



April 7, 2026

Committee Co-Chair Rep. Josh Heintzeman

Committee Co-Chair Rep. Peter Fischer

Re: Concerns Regarding Mandatory EIS for Livestock Operations (HF 4740)

Dear Co-Chairs Heintzeman and Fischer,

I am writing on behalf of Minnesota Milk to express our strong opposition to HF 4740. While the bill aims to regulate large-scale operations through mandatory Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), it also threatens the entire dairy ecosystem in Minnesota.

Experience in North Dakota shows that rigid regulatory barriers often lead to industry collapse. By limiting how family members can farm together and increasing capital risk, North Dakota's dairy industry has withered to just 17 remaining farms. Minnesota and surrounding areas currently faces a demand for roughly 250,000 additional cows to support our regional processing infrastructure.

When we create a regulatory "ceiling" for larger dairy farms, we remove the very infrastructure—processors, veterinarians, and equipment dealers—that small farms rely on to survive. Adding further layers of review will only drive our dairy growth into neighboring states, taking \$1.4 billion in annual economic impact with it.

Minnesota's current environmental review process and oversight by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency is more than thorough. We urge you to trust Minnesota's farmers to manage their growth and protect our state's agricultural future by opposing HF 4740.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lucas Sjostrom". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

Lucas Sjostrom

Minnesota Milk Executive Director



April 7, 2026

Committee Co-Chair Rep. Josh Heintzeman

Committee Co-Chair Rep. Peter Fischer

Re: Opposition to HF 3940 and the Preservation of Family Farm Growth

Dear Co-Chairs Heintzeman and Fischer,

Minnesota Milk stands in opposition to HF 3940. We believe this legislation places an undue burden on the “grit and risk” required to operate a modern livestock facility in today’s economy.

The intentions behind stopping large farms typically result in stopping smaller farms from ever reaching a sustainable scale. We have seen this in neighboring states where restrictive definitions of “family” or “size” decimated the local dairy population. Today’s economics often dictate larger operations to remain viable, yet this bill suggests the legislature—rather than the farmer or local feedlot officer—knows the “right” size for a business.

Adding extra costs to financing will slow down projects – likely the intent of this bill. Every cow in production represents over \$25,000 in economic impact. We cannot afford to stifle this growth and hurt the very creameries and rural communities we aim to protect.

Please support the diversity of Minnesota’s dairy industry by opposing HF 3940.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lucas Sjostrom". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being the most prominent.

Lucas Sjostrom

Minnesota Milk Executive Director

**MINNESOTA
CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE**

GROWING MINNESOTA

April 9, 2026

Representative Josh Heintzeman
Co-Chair
House Environment and Natural Resources
Finance and Policy Committee

Representative Peter Fischer
Co-Chair
House Environment and Natural Resources
Finance and Policy Committee

On behalf of the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce, a statewide organization representing more than 6,300 businesses and more than half a million employees, I write today opposing HF 4740 (Rep. Hansen), a bill that creates unnecessary financial assurance for feedlot permits, and HF 3940 (Rep. Pursell), which directs the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) to require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for certain large animal projects.

Directing the Environmental Quality Board (EQB) under HF 3940 to require an EIS for large animal projects is unnecessary. The existing Environmental Assessment (EAW) requirement more than covers any potential impacts a project may have, including but not limited to water use, air quality, soil, traffic, and wildlife. Requiring an EIS would take reviews from hundreds of pages to thousands, requiring further full-time employee hours dedicated to duplicating work already completed by the EAW.

Further, the authority already exists to petition an EAW project to become an EIS. Under Minn. Stat. 116D.04(e), 100 Minnesotans who live in the county of the project or an adjoining county can submit a petition to the EQB, who can then require an EIS if warranted.

HF 4740 would require financial assurance for feedlots of a certain size. The MPCA has an existing manure storage area closure requirement for both temporary and permanent closure. Practices such as removing bottom sludge and spreading remaining manure at agronomic rates are detailed in MPCA procedure.

Requiring financial assurance would also be a significant barrier to farms looking to expand or incentivize new farmers to participate, which would undermine the state's goal of incentivizing new farmers. Adding a carrying fee of \$5,000 to \$15,000 over the life of the permit would accomplish little besides becoming a barrier to entry, as there currently are no known abandoned sites over 1,000 animal units.

Mandating an EIS and financial assurance would be duplicative practices that would overburden the agency and regulated community alike, with little to no increase in environmental outcomes.

Sincerely,



380 St. Peter Street, Suite 1050, St. Paul, MN 55102
www.mnchamber.com

Andrew Morley
Director, Environmental Policy
Minnesota Chamber of Commerce
amorley@mnchamber.com
763-221-7523