Mickey Pearson

What data matters most to you?

- Looking at these topics and subtopics, what needs clarification?
- Which topics and subtopics do you think are most important for being included in a data tool?
- What is missing? What do we need more of?

When we look at cumulative impacts, we want to use information that's trustworthy, easy for everyone to access, and detailed enough to really tell us something useful about the local area. It's important to remember that this is a new and growing field of study. We should start with methods we're more familiar with and look to comparable processes from Minnesota and the greater US when shaping our own analysis metrics.

Massachusetts recently went through a similar process. They started out considering hundreds of different factors to judge environmental and health impacts. In the end, they narrowed it down to just 33. We'll need to do something like that here in Minnesota - figure out what information really matters for each community as well as define the data sets that best represent environmental and community health.

We must also be deliberate and specific when informing communities about the permitting process and the science that informs those decisions. Sometimes, public sentiment regarding a community's problems can only be tangentially linked to the existence of a permitted facility. Additionally, it might not be clear if a new or expanded facility would make things worse. We don't want to block new developments or demand extra community benefits based on guesses instead of solid facts. The key is to find a balance - we want to protect our communities and make decisions based on real evidence rather than assumptions.

How will MPCA narrow down which data indicators to include?

- What needs clarification or updating?
- Are there standards missing? Any that can be removed?
- Are any of these standards more important than others?

In the same manner MPCA will work with communities to define the CI and CBA processes, there should be strong and clear engagement on the science and data sets currently used in the permitting process as well as those proposed in this new rulemaking. This should include communications from the scientific community and illustrate the strengths of the agency's commitment to protecting our environment with proven contemporary expert analysis.

What else should we know?

- What are the important things you want us to know about your neighborhood?
- Are there specific types of pollution, environmental stressors, health stressors, or other topics you experience in your neighborhood?
- What are other important things we should consider in a cumulative impacts analysis – they can be social political economic?
- What do you think is missing?

To provide a fair and comprehensive assessment when considering future permit decisions, the MPCA should also take into account the positive economic contributions a facility can bring to the community. This doesn't mean ignoring the challenges and stressors the community faces, but recognizing that industrial facilities can also provide significant economic benefits.

• Contributions to the local tax base.
• Providing good wages and health benefits.
• Offering jobs to people who live nearby.
• Providing training and educational opportunities.
• Getting involved in the community through volunteer work, donations to local causes, and improvements to public spaces.

By including these positive aspects in the final permit decision, we can ensure that the overall impact on the community is thoughtfully and fairly evaluated. This balanced view helps us recognize both the challenges and the opportunities that come with having an industrial facility in an Environmental Justice community.