

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Government and 3M Working Group Meeting
April 17, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Kevin Chapdelaine	Daniel Kylo
Shann Finwall	Jennifer Levitt
Bart Fischer	Ron Moore
Kristina Handt	Jess Richards
Chris Hartzell	Monica Stiglich
Greg Johnson	Jessica Stolle
Kirk Koudelka	

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Jess Richards, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Jim Feild, Wood
- Erin Daugherty, Wood
- Milt Thomas, facilitator, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)

Welcome and Updates

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Jess Richards (DNR) welcomed the Work Group.

Jim Kelly (Minnesota Department of Health; MDH) provided MDH updates to the Work Group, including: (1) MDH issued new health-based guidance values for PFOS and PFHxS; (2) MDH is working on methodology to provide detection limits that are below this new value; and (3) MDH is preparing to submit an application to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) looking at the connection between PFAS and health.

Kirk Koudelka provided updates to the Work Group on a wide range of topics, including:

- Cottage Grove, in partnership with MPCA and MDH, is proposing to conduct a pilot study at their temporary treatment facility in Cottage Grove exploring the use of ion exchange as a treatment technology.
- The Co-Trustees (MPCA and DNR) submitted the Settlement Legislative priority report to the legislator on April 5th, 2019. The purpose of this report was to determine how the priorities in the Settlement Agreement will be met and how the spending will move from the first priority to the second priority and from the second priority to the third priority, as outlined in the Settlement Agreement. In the report, the Co-Trustees noted that at this time they do not have a complete picture of everything that is needed to fulfill the goals of the first priority, and will develop this at a future date. The report is on the Settlement website.
- The April 11th Local Government Unit (LGU) meeting was canceled due to weather conditions. The Work Group suggested holding this meeting in conjunction with the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan public meeting in July, given the legislative calendar and holidays in May. In the

meantime, the Co-Trustees could consider reaching out to the commissions or do a council briefing/workshop.

- Well advisories have been issued in Lakeland Shores. The Co-Trustees have formally invited Lakeland Shores to participate in the Government and 3M Working Group.
- As a result of well advisories issued to Lake Elmo and St. Paul Park in 2017, MPCA and MDH are working to find alternative drinking water sources for these two communities. For Lake Elmo, it was decided that the best and most cost-effective alternative is to drill a new municipal well. This project is proposed to be funded by the 2018 Settlement because it is a long-term solution (with the exception of a portion of the project cost that would be covered by Lake Elmo for the increased capacity of the well). For St. Paul Park, options are still being evaluated. In addressing a Work Group question about who covers the cost of the feasibility study, Kirk Koudelka indicated that the State is funding the preparation work. In addition, Cottage Grove is seeking reimbursement for a well that was put in last year.
- The Co-Trustees are currently in discussions with 3M about which funding source – 2007 Consent Order or 2018 Settlement Grant – should be used to reimburse some of the work that has been completed in the East Metropolitan Area to date.

Gary Krueger (MPCA) provided a status update on the feasibility study for Project 1007 (which was included in the 2018 Settlement Agreement). AECOM has been retained to help with this project, with close coordination with the Valley Branch Watershed District. In addressing a Work Group question on the purpose of this study, Gary Krueger indicated that the study is evaluating possible options to mitigate transport of PFAS from east to west and look at other sources.

Drinking water supply examples: thoughts and questions from February presentations

Jess Richards (DNR) discussed the February Work Group presentations that provided examples of regional water systems, including St. Paul Regional Water Services (SPRWS; urban example) and Lincoln Pipestone (rural example). Following these presentations in February, some communities expressed concerns that they would be forced to connect to SPRWS. Jess Richards emphasized that the Co-Trustees will not force communities to connect to SPRWS. The Co-Trustees have no plan to push specific options on any given community.

As a follow-up, Jess Richards (DNR) asked if the Work Group members had any additional questions, comments, or concerns. The Work Group discussed the timeline for communities' engagement with Wood to provide input on options to be considered in the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan.

Expedited project planning process

Terill Hollweg (Abt) provided an update on the expedited project planning process, including walking through the eligibility criteria and online application form, and discussing next steps. The Work Group members had a wide range of discussions about the expedited project planning process, including:

- LGUs involvement in and support of the expedited projects, with an understanding that the Co-Trustees will ensure that the LGUs are supported of expedited projects in their jurisdiction (if applicable).
- Concerns about a household opting out of project activities and, as a result, jeopardizing the whole project.
- Responding to application questions about public support. The Co-Trustees asked applicants to provide information on public support, if known.

- The need for applicants to note any potential conflict of interest. All applicants are required to disclose any relationships with MPCA, DNR, or the Work Group members that would prevent their ability to objectively evaluate the application. Having a relationship does not result in a rejection of a proposed project; instead, it simply notifies MPCA/DNR to take appropriate steps as needed to avoid a potential conflict (e.g., recusal of evaluating a specific project). The Co-Trustees noted that this requirement is part of the State’s overall conflict mitigation plan for implementing the Settlement.
- Monica Stiglich (liaison) indicated that in the Citizen-Business Work Group there was a discussion about how to include more than one point of contact on the application. The Work Group members noted that additional points of contact can be added in the “who contributed to the application” or “additional comments” sections of the application form.
- Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) noted that another topic raised in the Citizen-Business Work Group was a request for a word document that lists all the application questions. Terill Hollweg noted that the online application form lists all questions on one-page, which allows applicants to review all questions before starting. In addition, applicants can save their application at any time and continue filling in the application or revising the application at a later date; applicants can revise the application until the close of the application window. It was suggested that a note be added to the application form to indicate there are no more questions past the third page.
- The Work Group discussed the process and timeline for the expedited project planning effort. Work Group members noted that completing funding agreements in September, October, or November could result in delays in implementation. The Co-Trustees and the Work Group discussed trying to accelerate project funding agreements for applicants who specified timing concerns.

Terill Hollweg noted that the Work Group members will be given the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the submitted project applications by the June Work Group meeting. The Work Group agreed that the June meeting would be a good opportunity to discuss the expedited projects.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. No questions or comments were offered at this time.

Update on Drinking Water Supply Technical Subgroup 1

The Work Group received two updates on the Drinking Water Supply Technical Subgroup 1, including: (1) an update on the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP); and (2) an update on the models that are being developed to support the CDWSP.

Terill Hollweg (Abt) provided an overview of the CDWSP, including an outline of the plan, the timeline, and an overview of the first three chapters. MPCA/DNR will send the CDWSP to the Work Group members next week for their review and comment. Terill Hollweg noted that if the Work Group members are available and interested, their high-level review of the chapters would be appreciated. All comments on the CDWSP should be documented in an excel comment form, with comments sent to Walker Smith (MPCA) by May 10th.

Jim Feild and Erin Daugherty (Wood) provided updates on the drinking water and groundwater models that are under development. Jim Feild presented on the groundwater model and discussed how this model is incorporating previous groundwater models (e.g., Metro Model 3) and using new information to support the evaluation of scenarios for the CDWSP. He also mentioned that he and Rebecca Higgins (MPCA) developed a definitions list for groundwater modeling that is available to the Work Group

members. The Work Group discussed the capabilities of the model, and how the model will not be able to model changes in contamination but the flow path analysis could inform the future movement of the plume. Erin Daugherty provided an overview of the objectives and timeline for the drinking water model, and described the information Wood is collecting from communities to populate the base model. Erin Daugherty expects that the initial base model will be completed in early May 2019, and then Wood will begin evaluating projects and scenarios. In responding to questions about private wells, the Wood team indicated that the models will not incorporate private wells, but private wells may be added into the drinking water model at a later date.

There was no update on the April 3 planning meeting with watershed districts because of limited time.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. No questions or comments were offered at this time.

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) described several questions under consideration, including: the types of preferred alternatives; level of preventative measures that are consistent with Settlement; and how to handle long-term operation and maintenance (O&M) expenses. He then asked the Work Group about other big policy questions that communities are thinking about that are not already listed. The Work Group suggested considering how to evaluate new technologies if needed. A member of the public also suggested considering a pilot study to investigate different technologies of granular activated carbon (GAC), which could be similar to the ion exchange study. Terill Hollweg (Abt) indicated that Wood is evaluating potential treatment technologies as part of their scope of work.

Liaison report - 4/17/19

3M/Government Group's April meeting report to the Citizen Business Group

3] Drinking water supply February presentations questions: Multiple questions on the decision making process for deciding each community's best drinking water system and who makes these decisions were asked. Concern State agencies may "impose" one system over another were expressed. MPCA and DNR both responded that each community will be very involved in all decisions and the State agencies will not impose any system upon any community.

4] Expedited project planning process and timeline: Many questions on this process and timeline. Concern with the process not being "expedited enough". Feelings from many that Oct/Nov bid timing for 2020 projects will not be efficient and cost effective. An Aug/Sept timeline was preferred for potentially better bid outcomes. This conversation will continue. Both Woodbury and Cottage Grove requested meetings with MPCA/DNR Staff for further discussion.

7b] Subgroup 1 update - Drinking water and Groundwater modeling: Multiple questions on the technical planning of how each community's groundwater plans could affect the plumes movement and therefore affect neighboring communities water system. Staff agreed on the complexities of this process but feels confident it can be well managed with partnership of MDH and MPCA. This conversation will continue.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine