

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Agenda for Citizen - Business Group Meeting

Tuesday, September 18, 2018

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Cottage Grove City Hall — Training Room
12800 Ravine Parkway South, Cottage Grove

Meeting Purpose: Begin to develop project criteria for Priority 1 — ensure safe drinking water — and a shared understanding of subgroup process and tasks.

1. Welcome	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Barb Naramore – DNR Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	10 minutes
2. Update on Charters and Goals	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	10 minutes
3. Discussion of Criteria	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Jennifer Peers – Abt Associates	60 minutes
4. Break		10 minutes
5. Discussion of Subgroup Process and Tasks	Jennifer Peers – Abt Associates Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Barb Naramore – DNR	60 minutes
6. Next Steps: Upcoming Meetings and Agenda Items	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	10 minutes
7. Public comments and questions	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	20 minutes

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Citizen – Business Group Meeting
September 18, 2018 Meeting Notes**

Welcome and Introductions

Members in attendance:

Kevin Chapdelaine (liaison)		Michael Madigan
Betsy Daub		Barbara Ronningen
David Filipiak		Amy Schall
Charlotte Flint		Dave Schulenberg
Bob Fossum		Monica Stiglich
Jeff Holtz		Kirk Koudelka (MPCA)
Mark Jenkins		Barb Naramore (DNR)
Bruce Johnson		Steve Colvin (DNR alternate)
David Johnson		Kathy Sather (MPCA alternate)
Jack Lavold		

Kirk Koudelka and Barb Naramore welcomed the Group. They introduced Kevin Chapdelaine (Liaison from Government and 3M Working Group) and Monica Stiglich (Liaison from Citizen-Business Group), who will attend the other Group's meetings.

DNR and MPCA shared a copy of the second half of FY 2018 fiscal report to the legislature. This report is required every 6 months; an annual report in February will also detail annual activities.

DNR and MPCA are working on a request to provide more detailed information about how the 2007 Consent Order and the 2018 settlement work together – tentatively planned for October meeting.

Lakeland and Lakeland Shores will likely be participating in the planning process as PFAS has been detected in some wells and a broader sampling effort is beginning.

Update on Charter

The Charter has been finalized and posted to the 3M Settlement website. It is a living document and may need revisions in the future.

Update on Program Goals

The Program Goals document was edited based on comments provided in August work group meetings and by members subsequently. These included inclusion of more direct language from the Agreement in the Background section, addition of a Purpose statement, reorganization of goals into long-term program goals and operational goals, addition of several new goals, and clarifications to wording of goals. The Group discussed adding some additional language from the Agreement, the need to start planning for Priority 2, and concerns about some specific language in the Program Goals document. Group members will be asked to provide additional written comments by Friday, September 28. Those comments, along with ideas generated during the discussion, will be incorporated into the final goals document and distributed at the October meeting.

Discussion of Criteria

An approach to project evaluation criteria was presented that includes considering a range of projects (e.g., different scales and timelines for drinking water supply projects, as well as aquifer recharge and protection projects), screening and evaluating those projects and keeping in mind the overall Priority 1 goal. A project proposal framework will be developed to elicit information needed to evaluate the criteria, once they are agreed upon. There are two types of criteria:

- Screening – must meet all of these to move forward
- Evaluation – used to evaluate project ideas given multiple alternative options.

The draft Priority 1 Criteria document is preliminary, intended to serve as a starting point for discussion, based on Abt's experience with restoration planning for Natural Resource Damage Assessments. Criteria were numbered to facilitate discussion, not imply prioritization. Cost sharing will be important to ensure fairness and to be able to include good projects that only partially are relevant to the grant. Future discussions will include ranking, weighting, and order of application of the criteria.

The Group discussed the draft criteria, touching on the meaning and implications of several criteria, potential edits and clarifications, and new potential criteria. The Group also discussed why PFAS is included in both Screening and Evaluation Criteria – In Screening the project must address PFAS contamination where detected. In Evaluation, a project would be more favorable if it addresses areas where PFAS exceeds a health-based standard (a higher bar). Group members will be asked to provide additional written comments by Friday, September 28. Those comments, along with ideas generated during the discussion, will be incorporated into a revised version for additional discussion at the October meeting.

Discussion of Subgroup Process and Tasks

The Subgroups are intended to provide necessary technical expertise to help the work groups develop recommendations. They will compile necessary background information. For Project Proposals, they will weigh in on the Screening Criteria and provide technical input necessary for the work groups to consider the Evaluation Criteria. They may also evaluate potential technologies and approaches and provide feedback to the work groups. They may also play a technical peer review role in detailed project designs once we get to that point.

Subgroups will be directed by the co-Trustees (DNR and MPCA) based on input from the work groups. Project ideas can come from the co-Trustees and the work groups as well as Subgroups. Subgroup 1 will focus on drinking water, and Subgroup 2 will focus on groundwater supply. Participants in the Subgroups will be appropriate technical representatives as well as other experts brought in to weigh in on specific topics.

The Group discussed the proposed Subgroup process and tasks. A suggestion was made to change the name from "Subgroups" to something reflecting their technical nature. The Group asked for clarification of the distinction between drinking water and groundwater when most drinking water in the area is groundwater. Drinking water supply is focused on clean water at the end of the pipe – what is supplied to users. Groundwater is focused on the source – water in the ground. The Group discussed reporting and how project ideas will be identified and solicited.

Group members will be asked to provide additional written comments and input on participants by Friday, September 28. The MPCA and DNR will consider these comments and return to the Group with more information.

Action Items

1. Members will provide comments to MPCA/DNR (Walker Smith) by Friday, September 28 for the following:
 - a. Revised Program Goals document (final comments)
 - b. Priority 1 Draft Criteria
 - c. Subgroups
2. MPCA/DNR will post information from the September meeting on a public website.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. Other counties and parts of the country are also dealing with PFAS and could provide information for this process. MPCA noted that this is the first PFAS NRDA settlement, but there is ongoing sharing of information with others facing similar problems.