

August 12, 2025

VIA EMAIL

To: Interested parties

RE: Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 (anaerobic digester) Facility

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) has approved the Findings of Fact (FOF), Conclusions of Law, and Order for a Negative Declaration on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility (Project). The FOF document concludes that this project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects. The decision for a Negative Declaration completes the state environmental review process under Environmental Quality Board (EQB) rules, Minn. R. ch. 4410. Final governmental decisions on permits or approvals for the project may now be made.

The MPCA appreciates comments submitted on the Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW). The comments were considered by MPCA staff during the environmental review process and responses to these comments are provided in the FOF.

Interested parties can review the FOF and the EAW documents at the following locations: the MPCA office in Saint Paul; the Hennepin County Library at 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis; and the Willmar Public Library at 410 5th Street Southwest, Willmar, Minnesota. Interested parties can also view the documents at [Recently completed MPCA reviews](#) on MPCA's website. Please contact the MPCA's Saint Paul office at 651-757-2098 for copies of these documents.

Sincerely,

*Katrina Kessler*

*This document has been electronically signed.*

Katrina Kessler, P.E.  
Commissioner

KK/AM:rs

Attachments

cc: See next page.

Interested parties

Page 2

August 12, 2025

cc: Deb Dirlam, Lower Sioux Indian Community (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Cheyanne St. John, Lower Sioux Indian Community (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Hannah Panitzke, Lower Sioux Indian Community (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Mike Aude, Lower Sioux Indian Community (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Kelly Applegate, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Susan Klapel, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Mike Wilson, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Richard Martin, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Charlie Lippert, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Brian Scheinost, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Tony Pike, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Scott Doig, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Vanessa Alberto, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Nancy Komulainendillenburg, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Melanie Nowin, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Allison Smart, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Walt Ford, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Billie Isham, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Jolynn Shopteese, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Jackie Dionne, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Ravyn Gibbs, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Levi Brown, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Shannon Kesner, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Melissa King, Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Brian Steffen, NRCS Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Jeff Kjorness, NRCS Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Molly Mehl, NRCS Tribal Liaison (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Isaac Weston, Minnesota Indian Affairs Council (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Courtney Johnson, Forest City (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Greg Schultz, Meeker County (electronic) (w/attachments)  
Dave Benke, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Brian Timerson, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Lisa Scheirer, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Randy Hukriede, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Dan Card, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Josh Markham, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Scott Lucas, MPCA (w/attachments)  
Audrey Maass, MPCA (w/attachments)

**STATE OF MINNESOTA  
MINNESOTA POLLUTION CONTROL AGENCY**

**In The Matter Of The Decision  
On The Need For An Environmental  
Impact Statement For The Proposed  
Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility Project  
Located in Forest City Township, Meeker County, Minnesota**

**FINDINGS OF FACT  
CONCLUSIONS OF  
LAW AND ORDER**

**INTRODUCTION**

Pursuant to Minn. ch. 4410, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) staff prepared and distributed an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) for the proposed Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility (Project) in Forest City Township, Meeker County, Minnesota. Based on the MPCA staff environmental review, the EAW, comments, and information received during the comment period, and other information in the record of the MPCA, the MPCA hereby makes the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**Project Description**

1. Vanguard Organics, LLC (Vanguard) proposes to construct an anaerobic digestion facility with a design capacity for two anaerobic digestors to process up to 115,000 tons per year (tpy) of organic feedstock materials in Forest City Township, Meeker County, Minnesota (Project).
2. The Project will produce renewable natural gas (RNG) and biosolids through anaerobic digestion creating an alternative to landfilling organic feedstock materials. A pipeline will be constructed to offload the RNG. Because the pipeline is a connected action to the Project, as defined in Minn. R. 4410.0200, subp. 9(C), upon enactment of the interconnection agreement between Vanguard and Center Point, the proposed scale and activities for construction of the interconnection pipeline by Center Point will determine the requirements for environmental review and subsequent timeline for the review.
3. Vanguard applied for an Air Emissions Individual State Permit, and the application was deemed complete on May 19, 2025. Additional required Project permits are in Item 73.

**Procedural History**

4. An EAW is a brief document designed to provide the basic facts necessary for the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU) to determine whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required for a proposed Project or to initiate the scoping process for an EIS (Minn. R. 4410.0200, subp. 24). The MPCA as the RGU for this Project.
5. Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 1 requires preparation of an EAW for the Project because the Project involves the construction of a new fuel conversion facility for the conversion of biomass sources to gaseous, liquid and/or solid fuels with a capacity to utilize more than 25,000 dry tons per year of input which exceeds the threshold identified in Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 5(A)(1).
6. The MPCA provided public notice of the Project as follows:
  - The Environmental Quality Board (EQB) published the Notice of Availability of the EAW for public comment in the EQB Monitor on June 10, 2025, as required by Minn. R. 4410.1500.

- The MPCA published the EAW for review on the MPCA website at: <https://mpca.commentinput.com/comment/search>.
  - The MPCA provided a news release to media in Meeker County Minnesota, and other state-wide interested parties, on June 10, 2025.
7. During the 30-day comment period on the EAW ending on July 10, 2025, the MPCA received comments from the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) on July 8, 2025. The MPCA received one comment on June 25, 2025.
  8. On July 15, 2025, the MPCA requested and was granted approval from the EQB for a 15-day extension of the decision-making process on the need for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Project, extending that to August 21, 2025, in accordance with Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 2(B).
  9. The list of comments received during the 30-day public comment period are included as Appendix A to these Findings. The MPCA prepared written responses to the comments received during the 30-day public comment period. These responses are included as Appendix B to these Findings.

#### **The Four Criteria for Determining the Potential for Significant Environmental Effects**

10. The MPCA must base its decision on the need for an EIS on the information gathered during the EAW process and the comments received on the EAW (Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 3). The MPCA must order an EIS for projects that have potential for significant environmental effects (Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 1). In deciding whether a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, the MPCA must compare the impacts that may be reasonably expected to occur from the Project with the criteria set forth in Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7. The four criteria are:
  - A. Type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects.
  - B. Cumulative potential effects. The RGU shall consider the following factors:
    - whether the cumulative potential effect is significant;
    - whether the contribution from the project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect;
    - the degree to which the project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effect; and
    - the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project.
  - C. The extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority. The RGU may rely only on mitigation measures that are specific and that can be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the project.
  - D. The extent to which the environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs.

## **The MPCA Findings with Respect to Each of These Criteria**

### **A. Type, Extent, and Reversibility of Environmental Effects**

11. The first criterion that the MPCA must consider when determining if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects is the “type, extent, and reversibility of environmental effects” (Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7(A)). The MPCA Findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.
12. The types of impacts the MPCA anticipates may reasonably be expected to occur from the Project include the following:
  - Groundwater quantity/appropriation;
  - Air quality; and
  - Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG).
13. Written public comment received during the comment period raised additional issues, as follows:
  - Impacts related to dust suppression;
  - Impacts related to traffic; and
  - Impacts related to land application of end product.
14. With respect to the extent and reversibility of impacts that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project, the MPCA makes the following Findings.
15. Description of the types of impacts the MPCA finds may be reasonably expected to occur:
  - 15.1. Groundwater quantity/appropriation
    - 15.1.1. The DNR is the permitting authority for appropriating waters of the state in Minnesota. The DNR Water Appropriation Permit allows for a reasonable use of water if the use does not negatively impact surrounding wells or other water resources.
    - 15.1.2. Vanguard will apply for a DNR Water Appropriation Permit (WAP) for the Project that authorizes withdrawal of up to 1.5 million gallons per year. Vanguard does not expect pumping to be continuous as the Project will reuse water from the process. The DNR will determine if an aquifer test is required during the WAP permit process.
    - 15.1.3. Vanguard will install one water supply well used by the digesters and one for domestic potable water.
    - 15.1.4. The intended water usage for the Project operation is within the capacity of the groundwater supply based on other supply wells in the area.
    - 15.1.5. The DNR WAP ensures water resources are managed so that adequate supply is available for long-range seasonal requirements for domestic, agricultural, fish and wildlife, recreational, power, navigational and water quality.
    - 15.1.6. The DNR WAP balances competing management objectives, including both the development and protection of water resources. Minn. Stat. § 103G.261 establishes domestic water use as the highest priority of the state’s water when supplies are limited. If a well interference arises, the DNR has a standard

procedure for investigating the matter. If the DNR finds a commercial operator is causing interference, the operator must correct it.

- 15.1.7. Unauthorized pumping or use of the well or other water resources is subject to enforcement under Minn. Stat § 103G. upon completion of an investigation, a permit for water appropriation may be limited, amended or denied in accordance with applicable laws and rules for the protection of the public interests and the sustainability of Minnesota's water resources.
- 15.1.8. Due to the DNR oversight and permitting of water appropriations, the MPCA does not expect significant adverse impacts to water appropriation. However, if the DNR determines there is well interference based on concerns or well interference claims, the operator must fix the causes of the interference. Thus, the impacts to water appropriations would then be reversed. The MPCA finds that any water appropriation impacts that may occur from the Project are reversible.
- 15.1.9. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record are adequate to assess potential impacts to the quantity of groundwater appropriation that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.
- 15.1.10. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to groundwater appropriation, which are reasonably expected to occur.

15.2. Air quality  
Air permit

- 15.2.1. Vanguard is applying for and required to obtain an Air Emissions Individual State Permit for their proposed facility under Minn. R. 7007.0250, subp. 6.
- 15.2.2. The Project will have the potential to release criteria pollutant emissions of particulate matter (PM) 1.10 tpy, PM less than ten microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) 1.09 tpy, PM less than 2.5 microns (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) 1.08 tpy, sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) 6.27 tpy, nitrogen oxides (Nox) 17.68 tpy, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) 1.11 tpy, lead 4.3E-05 tpy and carbon monoxide (CO) 32.70 tpy.
- 15.2.3. The Project will operate as a minor Hazardous Air Pollutant source after construction is complete.

Air dispersion modeling

- 15.2.4. Vanguard used a Source Impact Analysis (SIA) to determine if refined criteria pollutant air dispersion modeling was required. Modeling was required as discussed in the following Findings and used to assess whether the Project will cause or contribute to an air quality violation.
- 15.2.5. The results of the modeling showed that CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions were below the Significant Impact Level (SIL). The ambient air quality background concentration (i.e., applicable ambient air quality design value for the Project area), plus the pollutant's SIL were less than 90% of CO's National Ambient Air

Quality Standard (NAAQS). Thus, no refined air dispersion modeling was required for CO, SO<sub>2</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. The SIA showed Lead, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S) and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>).

- 15.2.6. Vanguard conducted refined air dispersion modeling of Project emissions for Lead, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>S and NO<sub>2</sub> using the American Meteorological Regulatory Model (AERMOD). AERMOD was developed by the American Meteorological Society and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The model evaluated the air quality impacts of the Project. AERMOD is a widely accepted air dispersion model, which uses conservative assumptions to predict air quality.
- 15.2.5. The Cumulative Impact Analysis (CIA) accounts for as many lead, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>2</sub> emitting sources as can be quantified in the area as well as a monitored background value.
- 15.2.6. All of the pollutants passed the CIA by modeling under the NAAQS and the Minnesota Ambient Air Quality Standards (MAAQS).
- 15.2.7. Based on the CIA, the Project will meet all NAAQS and MAAQS.

#### Air Emission Risk Analysis (AERA)

- 15.2.8. The AERA was completed to evaluate and quantify potential human risks associated with emissions from the Project. The AERA includes both a quantitative analysis of potential impacts to human health using the risk assessment screening spreadsheet, and a qualitative analysis using information from Vanguard and the surrounding community.
- 15.2.9. The AERA shows that the air emissions from the Project are not expected to cause or contribute to a violation of the NAAQS or MAQQS.
- 15.2.10. The results of the AERA indicate that the calculated cumulative excess cancer risks and hazards are below the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) risk management levels. The Project does not significantly change the rural risk and hazard levels.
- 15.2.11. The MPCA finds that the information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record are adequate to assess potential impacts to the air quality that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.
- 15.2.12. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to air quality, which are reasonably expected to occur.

#### 15.3. Greenhouse gas emissions

- 15.3.1. The MPCA considered GHG emission sources that are within the scope of the Project.
- 15.3.2. The Project will directly release GHG emissions, which can widely disperse within the atmosphere, and which vary both in terms of their global warming potential and their persistence in the atmosphere.

- 15.3.3. To provide a common unit of measure, the MPCA uses the individual global warming potential of methane and nitrous oxide to convert to carbon dioxide equivalency (CO<sub>2</sub>e).
  - 15.3.4. Using the EPA emission factors, Scope 1 Construction Sources (mobile equipment), the Project will release 25.5 tpy of CO<sub>2</sub>e during construction. Further, the Project will save 45,233 tpy of CO<sub>2</sub>e during operation via the anaerobic digestion process compared to landfilling. The Project will release 39,988 tpy of CO<sub>2</sub>e during operation from Scope 1 Combustion Sources (stationary and mobile equipment), Scope 2 Electricity (grid-based), and Scope 3 Off-site Waste Management (area).
  - 15.3.5. There are no MAAQS or NAAQS for GHGs.
  - 15.3.4. Currently, there are no federal or Minnesota thresholds of GHG significance for determining impacts of GHG emissions from an individual project on global climate change.
  - 15.3.5. In absence of a threshold of GHG significance, the MPCA looks to existing regulation. Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 15(B) establishes a mandatory category requiring preparation of an EAW for stationary source facilities generating 100,000 tpy of GHGs. The purpose of an EAW is to assess environmental effects associated with a proposed project to aid in the determination of whether an EIS is needed. On the premise of GHG emissions, environmental review regulations establish 100,000 tpy as a “trigger” to prepare an EAW to aid in determining potential significant environmental effects. A reasonable conclusion is that the Project’s total GHG emissions below 100,000 tpy are not considered significant.
  - 15.3.6. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record are adequate to assess potential GHG emissions, which are reasonably expected to occur to and from the Project.
  - 15.3.7. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to GHG emissions, which are reasonably expected to occur.
16. Written public comment received during the comment period raised additional issues, as follows:
- 16.1. Impacts related to dust suppression
    - 16.1.1. The air dispersion modeling demonstration show that emissions from the source, including fugitive dust from vehicles will not cause or contribute to a violation of ambient air quality standards.
    - 16.1.2. During the operation of the Project, fugitive dust emissions were included in the air dispersion modeling demonstration.
    - 16.1.3. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related to dust suppression. The impacts from dust that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review

process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.

- 16.1.4. The MPCA finds that the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to dust suppression that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

16.2. Impacts related to traffic

- 16.2.1. The Project will occur on the north side of 288th Street.
- 16.2.2. For Project operations, Vanguard anticipates a total of ten trips (five in to and five leaving the Project area) per day for employees. Per day, Vanguard anticipates up to 30 truck trips to and 30 leaving the Project area as well. Trucks delivering food waste/organics to the Project area are expected to be end-dump or tanker trucks dependent on the load content (liquid/slurry vs. solids).
- 16.2.3. Traffic for employees and deliveries would utilize 288th Street during operational hours (5 a.m. to 10 p.m., Monday through Saturday with little to no traffic on holidays).
- 16.2.4. From the Meeker County 2024 Seasonal Load Limit Map, gravel surface roads have a seasonal five-ton weight limit. Loads delivered to the Project would follow Meeker County Highway Department restrictions.
- 16.2.5. A road access and maintenance agreement with Meeker County for 288th Street would be prepared for the Project as part of the CUP process. Conditions expected within the road agreement would include upgrades to approximately 2.3 miles of 288th Street for use as a Class A road and long-term road maintenance at Vanguard's cost.
- 16.2.6. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related to traffic. The impacts on traffic that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.
- 16.2.7. The MPCA finds that the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to traffic that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

16.3. Impacts related to land application of end product

- 16.3.1. The Project has a specification for organic feedstock entering the facility. This specification was developed to address any issues with heavy metals and other contaminants.
- 16.3.2. Specific to land application, the products would need to be approved by the MPCA via a land application permit prior to land application occurring.
- 16.3.3. The MPCA finds that information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record is adequate to address the concerns related

to land application of end products. The impacts from land application of end products that are reasonably expected to occur from the proposed Project have been considered during the review process and methods to prevent significant adverse impacts have been developed.

- 16.3.4. The MPCA finds that the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects based on the type, extent and reversibility of impacts related to land application of end products that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project.

## **B. Cumulative Potential Effects**

17. The second criterion that the MPCA must consider when determining if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects, is the cumulative potential effects. In making this determination, the MPCA must consider “whether the cumulative potential effect is significant; whether the contribution from the project is significant when viewed in connection with other contributions to the cumulative potential effect; the degree to which the project complies with approved mitigation measures specifically designed to address the cumulative potential effect; and the efforts of the proposer to minimize the contributions from the project . . .”  
Minn. R. 4410.1700 subp.7(B). The MPCA findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.
18. The EAW, public comments, and the MPCA follow-up evaluation did not disclose any related or anticipated future projects that may interact with this Project in such a way as to result in significant cumulative potential environmental effects.
19. The EAW addressed the following areas for cumulative potential effects for the proposed Project:
- Air quality.
20. Cumulative potential effects related to air quality were discussed in Item 17 and 21.c. of the EAW. Findings 15 through 18 are incorporated herein as part of the MPCA’s cumulative potential effects evaluation for human health impacts to air quality, in that the air assessment through refined air dispersion modeling and AERA incorporated ambient background concentrations and nearby contributing emission sources in the same geographic region.
21. The impacts are below the PM<sub>10</sub> CIA for all days and locations that nearby source allowable emissions are showing modeled exceedances. Based on the CIA, Vanguard and the remainder of the Project will meet all NAAQS and MAAQS.
22. The results of the AERA indicate that the calculated cumulative excess cancer risks and hazards are below the MDH risk management levels. The Project does not significantly change the rural risk and hazard levels.
23. The MPCA finds that the information presented in the EAW and other information in the environmental review record does not demonstrate that the Project has the potential for significant environmental effects to air quality based on significant cumulative potential effects because: the Project will obtain and comply with an MPCA Air Emissions Permit, will meet the NAAQS and will not pose any acute inhalation health hazards or any sub-chronic or chronic multi-pathway health hazards to the public.
24. Therefore, the MPCA finds that the Project is not expected to contribute significantly to adverse cumulative potential effects on air quality.

**Cumulative Effects Summary**

- 25. Based on information on the Project obtained from air modeling reports and on water quality/groundwater appropriation and air quality presented in the EAW, and consideration of potential effects due to related or anticipated future projects, the MPCA does not expect significant cumulative effects from this Project.
- 26. The MPCA finds the Project, as proposed, does not have the potential for significant environmental effects related to cumulative potential effects that are reasonably expected to occur.

**C. The Extent to Which the Environmental Effects are Subject to Mitigation by Ongoing Public Regulatory Authority**

- 27. The third criterion that the MPCA must consider when determining if a project has the potential for significant environmental effects is “the extent to which the environmental effects are subject to mitigation by ongoing public regulatory authority. The RGU may rely only on mitigation measures that are specific and that can be reasonably expected to effectively mitigate the identified environmental impacts of the project.” Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7(C). The MPCA Findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.
- 28. The following permits or approvals will be required for the Project.

**Permits and approvals.**

<b>Unit of Government</b>	<b>Permit or approval required</b>	<b>Status</b>
MPCA	National Pollutant Disposal Elimination System (NPDES)/State Disposal System (SDS) Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSW)	To be applied for and obtained
	NPDES/SDS Industrial Stormwater General Permit (ISW)	To be applied for and obtained
	Aboveground Storage Tank Registration	To be applied for and obtained
	Air Emission Project Permit	Applied for, to be obtained
	Land application of Industrial By-products	To be applied for and obtained
DNR	Water Appropriation Permit – Temporary Construction Dewatering	To be applied for and obtained if needed
	Preliminary Well Construction Assessment	To be applied for and obtained if needed
	Water Appropriation Permit	To be applied for and obtained if needed
Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry	Electrical Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Plumbing Inspection Permit	To be applied for and obtained
MDH	Well Construction Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Minnesota Department of Public Safety	Fire Sprinkler Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Meeker County	Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) – Wetland Boundary and Type	Obtained September 8 2023

Fence Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Sign Permit	To be applied for and obtained if needed
Fill (Grading) Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Excavation and Utility Connection Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Erosion and Sediment Control Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Septic Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Building Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Land Use Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Site Plan Review	To be applied for and obtained
Conditional Use Permit	Applied for, to be obtained
Preliminary and Final Plat	
Street and Utility Permits	To be applied for and obtained if needed
General Permit of Work in Right-of-Way	To be applied for and obtained if needed

Below are numbered paragraphs describing each permit listed above, including special conditions.

29. **MPCA NPDES/SDS ISW and Spill Response Plan:** The NPDES/SDS ISW Permit requires that specific conditions be adhered to for construction and operation of the facility, and for overall compliance with water quality requirements. The facility will need to prepare a Spill Response Plan and/or revise its Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).
30. **MPCA NPDES/SDS CSW:** The NPDES/SDS CSW Permit is required when a project disturbs one acre or more of soil. The CSW Permit requires the use of best management practices to prevent erosion and to keep eroded sediment from leaving the construction site and requires projects that create one acre or more of new impervious surface to provide permanent treatment of stormwater runoff. The Project Proposer must have a SWPPP that provides details of the specific measures to be implemented.
31. **MPCA Above Ground Storage Tank Registration Over 110 Gallons:** The Above Ground Storage Tank Registration General Permit requirements include notification, labeling and secondary containment to prevent or minimize the potential for environmental impacts.
32. **MPCA Air Permit:** The Air Emissions Permit for the facility would contain operational and emission limits, including requirements for the use of control equipment, that would help prevent or minimize the potential for significant environmental effects.
33. **MPCA Biosolids Land Application Site Approval and/or Long-Term Biosolids Storage Approval:** The Project Proposer must obtain MPCA approval for land application and/or long-term storage. Review requirements for application sites include site boundaries, soils data, tile inlet locations, cropping and site management, and application methods. Long-term storage requests must also include quantity, duration and management to control leachate and runoff.
34. **DNR Water Appropriation Permit:** The Water Appropriation Permit is required for all users withdrawing more than 100,000 gallons of water per day or one million gallons per year. The purpose of the permit program is to ensure water resources are managed so that adequate supply is

provided to long-range seasonal requirements for domestic, agricultural, fish and wildlife, recreational, power, navigational and quality control. The program exists to balance competing management objectives including both the development and protection of the water resources. Information on permitted water users and reported water use is used to evaluate impacts from pumping on surface and groundwater resources. Water use data are also used for water supply planning and resolving water use conflicts and well interferences. The DNR administers this permit and requires a monthly usage monitoring and annual reporting to ensure that surrounding communities' and industries' water supplies will not be affected by draw-down of the aquifer. Minn. Stat. § 103G.261 establishes domestic water use as the highest priority of the state's water when supplies are limited.

35. **DNR Well Construction Assessment:** The Preliminary Well Construction Assessment (PWCA) is a review of sensitive resources and potential water supply issues completed through analysis of historic resource and water appropriation data in the vicinity of a new proposed high capacity well site(s). the purpose of the PWCA is to provide the applicant with a determination of the potential need for additional testing (at the cost of the applicant) to assess impacts to surrounding resources and users. The PWCA is not considered a Water Appropriations Permit application, in which the exact specifications of a water use system are necessary in order to issue a permit.
36. **Department of Labor Electrical Inspection Permit:** At or before the start of any new electrical wiring installation that is required to be inspected by the Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry, the person lawfully responsible for making the installation must submit a permit application and applicable fees.
37. **Department of Labor Plumbing Inspection Permit:** Plan review includes all interior plumbing, building sewer and water service connections within property lines and stormwater drainage systems. A few of the items we review include adequate pipe sizing, proper pipe connections, approved pipe material, fixture specifications and backflow prevention devices. Our Agency must give you complete plan approval before installation of any portion of your plumbing system may begin.
38. **MDH Well Construction Permit:** Minn. Stat. ch. 103I authorizes the Commissioner of MDH to issue Well Construction Permits. A licensed well contractor, licensed environmental well contractor or a delegated well program must submit permits and applicable fees to the MDH.
39. **Department of Public Safety Fire Sprinkler Permit:** Licenses and permits help ensure that businesses, individuals and activities comply with established standards and regulations. Licenses and permits also help protect public safety and health, protect the environment and consumers, ensure quality and encourage responsible behavior.
40. **County Certificate of WCA – Wetland Boundary and Type:** The Certificate of Wetland Boundary and Type under the Minnesota WCA verifies the precise location and classification of a wetland. This certificate is crucial for determining the extent of wetland areas and the type of wetland present, which directly impacts regulations and potential impacts from development activities. It ensures compliance with WCA requirements, which aim to protect wetland resources.
41. **County Fence Permit:** The Fence Permit ensures that a fence is installed safely, legally and in accordance with local regulations. It allows authorities to verify that the fence meets zoning requirements, such as height restrictions, material specifications and placement on the property, including setbacks from property lines and streets. By requiring a permit, local governments can maintain safety, aesthetic standards and property values within the community.

42. **County Sign Permit:** The Sign Permit is a legal document that grants permissions to display a sign, ensuring it complies with local building codes, zoning regulations and safety standards. Its essentially a way for local governments to regulate signage, ensuring that its safe, visually appealing and doesn't negatively impact the community.
43. **County Grading and Building Permits:** Building permits and inspections assure that the project will be constructed or installed in accordance with county ordinances and codes.
44. **County Excavation/Obstruction Permit:** The Excavation/Obstruction Permit is for miscellaneous minor activities on city street right-of-way. It may be used for installation of utility customer service line connections that do/do not cross or parallel the roadway within the right-of-way. It is also used for repair and maintenance of existing utility facilities, installing miscellaneous guy wires and anchors or tree trimming around utility lines. It may also be used to place temporary obstructions on the right-of-way, to perform temporary relocations to accommodate construction projects and to place objects on the right-of-way, Minn. Stat. § 160.27.
45. **County Erosion and Sediment Control Permit:** The Erosion and Sediment Control Permit ensures that construction sites and other land-disturbing activities implement measures to prevent soil erosion and the discharge of sediment into waterways. It helps protect water quality and maintain the stability of land during and after construction.
46. **County Septic Permit:** The Septic Permit ensures that a septic system is installed or repaired according to local health and safety codes, protecting public health and the environment. It involves a series of steps, including site evaluation, design approval and inspections during and after construction. This process helps prevent groundwater contamination and ensures the system functions properly.
47. **County Building Permit:** No building permit shall be issued by any governing official for the construction of any building, structure or improvement on any land subdivided until all requirements have been fully complied with.
48. **County Land Use Permit:** The Land Use Permit is a document that allows specific activities on a piece of land, ensuring they comply with local zoning regulations and comprehensive plans. It's a crucial step in development, ensuring projects align with community goals and legal standards.
49. **County Site Plan:** The Site Plan Permit demonstrates how a proposed construction project will be situated on a property, ensuring compliance with local zoning laws and regulations. It provides a detailed map pf the property, including existing and proposed structures, property lines, setbacks and other relevant features. Authorities use the site plan to verify that the project meets standards for health, safety and land use.
50. **County Conditional Use Permit:** The Project Proposer is required to obtain all required building and conditional use permits required by local units of government to ensure compliance with local ordinances. The Conditional Use Permit will address local zoning, environmental, regulatory and other requirements that are needed to avoid adverse effects on adjacent land use.
51. **County Preliminary and Final Plat Review:** The Preliminary Plat Review evaluates the overall layout of a proposed subdivision, including lot lines, street patterns and utilities, to ensure it complies with local regulations and standards. A Final Plat Review examines the detailed engineering plans for the subdivision, ensuring it aligns with approved preliminary plat and includes all necessary infrastructure and construction details.

52. **County Street Permit:** The Street Permit grants permissions to use or alter a city's public right-of-way, which includes streets, sidewalks and other publicly owned areas. These permits are required for various activities, such as construction, utility work, special events and even residential block parties. They ensure that work or activities are conducted safely and in compliance with local regulations.
53. **County Utilities Permit:** The permit assures that the utilities will be constructed or installed in accordance with ordinances and codes and provides for inspections.
54. **County Work in Right-of-Way Permit:** The Right-of-Way Permit authorizes work within the public right-of-way, which includes areas like streets, sidewalks and boulevards. It ensures that any work done in these areas, such as utility installations, driveway modifications or even landscaping, adheres to city regulations and does not negatively impact public safety or infrastructure.
55. The above-listed permits include general and specific requirements for mitigation of environmental effects of the Project. The MPCA finds that the environmental effects of the Project are subject to mitigation, as explained in these Findings and the EAW, by ongoing public regulatory authority.

**D. The Extent to Which Environmental Effects can be Anticipated and Controlled as a Result of Other Available Environmental Studies Undertaken by Public Agencies or the Project Proposer, Including Other EISs**

56. The fourth criterion that the MPCA must consider is "the extent to which environmental effects can be anticipated and controlled as a result of other available environmental studies undertaken by public agencies or the project proposer, including other EISs," Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7(D). The MPCA Findings with respect to this criterion are set forth below.
57. Although not exhaustive, the MPCA reviewed the following documents as part of the environmental impact analysis for the proposed Project:
- Data presented in the EAW;
  - Air Dispersion Modeling Report; and
  - Permits and environmental review of similar projects.
58. The MPCA also relies on information provided by Vanguard, persons commenting on the EAW, staff experience, and other available information obtained by staff.
59. The environmental effects of the Project have been addressed by the design and permit development processes, and by ensuring conformance with regional and local plans. No elements of the Project pose the potential for significant environmental effects that are not addressed or mitigated by the requirements of the permits listed above or in the EAW.
60. Based on the environmental review, previous environmental studies by public agencies or the Project Proposer, and staff expertise and experience on similar projects, the MPCA finds that the environmental effects of the Project that are reasonably expected to occur can be anticipated and controlled.
61. The MPCA adopts the rationale stated in the attached Response to Comments (Appendix B) as the basis for response to any issues not specifically addressed in these Findings.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

62. The MPCA has jurisdiction in determining the need for an EIS for this Project. Minn. R. 4410.4300, subp. 1. The EAW, the permit development process, and the evidence in the record are adequate to support a reasoned decision regarding the potential significant environmental effects that are reasonably expected to occur from this Project.
63. The MPCA identified areas for potential significant environmental effects. The Project design and permits ensure Vanguard will take appropriate mitigation measures to address significant effects. The MPCA expects the Project to comply with all environmental rules, regulations, and standards.
64. Based on a comparison of the impacts that are reasonably expected to occur from the Project with the criteria established in Minn. R. 4410.1700, subp. 7, the Project does not have the potential for significant environmental effects.
65. An EIS is not required for the proposed Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility Project.
66. Any Findings that might properly be termed conclusions and any conclusions that might properly be termed Findings are hereby adopted as such.

### ORDER

The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency determines that there are no potential significant environmental effects reasonably expected to occur from the Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility and that there is no need for an Environmental Impact Statement.

### IT IS SO ORDERED

August 12, 2025

---

Date signed

*Katrina Kessler*

*This document has been electronically signed.*

Katrina Kessler, P.E.

Commissioner

Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

**Minnesota Pollution Control Agency**  
**Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility Project**  
**Environmental Assessment Worksheet**

**Appendix A**

**List of Comment Letters Received**

1. Harlan Andersen. Letter received June 25, 2025.
2. Haley Bryon, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Letter received July 8, 2025.

## Harlan Andersen

Being a nearby neighbor, I can't believe this is the first we have heard of this project. Increased water usage, increased truck traffic, lack of sufficient infrastructure meaning roads capable of being used, the potential for smells leaks and damage to the lakes less than 1/2 mile from the site are concerning. We already see water quality changes when the surrounding farm pump millions of gallons of waste on nearby land that drains to the lake watershed. I feel the neighbors are being neglected in this planning process... we did notice that the erected a new building last fall, must be pretty sure it will pass. Where are the solids going once dried. Back on the soil to wash into the lake.



Division of Ecological & Water Resources  
Region 4 (South Region)  
21371 Highway 15 South  
New Ulm, MN 56073

July 08, 2025

Audrey Maass  
Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  
520 Lafayette Road North  
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55155

**Subject: Litchfield AD1 Environmental Assessment Worksheet**

Audrey Maass,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Litchfield AD1 Environmental Assessment Worksheet. The following comments are offered for your consideration.

**Groundwater Appropriation Permit**

A water use permit will be required if water withdrawals exceed 10,000 gallons per day (GPD) or 1 million gallons per year (GPY) for long-term project operations, construction dewatering, or hydrostatic tank testing for the anaerobic digester tanks.

Table 11 notes that a Well Construction Permit from the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) will be applied for and obtained. The DNR recommends applying for a Preliminary Well Construction Assessment just in case the project will require more than 10,000 GPD or 1 million GPY. This will help shorten the permitting process should the need arise.

**Wildlife-Friendly Landscaping**

Integrating native plants into the project design is strongly encouraged to help mitigate impacts on wildlife. Once established, native plants are lower maintenance compared to non-native species and provide a range of benefits. Native plants are adapted to the local environment and require less water, fertilizer, and pesticides, as well as less maintenance, including mulching, frost protection, and continuous mowing. They produce nectar, pollen, and seeds that serve as food for native birds, butterflies, bees, and other wildlife. The deep roots of many native plants help stabilize soil, prevent erosion, and improve soil structure. They also improve the soil's ability to absorb water, reducing runoff and promoting groundwater recharge. For more information regarding incorporating native plants into the site design, please review the resources below from the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources.

- [Native Vegetation Establishment and Enhancement Guidelines](#)
- [Pollinator and Biodiversity Toolbox](#)

- [Resources for Creating Pollinator Habitat](#)

### **Dust Suppression**

The DNR recommends avoiding chemical dust suppressants containing chloride. Chloride products released into the environment do not break down and can accumulate to toxic levels for plants and wildlife.

### **Attachments:**

- DNR Standard Erosion Control and Invasive Species Prevention Best Practices

Regards,

*/s/ Haley Byron*

Haley Byron  
Regional Environmental Assessment Ecologist

117 Rogers Street  
Mankato, MN 56001  
Office: 507-389-8813  
Cell: 507-910-8963  
Email: [haley.byron@state.mn.us](mailto:haley.byron@state.mn.us)

CC:

Theresa Ebbenga, Assistant Regional Manager  
Ethan Jenzen, Northern District Manager  
Anne Hall, Groundwater Appropriations Hydrologist

*Equal Opportunity Employer*

## Standard Erosion Control and Invasive Species Prevention Best Practices

Take precautions when working near waterbodies to prevent sedimentation and erosion:

- Erodible surfaces should not be left exposed for greater than one day. For example, work should not commence late in the week if it will be left unfinished over a weekend.
- Work should not commence if rain is predicted.
- All wheeled or tracked construction equipment should be restricted to work areas above the stream bank.
- Fill material should not be stockpiled in the floodplain.
- Backfill placed below Ordinary High Water (OHW) should consist of clean granular material free of fines, silts, soils, and mud.
- Use [Best Practices for DNR General Public Waters Work Permit GP 2004-0001: Species Protection](#). Refer to pages: 3, 11, 14, 16, 25, 33, and 34 as relevant to a particular project.
- Vegetative “grout” should be incorporated with any installed rip rap (see page 33 of above link).
- [Native species planting/seeding](#) should be used.
- DNR Public Waters Work Permit may be required. Permit requirements must be followed.

Use wildlife friendly erosion control:

- Biodegradable netting should be used, preferably natural materials with short degradation periods.

Erosion control blankets should be limited to bio-netting or natural netting types due to the risk of entanglement and death of small animals.

- Identify acceptable materials in Category 3N or 4N mulches. See [Standard Specifications for Construction - MnDOT \(state.mn.us\)](#)
- Do not use products that require UV-light to degrade (also called “photodegradable”), as they do not degrade properly when covered/shaded.
- Do not use products containing plastic mesh netting or other plastic components.
- Do not use mulch products that contain synthetic (plastic) fiber additives near waterbodies.
- See [Wildlife Friendly Erosion Control](#) for more information.

Take active steps to prevent invasive species introduction and spread:

- Clean all equipment (including but not limited to: vehicles, clothing, and gear) at a site prior to moving to another site. All soil, aggregate material, mulch, vegetation, seeds, animals, etc. need to be removed using a hand tool, brush, compressed air, pressure washer, or otherwise.
- If equipment is not cleaned before arriving to a work site, then clean the equipment in the parking or staging area, ensuring no material is deposited at the new site. Material cleaned from equipment should be disposed of legally.
- All equipment (including but not limited to: waders, tracked vehicles, barges, boats, turbidity curtain, sheet pile, and pumps) used for work in an “infested water” must be adequately decontaminated. See [Watercraft Decontamination Manual](#) for more information.
- See [Come Clean, Leave Clean](#) for more detailed guidance. This guidance is required for those working on DNR lands as part of grant or contract or are working under a permit, your grant, contract, or permit.

### Additional Referenced Links

[https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/watermgmt\\_section/pwpermits/gp\\_2004\\_0001\\_chapter1.pdf](https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/watermgmt_section/pwpermits/gp_2004_0001_chapter1.pdf) <https://bwsr.state.mn.us/seed-mixes>

<https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/eco/nongame/wildlife-friendly-erosion-control.pdf>

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/pre-letting/spec/2018/2018-spec-book-final.pdf>

<https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/invasives/dnrlands.html>

<https://www.dnr.state.mn.us/invasives/dnrlands.html>

[https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/natural\\_resources/invasives/mndnr\\_ais\\_decontamination\\_handbook.pdf](https://files.dnr.state.mn.us/natural_resources/invasives/mndnr_ais_decontamination_handbook.pdf)

MPCA Perimeter Control Guidance Factsheet: <https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-strm2-26.pdf>

MPCA Sediment control practices - Perimeter controls for disturbed areas: [https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/Sediment\\_control\\_practices\\_-\\_Perimeter\\_controls\\_for\\_disturbed\\_areas](https://stormwater.pca.state.mn.us/index.php/Sediment_control_practices_-_Perimeter_controls_for_disturbed_areas)

**Minnesota Pollution Control Agency**  
**Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility Project**  
**Environmental Assessment Worksheet**

**Appendix B**

**Responses to Comments on the EAW**

**1. Comments Harlan Andersen. Letter received June 25, 2025.**

**Comment 1-1:** Being a nearby neighbor, I can't believe this is the first we have heard of this project... I feel the neighbors are being neglected in this planning process... we did notice that the erected a new building last fall, must be pretty sure it will pass.

**Response:** Thank-you for your comment. The EAW was published in accordance with the procedures outlined in Minnesota Rules chapter 4410.1500.

**Comment 1-2:** Increased water usage and damage to the lakes less than 1/2 mile from the site are concerning. We already see water quality changes when the surrounding farm pump millions of gallons of waste on nearby land that drains to the lake watershed.

**Response:** The Project would require an NPDES Industrial Stormwater permit and related stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). This incorporates a post- construction stormwater management plan for the operational aspects of the Project and benchmark monitoring. The bio-solids can be used for animal bedding, topsoil, etc. on a continuous basis. Vanguard intends to work with both Wagner Dairy personnel and any applicable neighboring farm operators to ensure all digestate material intended for land application complies with state and local nutrient management requirements. Vanguard will obtain a permit for land application of industrial by-products from the MPCA prior to operation in order for the liquid digestate to be used as fertilizer on area crop fields.

**Comment 1-3:** increased truck traffic, lack of sufficient infrastructure meaning roads capable of being used...are concerning

**Response:** For Project operations, Vanguard anticipates a total of ten trips (five in to and five leaving the Project Area) for employees. Vanguard anticipates up to 30 truck trips to and 30 leaving the Project Area as well. Trucks delivering food waste/organics to the Project Area are expected to be end-dump or tanker trucks dependent on the load content (liquid/slurry vs solids).

Traffic estimates, provided by Vanguard, indicate the daily peak traffic to the Project will increase, but not to excessive levels. Traffic for employees and deliveries would utilize 288th Street during operational hours (5 a.m. to 10 p.m. Monday through Saturday with little to no traffic on holidays). As the MnDOT Traffic Mapping Application does not have traffic counts or estimates for 288th Street, it is expected trips to and from the Project would increase traffic for the surrounding area but not exceed 250 vehicle trips per day or 2,500 daily trips (requirements for a Traffic Impact Study).

From the Meeker County 2024 Seasonal Load Limit Map, gravel surface roads have a seasonal five-ton weight limit (Meeker County). Loads delivered to the Project would follow Meeker County Highway Department restrictions.

**Comment 1-4:** the potential for smells leaks...are concerning.

**Response:** Handling and process of food wastes and digestate can release odorous compounds such as ammonia, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S). Once operational, possible sources of odor from the Project and associated best management practices or mitigation include:

- Liquid food waste will be unloaded directly into the hydrolysis tank(s). As the tanks' level changes, the headspace will be displaced. Emissions from the hydrolysis tank will vent to an odor control system prior to discharge to the atmosphere. The odor control system will consist of catalytic treatment, a carbon bed, or other odor control technology.
- The anaerobic digestion process occurs in an enclosed, sealed vessel to capture the biogas. Next, the biogas is upgraded to remove contaminants such as H<sub>2</sub>S, VOCs, and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) prior to injection into the natural gas pipeline. If there were to be any upsets during the conditioning process flaring will control the biogas.
- After the feedstock passes through the anaerobic digester, some residual digestate is leftover. The digestate then passes through a screw press to separate out the liquid and solid portions. Vanguard will store the solid digestate inside a building to dry. The solid digestate will contain little odor causing organic matter because it has undergone biological decomposition with the odorous compounds removed, including sulfur. This will reduce the potential for odors during drying and storage prior to utilization as an agricultural fertilizer.
- Liquid digestate will be stored in storage basins within the Project Area and will be applied to nearby farm fields for agronomic benefit.

The Project will use manure from the existing neighboring Wagner Dairy Farm. Anaerobic digestion is an established method for treating manure to prevent odor production since anaerobically digested manure produces significantly less odor than untreated liquid manure.

**Comment 1-5:** Where are the solids going once dried. Back on the soil to wash into the lake?

**Response:** See response to comment 1-2.

## **2. Comments by Haley Bryon, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Letter received July 8, 2025.**

**Comment 2-1:** A water use permit will be required if water withdrawals exceed 10,000 gallons per day (GPD) or 1 million gallons per year (GPY) for long-term project operations, construction dewatering, or hydrostatic tank testing for the anaerobic digester tanks.

**Response:** Comment noted. This information will be passed on to Vanguard Renewables.

**Comment 2-2:** Table 11 notes that a Well Construction Permit from the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) will be applied for and obtained. The DNR recommends applying for a Preliminary Well Construction Assessment just in case the project will require more than 10,000 GPD or 1 million GPY. This will help shorten the permitting process should the need arise.

**Response:** Comment noted. This information will be passed on to Vanguard Renewables.

**Comment 2-3:** Integrating native plants into the project design is strongly encouraged to help mitigate impacts on wildlife. Once established, native plants are lower maintenance compared to non-native species and provide a range of benefits. Native plants are adapted to the local environment and require less water, fertilizer, and pesticides, as well as less maintenance, including mulching, frost protection, and continuous mowing. They produce nectar, pollen, and seeds that serve as food for native birds,

butterflies, bees, and other wildlife. The deep roots of many native plants help stabilize soil, prevent erosion, and improve soil structure. They also improve the soil's ability to absorb water, reducing runoff and promoting groundwater recharge. For more information regarding incorporating native plants into the site design, please review the resources below from the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources.

**Response:** Comment noted. This information will be passed on to Vanguard Renewables.

**Comment 2-4:** The DNR recommends avoiding chemical dust suppressants containing chloride. Chloride products released into the environment do not break down and can accumulate to toxic levels for plants and wildlife.

**Response:** Comment noted. This information will be passed on to Vanguard Renewables.

**Minnesota Pollution Control Agency**  
**Vanguard Renewables Litchfield AD1 Facility Project**  
**Environmental Assessment Worksheet**

**Appendix C**

**Errata Sheet**

1. Table 11 of the EAW did not include a Preliminary Well Construction Assessment or a Water Use Permit by the DNR.

**Table 11. Permits and approvals.**

<b>Unit of Government</b>	<b>Permit or approval required</b>	<b>Status</b>
MPCA	National Pollutant Disposal Elimination System (NPDES)/State Disposal System (SDS) Construction Stormwater General Permit (CSW)	To be applied for and obtained
	NPDES/SDS Industrial Stormwater General Permit (ISW)	To be applied for and obtained
	Aboveground Storage Tank Registration	To be applied for and obtained
	Air Emission Project Permit	Applied for, to be obtained
	Land application of Industrial By-products	To be applied for and obtained
DNR	Water Appropriation Permit – Temporary Construction Dewatering	To be applied for and obtained if needed
	<b>Preliminary Well Construction Assessment</b>	<b>To be applied for and obtained if needed</b>
	<b>Water Appropriation Permit</b>	<b>To be applied for and obtained if needed</b>
Minnesota Department of Labor and Industry	Electrical Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Plumbing Inspection Permit	To be applied for and obtained
MDH	Well Construction Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Minnesota Department of Public Safety	Fire Sprinkler Permit	To be applied for and obtained
Meeker County	Wetland Conservation Act (WCA) – Wetland Boundary and Type	Obtained September 8 2023
	Fence Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Sign Permit	To be applied for and obtained if needed
	Fill (Grading) Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Excavation and Utility Connection Permit	To be applied for and obtained

<b>Unit of Government</b>	<b>Permit or approval required</b>	<b>Status</b>
	Erosion and Sediment Control Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Septic Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Building Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Land Use Permit	To be applied for and obtained
	Site Plan Review	To be applied for and obtained
	Conditional Use Permit	Applied for, to be obtained
	Preliminary and Final Plat	
	Street and Utility Permits	To be applied for and obtained if needed
	General Permit of Work in Right-of-Way	To be applied for and obtained if needed