

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

Tuesday, November 13, 2018

1:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.

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

Meeting Purpose: Provide updates on process, present information and initiate discussion of other relevant planning efforts, and develop a shared understanding of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan and the process to develop it over the next 14 months.

1. Welcome	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Barb Naramore – DNR Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	10 minutes
2. Process Updates a. Categories of Costs figure b. Goals c. Criteria and Prioritization Survey d. Subgroup 1 Charter and Initial Charge e. Subgroup Financial Support	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Barb Naramore – DNR Jennifer Peers – Abt Associates	40 minutes
3. Discussion of other relevant planning efforts	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	30 minutes
4. Public comments and questions	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	10 minutes
5. Break		10 minutes
6. Discussion of Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan and Schedule/Milestones for Progress	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Barb Naramore – DNR Diana Lane – Abt Associates Jennifer Peers – Abt Associates	60 minutes
7. Next Steps: Upcoming Meetings and Agenda Items	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	10 minutes
8. Public comments and questions	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates	10 minutes

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Citizen–Business Group Meeting
November 13, 2018 Meeting Notes**

Welcome and Introductions

Members in attendance:

Julie Bunn		Steve Johnson
Kevin Chapdelaine		Kirk Koudelka-MPCA
David Filipiak		Jack Lavold
Steve Colvin-DNR		Michael Medigan
Charlotte Flint		Barbara Ronnigen
Jeff Holtz		Amy Schall
Mark Jenkins		Dave Schulenberg
Bruce Johnson		Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

Jennifer Peers, Diana Lane, and Mark Lorie, Abt Associates

Introduction and Liaison Report

Kevin Chapdelaine provided a report-out from the Government and 3M Working Group’s October meeting, including discussion of the project criteria as well as a desire to see how other municipalities are approaching collective challenges.

Kirk Koudelka and Steve Colvin (alternate for Barb Naramore) welcomed the Group. Kirk noted the value of the discussions and different perspectives brought by the two Work Groups.

Process Updates

Kirk presented an improved illustration depicting 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.

A few minor wording changes were made to the project goals document in response to comments received in October and it will be posted to the public website. As a living document it can be revised if necessary in the future.

Similarly, a few minor wording changes were made to the Priority 1 criteria document in response to comments received in October. A new criterion was added that addresses minimizing risks of unintended adverse health impacts in response to a comment from a representative of the Minnesota Department of Health. Diana Lane presented results from a survey of Work Group members regarding the relative importance of different criteria. The group discussed how the criteria may be applied to project evaluation both narratively and numerically. The criteria will next be used to develop a concept-level project submission form and a rubric for using the criteria to evaluate projects.

The Subgroup 1 Charter and Initial Charge have been revised in response to comments received in October and will be passed to Subgroup 1 for review at their first meeting on December 19.

Kirk updated the group on a decision to offer financial support to local units of government for technical staff or consultant participation in the subgroups. Each local government would be able to enter into a funding agreement and request reimbursement of expense up to \$25,000 per year. These funds are intended to allow for equitable participation in the technical work leading up to the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan.

Discussion of other relevant planning efforts

Mark Lorie provided a presentation on other potentially relevant multi-community planning efforts, which typically employ either a new (or expanded) regional utility, a cooperative agreement for a regional joint investment, or smaller agreements. This group discussed two examples; the Lincoln Pipestone Rural Water system and the Cooperative Water Supply for the Washington, DC Metro Area. Other examples are contained in the presentation, but the group did not get to reviewing them in the allotted time. The group had discussions about these examples, noting that there are State statutes to consider (e.g. Section B, Statute 103b), and expressed an interest in other examples related more specifically to PFAS (such as the Cities of Kalamazoo and Parchment, Michigan).

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. The St. Paul regional water system was discussed as an example of a regional water utility that also sells water to neighboring communities. It was noted that agreements can be difficult to back out of once money is invested in infrastructure.

Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan

Jennifer Peers provided a presentation on the proposed workflow, contents, and timeline for achieving a Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan by the self-imposed deadline of January 2019. The objective is to have a streamlined (not unnecessarily long or wordy) plan that will allow us to move forward with project design and implementation in the beginning of 2020. The overall proposed approach is to have Subgroup-1 first compile necessary background information on the region and the affected communities' water supply infrastructure, review technical options, and define the elements of feasibility for each option to determine what types of options will be feasible in different portions of the affected area. From that information, concept-level projects will be developed, screened against the pass/fail screening criteria, and evaluated using the evaluation criteria. Approximately two to three alternative project bundles will be developed using the best projects and considered, and ideally a preferred alternative can be selected from those.

The group had an extensive discussion about the need for communications and public input. The proposed schedule includes four public meeting check-in points and the format of these was discussed. The group also indicated a need for more information on progress to be provided through alternative channels (including local city newsletters, government meetings, and social media) to members of the public.

The group also discussed that this aggressive schedule will require monthly meetings through 2019. Some members may not have realized this when applying to be on the group (originally the charge was to eventually meet quarterly) and there may be a need for a check-in with members on their ability to participate at a monthly level long-term.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. A comment was made that because of the aggressive timeline, the plan will be concept-level, with a need to address detailed design issues for projects subsequently.

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 Friday, December 7. Members of the group indicated that they would like a short technical presentation on what technical alternatives there are for treating PFAS in drinking water, and it was noted that Northwestern University is having an international meeting about PFAS.

The next meeting will be on Tuesday, December 18.

Stiglich liaison report – 13 November 2018

Citizen – Business Group November meeting report to the Government and 3M Working Group

Item #2 Process Updates

Concern voiced that citizen volunteers were originally planning for quarterly meetings for the Working Group. We have been meeting monthly since July, and plans are for monthly meetings through 2019. Volunteers should advise the regulatory contacts if they are unable to continue with the commitment to participate on the Working Group.

Item #3 Discussion of other relevant planning efforts

This presentation was cut short due to time over-run with comments and discussion. The full presentation, with pertinent website links, will be posted.

Item #6 Discussion of Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan and Schedule/Milestones for Progress

Several comments were made regarding the timing of public meetings on the Proposed Timeline. If public input is being sought, the meetings would be more appropriate somewhat earlier so that comments can be incorporated.

Other discussion on communications plans noted that multiple formats must be used to reach the widest audience possible. All of the following were listed as viable methods: televised council meetings, newspaper articles, website updates, mailers, city/county/township websites and publications. Requests for progress reports have been noted, and ongoing activity needs to be communicated.

General Discussion

A presentation on the treatment options for removal of PFAS materials from drinking water was requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Monica Stiglich

Chapdelaine liaison report - 11/14/18

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

#2e Process Updates: Subgroup Financial Support. Discussed process for communities to receive financial support for their staff's participation in the Subgroup committees. They'll need to provide an authorized representative for expense reports and required signatures. It's hoped this method will keep the process simple and efficient. Interested communities should submit required documents ASAP to lessen unrecoverable costs.

#3 Discussion of other relevant planning efforts: Some additional regional systems not seen by the Citizen/Business Group were discussed.

Southern Water Supply Project II – Boulder Co area. Cost share for construction and O&M, A simple agreement for coordinated water supply only.

Willamette River Water Coalition – Portland Or area. New agreement for future development and system growth.

MDH briefly discussed St Paul Regional Water System, Mpls Water System and the positives of a diversified [surface and groundwater] water sourced system.

#6 Discussion of Conceptual Drinking Water Supply plan: Discussed how projects must ultimately come from/be supported by the involved cities/townships. The cities will have to "build it and own it" so they will have to be "bought in". Discussion to continue.

There was discussion about each community creating a Comprehensive Water Supply Plan for the Tech Subgroups utilization. Discussion to continue.

Also discussed was concern about the "uncertainties", including the possibility of changing health based values of contamination. Discussion to continue.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine