

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**  
**VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (DEQ)**  
**HB 206 Small Renewable Energy Projects: 2023 Regulatory Advisory Panel (RAP)**

**2023 RAP Meeting 1: Friday, June 23, 2023 | 10 am – 3 pm**

Meeting Location: DEQ Piedmont Regional Office | 4949-A Cox Road | Glen Allen, VA 23060

**Facilitated by:** Tanya Denckla Cobb | Michelle Montserrat Oliva  
 Institute for Engagement & Negotiation (IEN), University of Virginia

**MEETING NOTES (MINUTES)**

**In Attendance (Organization, Name – in alphabetical order by Last Name)**

**RAP Primary Members**

King George County	Cathy Binder	American Clean Power Association	David Murray
Dominion Energy	Amelia Boschen	Geosyntech Consultants	Tim Seldon
City of Danville	Rick Drazenovich	Virginia Forest Products Association	Susan Seward
The Nature Conservancy	Judy Dunscomb	Virginia Forestry Association	Kyle Shreve
Advanced Energy United	Chris Hawk	Energyx Renewables	Dominika Sink
Piedmont Environmental Council	Dan Holmes	James River Association	Bill Street
Chesapeake Bay Commission	Adrienne Kotula	CEP Solar	Tyson Utt
Virginia Association of Counties	Joe Lerch		

**Alternates**

CEP Solar	Don Giecek	Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware Association of Electric Cooperatives	Jacob Newton
Chesapeake Solar and Storage Association	Greg Habeeb	Dominion Energy	Brandon Searcey
Piedmont Environmental Council	Ashish Kapoor	Virginia Agribusiness Council	Cliff Williamson
Virginia Farm Bureau Federation	Martha Moore		

**Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) including Virginia State Agencies and Universities**

Dept of Historic Resources	Jenny Belville-Marrion	University of Virginia	Jonah Fogel
Dept of Energy	Aaron Berryhill	Dept of Energy	Carrie Hearne
Dept of Conservation & Recreation	Jason Bulluck		Sigrid Lamp
Virginia Tech	Lee Daniels	Dept of Forestry	Terry Lasher
Virginia Economic Development Partnership	Michael Dreiling	Dept of Wildlife Resources	Amy Martin
Virginia Economic Development Partnership	Kevin Farrelly	Dept of Agriculture and Consumer Services	Kevin Schmidt

**Dept of Environmental Quality:**

**Facilitation Team, IEN, University of Virginia**

Melanie Davenport	Jonathan Rak	Tanya Denckla Cobb
Michael Dowd	Rebecca Rochet	Em Mortimer
Chris Egghart	Michael Rolband	Michelle Montserrat Oliva
Amber Foster	Riley Stiles	
Megan Mayfield	Susan Tripp	
Anderson Meade		

**General Public Attendance:**

Southern Environmental Law Center	Josephus Allmond
State Water Control Board Member / Vice Chair	Scott Cameron
Spotts Fain PC	Darren Hays
Henrico County Citizen	Michael Mason
Reed Smith LLP	Chrissy Noonan
Pittsylvania County	Emily Ragsdale
Wetland Studies and Solutions, Inc.	Colin Walthall

The meeting began at approximately 10:00am EST.

**Meeting Purpose:** This regulatory advisory panel (RAP) convened for Meeting #1 with the purpose of informing stakeholders about the scope of this year’s HB 206 RAP, important preliminary approaches/decisions that the DEQ has drawn in response to the proposals generated during the previous 2022 RAP, and guidance about what topics would be discussed in further detail over the next four meetings.

**10:00 am SESSION: Welcoming Remarks, RAP Charge for 2023**

Mike Dowd, Director of Air and Renewable Energy, DEQ opened the session and introduced Michael Rolband, DEQ Director who gave opening remarks. Director Rolband welcomed all RAP members and emphasized the balance that members will need to reach between the interests represented. Additionally, Director Rolband explained that while his hope is to strive for general agreement, consensus is not required to move forward with an item or proposal. This is a difference in the scope from the 2022 RAP sessions, where consensus was sought to the greatest extent possible for each proposal developed by RAP workgroups.

**10:10 am SESSION: Introductions**

Facilitators Tanya Denckla Cobb and Michelle Montserrat Oliva introduced themselves and proposed several Discussion Requests for input/agreement by the RAP to honor across the 5 meetings, which included:

- (1) one speaker at a time
- (2) all perspectives are welcome
- (3) listen for new understanding, be curious and open
- (4) (electronic) e-etiquette

Afterwards, participants were invited to introduce themselves, the organization they are representing, to share (in 3 words or less) their greatest hope related solar energy in Virginia, captured below:

Support equitable process	Learning	Listening
Develop areas of agreement	Fair path to goals	Reaching agreement
Fair regulations	Natural resource protection	Standard of care
Understanding all interests	All in this together	Balanced interests
Meeting clean energy goals	Clean and affordable energy	Technical assistance
Solar is the answer	Drafting	Consensus
Support agriculture	Balance of interests	Trees are the answer
Make it work for everyone	Responsibly developed solar	Transparency
Factual information	Minimal impacts	Consistency
Soil	Responsible stewardship	Standardization and regulations
Forest	Cultural resources	Public policy goal alignment
Get the band back together	Certain, sustainable, pro-	Collaboration and success
Solar without hurting farmers	business outcomes	Development
Clear and concise regulations	Adequate stormwater	Equitable future
Energy affordability	management	Protect water quality
Environmental stewardship	Research	Working for wildlife
Predictable	Minimize	Remediate disturbance

**10:30 am SESSION: RAP Process, Roles, and Timeline (June-November 2023)**

Ms. Denckla Cobb then shared the goal of the facilitation team and DEQ/lead convener for the RAP: *Participation by all stakeholders to help make the best possible set of regulations and process.*

“Best possible” meaning that in implementation:

- Balances the interests of protecting of prime ag/forest land with renewable energy generation
- Feasible, not overly complicated, understandable
- Addresses the interests of as many of the stakeholders as possible
- Grounded in science and expertise

Ms. Oliva outlined the following participation guidelines and roles for the 2023 RAP process, which were also shared in writing on the agenda as follows:

**2023 RAP Meeting Guidance: Participation Guidelines (includes changes from 2022 RAP)**

**Role of DEQ Representatives**

- DEQ is serving in multiple roles: as lead convener, as a decision maker, and as a stakeholder
- DEQ representatives will prepare materials, present, and actively participate in the process, including gathering and synthesizing technical information for the stakeholders

- DEQ will draft the regulations

Role of RAP Members: Review DEQ draft language/rationale and provide input for DEQ to consider that will:

- Help improve the outcome (to benefit from brain trust of this group)
- Identify potential implementation challenges
- When possible, propose draft alternative language/approach
- Provide comments to flag/document any serious concerns
- To do in between meetings: Review materials, bring your organization/constituency up-to-speed and consult them on what to discuss/offer input at following meeting

**Primary & Alternate RAP Members**

- 1 Primary representative per organization. Represents their organization/constituency. Consults within their organization for input as needed per above (Role of RAP Members)
- Alternate may be designated by the Primary to attend/participate in Primary’s absence. Primary to inform DEQ who the alternate will be in advance
- If Primary is present, alternates may attend in-person meetings, but observing only

**Role of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)**

- SMEs from State Agencies/Universities may actively participate to inform the process and provide relevant context/expertise. This may include:
  - Answering questions
  - Stepping in with information/expertise to add, clarify, or otherwise support the discussion
  - Provide expert opinions
  - If called on to do so by DEQ: May draft, advise or review draft language

Seating Protocols: Primary RAP members at the main tables; Additional SME resources, agency staff, alternates, and public in chairs along the walls.

Ms. Oliva provided a brief explanation and reminder of the FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) requirements for the RAP, namely that outside of RAP in-person public meetings, RAP members may have no virtual or in-person meetings, or email threads with more than 2 people, and may only consult each other 1:1. She also announced that copies of the FOIA tip sheet were available for RAP participants at the sign-in table.

**2023 RAP Timeline**

Ms. Oliva reviewed the RAP meeting timeline and the next steps post-RAP. After the RAP meetings are concluded, the DEQ expects that draft regulations will be published and put out for comment in early 2024. The final deadline for the DEQ to adopt the regulations is in December 2024.

<b>2023 RAP MEETINGS: 10 am-3 pm at the DEQ Piedmont Regional Office</b>	<b>Dates</b>
1: Overview of the Current Situation (Informational)	Fri Jun 23
2: Issues focusing on Soil	Tue Jul 25
3: Issues focusing on Forestry	Fri Sep 8
4: Issues focusing on Local Control	Thu Sep 28
5: Wrap-up meeting	Tue Oct 31

Mike Dowd, DEQ shared that the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) for this legislation has not been published yet, but it will be made available as soon as the DEQ obtains approval from the executive branch. At that point, the NOIRA will be published on Virginia Regulatory Town Hall ([www.townhall.virginia.gov](http://www.townhall.virginia.gov)), where it will be open for public comment. The DEQ was not legally required to wait for the NOIRA to be approved before commencing the RAP process.

### **Focused Scope of 2023 RAP**

Ms. Denckla Cobb explained the scope of the 2023 RAP is much more focused than last year's RAP and with some topics "on the menu" and others "off the menu", based on what the DEQ is required to do per HB206 specifically for its Permit-by-Rule (PBR) process

The following key information was also shared by Ms. Denckla Cobb:

- The DEQ has already incorporated recommendations from a number of 2022 RAP consensus and close-to-consensus proposals into its preliminary decisions/approaches -- to be summarized in the afternoon session and presented in greater detail for RAP input over the next four sessions.
- Because of time, we will not be able devote meeting time to out-of-scope issues raised. If something outside of this scope is brought up by a RAP member, it will be recorded (and potentially briefly addressed by the DEQ staff if time allows), but it will not be deliberated on further during the RAP meeting.
- There will be two public comment periods where issues may also be raised and documented: NOIRA and the proposed regulatory language development stage.

### **11:00 am SESSION**

#### **PRESENTATION: Review Current Permit-By-Rule (PBR) Steps & Timing – w/Focus on Areas Most Relevant to HB206**

Presenter: Amber Foster, Renewable Energy Permit by Rule Coordinator, DEQ

*See PDF presentation file attached for details.*

Amber Foster gave a 15-minute presentation providing a brief overview of the current Permit-By-Rule (PBR) process. She explained that the number of permits issued is growing exponentially, and reviewed the 15 basic solar PBR application components, as well as the timeline from Notice of Intent to Approval.

She shared that the key points in the application timeline being impacted by HB 206 are: (1) during the pre-application stage, where if significant adverse impacts to prime agricultural soils or forest land (per HB 206 thresholds) are anticipated, a mitigation plan must be developed prior to PBR application submittal and be included in the 30-day public comment period; and (2) if during the application review stage, it is determined that an applicant who had not previously submitted a mitigation plan with a PBR application does in fact require a mitigation plan, the permit review process would be put on hold until the applicant develops the mitigation plan and conducts a 45-day public comment period. Once the application is resubmitted, the review process will resume. Ms. Foster clarified that the current total permitted acreage, reported on Slide 2 of her presentation, refers to total acreage reported by the applicants, and not specifically under solar panels.

There was some discussion around the possible interpretations of the "Local Zoning Approval" requirement. The DEQ requires that a developer obtain certification from a responsible official at the local level that their project is compliant with relevant local zoning ordinances. The DEQ agrees to provide more clarification on this requirement in the Local Control meeting (RAP Meeting 4).

## **PRESENTATION: Recap of 2019 Solar PBR Proposed Amendments**

Presenter: Susan Tripp, Renewable Energy Permit by Rule Coordinator, DEQ  
*See PDF presentation file attached for details.*

Susan Tripp gave a 30-minute presentation that summarized 2019 proposed amendments related to the solar PBR process. These were the subject of a prior RAP process and public comment period, several years before HB 206 was passed. The 2019 solar PBR amendments will not be discussed by the 2023 RAP except where a given issue overlaps with the specific charge of HB 206. The only amendment from the 2019 amendments expected to be brought up for discussion by the 2023 HB 206 RAP relates to the protection of forest cores. See Mrs. Tripp's presentation for more information.

For logistical reasons, these proposed amendments will be jointly submitted to the Governor's office together with the HB 206 draft regulations. Mr. Dowd clarified that the DEQ may have to cut several of these proposed items from 2019, and that the final set of amendments may look different from the one presented today. For more information, please reference the resources (links) provided below.

A few solar developers voiced concerns that new guidelines to protect the Northern Long-Eared Bat may make it more difficult for the development of solar sites, particularly in forested areas. An SME from the Department of Wildlife Resources acknowledged their concerns and shared that the DWR is preparing resources to help developers through issues related to endangered species. Namely, DWR aims to publish a directive document that informs developers where the range of the bat species lies with instructions about how to proceed should they find their project site will disturb a Northern Long-Eared Bat habitat.

An SME from the DEQ pointed out to the group that any project that is impacting a wetland or stream will also need to undergo a separate federal permitting process.

In response to the DEQ decision not to raise permit fees, a concern was voiced to ensure the DEQ has sufficient staff capacity and resources to return decisions in a timely manner. The DEQ acknowledged this issue and that it will be assessing how to meet this challenge going forward.

## **1:00 pm SESSION Summary of DEQ Preliminary Approach and Decisions**

### **PRESENTATION and DISCUSSION (Comments and Q&A)**

Presenter: Jonathan Rak, Regulatory Analyst, DEQ  
*See PDF presentation file attached for details.*

Over the last hour and a half of the meeting, Jonathan Rak presented a summary of the DEQ's preliminary proposals to address HB 206 requirements. The facilitators asked RAP members to ask questions for clarification and understanding, and to raise their key questions/areas of concerns to be discussed in more detail in the upcoming RAP meetings focusing on soil, forests, and local control.

Mr. Rak shared that some of the items presented are required by HB 206, while others are being proposed by the DEQ. These preliminary conclusions are grounded in the proposals and evidence featured in the 2022 HB 206 RAP Report to the General Assembly.

After each sub-section in Mr. Rak's presentation, a discussion was facilitated, and RAP members were prompted for questions and comments. These are outlined below:

## Scope of Amendments

The DEQ will confine any proposed changes to current PBR regulations to the specific requirements of HB 206, certain of the previously proposed 2019 PBR (solar) amendments, and some minor procedural clarifications.

RAP members had the following comments:

- A local government representative mentioned that some of the public comments generated during the above-mentioned 2019 amendment process, particularly those related to forest cores, could be helpful to reference for RAP members.
  - The DEQ agreed, and Mrs. Tripp said that she would look into sharing those comments with the RAP (links below).

## Definitions

DEQ is required by HB 206 to use the following definitions:

- “Prime agricultural soils” means soils recognized as prime farmland by the US Department of Agriculture. The USDA definition relies on several technical measurements to make a determination, including soil moisture classification, soil temperature regime, pH, erodibility factor, permeability rate, and maximum percentage of rock fragments.
- “Forest land” has the same meaning provided in Va Code § 10.1-1178, in which “forest land” means land on which forest trees are found. Secondly, “forest trees” means only those trees which are a part of and constitute a stand of potential, immature, or mature commercial timber trees.
- The definition of “lands enrolled in a forestry preservation program” will rely on the local assessing officers’ classification for use-value real estate taxation per Va Code § 10.11178.

RAP members had the following comments:

- RAP members discussed whether aspects of the Virginia definition of prime farmland soil could be incorporated into that definition, particularly the portion of the definition that gauges whether that parcel has actually been used to produce crops in the past.
  - RAP member Dan Holmes, representing Piedmont Environmental Council, responded to this question, affirming that resource protection is the key goal of the policy regardless of whether the land has been farmed in the recent past. The DEQ concluded that the use of the USDA definition was intentional, and it will not be altered during this RAP process.
- A RAP member from the timber industry noted that the criteria determining land to be forested are much less clear-cut than the criteria for prime agricultural soil. There could be cases where such a drastic change has occurred in the land’s use such that it is no longer able to be re-timbered, but nonetheless, the definition cited by HB 206 for a forest includes all land that was forested less than two years prior. Additionally, the bill as it stands does not ecologically distinguish between a naturally evolved forest and a timber forest.
  - The DEQ acknowledged this issue and agreed to discuss this at length during RAP Meeting 3: Issues focusing on Forestry.

- RAP members Brandon Searsey, representing Dominion Energy, and Judy Dunscomb, representing the Nature Conservancy, discussed for some time whether a developer needed to contract with a forester to certify that a parcel of land was forested or unforested. Timber industry representatives stated that this task could be completed by someone with less training.
  - The DEQ acknowledged this comment. While the DEQ does not anticipate changing its proposed approach, the topic of field verification will be discussed further during RAP Meeting 3.
  - The DEQ clarified that, where applicable for forested areas, there may be some alterations to the Stormwater Law’s existing list of activities excluded from the definition of “disturbance.”

### **Mapping**

DEQ will use publicly available GIS resources specified in the regulation to confirm the acreage of prime agricultural soils and contiguous forest land to determine the acreage of such areas impacted by the project. To identify areas with prime agricultural soils, the DEQ’s proposed approach is to use the VaLEN (Virginia Land and Energy Navigator) map layer, which uses a USDA-generated dataset. To identify forested areas, the DEQ is considering using the Forest Conservation Values layer in the Virginia Natural Heritage Data Explorer. This decision was based on input from the Department of Forestry.

Also, the DEQ will require the applicant to certify if any lands enrolled in a forestry preservation program are present within the project site.

The DEQ is proposing that applicants will also have a field verification option, a site-specific determination of such areas by a qualified private consultant as an alternative to relying on the publicly available maps. In future RAP meetings the DEQ will invite SMEs to expand on several of the mapping resources that the DEQ intends for developers to use.

RAP members had the following comments:

- A RAP member voiced concerns about the resolution of the VaLEN Map affecting its real-life applicability.
  - DEQ acknowledged that this may be an issue and agreed to examine this issue more closely before the next RAP session.

### **Significant Adverse Impacts**

DEQ intends to use the definition of “land disturbance” or “land disturbing activity” based on the 2019 PBR (solar) amendments, wherein "land disturbance" or "land-disturbing activity" means a man-made change to the land surface that may result in soil erosion or has the potential to change its runoff characteristics, including construction activity such as the clearing, grading, excavating, or filling of land.

HB 206 defines “significant adverse impact” as having disturbed one or more of the following:

- (a) more than 10 acres of prime agricultural soils;
- (b) more than 50 acres of contiguous forest lands;
- (c) forest lands enrolled in a program for forestry preservation pursuant to subdivision 2 of § 58.1-3233.



Disturbance of less than 10 acres of prime agricultural soils or 50 acres of contiguous forest land will not require mitigation unless the project impacts forest cores. If the project impacts wildlife, historic resources, or natural heritage resources, the developer will have to complete a mitigation plan based on existing regulations.

The DEQ is proposing no explicit definitions for “avoid” or “minimize,” as incentives to avoid and minimize significant adverse impacts will be embedded within mitigation requirements. No separate requirements to avoid or minimize should be necessary.

### **Mitigation**

Significant adverse impacts to prime agricultural soils, contiguous forest lands, and land in a forestry preservation program will require conservation of similar lands off-site. Conservation may include easements on private lands preventing conversion of prime agricultural soils and contiguous forest lands to other land uses.

For example, clearing 100 acres of forest will require protection of 100 acres of existing forest elsewhere. Mitigation ratios will be subject to discussion at future meetings. Providing mitigation through off-site conservation of lands has precedent from other programs and from energy projects approved by the State Corporation Commission (SCC) and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC).

There may be opportunities for developers to engage in partial on-site mitigation, with the recognition that not all functions and values of prime agricultural land can be mitigated on-site. The DEQ would like to provide a matrix of commitments that qualify as partial mitigation and establish ratios to reduce off-site conservation.

RAP members had the following comments:

- A RAP member representing an environmental advocacy organization stated that allowing off-site mitigation to be completed using privately or publicly owned easements could make enforcing mitigation more problematic, and that while easements are cheap to initiate, they pose long-term costs in-terms of management.
  - The DEQ acknowledges that there are potential challenges here, and that they have begun consulting with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) on this issue. The VOF may be present at later meetings as an SME and can potentially address this issue directly.
- A RAP member representing a locality stated that off-site mitigation may allow developers to protect land that was never realistically going to be developed, such as land on a steep mountainside that could not sustain intense construction. Another RAP member representing the solar industry responded that as written, the off-site mitigation clause is intended for resource protection, a charge that it would still achieve in that situation.
- Several RAP members representing environmental advocacy organizations noted that additionality and proximity in terms of off-site mitigation will be an important dimension to discuss. For both equity and water-quality, it is preferable for the off-site plot to be close to the impacted site so that the benefits garnered through mitigation will be conferred to the affected population(s).

- RAP member Susan Seward, representing the Virginia Forest Products Association, expressed concerns about the potential for the off-site mitigation clause to diminish the number of available forested plots for timber production. The demand for forestlands may rise twice as fast, as in cases where there is a significant environmental impact, the solar developer will need to acquire both their project area for solar panel installation and a plot of a similar acreage to be protected as an off-site mitigation strategy.
  - To this point, the DEQ explained that ideally these easements or protected areas can remain as “working forests,” so hopefully this will lessen the strain that an increase in utility-scale solar will have on the timber industry.
- A RAP member from the solar industry asked about whether “crossover mitigation” would be allowed, which would enable a developer whose project site impacts farmland to mitigate forest land instead.
  - The DEQ expressed hesitation to allow crossover mitigation but acknowledges that the topic merited further discussion in RAP Meetings 2 and 3, focusing on Soil and Forests respectively
- A RAP member from an environmental advocacy group questioned a draft clause that the DEQ proposed which would exclude qualified conservation organizations from holding easements serving as off-site mitigation.
  - The DEQ acknowledged this comment, but that the agency was concerned with qualified conservation organizations holding such easements, because tax credit rules would not apply. This topic will be discussed further during later RAP sessions.
- A RAP member from the local timber industry asked whether a locality’s mitigation requirements would still be enforced if those regulations are more stringent than the ones the DEQ is to set.
  - The DEQ responded that developers must follow any additional mitigation requirements at the local level on top of the mitigation efforts required by the DEQ.
- Representatives from the solar industry voiced concerns that without an option for in-lieu fees of mitigation, it may be unrealistic to expect developers to find and maintain off-site plots themselves, and that the DEQ should consider other solutions.
  - The DEQ’s preference is not to allow in-lieu fees because the cost of these fees is typically higher or lower than the actual cost of mitigation, and on- and off-site mitigation can be more efficient economically. In-lieu fees are one of the 8 factors that the RAP is required by HB 206 to consider, so this topic will be discussed further in a future meeting.
- RAP member Judy Dunscomb, representing the Nature Conservancy, brought up that the concept of functions and values of a mitigation site has not yet been mentioned as a priority in DEQ’s proposed mitigation requirements. Ms. Dunscomb requested that the topic be brought back up during RAP Meetings #2 and #3.

## Relationship with Localities

Local government review and approval always precedes a PBR application. The DEQ proposed that applicants should include a copy of any local siting agreement, zoning use conditions, and a preliminary site plan with local certification. Such local documents will assist the DEQ in understanding the project and allow the DEQ to align mitigation requirements to the greatest extent possible.

RAP members had the following comments:

- RAP members discussed at length the relevance of local tax laws incentivizing owners to register their lands under their locality's forestry preservation program. Should the land use change from forest to something of a higher intensity, landowners will have to pay back the amount of money that they saved through tax breaks for the extent of time that their land was registered in the program.
  - Complying with the DEQ's mitigation requirements should ensure that the mitigation land remains in a locality's forest preservation program, and so this should hopefully not be an issue the RAP will need to discuss. Still, the DEQ acknowledges that a fact sheet could be helpful to explain in brief any relevant tax codes or land use legislation.
- A RAP member asked for clarification about whether under the proposed regulatory language, any kind of significant impact on a project site (to the wildlife, to historic resources, etc.) will trigger the need for a mitigation plan.
  - The DEQ responded that the existing PBR regulations require mitigation of impacts to wildlife and historic resources, and this will not change.

## 2:45 pm SESSION: Wrap-up

Ms. Oliva shared the following closing remarks and reminders:

- The next RAP meeting (once again 10 am-3 pm at the DEQ Piedmont Regional Office) will focus on Soil and is scheduled for Tuesday, July 25.
- RAP members and SME representatives, please be on the lookout for:
  - Meeting 1 follow-up email which will include the meeting notes (this document) and a number of additional resources (listed below).
  - An email which will be sent before Meeting 2 with materials to review in advance.
  - In between meetings, please review materials, bring your organization/constituency up-to-speed, and consult them on what to discuss/offer as input at subsequent meetings.

The facilitators and DEQ team thanked the RAP members for their participation, and the meeting was adjourned.

## Additional resources in response to RAP requests:

1. [RD773-A Study of Small Renewable Energy Projects: Impact on Natural Resources-HB 206-Dec 1, 2022 \(2022 RAP Final Report\)](#)
2. [Proposed 2019 Solar PBR Amendments-Agency Background Document](#)
3. [Proposed 2019 Solar PBR Amendments-Comments Submitted](#)
4. [Public Guide to the Standard Regulatory Process](#)
5. PDF attached with DEQ presentations