



Petition Process for Environmental Review when MPCA is RGU

Division: RMAD

Problem description

The Environmental Review Program lacked a formal standardized process for review of and decision-making related to petitions.

Background

A well-defined standardized process is needed that directs decisions and tracks impacts and mitigations.

Baseline measurement

Lack of a standardized process.

- ▶ No way to track the mitigation of potential environmental impacts identified in the petition.

Results

Petition process map is completed and awaiting a pilot test.

Database needs have been identified to track potential environmental impacts and mitigation outcomes of petitions.

| | | | |
|--|-------|--|-------|
| Impacts to wetland | 81.5% | Impacts to Native plants | 29.6% |
| Impacts to lake | 66.7% | Impacts to River | 25.9% |
| Wildlife impacts | 66.7% | Flooding concerns | 25.9% |
| Stormwater run-off | 63.0% | Noise | 25.9% |
| Erosion | 55.6% | Dust | 25.9% |
| Cutting down trees | 51.9% | Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species | 22.2% |
| Increased car traffic | 48.1% | Increased Boat Traffic | 22.2% |
| GW contamination | 44.4% | Dec Property Values | 22.2% |
| Detract from the scenic beauty of site | 48.1% | Air Pollution | 18.5% |
| Safety Concerns | 40.7% | Property Taxes | 18.5% |
| Wastewater or Septic issues | 37.0% | Property rights | 14.8% |
| Other* | 37.0% | Odor | 7.4% |
| Soil Contamination | 33.3% | | |

*Other includes: traffic/didn't trust developers; light; septic failure into lake; light pollution; archeaology site; water quality impacts; MN Statute 116A not followed; violations on tributary; concerns about natural resources; and effects on designated trout stream.

