

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement  
Citizen–Business Group Meeting  
October 16, 2018 Meeting Notes**

**Welcome and Introductions**

Members in attendance:

Julie Bunn		Jack Lavold
Kevin Chapdelaine (Liaison)		Michael Madigan
Besty Daub		Amy Schall
David Filipiak		Dave Schulenberg
Jeff Holtz		Monica Stiglich
Bruce Johnson		Kirk Koudelka
Steven Johnson		Barb Naramore
Katie Johnson-Goodstar		Steve Colvin

Presenters:

Jennifer Peers, Connie Travers, and Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates  
Ginny Yingling, MDH

**Introduction**

The November meetings have been moved up a week because of Thanksgiving – the next Citizen–Business Group meeting will be on Tuesday, November 13, at the same time and in the same location.

The Group was reminded that they can continue to provide comments to MPCA and DNR verbally during the meeting or via email between meetings.

Kirk Koudelka and Steve Colvin (alternate for Barb Naramore) welcomed the Group. Kirk requested feedback on how participants feel that the process is going. Members provided feedback that the time frame was initially frustrating, but now expressed an appreciation for the process and a need to lay the groundwork before entertaining specific project proposals, a desire to understand the mechanisms for funding immediate needs, and the need to not over plan.

**Consent Order/Settlement Interactions**

Kirk presented an overview of the 2007 Consent Order and the 2018 Settlement Agreement with an explanation of the intent of the \$40 million to implement temporary drinking water projects and/or activities set forth in Part VIII.B. of the 2007 Consent Order. MPCA and DNR are working on an illustration that depicts how short-term drinking water needs are addressed over time.

**Update on Program Goals**

The Program Goals document Version 2.0 has been finalized and will be posted on the website. It is a “living document” – if there is a need to revisit the document in the future, this can be done. Some final edits made to this version included adding some clarifying text from the 2018 Settlement Agreement; clarifying the text of several Priority 1 Long-Term Program Goals, Planning Goals, and Monitoring/Evaluation/Learning Goals; and adding a new Planning Goal (“Seek a portfolio of projects that benefits all affected communities”).

**Discussion of Criteria**

A revised draft Priority 1 Criteria document was presented. This document was revised based on input provided during and following the September Work Group meetings. Edits included adding some

clarifying text from the 2018 Settlement Agreement; adding text to the Purpose section that discusses the need to address clean drinking water across all of the affected communities in the East Metropolitan Area; clarifying the screening criteria and evaluation criteria; and adding several new evaluation criteria. The Agencies plan to finalize this document before the November meeting. As with the Program Goals document, the criteria will be a living document and can be revisited if necessary.

The Group discussed the draft criteria. A recommendation was made to note in the introductory language about Priority 1 that the list of project examples there are also for reference and do not indicate preference or prioritization. The Group walked through an example of how different criteria could be weighted for importance of each criterion, and then projects could be scored against each criterion. The Group expressed some concern that we do not want projects competing with each other for funding, when there is a need to address the needs of all of the affected communities.

The Group discussed that the criteria will be used to inform the proposal planning process via the proposal form, as well as for evaluating proposals. The Group recommended using a survey mechanism to elicit input on which criteria are more important than others. A survey will be sent to the Group members to elicit input and the results will be reported at the next meeting in November.

There was a discussion about the timing of the development of criteria for natural resource projects (Priority 2). The current plan is for the Work Groups to begin work on this in early 2019 and for the Technical Subgroup to start up later in the year.

There was a discussion on the most effective way for the liaisons to share information with the respective Work Groups. A suggestion was made to have each liaison participate in the meetings as appropriate and to provide some key points that were discussed at the other Work Group's meeting in writing along with the monthly meeting notes.

### **Public Comments and Questions**

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. A proposal from a citizen for a new water line and well hook-ups was shared with the Group.

### **Spatial Extent of PFAS Problem**

Ginny Yingling (Minnesota Department of Health; MDH) gave a follow-up presentation to the Group on the extent of PFAS contamination in the East Metropolitan Area. She focused on the geology and aquifers in the area, how contamination has moved through these aquifers and surface water, and where wells have been completed and have been sampled. Members of the Group asked if there was a narrative of this document on the web – there is a more basic description on the MDH website. The slides from Ginny Yingling's presentation will be provided on the 3M Settlement website.

### **Potential Financial Support for Subgroup Work**

At the September Government and 3M Working Group meeting, several communities expressed a need for capacity funding for communities to participate in the technical subgroups. MPCA and DNR circulated a draft concept to address this need in light of the desire to get the Drinking Water Subgroup up and working this fall. The intent would be to ensure that the communities are able to participate in the process and share their technical knowledge, as well as to help the process move forward efficiently.

### **Discussion of Drinking Water Subgroup Initial Charge**

A draft of the Drinking Water Subgroup Charter was provided. The Subgroup will meet at least once a month. Kirk summarized the current thinking on membership.

A working draft of an initial charge, or list of initial tasks, for the Subgroup was presented. A brief summary of the 2016 Washington County Drinking Water Supply Feasibility Assessment was presented along with a summary of what the Assessment did not cover. The report provides a lot of good

information that will be useful to the Subgroup but does not include all of the PFAS-affected communities, did not look at some potential alternatives, and was intended to be a high-level evaluation, not a prescriptive solution. The Group requested that a link to the Feasibility Assessment be provided and that a printed copy of the Executive Summary be provided at the November meeting.

### Other Updates/Next Steps

MPCA and DNR will send out notes and materials discussed at this meeting. Group members will be asked to provide additional written comments and respond to the criteria survey by October 31. Kirk mentioned that he recalled a presentation on the Feasibility Assessment that was made to some communities and indicated that he would try to locate and share it.

The next meeting will be on November 13.

### Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. A member of the public expressed appreciation for the MDH presentation and asked if a video could be created and shared online. A question was asked about residents who want to be hooked up to a municipal supply – should they propose this directly or work through their municipality? It was noted that the process is not yet worked out but ideally, the municipalities would work with their residents.

## 3M Government Group's October meeting report to the Citizen–Business Group

**Under agenda item #1** — Welcome: There was an initial discussion about the need for a pre-determined process on how the group moves forward. A known game plan for success. Discussion to continue.

**Under agenda item #4** — Discussion of Criteria: During the Criteria language discussion on #17 the term “recreational improvement” was objected to in the statement. The concern was over the possibility of a recreation component taking precedence over drinking water concerns. Discussion to continue.

Also discussed was the need to set a Criteria weighting system that fairly balances large communities/urban projects against small communities/rural projects. Cost vs. benefits per capita that doesn't favor one over the other. Discussion to continue.

The final Criteria discussion was over long-term financial concerns. 10, 20, 30 years out, how will we fund needs? Do we set up Trust Funds or Endowments to ensure funds will be available? Discussion to continue.

**Under agenda item #7** — Financial support for Subgroup work: Discussed various methods of funding LGU's for staff or consultants to participate on subgroup committees. JPA? MOU? Grants? MPCA and DNR will discuss with financial counsel and come back with options. Funding for participation in initial subgroup meetings may have to be responsibility of participating LGU's.

**Under agenda item #8** — Drinking Water Subgroup Initial Charge: Discussion of membership, who should participate? Discussed concerns over parochial advocacy vs. regional interest. Discussion to continue.

It was suggested that both Government and 3M and Citizen–Business Groups study other regional water suppliers across the country for ideas, resolutions and inspiration.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine