

TWENTY-SEVENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

St. Paul, Minnesota, Tuesday, April 29, 2025

The Senate met at 12:00 noon and was called to order by the President Pro Tem.

CALL OF THE SENATE

Senator Murphy imposed a call of the Senate. The Sergeant at Arms was instructed to bring in the absent members.

The members of the Senate paused for a moment of silent prayer and reflection.

The members of the Senate gave the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

The roll was called, and the following Senators were present:

Abeler	Duckworth	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Rasmusson
Anderson	Farnsworth	Klein	McEwen	Rest
Bahr	Fateh	Koran	Miller	Seeberger
Boldon	Frentz	Kreun	Mitchell	Utke
Carlson	Green	Kunesh	Mohamed	Weber
Champion	Gruenhagen	Kupec	Murphy	Wesenberg
Clark	Gustafson	Lang	Nelson	Westlin
Coleman	Hauschild	Latz	Oumou Verbeten	Westrom
Cwodzinski	Hawj	Lieske	Pappas	Wiklund
Dahms	Hoffman	Limmer	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Housley	Lucero	Port	
Dornink	Howe	Mann	Pratt	
Draheim	Jasinski	Marty	Putnam	
Drazkowski	Johnson	Mathews	Rarick	

The President declared a quorum present.

The reading of the Journal was dispensed with and the Journal, as printed and corrected, was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. President:

I have the honor to announce the passage by the House of the following House Files, herewith transmitted: H.F. Nos. 2431 and 2438.

Patrick Duffy Murphy, Chief Clerk, House of Representatives

Transmitted April 28, 2025

FIRST READING OF HOUSE BILLS

The following bills were read the first time.

H.F. No. 2431: A bill for an act relating to higher education; providing funding and policy-related changes for the Office of Higher Education, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, and the University of Minnesota; modifying certain scholarship and student aid programs; establishing and modifying grant programs to higher education institutions; providing authority to the Office of Higher Education for treatment of certain appropriations; providing for certain policy changes to student financial aid, institution eligibility, institutional licensure provisions, student loan programs, and institutional grant programs; requiring reports; appropriating money; canceling an appropriation; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 135A.052, subdivision 1; 135A.137; 135A.15, subdivision 2a; 135A.1582; 136A.01, by adding a subdivision; 136A.101, subdivision 5a; 136A.103; 136A.121, subdivision 9; 136A.1465, subdivisions 1, 2, by adding a subdivision; 136A.155; 136A.162; 136A.1701, subdivision 4; 136A.1796; 136A.246, subdivisions 1a, 3, 6, 8; 136A.65, subdivision 4; 136A.653, subdivision 5; 136A.658; 136A.69, subdivision 1; 136A.82; 136A.821, subdivisions 4, 5, by adding subdivisions; 136A.822, subdivisions 3, 6, 8, 13; 136A.824, subdivisions 1, 2, 6, 7; 136A.833; 136A.834, subdivisions 1, 5; 136A.901, subdivision 1; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapter 136A; repealing Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 5.41, subdivision 2; 136A.057; 136A.091; 136A.1251, subdivisions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; 136A.1788; 136A.1789; 136A.1791, subdivisions 1, 2, 3a, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10; 136A.246, subdivision 9; 136A.69, subdivisions 3, 5; 136A.824, subdivisions 3, 5; 136A.861, subdivision 7; 136A.901, subdivision 2; 136A.91; Laws 2022, chapter 42, section 2, as amended; Minnesota Rules, part 4850.0014, subparts 1, 2.

Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for comparison with S.F. No. 2483.

H.F. No. 2438: A bill for an act relating to transportation; establishing a budget for transportation; appropriating money for transportation purposes, including Department of Transportation, Department of Public Safety, and Metropolitan Council activities; modifying prior appropriations; transferring money; modifying various policy and finance provisions; modifying and providing for allocation of certain fees; directing certain rulemaking; requiring studies; modifying and requiring certain legislative reporting; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 4.076, subdivisions 4, 5; 161.115, subdivision 177; 161.178, subdivisions 1, 2a, 8, by adding a subdivision; 162.16; 168.002, subdivision 6; 168.013, subdivision 1m; 168.091; 168.1287, subdivisions 1, 5; 168.27, subdivisions 8, 11, 16, 22; 168.33, by adding a subdivision; 168A.11, subdivision 1; 168E.01, by adding subdivisions; 168E.05, subdivision 1; 169.011, subdivision 36; 169.06, subdivision 5; 169.09, subdivision 8; 169.14, subdivision 1a; 169.686, subdivision 1; 169.865, subdivisions 1a, 3; 169A.55, subdivision 5; 171.01, by adding a subdivision; 171.05, subdivision 1; 171.06, by adding a subdivision; 171.0605, subdivision 2, by adding a subdivision; 171.061, by adding a subdivision; 171.13, subdivisions 7, 8; 171.17, subdivision 1; 171.2405, subdivision 1; 171.301, subdivision 1; 171.306, subdivisions 1, 4; 174.02, by adding a subdivision; 174.03, subdivision 12, by adding a subdivision; 174.07, subdivision 3; 174.38, subdivision 4; 174.49, by adding a subdivision; 174.56; 174.634, subdivision 2; 289A.51, subdivisions 1, 3, 4; 297A.993, subdivision 2a; 299A.01, by adding a subdivision; 360.511, by adding subdivisions; 360.55, subdivisions 4, 4a, 8, by adding a subdivision; 398A.04,

by adding a subdivision; 473.13, by adding a subdivision; 473.39, subdivision 6, by adding subdivisions; 473.408, by adding a subdivision; 473.4465, subdivision 4, by adding a subdivision; Laws 2021, First Special Session chapter 5, article 1, section 2, subdivision 2, as amended; Laws 2021, First Special Session chapter 14, article 11, section 45; Laws 2023, chapter 60, article 10, section 9; Laws 2023, chapter 68, article 1, section 2, subdivisions 2, 3; article 4, section 109; Laws 2024, chapter 127, article 1, section 2, subdivision 3; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapters 137; 168; 168A; 174.

Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for comparison with S.F. No. 2082, now on General Orders.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Senator Murphy moved that the Committee Reports at the Desk be now adopted. The motion prevailed.

Senator Murphy, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred

H.F. No. 2432 for comparison with companion Senate File, reports the following House File was found not identical with companion Senate File as follows:

GENERAL ORDERS		CONSENT CALENDAR		CALENDAR	
H.F. No.	S.F. No.	H.F. No.	S.F. No.	H.F. No.	S.F. No.
2432	1417				

Pursuant to Rule 45, the Committee on Rules and Administration recommends that H.F. No. 2432 be amended as follows:

Delete all the language after the enacting clause of H.F. No. 2432, the third engrossment; and insert the language after the enacting clause of S.F. No. 1417, the second engrossment; further, delete the title of H.F. No. 2432, the third engrossment; and insert the title of S.F. No. 1417, the second engrossment.

And when so amended H.F. No. 2432 will be identical to S.F. No. 1417, and further recommends that H.F. No. 2432 be given its second reading and substituted for S.F. No. 1417, and that the Senate File be indefinitely postponed.

Pursuant to Rule 45, this report was prepared and submitted by the Secretary of the Senate on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Amendments adopted. Report adopted.

Senator Murphy, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred

H.F. No. 2551 for comparison with companion Senate File, reports the following House File was found identical and recommends the House File be given its second reading and substituted for its companion Senate File as follows:

GENERAL ORDERS		CONSENT CALENDAR		CALENDAR	
H.F. No.	S.F. No.	H.F. No.	S.F. No.	H.F. No.	S.F. No.
2551	2706				

and that the above Senate File be indefinitely postponed.

Pursuant to Rule 45, this report was prepared and submitted by the Secretary of the Senate on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Report adopted.

Senator Murphy, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred

H.F. No. 2563 for comparison with companion Senate File, reports the following House File was found not identical with companion Senate File as follows:

GENERAL ORDERS		CONSENT CALENDAR		CALENDAR	
H.F. No.	S.F. No.	H.F. No.	S.F. No.	H.F. No.	S.F. No.
2563	2865				

Pursuant to Rule 45, the Committee on Rules and Administration recommends that H.F. No. 2563 be amended as follows:

Delete all the language after the enacting clause of H.F. No. 2563, the first engrossment; and insert the language after the enacting clause of S.F. No. 2865, the second engrossment; further, delete the title of H.F. No. 2563, the first engrossment; and insert the title of S.F. No. 2865, the second engrossment.

And when so amended H.F. No. 2563 will be identical to S.F. No. 2865, and further recommends that H.F. No. 2563 be given its second reading and substituted for S.F. No. 2865, and that the Senate File be indefinitely postponed.

Pursuant to Rule 45, this report was prepared and submitted by the Secretary of the Senate on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Amendments adopted. Report adopted.

Senator Marty from the Committee on Finance, to which was re-referred

S.F. No. 2483: A bill for an act relating to higher education; providing funding and policy related changes for the Office of Higher Education, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities, and the University of Minnesota; creating and modifying certain scholarships and student aid programs; modifying program reporting requirements; modifying requirements for sexual misconduct grievance processes; requiring a standardized financial aid offer form; modifying requirements for licensing of nonpublic and out-of-state postsecondary institutions; requiring reports; appropriating money; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 135A.052, subdivision 1; 135A.15, subdivisions 1a, 2a; 135A.1582; 136A.01, by adding a subdivision; 136A.101, subdivision 5a; 136A.103; 136A.121, subdivisions 6, 7, 7a, 9, 13; 136A.1465, subdivisions 1, 2, by adding a subdivision; 136A.155; 136A.162; 136A.1796; 136A.246, subdivisions 1a, 3; 136A.65, subdivision 4; 136A.653, subdivision 5; 136A.658; 136A.69, subdivision 1; 136A.821, subdivisions 4, 5, by adding subdivisions; 136A.822, subdivisions 3, 6, 8, 13; 136A.824, subdivisions 1, 2, 6, 7; 136A.833; 136A.834, subdivisions 1, 5; 136A.87; 136A.901, subdivision 1; 137.022, subdivisions 3, 4; 151.37, subdivision 12; 474A.061, subdivision 2b; Laws 2023, chapter 41, article 2, section 31, subdivisions 1, 4; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapters 120B; 135A; 136A; repealing Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 5.41, subdivision 2; 135A.137; 136A.057; 136A.1251, subdivision 5; 136A.1788, subdivision 5; 136A.1791, subdivision 9; 136A.69, subdivisions 3, 5; 136A.824, subdivisions 3, 5; 136A.861,

subdivision 7; 136A.91, subdivision 3; Laws 2023, chapter 41, article 2, section 31, subdivision 5; Minnesota Rules, part 4850.0014, subparts 1, 2.

Reports the same back with the recommendation that the bill be amended as follows:

Page 45, line 4, delete "90" and insert "100"

Amend the title accordingly

And when so amended the bill do pass. Amendments adopted. Report adopted.

SECOND READING OF SENATE BILLS

S.F. No. 2483 was read the second time.

SECOND READING OF HOUSE BILLS

H.F. Nos. 2432, 2551, and 2563 were read the second time.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING OF SENATE BILLS

The following bills were read the first time.

Senators Marty, Wiklund, Mann, and Maye Quade introduced--

S.F. No. 3462: A bill for an act relating to commerce; requiring health care sharing arrangements to report annually; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapter 62A.

Referred to the Committee on Commerce and Consumer Protection.

Senator Howe introduced--

S.F. No. 3463: A bill for an act relating to legislative compensation; amending per diem, mileage, and meal payments and reimbursements for legislators; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 3.099, subdivision 1, by adding subdivisions; 3.103.

Referred to the Committee on State and Local Government.

Senators Pappas and Frentz introduced--

S.F. No. 3464: A bill for an act relating to retirement; Minnesota State Retirement System correctional state employees retirement plan; implementing the recommendations of the MSRS correctional plan eligibility work group; modifying the eligibility requirements; updating eligible employment positions; adding definitions; modifying the procedures for adding or removing plan coverage; adding a right to appeal; making conforming changes; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 352.01, by adding a subdivision; 352.029, subdivision 3; 352.03, subdivision 5; 352.90; 352.93, subdivision 1; 352.955, subdivision 1; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes,

chapter 352; repealing Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 352.91, subdivisions 1, 2, 2a, 3c, 3d, 3e, 3f, 3g, 3h, 3i, 3j, 4a, 4b, 4c, 6.

Referred to the Committee on State and Local Government.

MOTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS

Senator Fateh moved that the name of Senator Oumou Verbeten be added as a co-author to S.F. No. 1422. The motion prevailed.

Senator Frentz moved that the name of Senator Gruenhagen be added as a co-author to S.F. No. 2563. The motion prevailed.

Senator Westrom moved that the name of Senator Weber be added as a co-author to S.F. No. 3409. The motion prevailed.

Senator Wiklund moved that the name of Senator Marty be added as a co-author to S.F. No. 3437. The motion prevailed.

Senator Pappas moved that the name of Senator Mitchell be added as a co-author to S.F. No. 3455. The motion prevailed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Pursuant to Rule 26, Senator Murphy, Chair of the Committee on Rules and Administration, designated the following bills a Special Orders Calendar to be heard immediately:

S.F. Nos. 1832 and 2077.

SPECIAL ORDER

S.F. No. 1832: A bill for an act relating to state government; establishing a biennial budget for jobs, labor, and economic development; appropriating money for the Department of Employment and Economic Development, Department of Labor and Industry, Bureau of Mediation Services, and Workers' Compensation Court of Appeals; modifying economic development provisions; modifying Explore Minnesota provisions; making labor policy changes; modifying provisions governing the certification of underground telecommunications installers; canceling prior appropriations; creating accounts; requiring reports; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 116J.431, subdivision 2; 116J.659, subdivisions 4, 5; 116J.8733, subdivision 4; 116J.8752, subdivision 2; 116L.04, subdivisions 1, 1a; 116L.05, subdivision 5; 116L.98, subdivision 2; 116M.18, subdivision 3; 116U.05; 116U.06; 116U.15; 116U.30; 116U.35; 177.253, subdivision 1, by adding a subdivision; 177.254, subdivisions 1, 2, by adding a subdivision; 177.27, subdivision 5; 248.07, subdivisions 7, 8; 268.085, subdivision 15; 268.184, subdivision 1; 326B.103, by adding subdivisions; 326B.184, subdivisions 1a, 2; 326B.198, subdivisions 2, 3; 326B.31, subdivision 29; 326B.33, subdivision 21; 326B.37, subdivisions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, by adding a subdivision; 326B.49, subdivisions 2, 3; 326B.986, subdivision 9; 327.31, by adding a subdivision; 327.32, subdivisions 1a, 1e, 7; 327.33, subdivisions 1, 2, 2a, 2b, 2c, by adding subdivisions; 327B.01, subdivisions 1, 7, 19, by adding subdivisions; 327B.04, subdivisions 3, 4, 6, 7a; 327B.041; 327B.05, subdivision 1; 469.54, subdivision 4; Laws

2023, chapter 53, article 15, section 33, subdivision 4, as amended; article 18, sections 2, subdivisions 1, 4; 3, subdivisions 1, 4, 5; article 20, section 2, subdivision 2, as amended; article 21, section 7, as amended; Laws 2024, chapter 127, article 14, section 3; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapters 116J; 326B; repealing Laws 2024, chapter 120, article 1, section 13.

Senator Farnsworth moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A64):

Page 98, after line 25, insert:

"Sec. 6. **IRON ORE MINING ADDITIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS PROGRAM.**

Subdivision 1. **Availability of additional benefits.** Additional unemployment benefits are available from the Minnesota unemployment insurance trust fund to an applicant who was laid off due to lack of work on or after March 15, 2025, and before June 16, 2025, from:

(1) an employer in the iron ore mining industry that laid off 40 percent or more of the employer's workforce on or after March 15, 2025, and before June 16, 2025; or

(2) an employer that is in the explosive manufacturing industry providing goods or services to an employer in the iron ore mining industry if the applicant was laid off due to the cessation or substantial reduction in operations of an employer in the iron ore mining industry as described in clause (1).

Subd. 2. **Eligibility requirements.** An applicant is eligible to receive additional unemployment benefits under this section for any week through the week ending June 19, 2026, if:

(1) the applicant established a benefit account under Minnesota Statutes, section 268.07, with 50 percent or greater of the wage credits from an employer as described in subdivision 1, and has exhausted the maximum amount of regular unemployment benefits available on that benefit account; and

(2) the applicant meets the same requirements that an applicant for regular unemployment benefits must meet under Minnesota Statutes, section 268.069, subdivision 1.

Subd. 3. **Weekly and maximum amount of additional unemployment benefits.** (a) The weekly benefit amount of additional unemployment benefits is the same as the weekly benefit amount of regular unemployment benefits on the benefit account established in subdivision 2, clause (1).

(b) The maximum amount of additional unemployment benefits available to an applicant under this section is an amount equal to 26 weeks of payment at the applicant's weekly additional unemployment benefit amount.

(c) If an applicant qualifies for a new regular benefit account that meets the requirements of subdivision 4, paragraph (b), before the applicant has been paid additional unemployment benefits, and the new regular benefit account meets the requirements of subdivision 2, clause (1), the applicant's weekly additional unemployment benefit amount is equal to the weekly unemployment benefit amount on the applicant's new regular benefit account.

Subd. 4. **Qualifying for a new regular benefit account.** (a) If, after exhausting the maximum amount of regular unemployment benefits available as a result of the layoff under subdivision 1, an applicant qualifies for the new regular benefit account under Minnesota Statutes, section 268.07, the applicant must apply for and establish the new regular benefit account.

(b) If the applicant's weekly benefit amount under the new regular benefit account is equal to or higher than the applicant's weekly additional unemployment benefit amount, the applicant must request unemployment benefits under the new regular benefit account. An applicant is ineligible for additional unemployment benefits under this section until the applicant has exhausted the maximum amount of unemployment benefits available on the new regular benefit account.

(c) If the applicant's weekly unemployment benefit amount on the new regular benefit account is less than the applicant's weekly benefit amount of additional unemployment benefits, the applicant must request additional unemployment benefits. An applicant is ineligible for new regular unemployment benefits until the applicant has exhausted the maximum amount of additional unemployment benefits available under this section.

Subd. 5. **Eligibility for federal Trade Readjustment Allowance benefits.** An applicant who has applied and been determined eligible for federal Trade Readjustment Allowance benefits is not eligible for additional unemployment benefits under this section.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective retroactively from March 15, 2025."

Amend the title accordingly

The motion prevailed. So the amendment was adopted.

Senator Housley moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A86):

Page 85, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 16. **MINNESOTA PAID LEAVE DAY ONE CALL CENTER OPERATIONS.**

The commissioner of employment and economic development must ensure that call center operations for the Minnesota paid leave program are fully operational on January 1, 2026, to provide customer service on day one of implementation of the program.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective the day following final enactment."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

Senator Pappas questioned whether the amendment was germane.

The President ruled that the amendment was not germane.

Senator Rasmusson appealed the decision of the President.

The question was taken on "Shall the decision of the President be the judgment of the Senate?"

The roll was called, and there were yeas 34 and nays 32, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Johnson Stewart, Marty, Port, and Xiong.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson and Nelson.

So the decision of the President was sustained.

Senator Jasinski moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A83):

Page 54, after line 12, insert:

"Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116J.682, subdivision 2, is amended to read:

Subd. 2. **Establishment.** The commissioner shall establish the small business assistance partnerships program to make grants to local and regional community-based organizations to provide small business development and technical assistance services to entrepreneurs and small business owners, and to revitalize or strengthen downtown and neighborhood commercial districts.

Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116J.682, subdivision 3, is amended to read:

Subd. 3. **Small business assistance partnerships grants.** (a) The commissioner shall make small business assistance partnerships grants to local and regional community-based organizations to provide small business development and technical assistance services to entrepreneurs and small business owners, or to revitalize or strengthen a downtown or neighborhood commercial district. The commissioner must prioritize applications that provide services to underserved populations and geographies.

(b) Grantees shall use the grant funds to provide high-quality, free professional business development and technical assistance services that support the start-up, growth, and success of Minnesota's entrepreneurs and small business owners.

(c) Grantees may use up to 15 percent of grant funds for expenses incurred while administering the grant, including but not limited to expenses related to technology, utilities, legal services, training, accounting, insurance, financial management, benefits, reporting, servicing of loans, and audits."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 33 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson
Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Johnson Stewart, Marty, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Pratt moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A82):

Page 45, after line 18, insert:

"(g) A grantee that fails to comply with the terms of the grant agreement must return any grant funds received. Such a grantee is ineligible for future grants until the amounts received are repaid."

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Dahms	Duckworth	Housley	Koran
Anderson	Dornink	Farnsworth	Howe	Kreun
Bahr	Draheim	Green	Jasinski	Lang
Coleman	Drazkowski	Gruenhagen	Johnson	Lieske

Limmer
Lucero
Mathews

Miller
Nelson
Pratt

Rarick
Rasmusson
Utke

Weber
Wesenberg
Westrom

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon
Carlson
Champion
Clark
Cwodzinski
Dibble
Fateh

Frentz
Gustafson
Hauschild
Hawj
Hoffman
Johnson Stewart
Klein

Kunesh
Kupec
Latz
Mann
Marty
Maye Quade
McEwen

Mitchell
Mohamed
Murphy
Oumou Verbeten
Pappas
Pha
Port

Putnam
Rest
Seeberger
Westlin
Wiklund
Xiong

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Johnson Stewart, Marty, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Pratt moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A80):

Page 57, after line 22, insert:

"Sec. 7. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116L.20, is amended by adding a subdivision to read:

Subd. 3. **Employer workforce training refunds.** (a) An employer subject to the requirements of subdivision 1 that employs 100 or fewer employees may annually request from the commissioner a refund of the special assessment amounts that the employer paid into the workforce development fund. Money refunded under this subdivision must be used for employee training as provided under paragraph (b). The amounts necessary to provide the refunds under this paragraph are annually appropriated to the commissioner.

(b) Training provided by an employer funded by the refund allowed under this subdivision:

(1) must be used to upskill current entry-level employees or for training that leads to an increased salary or increased opportunities for career advancement with the employer; and

(2) must only be used to train Minnesota employees.

(c) By January 15, 2026, and each January 15 thereafter, the commissioner must submit a report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the senate and house of representatives committees with jurisdiction over workforce development providing the following information:

(1) the current balance in the workforce development fund; and

(2) for the previous calendar year:

(i) the total amount of special assessments collected; and

(ii) the total amount of money refunded to employers under this subdivision.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective July 1, 2025."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Farnsworth, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Draheim moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A92):

Page 8, delete lines 5 to 11

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 42, line 28, delete "\$3,011,000" and insert "\$7,011,000"

Page 42, line 30, after the period, insert "The base for this appropriation is \$3,011,000 in fiscal year 2028 and each year thereafter."

Page 46, delete lines 3 to 10

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 33 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Rasmusson
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Weber
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pappas	Westrom
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Pratt	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rarick	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Port	
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Draheim moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A97):

Page 8, delete lines 5 to 11

Page 17, delete lines 26 to 30

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 44, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 4. **PUBLIC FACILITIES AUTHORITY** \$ **6,000,000** \$ **6,000,000**

\$6,000,000 each year is to provide lead service line replacement grants under Minnesota Statutes, section 446A.077. This is a onetime appropriation."

Page 46, delete lines 3 to 10

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodziński	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Draheim moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A81):

Page 57, after line 22, insert:

"Sec. 7. [116L.36] GRANTS PROHIBITED TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS WITH HIGHLY COMPENSATED OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES.

(a) A nonprofit organization that compensates an officer or employee in an amount greater than 125 percent of the governor's salary in a 12-month period is not eligible to receive a grant under any economic development or workforce development program administered or overseen by the commissioner in the first fiscal year beginning, during, or after that 12-month period or in the following fiscal year.

(b) The salary limit in paragraph (a) must be adjusted annually on January 1. The new limit must equal the limit for the prior year increased by any increase to the governor's salary and the percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers from October of the second prior year to October of the immediately prior year.

(c) Compensation for purposes of this section includes salary, bonuses, the present value of stock options, the value of employee benefits, employer contributions to retirement or deferred compensation plans on behalf of the officer or employee, and any other compensation or benefit of value.

(d) This section does not apply to performance grants administered under section 116J.8747."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 31 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Mathews	Weber
Anderson	Duckworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Bahr	Farnsworth	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Coleman	Green	Lang	Pratt	
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lieske	Rarick	
Dornink	Housley	Limmer	Rasmusson	
Draheim	Howe	Lucero	Utke	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Fateh, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Draheim moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A57):

Page 94, after line 11, insert:

"Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116J.035, is amended by adding a subdivision to read:

Subd. 7a. **Competitive grants.** The commissioner shall give priority to programs or organizations that focus job training in high-wage, high-demand careers when awarding competitive grants to organizations for the purpose of providing job training. For purposes of this subdivision, "high-wage, high-demand" has the meaning given in section 116L.99."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Johnson, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Fateh, Frentz, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Draheim moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A59):

Page 85, after line 10, insert:

"Sec. 16. **REPORT.**

By January 15, 2026, the commissioner of employment and economic development must submit a report containing ideas and options for converting legislatively-named grants into pay-for-performance grants to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over workforce development."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 33 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson
Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Johnson, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Fateh, Frentz, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Dornink moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A40):

Page 131, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9445, subdivision 5, is amended to read:

Subd. 5. **Employee.** "Employee" means any person who is employed by an employer, including temporary and part-time employees, who is anticipated by the employer to perform work for at least 80 hours in a year for that employer in Minnesota. Employee does not include:

(1) an independent contractor;

(2) an individual who is a volunteer firefighter or paid on-call firefighter, with a department charged with the prevention or suppression of fires within the boundaries of the state; is a volunteer ambulance attendant as defined in section 144E.001, subdivision 15; or is an ambulance service personnel as defined in section 144E.001, subdivision 3a, who serves in a paid on-call position;

(3) an individual who is an elected official or a person who is appointed to fill a vacancy in an elected office as part of a legislative or governing body of Minnesota or a political subdivision; or

(4) an individual employed by a farmer, family farm, or a family farm corporation to provide physical labor on or management of a farm if: (i) the farmer, family farm, or family farm corporation employs five or fewer employees; or (ii) the individual is employed by the farmer, family farm, or family farm corporation to perform work for 28 days or less each year."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

Senator McEwen questioned whether the amendment was germane.

The President ruled that the amendment was not germane.

Senator Rasmusson appealed the decision of the President.

The question was taken on "Shall the decision of the President be the judgment of the Senate?"

The roll was called, and there were yeas 33 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Xiong
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Fateh, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Seeberger
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Weber
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	Westrom
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Johnson, Nelson, and Weber.

So the decision of the President was sustained.

Senator Pratt moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A41):

Page 131, after line 9, insert:

"Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9445, subdivision 5, is amended to read:

Subd. 5. **Employee.** "Employee" means any person who is employed by an employer, including temporary and part-time employees, who is anticipated by the employer to perform work for at least 80 hours in a year for that employer in Minnesota. Employee does not include:

(1) an independent contractor;

(2) an individual who is a volunteer firefighter or paid on-call firefighter, with a department charged with the prevention or suppression of fires within the boundaries of the state; is a volunteer ambulance attendant as defined in section 144E.001, subdivision 15; or is an ambulance service personnel as defined in section 144E.001, subdivision 3a, who serves in a paid on-call position;

(3) an individual who is an elected official or a person who is appointed to fill a vacancy in an elected office as part of a legislative or governing body of Minnesota or a political subdivision; ~~or~~

(4) an individual employed by a farmer, family farm, or a family farm corporation to provide physical labor on or management of a farm if the farmer, family farm, or family farm corporation employs the individual to perform work for 28 days or less each year; or

(5) an inmate of a correctional facility performing work for the correctional facility while incarcerated."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

Senator McEwen questioned whether the amendment was germane.

The President ruled that the amendment was not germane.

Senator Rasmusson moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A108):

Page 133, after line 15, insert:

"ARTICLE 11

EARNED SICK AND SAFE TIME MODIFICATIONS

Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9445, subdivision 6, is amended to read:

Subd. 6. **Employer.** "Employer" means a person who has ~~one~~ 15 or more employees. Employer includes an individual, a corporation, a partnership, an association, a business trust, a nonprofit organization, a group of persons, the state of Minnesota, a county, town, city, school district, or other governmental subdivision. In the case of an employee leasing company or professional employer organization, the taxpaying employer, as described in section 268.046, subdivision 1, remains the employer. In the case of an individual provider within the meaning of section 256B.0711, subdivision 1, paragraph (d), the employer includes any participant within the meaning of section 256B.0711, subdivision 1, paragraph (e), or participant's representative within the meaning of section 256B.0711, subdivision 1, paragraph (f). In the event that a temporary employee is supplied by a staffing agency, absent a contractual agreement stating otherwise, that individual shall be an employee of the staffing agency for all purposes of section 177.50 and sections 181.9445 to 181.9448. Employer does not include the United States government.

Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9446, is amended to read:

181.9446 ACCRUAL OF EARNED SICK AND SAFE TIME.

(a) An employee accrues a minimum of one hour of earned sick and safe time for every 30 hours worked up to a maximum of 48 hours of earned sick and safe time in a year. Employees may not accrue more than 48 hours of earned sick and safe time in a year unless the employer agrees to a higher amount.

(b)(1) Except as provided in clause (2), employers must permit an employee to carry over accrued but unused sick and safe time into the following year. The total amount of accrued but unused earned sick and safe time for an employee must not exceed 80 hours at any time, unless an employer agrees to a higher amount.

(2) In lieu of permitting the carryover of accrued but unused sick and safe time into the following year as provided under clause (1), an employer may provide an employee with earned sick and safe time for the year that meets or exceeds the requirements of this section that is available for the employee's immediate use at the beginning of the subsequent year as follows: (i) 48 hours, if an

employer pays an employee for accrued but unused sick and safe time at the end of a year at the same base rate as an employee earns from employment and in no case at a rate less than that provided under section 177.24 or an applicable local minimum wage; ~~or~~ (ii) 80 hours, if an employer does not pay an employee for accrued but unused sick and safe time at the end of a year; or (iii) upon initial employment, an employer providing sick and safe time under item (i) or (ii) may prorate sick and safe time amounts for an employee based on full- or part-time work for the remainder of that year.

(c) Employees who are exempt from overtime requirements under United States Code, title 29, section 213(a)(1), as amended through January 1, 2024, are deemed to work 40 hours in each workweek for purposes of accruing earned sick and safe time, except that an employee whose normal workweek is less than 40 hours will accrue earned sick and safe time based on the normal workweek.

(d) Earned sick and safe time under this section begins to accrue at the commencement of employment of the employee.

(e) Employees may use earned sick and safe time as it is accrued.

Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9447, subdivision 2, is amended to read:

Subd. 2. **Notice.** An employer may require notice of the need for use of earned sick and safe time as provided in this paragraph. If the need for use is foreseeable, an employer may require advance notice of the intention to use earned sick and safe time but must not require more than seven days' advance notice. If the need is unforeseeable, an employer may require an employee to give notice of the need for earned sick and safe time as ~~soon as practicable~~ reasonably required by the employer. An employer that requires notice of the need to use earned sick and safe time in accordance with this subdivision shall have a written policy containing reasonable procedures for employees to provide notice of the need to use earned sick and safe time, and shall provide a written copy of such policy to employees. If a copy of the written policy has not been provided to an employee, an employer shall not deny the use of earned sick and safe time to the employee on that basis.

Sec. 4. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9447, subdivision 3, is amended to read:

Subd. 3. **Documentation.** (a) When an employee uses earned sick and safe time for more than ~~three~~ two consecutive scheduled work days, an employer may require reasonable documentation that the earned sick and safe time is covered by subdivision 1.

(b) For earned sick and safe time under subdivision 1, clauses (1), (2), (5), and (6), reasonable documentation may include a signed statement by a health care professional indicating the need for use of earned sick and safe time. However, if the employee or employee's family member did not receive services from a health care professional, or if documentation cannot be obtained from a health care professional in a reasonable time or without added expense, then reasonable documentation for the purposes of this paragraph may include a written statement from the employee indicating that the employee is using or used earned sick and safe time for a qualifying purpose covered by subdivision 1, clause (1), (2), (5), or (6). The employer may require documentation at such time that reasonable documentation is available if it is not available in a reasonable amount of time initially.

(c) For earned sick and safe time under subdivision 1, clause (3), an employer must accept a court record or documentation signed by a volunteer or employee of a victims services organization,

an attorney, a police officer, or an antiviolence counselor as reasonable documentation. If documentation cannot be obtained in a reasonable time or without added expense, then reasonable documentation for the purposes of this paragraph may include a written statement from the employee indicating that the employee is using or used earned sick and safe time for a qualifying purpose covered under subdivision 1, clause (3).

(d) For earned sick and safe time to care for a family member under subdivision 1, clause (4), an employer must accept as reasonable documentation a written statement from the employee indicating that the employee is using or used earned sick and safe time for a qualifying purpose as reasonable documentation.

(e) An employer must not require disclosure of details relating to domestic abuse, sexual assault, or stalking or the details of an employee's or an employee's family member's medical condition as related to an employee's request to use earned sick and safe time under this section.

(f) Written statements by an employee may be written in the employee's first language and need not be notarized or in any particular format.

Sec. 5. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9447, subdivision 4, is amended to read:

Subd. 4. **Replacement worker.** For earned sick and safe time use that is unforeseeable, an employer may not require, as a condition of an employee using earned sick and safe time, that the employee seek or find a replacement worker to cover the hours the employee uses as earned sick and safe time. This subdivision does not prohibit an employee from voluntarily seeking or trading shifts with a replacement worker to cover the hours the employee uses as earned sick and safe time.

Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9448, subdivision 1, is amended to read:

Subdivision 1. **Effect on more generous sick and safe time policies.** (a) Nothing in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 shall be construed to discourage employers from adopting or retaining earned sick and safe time policies that meet or exceed, and do not otherwise conflict with, the minimum standards and requirements provided in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448. ~~All paid time off and other paid leave made available to an employee by an employer in excess of the minimum amount required in section 181.9446 for absences from work due to personal illness or injury, but not including short-term or long-term disability or other salary continuation benefits, must meet or exceed the minimum standards and requirements provided in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448, except for section 181.9446. For paid leave accrued prior to January 1, 2024, for absences from work due to personal illness or injury, an employer may require an employee who uses such leave to follow the written notice and documentation requirements in the employer's applicable policy or applicable collective bargaining agreement as of December 31, 2023, in lieu of the requirements of section 181.9447, subdivisions 2 and 3, provided that an employer does not require an employee to use leave accrued on or after January 1, 2024, before using leave accrued prior to that date.~~

(b) Nothing in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 shall be construed to limit the right of parties to a collective bargaining agreement to bargain and agree with respect to earned sick and safe time policies or to diminish the obligation of an employer to comply with any contract, collective bargaining agreement, or any employment benefit program or plan that meets or exceeds, and does not otherwise conflict with, the minimum standards and requirements provided in this section.

(c) Nothing in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 shall be construed to preempt, limit, or otherwise affect the applicability of any other law, regulation, requirement, policy, or standard that provides for a greater amount, accrual, or use by employees of paid sick and safe time or that extends other protections to employees.

(d) Nothing in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 shall be construed or applied so as to create any power or duty in conflict with federal law.

(e) Employers who provide earned sick and safe time to their employees under a paid time off policy or other paid leave policy that may be used for the same purposes and under the same conditions as earned sick and safe time, and that meets or exceeds, and does not otherwise conflict with, the minimum standards and requirements provided in sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 are not required to provide additional earned sick and safe time.

(f) The provisions of sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 may be waived by a collective bargaining agreement with a bona fide building and construction trades labor organization that has established itself as the collective bargaining representative for the affected building and construction industry employees, provided that for such waiver to be valid, it shall explicitly reference sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 and clearly and unambiguously waive application of those sections to such employees.

(g) The requirements of section 181.9447, subdivision 3, may be waived for paid leave made available to an employee by an employer for absences from work in excess of the minimum amount required in section 181.9446 through a collective bargaining agreement with a labor organization that has established itself as the collective bargaining representative for the employees, provided that for such waiver to be valid, it shall explicitly reference section 181.9447, subdivision 3, and clearly and unambiguously waive application of that subdivision to such employees.

(h) An individual provider, as defined in section 256B.0711, subdivision 1, paragraph (d), who provides services through a consumer support grant under section 256.476, consumer-directed community supports under section 256B.4911, or community first services and supports under section 256B.85, to a family member who is a participant, as defined in section 256B.0711, subdivision 1, paragraph (e), may individually waive the provisions of sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 for the remainder of the participant's service plan year, provided that the funds are returned to the participant's budget. Once an individual provider has waived the provisions of sections 181.9445 to 181.9448, they may not accrue earned sick and safe time until the start of the participant's next service plan year.

(i) Sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 do not prohibit an employer from establishing a policy whereby employees may donate unused accrued sick and safe time to another employee.

(j) Sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 do not prohibit an employer from advancing sick and safe time to an employee before accrual by the employee.

Sec. 7. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 181.9448, is amended by adding a subdivision to read:

Subd. 4. **New business exemption.** Sections 181.9445 to 181.9448 shall not apply to an employer that is a new business during the first year of operation."

Amend the title accordingly

Senator Pappas questioned whether the amendment was germane.

The President ruled that the amendment was not germane.

Senator Rasmusson appealed the decision of the President.

The question was taken on "Shall the decision of the President be the judgment of the Senate?"

The roll was called, and there were yeas 33 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Xiong
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Seeberger
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Weber
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	Westrom
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Johnson, Lang, and Nelson.

So the decision of the President was sustained.

Senator Draheim moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A105):

Page 47, line 11, delete "50,133,000" and insert "50,113,000" and delete "49,866,000" and insert "49,846,000"

Page 47, line 14, delete "7,876,000" and insert "7,856,000" and delete "8,043,000" and insert "8,023,000"

Page 47, line 22, delete "\$7,543,000" and insert "\$7,523,000"

Page 47, line 29, delete "8,381,000" and insert "8,361,000" and delete "8,595,000" and insert "8,575,000"

Page 47, line 31, delete "6,685,000" and insert "6,665,000" and delete "6,899,000" and insert "6,879,000"

Correct the subdivision and section totals and the appropriations by fund

Page 130, line 13, delete "(a)"

Page 130, delete lines 17 to 19

Page 131, line 3, delete "(a)"

Page 131, delete lines 7 to 9

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Dornink moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A100):

Page 130, after line 19, insert:

"(c) An employer is not liable or subject to the remedies and penalties provided in paragraphs (a) and (b) if an employee voluntarily waives the rest break required by this section."

Page 131, after line 9, insert:

"(c) An employer is not liable or subject to the remedies and penalties provided in paragraphs (a) and (b) if an employee voluntarily waives the meal break required by this section."

RECESS

Senator Westrom moved that the Senate do now recess for 15 minutes.

The question was taken on the adoption of the Westrom motion.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 30 and nays 35, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Draheim	Hoffman	Lieske	Rarick
Anderson	Drazkowski	Housley	Limmer	Rasmusson
Bahr	Duckworth	Howe	Lucero	Utke
Coleman	Farnsworth	Jasinski	Mathews	Weber
Dahms	Green	Koran	Nelson	Wesenberg
Dornink	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	Westrom

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kreun	McEwen	Pha
Carlson	Gustafson	Kunesh	Miller	Port
Champion	Hauschild	Kupec	Mitchell	Putnam
Clark	Hawj	Latz	Mohamed	Rest
Cwodzinski	Johnson	Mann	Murphy	Westlin
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Marty	Oumou Verbeten	Wiklund
Fateh	Klein	Maye Quade	Pappas	Xiong

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail.

The question was taken on the adoption of the Dornink (A100) amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Johnson, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Marty, Murphy, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Gruenhagen moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A36):

Page 100, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 326B.106, subdivision 1, is amended to read:

Subdivision 1. **Adoption of code.** (a) Subject to paragraphs (c) and (d) and sections 326B.101 to 326B.194, the commissioner shall by rule and in consultation with the Construction Codes Advisory Council establish a code of standards for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, and repair of buildings, governing matters of structural materials, design and construction, fire protection, health, sanitation, and safety, including design and construction standards regarding heat loss control, illumination, and climate control. The code must also include duties and responsibilities for code administration, including procedures for administrative action, penalties, and suspension and revocation of certification. The code must conform insofar as practicable to model building codes generally accepted and in use throughout the United States, including a code for building conservation. In the preparation of the code, consideration must be given to the existing statewide specialty codes presently in use in the state. Model codes with necessary modifications and statewide specialty codes may be adopted by reference. The code must be based on the application of scientific principles, approved tests, and professional judgment. To the extent possible, the code must be adopted in terms of desired results instead of the means of achieving those results, avoiding wherever possible the incorporation of specifications of particular methods or materials. To that end the code must encourage the use of new methods and new materials. Except as otherwise provided in sections 326B.101 to 326B.194, the commissioner shall administer and enforce the provisions of those sections.

(b) The commissioner shall develop rules addressing the plan review fee assessed to similar buildings without significant modifications including provisions for use of building systems as specified in the industrial/modular program specified in section 326B.194. Additional plan review fees associated with similar plans must be based on costs commensurate with the direct and indirect costs of the service.

(c) Beginning with the 2018 edition of the model building codes and every six years thereafter, the commissioner shall review the new model building codes and adopt the model codes as amended for use in Minnesota, within two years of the published edition date. The commissioner may adopt amendments to the building codes prior to the adoption of the new building codes to advance construction methods, technology, or materials, or, where necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public, or to improve the efficiency or the use of a building.

(d) Notwithstanding paragraph (c), the commissioner shall act on each new model residential energy code and the new model commercial energy code in accordance with federal law for which the United States Department of Energy has issued an affirmative determination in compliance with United States Code, title 42, section 6833. The commissioner may adopt amendments prior to adoption of the new energy codes, as amended for use in Minnesota, to advance construction methods, technology, or materials, or, where necessary to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public, or to improve the efficiency or use of a building.

~~(e) Beginning in 2024, the commissioner shall act on the new model commercial energy code by adopting each new published edition of ASHRAE 90.1 or a more efficient standard. The commercial energy code in effect in 2036 and thereafter must achieve an 80 percent reduction in annual net energy consumption or greater, using the ASHRAE 90.1-2004 as a baseline. The commissioner shall adopt commercial energy codes from 2024 to 2036 that incrementally move toward achieving the 80 percent reduction in annual net energy consumption. By January 15 of the year following each new code adoption, the commissioner shall make a report on progress under this section to the legislative committees with jurisdiction over the energy code.~~

~~(f) (e) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to limit the ability of a public utility to offer code support programs, or to claim energy savings resulting from such programs, through its energy conservation and optimization plans approved by the commissioner of commerce under section 216B.241 or an energy conservation and optimization plan filed by a consumer-owned utility under section 216B.2403.~~

~~(g) Beginning in 2026, the commissioner shall act on the new model residential energy code by adopting each new published edition of the International Energy Conservation Code or a more efficient standard. The residential energy code in effect in 2038 and thereafter must achieve a 70 percent reduction in annual net energy consumption or greater, using the 2006 International Energy Conservation Code State Level Residential Codes Energy Use Index for Minnesota, as published by the United States Department of Energy's Building Energy Codes Program, as a baseline. The commissioner shall adopt residential energy codes from 2026 to 2038 that incrementally move toward achieving the 70 percent reduction in annual net energy consumption. By January 15 of the year following each new code adoption, the commissioner shall submit a report on progress under this section to the legislative committees with jurisdiction over the energy code."~~

Page 130, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 48. **REPEALER.**

Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 326B.106, subdivision 16, is repealed."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 30 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Draheim	Jasinski	Limmer	Rarick
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Lucero	Rasmusson
Bahr	Green	Koran	Mathews	Utke
Coleman	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Miller	Weber
Dahms	Housley	Lang	Nelson	Wesenberg
Dornink	Howe	Lieske	Pratt	Westrom

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Johnson, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodziński	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Fateh, Marty, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Howe moved to amend S.F. No. 1832 as follows (A127):

Page 121, after line 11, insert:

"EFFECTIVE DATE; DELAY. The portions removed from paragraph (a) are effective January 1, 2027. Paragraphs (d) to (j) are effective January 1, 2027."

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 30 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Limmer	Rarick
Bahr	Duckworth	Johnson	Lucero	Rasmusson
Coleman	Green	Koran	Mathews	Utke
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Miller	Weber
Dornink	Housley	Lang	Nelson	Wesenberg
Draheim	Howe	Lieske	Pratt	Westrom

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Johnson, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodziński	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Dibble, Fateh, Marty, Port, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

S.F. No. 1832 was read the third time, as amended, and placed on its final passage.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill, as amended.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 35 and nays 30, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port
Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senator: Abeler.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Limmer	Rarick
Bahr	Duckworth	Johnson	Lucero	Rasmusson
Coleman	Green	Koran	Mathews	Utke
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Miller	Weber
Dornink	Housley	Lang	Nelson	Wesenberg
Draheim	Howe	Lieske	Pratt	Westrom

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

So the bill, as amended, was passed and its title was agreed to.

President Champion assumed the Chair.

SPECIAL ORDER

S.F. No. 2077: A bill for an act relating to state government; appropriating money for environment and natural resources; appropriating money from environment and natural resources trust fund; modifying prior appropriations; modifying fees and surcharges; modifying disposition of certain funds; modifying and establishing duties, authorities, and prohibitions regarding environment and natural resources; modifying and creating environment and natural resources programs; modifying and creating grant programs; providing civil and criminal penalties; authorizing rulemaking; modifying state trail, state forest, and state park provisions; authorizing sales, conveyances, and leases of certain state lands; modifying forestry provisions; modifying game and fish provisions; making technical changes; requiring reports; amending Minnesota Statutes 2024, sections 84.027, by adding a subdivision; 86B.415, subdivision 7; 97A.223, subdivision 1; 97A.421, by adding a subdivision; 97A.465, by adding a subdivision; 97A.475, subdivisions 2, 6; 103G.271, subdivision 6; 103G.301, subdivision 2; 115B.421; 116.07, by adding a subdivision; 116.073, subdivisions 1, 2; Laws 2023, chapter 60, article 1, sections 2, subdivisions 2, 7, 10; 3, subdivision 6; Laws 2024, chapter 83, section 2, subdivisions 3, 8; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapters 84; 86B; 325F.

Senator Green moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A58):

Page 139, after line 30, insert:

"ARTICLE 6

ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITTING REFORM

Section 1. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 115.542, is amended to read:

115.542 NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR PUBLICLY OWNED WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITIES.

Subdivision 1. **Definitions.** For the purpose of this section, the following terms have the meanings given:

(1) "permit" means a national pollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit or state disposal system (SDS) permit; and

(2) "permit applicant" means a person or entity submitting an application for a new permit or renewal, modification, or revocation of an existing permit for a publicly owned wastewater treatment facility.

Subd. 2. **Applicability.** This section applies to all draft permits and permits for publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities for which the commissioner of the Pollution Control Agency makes a preliminary determination whether to issue or deny.

Subd. 3. **Prepublic notice review requirements.** Unless waived by the permit applicant, the commissioner of the Pollution Control Agency must provide a permit applicant with a copy of the draft permit and any fact sheets required by agency rules at least 30 days before the distribution and public notice of the permit application and preliminary determination.

Subd. 4. **Permitting efficiency Public notice requirements.** The commissioner must prepare and issue a public notice of a completed application and the commissioner's preliminary determination as to whether the permit should be issued or denied. The public comment period must be at least 60 days for permit applications under this section but may be reduced to 30 days if:

(1) a request for the reduction is made by the permit applicant; and

(2) the commissioner approves the request based on consideration of public or Tribal interest in the permit action.

Subd. 5. **Permitting efficiency.** Notwithstanding section 116.03, it is the goal of the state that tier 2 permits for publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities be issued or denied within 210 days following submission of a permit application.

Sec. 2. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116.03, subdivision 2b, is amended to read:

Subd. 2b. **Permitting efficiency.** (a) It is the goal of the state that environmental and resource management permits be issued or denied within 90 days for tier 1 permits or 150 days for tier 2 permits following submission of a permit application. The commissioner ~~of the Pollution Control Agency shall~~ must establish management systems designed to achieve the goal. For the purposes

of this section, "tier 1 permits" are permits that do not require individualized actions or public comment periods, and "tier 2 permits" are permits that require individualized actions or public comment periods. Goals established in this paragraph do not apply to permit applications required due to agency enforcement actions.

(b) The commissioner ~~shall~~ must prepare an annual permitting efficiency report that includes statistics on meeting the tier 2 goal in paragraph (a) and the criteria for tier 2 by permit categories. The report must also provide information on consultants regarding achievement of the performance standards under paragraph (e), clauses (1) to (4). The report is ~~due~~ must be submitted to the governor and to the chairs and ranking minority members of the house of representatives and senate committees having jurisdiction over environment policy and finance by October 1 ~~August 1~~ each year and must be posted on the agency's website. Each report must include:

(1) for each permit applications application that have has not met the goal, the report must state the reasons for not meeting the goal. In stating the reasons for not meeting the goal, the commissioner shall separately identify delays an explanation of whether the delay was caused by the responsiveness of the proposer, lack of staff, scientific or technical disagreements, or the level of public engagement. The report must specify;

(2) for each permit that has not met the goal, the number of days from initial submission of the application to the day of determination that the application is complete. The report must aggregate;

(3) a summary of the data for the year reporting period and assess an assessment of whether program or system changes are necessary to achieve the tier 2 goal. The report must be posted on the agency's website and submitted to the governor and the chairs and ranking minority members of the house of representatives and senate committees having jurisdiction over environment policy and finance. in paragraph (a);

(4) a statement of the number of tier 2 permits completed within the reporting period and, immediately following in parentheses, a statement of the percentage of total applications received for that tier 2 permit category that the number represents, stated separately for industrial and municipal permits; and

(5) for permits that did not meet the goal due to lack of staff, a combined estimate of the aggregate staff resources that would have been necessary for all affected permits to meet the goal.

(c) The commissioner ~~shall~~ must allow electronic submission of environmental review and permit documents to the agency.

(d) Within 30 business days of application for a permit subject to paragraph (a), the commissioner ~~of the Pollution Control Agency shall~~ must notify the permit applicant, in writing, ~~whether the application is complete or incomplete. If the commissioner determines that an application is incomplete, the notice to the applicant must enumerate of all deficiencies, while citing specific provisions of the applicable rules and statutes, and must advise the applicant on how the deficiencies can be remedied. The applicant shall have five business days to remedy all identified deficiencies before the commissioner determines that the application is complete or incomplete. If the commissioner determines that the application is complete, the notice commissioner must confirm the application's tier 1 or tier 2 permit status. If the commissioner believes that a complete application for a tier 2 construction permit cannot be issued within the 150-day goal, the commissioner must~~

provide notice to the applicant with the commissioner's notice that the application is complete and, upon request of the applicant, provide the permit applicant with a schedule estimating when the agency will begin drafting the permit and issue the public notice of the draft permit. This paragraph does not apply to an application for a permit that is subject to a grant or loan agreement under chapter 446A.

(e) The commissioner must credential consultants who meet the requirements of this paragraph and must provide a logo or similar indicator with the credential that can be used by a consultant in marketing their services. For purposes of this section, "consultant" means a third-party professional representing a facility owner or operator to prepare or assist in preparing a permit application or other similar documentation required by the commissioner for authorizations under chapters 115 to 116. A consultant is credentialed on January 1 each odd-numbered year if, in the preceding two years, the consultant:

(1) submitted permit applications deemed complete under paragraph (d) at a rate of at least 80 percent;

(2) when applicable, met agreed-upon deadlines as part of a plan designed to increase the coordination and efficiency of regulatory activities, such as a plan described under section 116.035;

(3) did not represent an owner or operator to prepare or assist in preparing a permit application or other similar documentation when the owner or operator received a citation under section 116.073, subdivision 1, paragraph (b); and

(4) was not found in violation of Minnesota Rules, part 7000.0300, relating to duty of candor.

(f) If, after notifying the permit applicant that the application is complete, the commissioner determines that additional information is needed, the commissioner must notify the applicant. Upon notice under this paragraph, counting days toward the 90- or 150-day goal described in paragraph (a) stops until the applicant has responded with the additional information. Once the applicant has responded with all the additional information required, counting resumes from where it stopped. The applicant has 30 business days to provide the additional information to the commissioner, but the commissioner may extend the time upon the applicant's request.

(g) For purposes of this subdivision, "permit professional" means an individual not employed by the Pollution Control Agency who:

(1) has a professional license issued by the state of Minnesota in the subject area of the permit;

(2) has at least ten years of experience in the subject area of the permit; and

(3) abides by the duty of candor applicable to employees of the Pollution Control Agency under agency rules and complies with all applicable requirements under chapter 326.

(h) Upon the agency's request, an applicant relying on a permit professional must participate in a meeting with the agency before submitting an application:

(1) at least two weeks prior to the preapplication meeting, the applicant must submit at least the following:

(i) project description, including, but not limited to, scope of work, primary emissions points, discharge outfalls, and water intake points;

(ii) location of the project, including county, municipality, and location on the site;

(iii) business schedule for project completion; and

(iv) other information requested by the agency at least four weeks prior to the scheduled meeting; and

(2) during the preapplication meeting, the agency ~~shall~~ must provide for the applicant at least the following:

(i) an overview of the permit review program;

(ii) a determination of which specific application or applications will be necessary to complete the project;

(iii) a statement notifying the applicant if the specific permit being sought requires a mandatory public hearing or comment period;

(iv) a review of the timetable established in the permit review program for the specific permit being sought; and

(v) a determination of what information must be included in the application, including a description of any required modeling or testing.

~~(g)~~ (i) The applicant may select a permit professional to undertake the preparation of the permit application and draft permit.

~~(h)~~ (j) If a preapplication meeting was held, the agency ~~shall~~ must, within seven business days of receipt of an application, notify the applicant and submitting permit professional that the application is complete or is denied, specifying the deficiencies of the application.

~~(i)~~ (k) Upon receipt of notice that the application is complete, the permit professional ~~shall~~ must submit to the agency a timetable for submitting a draft permit. The permit professional ~~shall~~ must submit a draft permit on or before the date provided in the timetable. Within 60 days after the close of the public comment period, the commissioner ~~shall~~ must notify the applicant whether the permit can be issued.

~~(j)~~ (l) Nothing in this section shall be construed to modify:

(1) any requirement of law that is necessary to retain federal delegation to or assumption by the state; or

(2) the authority to implement a federal law or program.

~~(k)~~ (m) The permit application and draft permit ~~shall~~ must identify or include as an appendix all studies and other sources of information used to substantiate the analysis contained in the permit application and draft permit. The commissioner ~~shall~~ must request additional studies, if needed, and

the permit applicant ~~shall~~ must submit all additional studies and information necessary for the commissioner to perform the commissioner's responsibility to review, modify, and determine the completeness of the application and approve the draft permit.

Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116.07, subdivision 4a, is amended to read:

Subd. 4a. **Permits.** (a) The Pollution Control Agency may issue, continue in effect or deny permits, under such conditions as it may prescribe for the prevention of pollution, for the emission of air contaminants, or for the installation or operation of any emission facility, air contaminant treatment facility, treatment facility, potential air contaminant storage facility, or storage facility, or any part thereof, or for the sources or emissions of noise pollution. The Pollution Control Agency may issue separate permits for constructing a facility described in this paragraph and for its operation, except for a facility required to complete a mandatory environmental impact statement under Minnesota Rules, part 4410.4400. The Pollution Control Agency must prioritize these permits in a manner that minimizes the time required to construct and begin operation of the permitted facility while complying with state and federal requirements.

(b) The Pollution Control Agency may also issue, continue in effect or deny permits, under such conditions as it may prescribe for the prevention of pollution, for the storage, collection, transportation, processing, or disposal of waste, or for the installation or operation of any system or facility, or any part thereof, related to the storage, collection, transportation, processing, or disposal of waste.

(c) The agency may not issue a permit to a facility without analyzing and considering the cumulative levels and effects of past and current environmental pollution from all sources on the environment and residents of the geographic area within which the facility's emissions are likely to be deposited, provided that the facility is located in a community in a city of the first class in Hennepin County that meets all of the following conditions:

(1) is within a half mile of a site designated by the federal government as an EPA superfund site due to residential arsenic contamination;

(2) a majority of the population are low-income persons of color and American Indians;

(3) a disproportionate percent of the children have childhood lead poisoning, asthma, or other environmentally related health problems;

(4) is located in a city that has experienced numerous air quality alert days of dangerous air quality for sensitive populations between February 2007 and February 2008; and

(5) is located near the junctions of several heavily trafficked state and county highways and two one-way streets which carry both truck and auto traffic.

(d) The Pollution Control Agency may revoke or modify any permit issued under this subdivision and section 116.081 whenever it is necessary, in the opinion of the agency, to prevent or abate pollution.

(e) The Pollution Control Agency has the authority for approval over the siting, expansion, or operation of a solid waste facility with regard to environmental issues. However, the agency's

issuance of a permit does not release the permittee from any liability, penalty, or duty imposed by any applicable county ordinances. Nothing in this chapter precludes, or shall be construed to preclude, a county from enforcing land use controls, regulations, and ordinances existing at the time of the permit application and adopted pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 2020, sections 366.10 to 366.181, or sections 394.21 to 394.37, or 462.351 to 462.365, with regard to the siting, expansion, or operation of a solid waste facility.

(f) Except as prohibited by federal law, a person may commence construction, reconstruction, replacement, or modification of any facility prior to the issuance of a construction permit by the agency.

(g) For the purposes of this subdivision, the Pollution Control Agency may require the owners and operators of any emission facility, air containment treatment facility, treatment facility, potential air containment storage facility, or storage facility, or any part thereof, to conduct air dispersion modeling of air contaminants.

Sec. 4. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116.07, subdivision 4d, is amended to read:

Subd. 4d. **Permit fees.** (a) The agency may collect permit fees in amounts not greater than those necessary to cover the reasonable costs of developing, reviewing, and acting upon applications for agency permits and implementing and enforcing the conditions of the permits pursuant to agency rules. Permit fees shall not include the costs of litigation. The fee schedule must reflect reasonable and routine direct and indirect costs associated with permitting, implementation, and enforcement. The agency may impose an additional enforcement fee to be collected for a period of up to two years to cover the reasonable costs of implementing and enforcing the conditions of a permit under the rules of the agency. Any money collected under this paragraph shall be deposited in the environmental fund.

(b) Notwithstanding paragraph (a), the agency shall collect an annual fee from the owner or operator of all stationary sources, emission facilities, emissions units, air contaminant treatment facilities, treatment facilities, potential air contaminant storage facilities, or storage facilities subject to a notification, permit, or license requirement under this chapter, subchapters I and V of the federal Clean Air Act, United States Code, title 42, section 7401 et seq., or rules adopted thereunder. The annual fee shall be used to pay for all direct and indirect reasonable costs, including legal costs, required to develop and administer the notification, permit, or license program requirements of this chapter, subchapters I and V of the federal Clean Air Act, United States Code, title 42, section 7401 et seq., or rules adopted thereunder. Those costs include the reasonable costs of reviewing and acting upon an application for a permit; implementing and enforcing statutes, rules, and the terms and conditions of a permit; emissions, ambient, and deposition monitoring; preparing generally applicable regulations; responding to federal guidance; modeling, analyses, and demonstrations; preparing inventories and tracking emissions; and providing information to the public about these activities.

(c) The agency shall set fees that:

(1) will result in the collection, in the aggregate, from the sources listed in paragraph (b), of an amount not less than \$25 per ton of each volatile organic compound; pollutant regulated under United States Code, title 42, section 7411 or 7412 (section 111 or 112 of the federal Clean Air Act);

and each pollutant, except carbon monoxide, for which a national primary ambient air quality standard has been promulgated;

(2) may result in the collection, in the aggregate, from the sources listed in paragraph (b), of an amount not less than \$25 per ton of each pollutant not listed in clause (1) that is regulated under this chapter or air quality rules adopted under this chapter; and

(3) shall collect, in the aggregate, from the sources listed in paragraph (b), the amount needed to match grant funds received by the state under United States Code, title 42, section 7405 (section 105 of the federal Clean Air Act).

The agency must not include in the calculation of the aggregate amount to be collected under clauses (1) and (2) any amount in excess of 4,000 tons per year of each air pollutant from a source. The increase in air permit fees to match federal grant funds shall be a surcharge on existing fees. The commissioner may not collect the surcharge after the grant funds become unavailable. In addition, the commissioner shall use nonfee funds to the extent practical to match the grant funds so that the fee surcharge is minimized.

(d) To cover the reasonable costs described in paragraph (b), the agency shall provide in the rules promulgated under paragraph (c) for an increase in the fee collected in each year by the percentage, if any, by which the Consumer Price Index for the most recent calendar year ending before the beginning of the year the fee is collected exceeds the Consumer Price Index for the calendar year 1989. For purposes of this paragraph the Consumer Price Index for any calendar year is the average of the Consumer Price Index for all-urban consumers published by the United States Department of Labor, as of the close of the 12-month period ending on August 31 of each calendar year. The revision of the Consumer Price Index that is most consistent with the Consumer Price Index for calendar year 1989 shall be used.

(e) Any money collected under paragraphs (b) to (d) must be deposited in the environmental fund and must be used solely for the activities listed in paragraph (b).

(f) Permit applicants who wish to construct, reconstruct, or modify a project may ~~offer request expedited permitting under this paragraph. An applicant requesting expedited permitting under this paragraph must agree to reimburse the agency for the costs of staff time or consultant services needed to expedite the preapplication process and permit development process through the final decision on the permit, including the analysis of environmental review documents. The reimbursement shall be~~ is in addition to permit application fees imposed by law. ~~When the agency determines that it needs additional resources to develop the permit application in an expedited manner, and that expediting the development is consistent with permitting program priorities, the agency may accept the reimbursement.~~ The commissioner must give the applicant an estimate of the timeline and costs to be incurred by the commissioner. The estimate must include a brief description of the tasks to be performed, a schedule for completing the tasks, and the estimated cost for each task. If the applicant agrees to the estimated timeline and costs negotiated with the commissioner, the applicant and the commissioner must enter into a written agreement detailing the estimated costs for the expedited permit decision-making process to be incurred by the agency to proceed accordingly. The agreement must ~~also~~ identify staff anticipated to be assigned to the project. The agreement may provide that, if permitting is completed ahead of the schedule set forth in the written agreement, the commissioner may retain any fees that would have been due if the permitting had taken the time contemplated in

the written agreement. Fees retained by the commissioner under this paragraph are appropriated to the commissioner for administering the commissioner's permitting duties. The commissioner must not issue a permit until the applicant has paid all fees in full. The commissioner must refund any unobligated balance of fees paid. Reimbursements accepted by the agency are appropriated to the agency for the purpose of developing the permit or analyzing environmental review documents. Reimbursement by a permit applicant shall precede and not be contingent upon issuance of a permit; shall not affect the agency's decision on whether to issue or deny a permit, what conditions are included in a permit, or the application of state and federal statutes and rules governing permit determinations; and shall not affect final decisions regarding environmental review.

(g) The fees under this subdivision are exempt from section 16A.1285.

Sec. 5. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116D.04, subdivision 2a, is amended to read:

Subd. 2a. **When prepared.** (a) Where there is potential for significant environmental effects resulting from any major governmental action, the action must be preceded by a detailed environmental impact statement prepared by the responsible governmental unit. The environmental impact statement must be an analytical rather than an encyclopedic document that describes the proposed action in detail, analyzes its significant environmental impacts, discusses appropriate alternatives to the proposed action and their impacts, and explores methods by which adverse environmental impacts of an action could be mitigated. The environmental impact statement must also analyze those economic, employment, and sociological effects that cannot be avoided should the action be implemented. To ensure its use in the decision-making process, the environmental impact statement must be prepared as early as practical in the formulation of an action.

(b) The board shall by rule establish categories of actions for which environmental impact statements and for which environmental assessment worksheets must be prepared as well as categories of actions for which no environmental review is required under this section. A mandatory environmental assessment worksheet is not required for the expansion of an ethanol plant, as defined in section 41A.09, subdivision 2a, paragraph (b), or the conversion of an ethanol plant to a biobutanol facility or the expansion of a biobutanol facility as defined in section 41A.15, subdivision 2d, based on the capacity of the expanded or converted facility to produce alcohol fuel, but must be required if the ethanol plant or biobutanol facility meets or exceeds thresholds of other categories of actions for which environmental assessment worksheets must be prepared. The responsible governmental unit for an ethanol plant or biobutanol facility project for which an environmental assessment worksheet is prepared is the state agency with the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole.

(c) A mandatory environmental impact statement is not required for a facility or plant located outside the seven-county metropolitan area that produces less than 125,000,000 gallons of ethanol, biobutanol, or cellulosic biofuel annually, or produces less than 400,000 tons of chemicals annually, if the facility or plant is: an ethanol plant, as defined in section 41A.09, subdivision 2a, paragraph (b); a biobutanol facility, as defined in section 41A.15, subdivision 2d; or a cellulosic biofuel facility. A facility or plant that only uses a cellulosic feedstock to produce chemical products for use by another facility as a feedstock is not considered a fuel conversion facility as used in rules adopted under this chapter.

(d) The responsible governmental unit shall promptly publish notice of the completion of an environmental assessment worksheet by publishing the notice in at least one newspaper of general circulation in the geographic area where the project is proposed, by posting the notice on a website that has been designated as the official publication site for publication of proceedings, public notices, and summaries of a political subdivision in which the project is proposed, or in any other manner determined by the board and shall provide copies of the environmental assessment worksheet to the board and its member agencies. Comments on the need for an environmental impact statement may be submitted to the responsible governmental unit during a 30-day period following publication of the notice that an environmental assessment worksheet has been completed. The responsible governmental unit may extend the 30-day comment period for an additional 30 days one time. Further extensions of the comment period may not be made unless approved by the project's proposer. The responsible governmental unit's decision on the need for an environmental impact statement must be based on the environmental assessment worksheet and the comments received during the comment period, and must be made within 15 days after the close of the comment period. The board's chair may extend the 15-day period by not more than 15 additional days upon the request of the responsible governmental unit.

(e) An environmental assessment worksheet must also be prepared for a proposed action whenever material evidence accompanying a petition ~~by not less than 100 individuals who reside or own property in the state~~, submitted before the proposed project has received final approval by the appropriate governmental units, demonstrates that, because of the nature or location of a proposed action, there may be potential for significant environmental effects. Petitions may be submitted by:

(1) a Minnesota Tribal government as defined under section 10.65, subdivision 2; or

(2) not less than 100 individuals who reside or own property in the state.

(f) Petitions requesting the preparation of an environmental assessment worksheet under paragraph (e) must be submitted to the board. The chair of the board or designee shall determine the appropriate responsible governmental unit and forward the petition to it. A decision on the need for an environmental assessment worksheet must be made by the responsible governmental unit within 15 days after the petition is received by the responsible governmental unit. The board's chair or designee may extend the 15-day period by not more than 15 additional days upon request of the responsible governmental unit.

~~(f)~~ (g) Except in an environmentally sensitive location where Minnesota Rules, part 4410.4300, subpart 29, item B, applies, the proposed action is exempt from environmental review under this chapter and rules of the board, if:

(1) the proposed action is:

(i) an animal feedlot facility with a capacity of less than 1,000 animal units; or

(ii) an expansion of an existing animal feedlot facility with a total cumulative capacity of less than 1,000 animal units;

(2) the application for the animal feedlot facility includes a written commitment by the proposer to design, construct, and operate the facility in full compliance with Pollution Control Agency feedlot rules; and

(3) the county board holds a public meeting for citizen input at least ten business days before the Pollution Control Agency or county issuing a feedlot permit for the animal feedlot facility unless another public meeting for citizen input has been held with regard to the feedlot facility to be permitted. The exemption in this paragraph is in addition to other exemptions provided under other law and rules of the board.

~~(g)~~ (h) The board may, before final approval of a proposed project, require preparation of an environmental assessment worksheet by a responsible governmental unit selected by the board for any action where environmental review under this section has not been specifically provided for by rule or otherwise initiated.

~~(h)~~ (i) An early and open process must be used to limit the scope of the environmental impact statement to a discussion of those impacts that, because of the nature or location of the project, have the potential for significant environmental effects. The same process must be used to determine the form, content, and level of detail of the statement as well as the alternatives that are appropriate for consideration in the statement. In addition, the permits that will be required for the proposed action must be identified during the scoping process. Further, the process must identify those permits for which information will be developed concurrently with the environmental impact statement. The board shall provide in its rules for the expeditious completion of the scoping process. The determinations reached in the process must be incorporated into the order requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

~~(i)~~ (j) The responsible governmental unit shall, to the extent practicable, avoid duplication and ensure coordination between state and federal environmental review and between environmental review and environmental permitting. Whenever practical, information needed by a governmental unit for making final decisions on permits or other actions required for a proposed project must be developed in conjunction with the preparation of an environmental impact statement. When an environmental impact statement is prepared for a project requiring multiple permits for which two or more agencies' decision processes include either mandatory or discretionary hearings before a hearing officer before the agencies' decision on the permit, the agencies may, notwithstanding any law or rule to the contrary, conduct the hearings in a single consolidated hearing process if requested by the proposer. All agencies having jurisdiction over a permit that is included in the consolidated hearing shall participate. The responsible governmental unit shall establish appropriate procedures for the consolidated hearing process, including procedures to ensure that the consolidated hearing process is consistent with the applicable requirements for each permit regarding the rights and duties of parties to the hearing, and shall use the earliest applicable hearing procedure to initiate the hearing. All agencies having jurisdiction over a permit identified in the draft environmental assessment worksheet scoping document must begin reviewing any permit application upon publication of the notice of preparation of the environmental impact statement.

~~(j)~~ (k) An environmental impact statement must be prepared and its adequacy determined within 280 days after notice of its preparation unless the time is extended by consent of the parties or by the governor for good cause. The responsible governmental unit shall determine the adequacy of an environmental impact statement, unless within 60 days after notice is published that an environmental impact statement will be prepared, the board chooses to determine the adequacy of an environmental impact statement. If an environmental impact statement is found to be inadequate, the responsible governmental unit has 60 days to prepare an adequate environmental impact statement.

~~(h)~~ (1) The proposer of a specific action may include in the information submitted to the responsible governmental unit a preliminary draft environmental impact statement under this section on that action for review, modification, and determination of completeness and adequacy by the responsible governmental unit. A preliminary draft environmental impact statement prepared by the project proposer and submitted to the responsible governmental unit must identify or include as an appendix all studies and other sources of information used to substantiate the analysis contained in the preliminary draft environmental impact statement. The responsible governmental unit shall require additional studies, if needed, and obtain from the project proposer all additional studies and information necessary for the responsible governmental unit to perform its responsibility to review, modify, and determine the completeness and adequacy of the environmental impact statement.

Sec. 6. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116D.04, subdivision 2b, is amended to read:

Subd. 2b. **Project prerequisites.** (a) If an environmental assessment worksheet or an environmental impact statement is required for a governmental action under subdivision 2a, a project may not be started and a final governmental decision may not be made to grant a permit, approve a project, or begin a project, until:

- (1) a petition for an environmental assessment worksheet is dismissed;
- (2) a negative declaration has been issued on the need for an environmental impact statement;
- (3) the environmental impact statement has been determined adequate; or
- (4) a variance has been granted from making an environmental impact statement by the environmental quality board.

(b) Nothing in this subdivision precludes a local unit of government from beginning to review a feedlot permit application for a feedlot subject to environmental review under this chapter.

Sec. 7. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116D.04, subdivision 5a, is amended to read:

Subd. 5a. **Rules.** The board shall, by January 1, 1981, promulgate rules in conformity with this chapter and the provisions of chapter 15, establishing:

- (1) the governmental unit which shall be responsible for environmental review of a proposed action;
- (2) the form and content of environmental assessment worksheets;
- (3) a scoping process in conformance with subdivision 2a, paragraph ~~(h)~~ (i);
- (4) a procedure for identifying during the scoping process the permits necessary for a proposed action and a process for coordinating review of appropriate permits with the preparation of the environmental impact statement;
- (5) a standard format for environmental impact statements;
- (6) standards for determining the alternatives to be discussed in an environmental impact statement;

(7) alternative forms of environmental review which are acceptable pursuant to subdivision 4a;

(8) a model ordinance which may be adopted and implemented by local governmental units in lieu of the environmental impact statement process required by this section, providing for an alternative form of environmental review where an action does not require a state agency permit and is consistent with an applicable comprehensive plan. The model ordinance shall provide for adequate consideration of appropriate alternatives, and shall ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the policies and purposes of Laws 1980, chapter 447;

(9) procedures to reduce paperwork and delay through intergovernmental cooperation and the elimination of unnecessary duplication of environmental reviews;

(10) procedures for expediting the selection of consultants by the governmental unit responsible for the preparation of an environmental impact statement; and

(11) any additional rules which are reasonably necessary to carry out the requirements of this section.

Sec. 8. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116D.045, subdivision 1, is amended to read:

Subdivision 1. **Assessment.** The board must by rule adopt procedures to:

(1) assess the proposer of a specific action for the responsible governmental unit's reasonable costs of preparing, reviewing, and distributing the environmental impact statement. The costs must be determined by the responsible governmental unit according to the rules adopted by the board; and

(2) authorize a responsible governmental unit to allow a proposer of a specific action to prepare a draft environmental impact statement according to section 116D.04, subdivision 2a, paragraph ~~(k)~~ (l).

Sec. 9. SCOPING ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET NOT REQUIRED FOR PROJECTS THAT REQUIRE A MANDATORY ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

(a) The Environmental Quality Board must amend Minnesota Rules, part 4410.2100, as follows:

(1) to provide that an environmental assessment worksheet does not need to be prepared for a project that falls within a mandatory environmental impact statement category under Minnesota Rules, part 4410.4400, or other applicable law; and

(2) to provide that a scoping process undertaken under Minnesota Rules, part 4410.2100, must be completed no later than 280 days after the process begins.

(b) The board may use the good-cause exemption under Minnesota Statutes, section 14.388, subdivision 1, clause (3), to adopt rules under this section, and Minnesota Statutes, section 14.386, does not apply except as provided under Minnesota Statutes, section 14.388.

Sec. 10. **STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN REVISIONS.**

The commissioner of the Pollution Control Agency must seek approval from the federal Environmental Protection Agency for revisions to the state's federal Clean Air Act state implementation plan if changes are needed to reflect the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, section 116.07, subdivision 4a, as amended by this act.

Sec. 11. REPORT ON USE OF AUTHORITY TO EXTEND TIMELINE FOR CERTAIN AGENCY ACTIONS.

By February 15, 2028, the Board of Water and Soil Resources must report to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over environment and natural resources policy on the number of extensions noticed under Minnesota Statutes, section 15.99, subdivision 3, paragraph (f), that are made for any decision under Minnesota Rules, chapter 8420, between January 1, 2026, and December 31, 2027. A local government unit must supply the board with information necessary to prepare the report required by this section."

Amend the title accordingly

Pursuant to Rule 7.4, Senator Klein questioned whether the Green (A58) amendment was in order. The President ruled the amendment was in order.

The question was taken on the adoption of the Green (A58) amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 34 and nays 32, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Howe	Lieske	Rarick
Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Limmer	Rasmusson
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Lucero	Utke
Coleman	Green	Koran	Mathews	Weber
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Miller	Wesenberg
Dornink	Hauschild	Kupec	Nelson	Westrom
Draheim	Housley	Lang	Pratt	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Jasinski cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Carlson	Gustafson	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Champion	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Clark	Hoffman	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	McEwen	Port	
Dibble	Klein	Mitchell	Putnam	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mohamed	Rest	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion prevailed. So the amendment was adopted.

Senator Rarick moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A79):

Page 39, line 1, delete "\$298,000" and insert "\$11,000"

Page 41, delete lines 27 to 35

Page 42, delete lines 1 to 34

Page 46, delete lines 1 to 34

Page 47, delete lines 1 to 8

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 51, delete lines 24 to 33

Page 55, delete lines 25 to 34

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 63, delete lines 18 to 35

Page 64, delete lines 1 and 2

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 65, delete lines 32 to 36

Page 66, delete lines 1 to 8

Page 70, delete lines 14 to 27

Page 72, after line 10, insert:

"(r) Willard Munger Trail South Repair and Maintenance

\$8,000,000 the first year is from the trust fund to the commissioner of natural resources for maintenance and repair of the Willard Munger State Trail South."

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Correct the subdivision and section totals and the appropriations by fund

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodziński	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Wesenberg moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A77):

Page 46, line 34, delete "\$2,146,000" and insert "\$1,898,000"

Page 49, after line 28, insert:

"(kk) Study of Impact of Eagles on Loons

\$248,000 the first year is from the trust fund to the commissioner of natural resources to conduct a study of the impact that eagles have on loons in this state. The study must include an assessment of the impact that the presence of bald eagles has on juvenile loons and on the loon population generally. By March 1, 2026, the commissioner must submit a report on the results of the study to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees and divisions with jurisdiction over the environment."

Correct the subdivision and section totals and the appropriations by fund

Senator Wesenberg moved to amend the Wesenberg (A77) amendment to S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A102):

Page 1, line 12, delete "2026" and insert "2028"

The motion prevailed. So the amendment to the amendment was adopted.

The question recurred on the adoption of the Wesenberg (A77) amendment, as amended.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment, as amended, was not adopted.

Senator Lucero moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A72):

Page 38, delete lines 34 and 35

Page 39, delete lines 1 to 7

Page 41, delete lines 27 to 35

Page 42, delete lines 1 to 34

Page 46, delete lines 32 to 35

Page 47, delete lines 1 to 8

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 55, delete lines 25 to 34

Page 56, delete lines 9 to 18

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 63, after line 15, insert:

"(c) \$8,503,000 the first year is from the trust fund to the commissioner of revenue for aquatic invasive species prevention aid under Minnesota Statutes, section 477A.19."

Page 63, delete lines 18 to 35

Page 64, delete lines 1 and 2

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Page 65, delete lines 32 to 36

Page 66, delete lines 1 to 8

Page 70, delete lines 14 to 27

Reletter the paragraphs in sequence

Correct the subdivision and section totals and the appropriations by fund

Senator Klein questioned whether the amendment was germane.

The President ruled that the amendment was germane.

The question was taken on the adoption of the Lucero (A72) amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 31 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	
Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

RECONSIDERATION

Having voted on the prevailing side, Senator Kupec moved that the vote whereby the Green (A58) amendment to S.F. No. 2077 was adopted on April 29, 2025, be now reconsidered.

The question was taken on the adoption of the motion.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 34 and nays 32, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Klein	McEwen	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Anderson	Duckworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Lang	Pratt	
Dornink	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Draheim	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, and Nelson.

The motion prevailed. So the vote was reconsidered.

The question was taken on the adoption of the Green (A58) amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 33 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Abeler	Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson
Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hauschild	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Abeler, Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Wesenberg moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A71):

Page 38, line 26, delete "\$1,441,000" and insert "\$441,000"

Page 49, after line 28, insert:

"(kk) Cervidae Semen Development

\$1,000,000 the first year is from the trust fund to the commissioner of natural resources to establish a program to make disease-free Cervidae semen available to Cervidae farmers."

Correct the subdivision and section totals and the appropriations by fund

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, and Nelson.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Wesenberg moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A70):

Page 38, line 26, delete "\$1,441,000" and insert "\$441,000"

Page 49, after line 28, insert:

"(kk) Electric Fencing Effectiveness Study

\$1,000,000 the first year is from the trust fund to the commissioner of natural resources for a study of the effectiveness of single strand electric fencing at preventing contact between wild white-tailed deer and farmed white-tailed deer. By July 1, 2028, the commissioner must report the results of the study to the chairs and ranking minority members of the senate and house of representatives committees with primary jurisdiction over environment policy."

Correct the subdivision and section totals and the appropriations by fund

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Utke
Bahr	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Weber
Coleman	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Wesenberg
Dahms	Green	Koran	Miller	Westrom
Dibble	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Pratt	
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Rarick	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Gruenhagen, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, and Miller.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Rest
Carlson	Hauschild	Mann	Nelson	Seeberger
Champion	Hawj	Marty	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Klein	McEwen	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Port	
Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senator: Nelson.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

Senator Farnsworth moved to amend S.F. No. 2077 as follows (A56):

Page 87, after line 33, insert:

"Sec. 3. Minnesota Statutes 2024, section 116P.08, is amended by adding a subdivision to read:

Subd. 2a. **Appropriation limits.** No more than 20 percent of the money appropriated from the trust fund in any fiscal year may be appropriated or allocated to the University of Minnesota and no more than 20 percent of the money appropriated from the trust fund in any fiscal year may be appropriated or allocated to other state agencies.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective July 1, 2026, and applies to appropriations on or after that date."

Renumber the sections in sequence and correct the internal references

Amend the title accordingly

The question was taken on the adoption of the amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 31 and nays 34, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Weber
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Wesenberg
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Westrom
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Pratt	
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Rarick	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rasmusson	
Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Utke	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, and Weber.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Putnam
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Rest
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Nelson	Seeberger
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pappas	Wiklund
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Pha	Xiong
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Port	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senator: Nelson.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

RECONSIDERATION

Having voted on the prevailing side, Senator Latz moved that the vote whereby the Wesenberg (A70) amendment to S.F. No. 2077 was not adopted on April 29, 2025, be now reconsidered.

The question was taken on the adoption of the motion.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 61 and nays 4, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Fateh	Kreun	Miller	Rest
Bahr	Frentz	Kunesh	Mitchell	Seeberger
Boldon	Gruenhagen	Kupec	Mohamed	Utke
Carlson	Gustafson	Lang	Murphy	Weber
Champion	Hauschild	Latz	Nelson	Wesenberg
Clark	Hawj	Lieske	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Coleman	Hoffman	Limmer	Pappas	Westrom
Cwodzinski	Housley	Lucero	Pha	Wiklund
Dibble	Jasinski	Mann	Port	Xiong
Draheim	Johnson	Marty	Pratt	
Drazkowski	Johnson Stewart	Mathews	Putnam	
Duckworth	Klein	Maye Quade	Rarick	
Farnsworth	Koran	McEwen	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, Nelson, and Weber.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Dahms	Dornink	Green	Howe
-------	---------	-------	------

The motion prevailed. So the vote was reconsidered.

The question was taken on the adoption of the Wesenberg (A70) amendment.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 32 and nays 33, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Anderson	Duckworth	Jasinski	Lucero	Utke
Bahr	Farnsworth	Johnson	Mathews	Weber
Coleman	Green	Koran	Miller	Wesenberg
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Nelson	Westrom
Dornink	Hoffman	Lang	Pratt	
Draheim	Housley	Lieske	Rarick	
Drazkowski	Howe	Limmer	Rasmusson	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, Nelson, and Weber.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Carlson	Gustafson	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Champion	Hauschild	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Clark	Hawj	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Cwodzinski	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong
Dibble	Klein	McEwen	Port	
Fateh	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam	

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

The motion did not prevail. So the amendment was not adopted.

S.F. No. 2077 was read the third time and placed on its final passage.

The question was taken on the passage of the bill.

The roll was called, and there were yeas 35 and nays 30, as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Boldon	Frentz	Klein	McEwen	Port
Carlson	Green	Kunesh	Mitchell	Putnam
Champion	Gustafson	Kupec	Mohamed	Rest
Clark	Hauschild	Latz	Murphy	Seeberger
Cwodzinski	Hawj	Mann	Oumou Verbeten	Westlin
Dibble	Hoffman	Marty	Pappas	Wiklund
Fateh	Johnson Stewart	Maye Quade	Pha	Xiong

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Westlin cast the affirmative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Boldon, Fateh, Marty, Port, Wiklund, and Xiong.

Those who voted in the negative were:

Anderson	Drazkowski	Jasinski	Limmer	Rarick
Bahr	Duckworth	Johnson	Lucero	Rasmusson
Coleman	Farnsworth	Koran	Mathews	Utke
Dahms	Gruenhagen	Kreun	Miller	Weber
Dornink	Housley	Lang	Nelson	Wesenberg
Draheim	Howe	Lieske	Pratt	Westrom

Pursuant to Rule 40, Senator Rasmusson cast the negative vote on behalf of the following Senators: Anderson, Coleman, Duckworth, Jasinski, Koran, Lang, Lieske, Miller, Nelson, and Weber.

So the bill was passed and its title was agreed to.

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Senator Johnson was excused from the Session of today from 2:15 to 2:25 p.m. Senator Drazkowski was excused from the Session of today from 4:10 to 4:35 p.m. Senator Farnsworth was excused from the Session of today from 4:10 to 5:30 p.m. Senator Abeler was excused from the Session of today from 5:55 to 6:30 p.m. and at 6:40 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Senator Murphy moved that the Senate do now adjourn until 12:00 noon, Wednesday, April 30, 2025. The motion prevailed.

Thomas S. Bottern, Secretary of the Senate

