes). This summary was shared with stakeholders prior to and during the first stakeholder meeting.

¹ State agencies also participated to provide information and hear stakeholder input.

Table 1: Questionnaire themes

Theme	Energy Organizations	Energy Nonprofits	Farmers	Local Government
Land practices: Consider long- and short-term impacts to the land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal environmental impacts 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address drainage and weed control • Protect landowner rights • Restore land when finished • Flexibility around prime vs. marginal land • Cost of and responsibility for maintaining adjacent habitat • Maintain access to all land • Want to be engaged in the discussion and decisions around land use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on prime farmland • Cleanup • Erosion control • End stage—remove equipment, restore land

Theme	Energy Organizations	Energy Nonprofits	Farmers	Local Government
Location: What drives choices about location?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to transmission • Landowner should have the right to use prime farmland for solar • Consider slope, ground cover, proximity to interconnection points, proximity to population centers • Sites that present limited environmental and legal risks • Suitability depends on landowner participation, utility infrastructure, geographic and environmental characteristics, and zoning laws • Lowest cost site development • Site with highest revenue-generating potential • Sites that would benefit from the development (brownfield land) • Acquiring land rights sometimes overrides other siting considerations that are also important 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not oversimplify rules about type of land suitable • Prefer locations where people and government support solar development • Likelihood of catastrophic event in that location in 30-year project lifetime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honor landowners' preferences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Away from public eye • Marginal cropland • Away from dense population • Proximity to substation or transmission lines • Substation capacity

Theme	Energy Organizations	Energy Nonprofits	Farmers	Local Government
Economics: What are the issues and ideas related to financial costs and benefits?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider cost of programs like pollinator habitat • Generate new local tax revenues • There are many costs to factor in • Cost of decommissioning • Bolster farm family income 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistencies, e.g., between state and local regulation increase cost of projects • Benefits are not captured appropriately • Solar projects diversify revenue sources for farms • Community should benefit financially (tax or other methods) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax credits and tax incentives • Support long-term viability of farm • Contracts that are clear • Stable income stream • Insurance costs • Want development to add value to community • Using government-owned land since it is not contributing to the local tax base 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long-term payments for small amounts of land • Consider inflation into payments • Consider cleanup and maintenance costs • Amount of tax that goes to township suppresses interest from local government • Costs for maintaining roads
Regulation: Input about existing and potential statutes, standards, rules, certifications, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current statutes and rules about use of prime farmland could make it difficult to site solar • Should have and currently do not have standardized, predictable rules and timelines • Wisconsin is a model • Lengthy duration of Certificate of Need and Site Permit process • Regulations are becoming more burdensome • There should be a formal complaint and remedy process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulatory standards were not made for solar projects, leading to inappropriate design decisions • Want to develop in counties that have ordinances for pollinator-friendly ground cover 		

Theme	Energy Organizations	Energy Nonprofits	Farmers	Local Government
<p>Big picture: Thinking about long-term, overall, and overarching issues, concerns, and ideas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change • Transmission lines in Minnesota are largely at capacity • Demand for large solar projects is not going away • Can generate additional environmental benefits such as pollinator habitat and water quality benefits • Assurances about end-of-project-life decommissioning and return to tillable acreage • Jurisdictions should have access to objective educational materials from state agencies about what questions to ask, what ordinance options to consider, and workable design standards to ensure beneficial land use now and in the future • Improve land for future generations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change • Projects must have long-term viability • Freedom to use land and operate business of farm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change, renewable energy • Multi-generation outlook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want standardized guidance to use for local review of proposed projects

Theme	Energy Organizations	Energy Nonprofits	Farmers	Local Government
Other concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misinformation • The large number of upcoming projects could trigger pushback from communities, lawmakers, and regulators • Residents have fears including cancer, property values, and drainage • Some developers choose land without supporting infrastructure • Not In My Backyard (NIMBY) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social media makes false harmful claims about solar sites • Developers must engage transparently with communities • MDA could play leadership role but doesn't • Siting and design should be considered together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unknown risks • Stray voltage harming livestock • Fairness • Liabilities assumed? • Changes/harm to rural landscape • How will solar siting affect the cost of land for future generations? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glare • Stray voltage • Aesthetics • Impact on roads • Reduces amount of available agricultural land • Facilities change hands during development

First stakeholder meeting

MDA and Commerce hosted the first stakeholder meeting on June 12, 2019, from 10:30 to 2:30 in the Roseville, Minnesota public library community room. The agenda for this meeting is in Appendix F.

After several informational presentations, facilitators asked participants to sit at tables with others from the same stakeholder grouping and answer this question together: What one to three things would you like us to understand about your perspective on solar siting, including values, priorities, and interests? Renewable energy stakeholders had a relatively larger number of representatives present and were organized into two groups. Local government and utilities had a relatively small number of representatives present and were seated together. “Table 2: Stakeholder perspectives” presents the groups’ responses.

Table 2: Stakeholder perspectives

Stakeholder Group(s)	Responses
Agricultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider local control and landowner buy-in. • There is value in supporting the long-term viability of the farm as a business. • Consider prioritizing marginal land and include that land in this conversation.
Energy nonprofit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the cost difference between where it is most expedient and what offers the most benefit? • Where to site to maximize various metrics? • Where to site for most societal benefit? We need to include economic benefits, wealth creation benefits, and ecological benefits. • Climate change mitigation.
Local government and utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner and community impacts are critical. • Utilities are required to produce for lowest cost possible. • Substation and infrastructure consolidation/clustering.
Renewable energy (1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs are a real driver. Uncertainty adds to cost. • What was the original intent behind the prime land rule? • Are there best practices for land developed for solar to return to agricultural land? • We need a shared conversation about long-term vision in Minnesota about energy so we can have intentional planning.
Renewable energy (2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solar is already restrained by the grid. Consider that regulation came in before solar was widely in use. • Landowner rights need to be considered, especially rights to improve their economies. • The role for the governor and state agencies is to show leadership and how this can be a win-win, and help meet states’ goals in several domains.

As the last activity in this meeting, the facilitators asked the stakeholders to help plan for the second stakeholder meeting by identifying scenario characteristics that would be useful for exploring solar siting decision-making. The results were collected and used to help develop the scenarios for the second meeting.

Second stakeholder meeting

MDA and Commerce hosted the second stakeholder meeting on June 26, 2019, from 10:30 to 2:30 in the Roseville, Minnesota public library community room. The agenda for this meeting is in Appendix G. Participants were seated at tables organized to provide a mix of stakeholder group representation at each table.

MDA and Commerce prepared four scenarios, each based on a region of the state. Each table was provided with a five maps representing the region and asked to consider solar siting within that region. The maps included a base map containing substations, transmission lines, roads, cities and townships, a water quality map, a prime farmland map, an existing solar and wind site map, and a habitat map. Because of the large number of participants, one of the regional scenarios, Bonanza Valley, was addressed at two different tables. A facilitator worked with each table to address the following questions:

- What was the group’s process in selecting a site?
 - What information did the group decide was useful? Why?
 - What information did the group decide was not useful? Why?
 - Which factors was the group willing to negotiate on?
 - Which factors could not be negotiated on?
- How satisfied were you with the scenario outcome?

The facilitators allowed the groups to have flexibility in addressing these questions. As a result, some of the responses do not exactly match with the listed questions although they do all provide useful input about stakeholder decision processes, values, and priorities. “Table 3: Scenario responses” presents the groups’ responses, as transcribed from the flip charts produced by each group.

Table 3: Scenario responses

Table: Region	Information use	Factors negotiated	Other questions addressed
1: Nearest Metro	<p>Useful information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This process is mostly pragmatic and information is used in approximately this order • Grid • Which utility you are working with • Terrain—use and natural characteristics including shading • Community concerns /understanding • Community engagement • Community characteristics • All stakeholder preferences • Landowner preferences • Private and public ownership information <p>Not useful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater (why, not sure?) • Too much information about the whole grid—wrong scale, too big on the map, not enough information about specific site grids 	<p>Negotiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setback • Aesthetics • Location within site area • Early engagement • Ground cover • Maintenance • Inspection • Size of project • Local benefits • Compensation <p>Not negotiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering feasibility • Which utility you are working with • Physical world—lakes, cities, etc. • Landowner preferences 	<p>Overall satisfaction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed. Wanted more, smaller sites as an option. Wanted more granular information. Largely in agreement with each other at the table.

Table: Region	Information use	Factors negotiated	Other questions addressed
2: Bonanza Valley			<p>What were the group's process and priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects should be designed to benefit agriculture and ecosystems. • Solar is an approved use on prime farmland (conservation solar) • Minimize applying artificial boundaries that restrict site choice • Service territories • Regulatory certainty—variance for incorporating co-benefits • Understanding of agency (state and local) perspectives • Developer/landowner interests • Landowner interests (farmer or not)

Table: Region	Information use	Factors negotiated	Other questions addressed
3: Bonanza Valley	<p>Useful information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substation • Population density—where • Big tracts without prime farmland • Three areas • Groundwater map, wildlife areas—conservation • Willing community/landowners • Educating each other—not assuming we all know • Next step—who owns it—public/private • All of the information was useful • Nice to know—landowner interest, property rights, zoning, energy interests, currently have land agents (in or out) • Capacity of the roads • Tax schemes/approaches <p>Not useful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water/wildlife maps—no incentive to do it 	<p>Negotiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater/wildlife • Satisfaction with siting location(s)? Depends on the landowner, hit rate of 10–20% • In the dark—locals, structure/outreach • Transmission • Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) analogy for prime farmland—yes, but need to consider construction, soil health plan, goal—renewable energy/CO2 reduction? • How to create a state goal when it is a local decision • Do we have what we need locally to do this? 	

Table: Region	Information use	Factors negotiated	Other questions addressed
4: Southwest	<p>Useful information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substation location • Willing landowners • Groundwater susceptibility • Drain tile location <p>Not useful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crop Productivity Index (CPI) is a better indicator than prime farmland 	<p>Negotiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater susceptibility areas • Near substations—economic reasoning • No public land or critical habitat • Need to consider long-term productivity of land • Community stewardship • Starting planning process at developer’s level with transmission considerations <p>Not negotiated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics—communities have different opinions • Option for landowners wanting solar without transmission capacity 	<p>What are we trying to achieve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality, broad favorable environmental benefits/lower risks/fewer environmental impacts • Community acceptance—regulatory risks • Substation availability/capacity • Economics • Local willing landowner • Broader community support—local government

Table: Region	Information use	Factors negotiated	Other questions addressed
5: Southeast	<p>Starting point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption that the interconnections would work • Thought about counties that had ordinances—reduced risk • Thought about factors not on maps, like community acceptance • Talked about saturation of renewable energy projects. This could go either way, though, in terms of acceptance. • Where major cities located—tried to site away from them • Habitat areas—on the one hand, avoid because of potential permitting problems. On the other hand, might provide opportunities to connect habitat in corridors. But when get down to micro-siting, might be issues. • Except for little pockets, only spots not prime farmland were water or cities. Pockets not big enough for 100 MW. • Prime can be protected by solar and preserved from development. • Prime farmland map (in this area) not useful (except didn't matter) • All dependent on where is capacity (to connect solar) • Didn't talk about willing landowners 	<p>Factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is there nothing in terms of constraining factors vs. where are there opportunities (i.e., habitat) • Tradeoff—be near the load vs. where people will object • In end, where people will accept and support • Cultural resources part of developers' due diligence process too • Not a lot of disagreement in this process 	<p>Other important considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodplain • Proximity to airports • Cultural resources • State lands—maybe should have siting policy around that

Appendix A: Prime farmland exclusion rule

Minnesota Rules, part 7850.4400, subpart 4, MINN. R. 7850.4400 (2005)

Subp. 4. Prime farmland exclusion. No large electric power generating plant site may be permitted where the developed portion of the plant site, excluding water storage reservoirs and cooling ponds, includes more than 0.5 acres of prime farmland per megawatt of net generating capacity, or where makeup water storage reservoir or cooling pond facilities include more than 0.5 acres of prime farmland per megawatt of net generating capacity, unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative. Economic considerations alone do not justify the use of more prime farmland. "Prime farmland" means those soils that meet the specifications of Code of Federal Regulations 1980, title 7, section 657.5, paragraph (a). These provisions do not apply to areas located within home rule charter or statutory cities; areas located within two miles of home rule charter or statutory cities of the first, second, and third class; or areas designated for orderly annexation under Minnesota Statutes, section 414.0325.

Appendix B: Prime farmlands definition (Code of Federal Regulations)

C.F.R. 657.5(a) provides, in part,

Prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops, and is also available for these uses It has the soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to economically produce sustained high yields of crops when treated and managed, including water management, according to acceptable farming methods. In general, prime farmlands have an adequate and dependable water supply from precipitation or irrigation, a favorable temperature and growing season, acceptable acidity or alkalinity, acceptable salt and sodium content, and few or no rocks. They are permeable to water and air. Prime farmlands are not excessively erodible or saturated with water for a long period of time, and they either do not flood frequently or are protected from flooding.

Appendix C: Invited stakeholder organizations by stakeholder group

Academic Planners

- Extension/Regional Sustainable Development Partnerships (RSDP) Clean Energy Resource Teams (CERTs) Program University of Minnesota
- Energy Transition Lab University of Minnesota

Energy Nonprofits

- Clean Grid Alliance
- Fresh Energy
- Great Plains Institute
- Minnesota Solar Energy Industry Association (MnSEIA)

Energy Organizations

- Apex Clean Energy
- Fredrickson & Byron
- Geronimo Energy
- Green Financing Solutions
- Invenergy
- Innovative Power Systems (IPS) Solar
- Minnesota Power
- Novel Energy Solutions
- Sundial Solar
- US Solar
- Werner Electric
- Xcel Energy

Farmers Organizations

- Minnesota Corn Growers Association
- Minnesota Farm Bureau
- Minnesota Farmers Union
- Minnesota Soybean Growers Association
- Minnesota State Cattlemen's Association

Local Government

- Minnesota Association of County Planning and Zoning Administrators

- Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts
- Minnesota Association of Townships

State Agencies

- Board of Water and Soil Resources
- Department of Agriculture
- Department. of Commerce
- Department. of Natural Resources
- Public Utilities Commission

Appendix D: Stakeholder participation

Organization	Participant	Questionnaire	6/12/2019 Meeting	6/26/2019 Meeting
Apex Clean Energy	Alex Ingulsrud		x	x
Apex Clean Energy	Max Jay-Dixon			x
Apex Clean Energy	Chris Kunkle	x	x	
Blu S R	Paul Erdanaun		x	
CERTs, U of M Extension RSDP	Fritz Ebinger			x
CERTs, U of M Extension RSDP	Lissa Pawlisch		x	x
Clean Grid Alliance	Peder Mewis		x	x
Clean Grid Alliance	Beth Soholt		x	
Commerce	Katherine Blauvelt		x	
DNR	Becky Morton		x	
Commerce EERA	David Birkholz		x	
Commerce EERA	John Wachtler		x	
EDF Renewables	Shanelle Montana			x
Energy Transition Lab	Aaron Hanson		x	x
Energy Transition Lab	Charles Noble			x
Fredrikson & Byron PA	Jeremy Duehr		x	x
Fresh Energy	Rob Davis	x	x	x
Geronimo Energy	Melissa Schmit	x	x	x
Goodhue Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Minnesota Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts (MASWCD)	Beau Kennedy	x	x	x
Great Plains Institute	Katharine Chute			x
Great Plains Institute	Brian Ross	x		
Green Financing Solutions	Ian Schonwald	x		
Invenergy	Ann Coultas		x	x
Invenergy	Dan Litchfield	x	x	
Invenergy	Mark D. Crowl		x	
IPS Solar	Evan Carlson	x	x	x
McLeod County Minnesota Association of Planning & Zoning Administrators (MACPZA)	Marc Telecky	x	x	
MDA	Steve Roos	x	x	x
MDA	Bob Patton	x	x	x
MDA	Jordyn Bucholtz	x	x	x
Minnesota Farmers Union	Michelle Medina	x	x	
MN Corn Growers Association	Amanda Bilek	x	x	
MN Farm Bureau	Josie Lonetti	x	x	x
MN Farmers Union	Stu Lourey		x	x
MN Farmers Union	Peter Ripka			x
MN Power	Dan McCourtney		x	

Organization	Participant	Questionnaire	6/12/2019 Meeting	6/26/2019 Meeting
MN Power	Jennifer Peterson		x	
MN Soybean Growers Association	Joe Smentek	x	x	
Minnesota Solar Energy Industries Association	Liz Lucente	x	x	x
Minnesota Township Association	Steve Fenske	x		x
Minnesota Township Association	David Hamm			x
Murray County/Minnesota Association of County Planning and Zoning Administrators (MACPZA)	Jean Christoffels	x	x	x
Native Range Resources	Shannon Kulseth		x	
Novel Energy Solutions, K-Ler Cattle Co.	Ralph Kaehler	x	x	x
Public Utilities Commission (PUC)	Tricia DeBleekere		x	
Department of Natural Resources (DNR)	Becky Horton			x
US Solar	Ross Abbey	x	x	
Werner Electric	Matt Burt	x	x	x
Windustry	Lisa Daniels			x
Xcel Energy	Sean Lawler	x	x	
Xcel Energy	Tim Rogers			x

Appendix E: Email questionnaire

Solar Siting in Agricultural Landscapes Stakeholder Email Questionnaire

The Departments of Agriculture and Commerce have engaged the services of Management Analysis and Development (MAD) to collect your thoughts and opinions about solar siting in agricultural landscapes. This information will be aggregated into themes and discussed at the first meeting of the Stakeholder Workgroup. MAD, a management consulting practice housed at Minnesota Management and Budget, is a neutral entity and will be providing facilitation services during the stakeholder workgroup meetings.

Please provide your answers to the questions listed below and submit them to kristin.van.amber@state.mn.us at MAD **before May 29, 2019**. The information that you share in this questionnaire is considered private information and is confidential during this project. MAD will be reporting on the themes from you and others to represent perspectives, not individuals. This questionnaire has been sent to all members of the stakeholder workgroup with the expectation that each member organization will submit one completed questionnaire.

Name: _____ Organization: _____

1. What is your role?
2. How does your world intersect with solar project siting?

Energy organizations

3. Considering your experiences with siting solar projects, how well is the solar project siting process working?
4. What challenges have you experienced when siting solar projects?
5. What are your concerns about how solar projects are sited in Minnesota?
6. From your perspective, what have been the main drivers for siting solar projects?

All groups

7. Considering your constituent's perspectives:
 - a. What are their interests in how or where solar projects are sited?
 - b. What are their concerns?
 - c. What do they want us to understand?
8. If you could decide where solar projects are located in Minnesota:
 - a. What site characteristics would you consider when making your decision?
 - b. What economic considerations would factor into your decision?
 - c. What long-term implications would factor into your decision?

Appendix F: June 12 meeting agenda

Time	Activity	Who
10:30	Welcome	Whitney Place, Asst. Commissioner at MDA, and Katherine Blauvelt, Asst. Commissioner at Commerce
10:40	Introductions, agenda review, and group norms	Kris Van Amber, MAD
11:00	Project overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PUC and agency roles • Objectives • Scope—prime farmland exclusion • Meeting process 	Bob Patton, MDA, and John Wachtler, Commerce
11:30	Historic, present-day, and future issues (supported by maps and data)	Fritz Ebinger, U of M Extension
12:00	Lunch	
12:30	Email questionnaire summary	Kris Van Amber
12:50	Given the results of the summary, what 1 to 3 things would you like others to understand about your perspective (values, priorities, and interests)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small groups by sectors (farmers associations, developers, energy companies, community solar companies, energy nonprofits, local government, and state interests) 	
1:15	Small group report out & debrief	Kris Van Amber
1:45	Preparation for June 26 scenario exercise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the exercise • At your table you will find a scenario form. As a group, develop a scenario that you want to discuss/solve during our second meeting. • Identify the information you would need/want to inform your decisions. 	Steve Roos, MDA
2:00	Scenarios A couple of tables provide their scenario: who, what, where, when, and what information they will need.	

Appendix G: June 26 meeting agenda

Time	Activity	Who
10:30	Welcome	Bob Patton and John Wachtler
10:40	Introductions, agenda review, and group norms	Kris Van Amber
11:00	<p>“Getting to Yes”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mutually profitable agreement • We are interested in how you get to yes • All perspectives must be heard and honored 	Bob Patton
11:15	<p>Individual exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the worksheet, what are your values and motivations that influence your site selection process? 	
11:30	<p>Scenario exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals • Directions, table representation 	Steve Roos and Kris Van Amber
12:00	Lunch—located in the entryway	
12:30	<p>Scenario exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choose a scenario <p>2–3 minutes: Individually answer these questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is your plan of action or location considerations? • Where in the landscape meets these needs? • What conditions or features would you add to it to make it more amendable to others? <p>20–25 minutes: Go around the group and hear what people need, listening for what they are trying to achieve.</p> <p>20–25 minutes: As a group, meet all the needs/interests of your group when siting the location and designing the project. Keeping in mind what you are willing and not willing to give on in order to get what you want.</p>	Small representative groups
1:30	<p>Debrief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the group’s process in selecting a site? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What information did the group decide was useful? Why? ○ What information did the group decide was not useful? Why? • Which factors was the group willing to negotiate on? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Which factors could not be negotiated on? • How satisfied were you with the scenario outcome? 	Small representative groups
2:00	<p>Debrief report out</p> <p>Each group provide answers to their debrief questions</p>	Kris Van Amber