

Minnesota 3M PFAS Settlement

Notes for Combined Priority 2 Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, September 20, 2023

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Hybrid Teams and in-person meeting

Combined work group members in attendance

- Aaron Betcher
- Amy Sigveland
- Brian Johnson
- Howard Markus
- James Kelly
- Jeff Holtz
- Jess Richards
- Jill Trescott
- Kirk Koudelka
- Kristin Seaman
- Kristina Handt
- Laura Schulz
- Laurie Elliott
- Melissa Kuskie
- Michael Madigan
- Monica Stiglich
- Randall Clary
- Ron Moorse
- Stephanie Souter
- Steven Johnson
- Tony Manzara
- Victoria Reinhardt

Presenters

- Debra Fleischer, Abt Associates
- Heather Hosterman, Abt Associates
- Karen Carney, Abt Associates

Welcome

Debra Fleischer (Abt Associates) opened the work group meeting by walking through the hybrid meeting logistics, conducting roll call, and discussing the meeting agenda. Melissa Kuskie (Department of Natural Resources [DNR]) then provided opening remarks. She explained that the meeting would continue discussion on PFAS consideration options and introduce draft screening and evaluation criteria. She noted that the subgroup for Priority 2 was contacted regarding their organizations' natural resources and recreation planning efforts that are relevant to Priority 2 goals. She also provided scheduling notes – there will be a Priority 1 work group meeting in October, and the next Priority 2 work group meeting will be in November. Finally, she reported that the July work group meeting materials are posted on the 3M Settlement website.

One work group member added that Priority 1 work group member David Johnson, who served as a business representative, recently passed away.

Feedback Summary

Heather Hosterman (Abt Associates) provided a summary of the feedback received at the July work group meeting. She explained that MPCA and DNR will summarize feedback received at the previous meeting and from emails and will provide responses at the following work group meeting.

One work group member had a question about the screening and evaluation criteria that will be used to assess projects submitted to the request for proposals (RFP). Heather responded that DNR and MPCA drafted screening and evaluation criteria, which will be discussed later in this meeting. The criteria will be updated by DNR and MPCA according to feedback received from the work group, and the updated criteria will inform the RFP. The RFP scope will be presented to the work group during the November meeting.

Work group members asked if DNR and MPCA considered subsistence fishing as they drafted Priority 2 goals, instead of focusing on recreational fishing only. Heather noted that where PFAS levels are high, DNR and MPCA may not want to encourage or promote the consumption of fish. PFAS contamination data and its relation to project selection were discussed at the July work group meeting and will be further discussed later in this meeting.

Work group members asked about treatment standards on 3M's discharge at the Cottage Grove facility. Heather replied that the current permit from 2003 does not contain any numerical limitations on PFAS treatment, instead requiring the "best available technology" be installed for discharge treatment of the facility's wastewater. PFAS-treated source water, wastewater, and stormwater will be treated in the future with more robust PFAS treatment technology. MPCA is working on updating the facility's permit with the goal of reissuing it in the next 12 months. The updated permit will have numerical limits for PFAS compounds.

Work group members asked if the goals should be developed as Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound (SMART) goals. Heather explained that DNR and MPCA intended to develop high-level and broad goals for Priority 2, so while SMART goals were initially discussed, the Co-Trustees decided that the specific and measurable components of the goals would instead be captured in the criteria used to evaluate projects submitted through the RFP.

Work group members asked if DNR collects demographic information for people who fish in PFAS areas. Heather noted that DNR's creel surveys collect limited demographic information such as hometown, zip code, gender, and age, but not racial and ethnicity data.

A work group member asked if the State will assume liability related to PFAS injury from a project. Heather responded that applicants will be advised that the State will not assume liability, and if the project sponsors desire liability insurance, they can enroll in the Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup (VIC) Program.

Work group members expressed a desire for clarity of PFAS concentration units and asked for all data and thresholds to be presented in the same units. Heather reviewed a table displaying different units. Parts per trillion is usually seen in groundwater/drinking water standards, especially those set by EPA. This project and other Minnesota specific thresholds will consistently use parts per billion.

Feedback

One work group member requested clarification on the VIC program, as their understanding was that it did not offer liability to applicants. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) responded that the Brownfields Program provides liability assurance to applicants. In other permitting programs (e.g., stormwater), obtaining the permit does not provide liability assurance, so applicants would also have an option to enroll in the VIC program. The project design needs to account for the contaminants of concern to be eligible for such assurance.

Review Options to Consider PFAS Contamination

Heather Hosterman presented a review of the options for considering PFAS in Priority 2 planning. As presented and discussed fully at the July work group meetings, there are four options.

Option 1 would limit activities to those that are not PFAS sensitive. This would eliminate aquatic, wetland, and nearshore habitat restoration and fishing projects from further consideration. This is not recommended as it is not consistent with the Settlement and is too restrictive.

Option 2 would require that PFAS data be acquired before project approval. Only projects in areas below risk thresholds would be approved. This option is not recommended as it adds complexity and time to the Priority 2 planning process.

Option 3 would allow PFAS-sensitive activities to move forward, but only if they are located outside of “high risk” areas, which would be defined more clearly if this option were chosen. This option can potentially be included with Option 4.

Option 4 would allow any project with PFAS-sensitive activities to be considered. PFAS status would be included in the evaluation process and risks would be assessed qualitatively. This option is recommended as it provides a balance of reducing complexity, cost, and duration of planning while also funding projects that provide the most benefits to natural resources or people. This option can be combined with Option 3.

Feedback

One work group member asked why surface water quality improvement was listed as a non-PFAS-sensitive activity. The work group member brought up Project 1007, which managed stormwater and had the unintended consequence of distributing PFAS faster and further than it would have been otherwise. They wondered if the Co-Trustees should be encouraging a similar type of project. Heather and Karen noted that these would be smaller scale projects, such as reducing sedimentation into water bodies.

One work group member asked why Option 1 wasn't recommended if it is not PFAS sensitive. Heather explained that the idea is to balance the benefits with some of the risks associated with these projects. One of the goals of the Settlement is to improve habitats, and there are projects that are considered PFAS sensitive that would provide a lot of benefits to aquatic and nearshore habitats. Considering PFAS contamination status and high-risk areas can work to balance these benefits with the potential risks, so Option 4 is recommended over Option 1. Karen added that Option 1 was included because it is very conservative and reduces all risk. However, it might be too restrictive and rules out a lot of relevant projects that would compensate for the harm that has been done. Melissa added that Option 4 doesn't restrict the Co-Trustees from considering or approving a project that is compatible with Option 1, but Option 1 does restrict the ability to consider other types of projects.

One work group member noted that in the July meeting, there was a lot of discussion surrounding fishing in certain areas, and it seemed like no fishing projects would be approved – but that in this meeting, it seems like they would be. The work group member asked for clarification. Melissa said that the options are the framework for what projects get through the initial barrier for additional review. In Option 1, only non-PFAS-sensitive projects get through to further review. In Option 4, PFAS-sensitive projects may come through for further review, but there will be additional criteria for evaluating PFAS concerns. Option 4 may allow fishing projects to be subject to further review, but it does not mean they will be approved.

One work group member asked why the Co-Trustees are considering any projects with risk to begin with, given the previous conversation about liability, the fact that science and understanding of risk is always improving, and that the Priority 2 funding is a very small amount of money relative to Priority 1. Even high-risk areas may change – areas that are not currently categorized as high-risk might be found to be high-risk later. They asked what would be the value gained from implementing projects with PFAS-sensitive activities. Kirk said that some projects with PFAS risk may increase the health and overall resilience of [wildlife] populations, which would allow the populations to fare better later on. He acknowledged that this discussion is nuanced with a lot of trade-offs. The Co-Trustees would rather cast a wider net and be able to weigh these decisions as these projects come in. Melissa gave the example of a wetland restoration project, which may increase exposure by bringing more wildlife species to an area but will ultimately provide numerous ecological services.

One member of the public expressed frustration that the Co-Trustees were discussing screening and evaluation criteria. The member of the public worked on a \$2 million stream restoration project that has greatly increased the number of fish in the stream. They felt that DNR and MPCA could have paid for the project, but the local community had to do so instead. They want DNR and MPCA to go into the community and ask locals if they have any projects to fund. Heather said there is \$20 million available under Priority 2 funding and there are many projects available in the East Metro region. Awarding funding to all these projects would exceed the \$20 million available. The criteria are trying to establish a process to evaluate projects, considering PFAS contamination in the area. Projects that provide the most benefits will be awarded funds. The stream restoration project mentioned by the member of the public could be a great example of a project that the Co-Trustees are looking for. The member of the public again expressed frustration that the Co-Trustees must evaluate projects, as their restoration projects have already been evaluated and approved by the agencies. They believe it is a waste of public funds to evaluate further. Jess clarified that because the Co-Trustees have a settlement with 3M, there is a responsibility to have a thorough evaluation of potential projects and it is different than a simple distribution of state funds.

One work group member said that after the July meeting, they had sent an email to Kirk asking for PFAS permit limits and Discharge Monitoring Reports and asked when this data and information would be provided. Kirk said that the Cottage Grove permit and monitoring reports were sent out after the July meeting and included a chart that shows the amount of PFAS being monitored and discharged from the facility over time. The Priority 2 team will resend this email.

One work group member noted that in the materials sent out after the July meeting, the list of PFAS-sensitive activity examples included a bullet on aquatic connectivity projects that is missing from the current presentation. Heather said this was likely an accident and the bullet will be added back in.

One work group member stated that they still have concerns with the idea that the Co-Trustees would approve any projects with any PFAS risk, even though they understand that allowing PFAS-sensitive projects through the initial screening doesn't mean they will be approved. They understand that the Co-Trustees want to weigh benefits but think that not minimizing PFAS risk is a bad idea. They think that the project activity is more important than the project location and are in favor of Option 1. Heather noted that the options will be fleshed out with real project examples later in the meeting.

One work group member said that almost all corn and soybean seeds have PFAS as part of their coating, and so all agricultural land is polluted with PFAS. It would be hard to find a project that wouldn't result in any PFAS

movement or would occur in an area without detectable PFAS. The work group member agreed with comments that the project activity is more important than the project location because all locations will have some PFAS pollution. Karen agreed with this comment and explained that the Co-Trustees are not concerned about areas with minimal amounts of PFAS but would be most concerned with projects occurring in areas where the exceedances of the injury thresholds are high. The Co-Trustees do not want to fund projects in areas with the worst PFAS contamination.

Initial Review of Screening and Evaluation Criteria

Karen Carney (Abt Associates) presented on the Priority 2 Draft Evaluation Criteria. She explained that this is the first draft of project evaluation criteria that will guide the selection of projects submitted through the RFP. There may be many projects submitted, and the criteria will provide a framework to compare these projects against one another and help decide which projects are most relevant to Priority 2 goals.

The draft screening criteria include aspects such as nexus to restoration injury, feasibility, public health and safety, consistency with existing laws, policies, and regulations, and project additionality. There are two proposed PFAS-related screening criteria, the inclusion of which is dependent upon which PFAS consideration option is chosen.

If a submitted project passes all the screening criteria, it will be subject to evaluation criteria, which cover three broad topics: project implementation, measurement and monitoring, and matching funds. Project implementation criteria assess project components including benefits to injured resources and services; cost effectiveness; consistency of project with local, county, and regional planning; community engagement; equity and environmental justice; potential for adverse community impacts or additional wildlife and human health risks; and self-sustaining benefits. Measurement and monitoring criteria assess monitoring plans and the measurability of project benefits. The matching funds criterion would favor projects that leverage funding.

Feedback

One work group member discussed the screening criterion covering project additionality and noted that they understand the desire to not fund projects that might be required for regulatory reasons [other than the proposed project] but would challenge the importance of not having other sources of dedicated funding. There are many potential projects that meet the Priority 2 goals and criteria that might be already outlined in a local plan. The work group member would like to see the language about dedicated funding removed or de-emphasized because people are always combining potential or existing funding sources to implement projects. Another work group member disagreed, saying this opportunity is unique to the Settlement and the funds should not go to supplementing projects that would still get funded otherwise. One work group member asked for clarification on the difference between the project additionality screening criterion and the matching funds evaluation criterion because they seem to overlap. The evaluation criterion says that if a project has matching funding, it will be evaluated more favorably, but the screening criterion says that if the project already has additional funding, it will fail screening. Karen said this will be discussed internally among the Co-Trustees. She noted that a project can be supported by existing funding if the Priority 2 funding would allow the project to go beyond and improve the initial plans. The Co-Trustees do not want the Priority 2 funding to supplant another source of funding.

One work group member asked how the community engagement evaluation criterion would be measured and what success in this criterion looks like. Karen said that a proposal demonstrating that what the applicant is proposing to do has been successful in the past would be strong. Some projects could have already done engagement pre-proposal, or they could outline a strong plan to conduct engagement throughout the project. A project where the outcome is to release a report on a website would be evaluated less favorably under this criterion than a project that interacts with communities. The Co-Trustees will discuss how to measure this.

One work group member asked if every criterion would be weighed the same, or if there will be a future discussion to determine if some criteria should be weighted heavier than others. Karen said the screening criteria are not weighted. The Co-Trustees are considering weighting the evaluation criteria but have not made that decision. The work group likely would not be involved in the decisions on how to weight the criteria, as the evaluation process is not public. The final weighting will also not be shared ahead of the RFP. One work group member said that the weighting was discussed with the work group in Priority 1.

One work group member expressed concern that the feasibility screening criterion would favor counties and larger communities with more staff with relevant experience at the expense of smaller entities without much related experience. Karen said she did not anticipate smaller communities being screened out.

One work group member noted that for some projects (e.g., bird nesting platforms), it may be hard to measure success, especially if communities are implementing something they haven't had before.

One work group member noted that with many projects, some entity has to jump in first and say they'll provide the money, and it becomes easier to find matching funds after that. Requiring matching funds will put some communities at a disadvantage. The work group member added that for some communities, the most relevant activity they will be able to do under Priority 2 goals would be planning for a project. Many places don't have shovel-ready projects, and a smaller planning grant would allow them to undertake the work needed to get there. Karen said the Co-Trustees will discuss the matching funds criterion.

One work group member asked why the evaluation criterion regarding maintenance would be used if an applicant made it clear they would take responsibility for any maintenance. Karen explained that if an applicant demonstrates they can cover maintenance, that will score well. There are certain projects that need lots of maintenance, and the Co-Trustees don't want Priority 2 funds to be invested in projects whose benefits disappear quickly.

Public Comments and Questions

One member of the public noted that there are several plans and prioritization efforts at the local level that can be used to guide project selection. They encouraged the agencies to organize a specific discussion with local partners in Washington County to review these plans and priorities to avoid duplicative efforts. Kirk said that this is the intent of the subgroup work. The Co-Trustees agree and want to lean on what has been done already.

One member of the public noted that Washington County has a broad collaborative of partners to educate the public (East Metro Water Resource Education Program) about water resource issues. They encouraged the agencies to coordinate with EMWREP to help support efforts and coordinate proposed implementation efforts.

One work group member asked if the list of people and organizations contacted for the subgroup could be made public. Kirk said the list will be provided.

One work group member noted that projects are often funded by multiple sources. Projects may get funding from the state, which is the key funding that allows the project to get started.

Project Evaluation Under Different PFAS Options

Karen Carney (Abt Associates) presented project examples under some of the PFAS contamination consideration options to help work group members understand the implications of each option on how projects would be screened and evaluated. She explained that the presentation would only discuss the few screening and evaluation criteria that would be affected by the option selected. The example projects were three natural resource restoration projects and three fishing projects.

Karen provided a brief review of the PFAS contamination consideration options (discussed earlier in this meeting). She explained that the example projects would not be evaluated under Option 2 (which would require that PFAS data be acquired before project approval), since that option has likely been ruled out, given work group feedback. She also noted that project examples in this presentation would be evaluated under the Option 3 and 4 hybrid.

The three natural resource restoration project examples were:

1. Wetland habitat restoration in high-risk waterbody
2. Wetland habitat restoration in non-high-risk waterbody with unknown PFAS levels
3. Wetland habitat restoration in non-high-risk waterbody with PFAS levels below wildlife risk thresholds

Under Option 1, all three projects fail the relevant screening criterion (projects must consist of activities that would not increase PFAS-related risks to wildlife or people), as wetland habitat restoration is a PFAS-sensitive activity. As no PFAS-sensitive activities would be allowed, there would be no PFAS-related evaluation criterion.

Under Option 3, project 1 fails the screening criterion (no PFAS-sensitive activities in areas with a high risk of PFAS related injuries) while projects 2 and 3 pass. With this option, there would also be no PFAS-related evaluation criteria. Projects that would draw wildlife to high-risk areas would not be allowed, but projects outside of those areas would be allowed and would not be further evaluated for PFAS risk.

Under Option 4, there would be no PFAS-related screening criteria, so all three projects would pass. Under the relevant evaluation criterion (minimize potential for additional injury), project 1 would not be evaluated favorably due to high PFAS risks to wildlife, project 2 would be moderately favored as it may not increase risk of injury, and project 3 would be most favored as it is unlikely to increase risk of injury.

Under hybrid Option 3 + 4, the screening criterion from Option 3 and the evaluation criterion from Option 4 would be included. Project 1 would fail screening because it involves a PFAS-sensitive activity in a high-risk area, while projects 2 and 3 would pass as they are not in high-risk areas. Project 1 would not be evaluated further, while project 2 would be moderately favored as it may not increase risk of injury and project 3 would be most favored as it is unlikely to increase risk of injury. Under this option, PFAS-sensitive projects in high-risk areas would be screened out, and those that pass screening would be evaluated more favorably if they are in less contaminated areas.

Karen then reviewed three example fishing projects under the same options and criteria. The three fishing project examples were:

1. New fishing pier in a waterbody with do not eat PFOS-driven fish consumption advisory (FCA)
2. New fishing pier in a waterbody without PFOS-driven FCA (PFAS levels unknown)
3. New fishing pier in a waterbody without PFOS-driven FCA (PFAS levels below risk thresholds)

Under Option 1, all three projects fail the screening criterion, and there would be no PFAS-related evaluation criterion. Fishing projects would not be allowed under this option.

Under Option 3, project 1 fails the screening criterion, while projects 2 and 3 pass. There would be no PFAS-related evaluation criterion. Fishing projects would not be allowed in high-risk areas but would be allowed outside of these areas. Fishing projects would be required to have communications consistent with Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) guidelines.

Under Option 4, there would be no PFAS-related screening criterion. Under the evaluation criterion, project 1 would not be favored due to the FCA, project 2 would be moderately favored as it may not increase human health risks, and project 3 would be favored as it is unlikely to increase human health risks. Under this option, all fishing projects would be evaluated, but those in less contaminated areas would be favored.

Under hybrid Option 3 + 4, project 1 would fail the screening criterion, while projects 2 and 3 would pass. Project 1 would not be evaluated further, while project 2 would be moderately favored as it may not increase human health risks and project 3 would be favored as it is unlikely to increase human health risks. Fishing projects in high-risk areas would be screened out under this option, and those that pass screening would be favored if they are in less contaminated areas.

Feedback

One work group member asked if the criteria meant that all contaminated areas would be off-limits for projects. They also asked if the availability of PFAS data would determine which projects would get approved.

One work group member felt it was misleading not to include an example of a non-PFAS-sensitive project to show that there could be projects that can be carried out in contaminated areas. Melissa said that there are several activities that are not PFAS sensitive that were not analyzed in the presentation because they would pass screening under any of the options. The presentation was intended to show more complicated project examples. Karen added that the presentation was focused on the two screening and evaluation criteria presented because they were the only ones relevant to the PFAS option selected. She also noted that these are just a couple of criteria and there are many other criteria that projects will be evaluated against.

One work group member said they would like to see an example project evaluation, such as a trout stream restoration project, because it is a project type that may need to be looked at. The work group member thought that the examples provided were too simplistic. Karen responded that the Co-Trustees had considered providing a wide range of project examples but didn't want the presentation to be overly confusing or lengthy. The Co-Trustees felt that these examples clearly highlighted the differences in how projects would be evaluated, but they can provide more examples. Kirk added that they will not be able to provide an example for every type of project. At a high level, Option 1 screens the most projects out and Options 3 and 4 are more nuanced. Options 3 and 4 screen out the obvious projects and allow a discussion on the nuanced, multi-variable projects.

One work group member asked if the Co-Trustees were asking the work group to choose a PFAS consideration option. Karen confirmed this.

One work group member felt that the presentation led the work group members to the answer that the Co-Trustees want (hybrid Option 3 + 4). The work group member wanted a broader spectrum of example projects to understand the effect of Option 1. Karen responded that Option 1 means no fishing or habitat restoration activities in aquatic areas would ever pass screening criteria. It is the most restrictive option.

One work group member felt that the examples were helpful for them to understand the options but would like to see the evaluation scoring matrix for all the criteria, in order to see how the PFAS-relevant criteria may matter in the context of the other criteria. They are in support of getting rid of Option 1 but want to see more of what the evaluation criteria matrix looks like, otherwise they feel that the decision-making process on which option to use is being taken away. Melissa said the Co-Trustees do not have a scoring system set up yet and there would be limits to how they can share the scoring, to avoid conflict of interest. She asked whether the work group member felt that Options 3 and 4 are not PFAS protective enough or may be overly protective with regard to PFAS sensitivity. The work group member responded that they don't feel they can answer that question with the example projects that have been provided.

One work group member asked what protections will be included in the evaluation criteria under Options 3 and 4 that still ensure that there is no increased PFAS risk to wildlife. The work group member noted that they don't feel comfortable making a decision on an option until those are presented. Karen responded that the evaluation criteria were presented but the weighting of them hasn't been determined. Another work group member added that the work group won't know if the other options are protective enough until they see how the PFAS-relevant evaluation criteria are weighted against the other criteria.

One work group member asked if the next work group meeting would discuss the weighting and priority of the criteria. They thought it would be a worthwhile conversation to have with the work group members. Karen responded that the Priority 1 funding was non-competitive, which is why the Priority 1 work group was able to discuss the weighting of the criteria. Priority 2 is competitive, so the weighting of the criteria can't be shared with the work group. Karen noted that the Co-Trustees understand the desire to discuss and clarify, but due to the grant funding process they are unable to share the weighting. Jess added that the Co-Trustees can talk to the grants department to see if there would be legal impediments to a conversation on how the work group members think evaluation criteria should be weighted, without sharing the final weighting.

One work group member noted, regarding the options and level of PFAS-related risk, that Lake Elmo doesn't want to increase fish populations in their lakes if that would lead more people to eat contaminated fish. The work group member added that there are many possible projects that are not PFAS sensitive (allowable under Option 1), not just trails. They also noted that they do not like the idea that the Co-Trustees would favorably rate a project given that it has a known, lower level of PFAS. This was the approach taken in Priority 1, which at the time was thought to be using a conservative threshold, but the EPA recently lowered PFAS thresholds to be below what Priority 1 was using. The work group member felt that if the Co-Trustees select the hybrid 3 + 4 Option, there should not be a distinction between the second and third project examples (known, low levels of PFAS versus unknown levels) because there is still a wide unknown in the science of PFAS. Karen responded that if the Co-Trustees rule out projects with unknown levels of PFAS, which will be the case for many waterbodies, that will be more similar to Option 2, where a project can only move forward if levels are known and are below thresholds. This would constrain the geography of where projects could happen. The work group member responded that moving towards Option 2 is not what they meant. Their point was that if the PFAS levels are

compared against a current risk threshold, it may not end up being protective if that risk threshold changes in the future. This would apply to the evaluation criteria more than the screening criteria.

One work group member asked if the work group would rather spend significant amounts of money on testing in areas with unknown levels of PFAS or try to direct funds to projects that will meet the broader goals without having to do testing to determine PFAS levels. They noted that PFAS testing is expensive. Another work group member agreed with this comment.

One work group member proposed splitting the available P2 funds into pools for the different options. If this is possible, they want more specificity on what types of projects would be allowed in the different pools of funding so that people don't submit proposals that won't move forward. The work group member said they don't think there is a way to have Option 1 as the sole option and award any money. Karen asked if the work group member was asking for separate RFPs for non-PFAS-sensitive and PFAS-sensitive activities. The work group member confirmed this.

One work group member noted they are most in favor of Option 4. They believe it is necessary to get a wide range of project ideas in order to make the best use of the available P2 funds. They added that any project will involve some movement of PFAS because PFAS is everywhere in the region. The point is to improve the problem, which can't happen without implementing projects that involve some PFAS risk. They believe projects should not be screened out based on PFAS-sensitive activities and that experts should evaluate the PFAS risk.

Next Steps

Karen Carney covered the next steps for Priority 2. Before the next meeting, the Co-Trustees will share the content from the September meeting; continue to engage subgroup members on local natural resources and recreation planning efforts, including via one-on-one meetings; incorporate feedback into screening and evaluation criteria; and draft the RFP scope and language. Karen reviewed the schedule for the remaining work group meetings.

Feedback

One work group member said that the Co-Trustees should get feedback from the work group as to which criteria work group members think are the most important or should be weighted the highest. The Co-Trustees do not have to formally take this into account, but it would be beneficial to see what work group members are thinking. Another work group member noted they would like to see the ranking of which criteria are the most or least important, even if the Co-Trustees can't share the actual weighting. Another work group member agreed with the previous comments and felt that the work group members should have an opportunity to give their input.

Public Comments and Questions

One member of the public asked for the handout with the different options to be shared with the online audience. Heather said it will be posted on the website after the meeting. It shows the four PFAS consideration options that were discussed during the meeting as well as the project activity examples. The options were also presented at the July meeting and are available on the 3M Settlement website.



One member of the public noted that they are nervous about the negative impacts on good projects of not knowing the PFAS levels, versus projects in areas that have known PFAS levels. Without the weighting, they would be concerned that not knowing the PFAS levels would disqualify projects, effectively being Option 1.