

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

Agenda for Government and 3M Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, November 14, 2018

9:00 a.m.-12:00 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
Government and 3M Working Group Meeting
November 14, 2018 Meeting Notes**

Welcome and Introductions

Members in attendance:

Ryan Burfeind		Kirk Koudelka
Kevin Chapdelaine		Daniel Kylo
Bart Fischer		Dan Lund
Kristina Handt		Barb Naramore
Greg Johnson		Monica Stiglich
Lowell Johnson		Kevin Walsh
Ray Kaiser		Rob Weldon
Jim Kotsmith		

Presenters:

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

Introduction and Liaison Report

Monica Stiglich provided a report-out from the Citizen-Business Group’s October meeting, including discussion of communications with the public and a request for a presentation on kinds of treatment available for PFAS. Kevin Chapdelaine noted that to meet the December 2019 deadline will take a lot of work and the timeline is aggressive – there was discussion about the commitment of attendance at meetings.

Kirk Koudelka and Barb Naramore welcomed the Group.

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 applying the criteria will differ from normal grant processes because projects in one community will not be competing with projects in another – rather the criteria will be used to evaluate the best alternative for a piece of the puzzle given multiple options. 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 for participation in subgroup meetings, preparation and follow-up tasks, and limited technical work required for meeting participation. Reimbursements would require documentation of staff hours or contractor invoices (number of hours at an hourly rate) – the goal is accountability without undue burden. These funds are intended to allow for equitable participation in the technical work leading up to the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. If a community needs specialized technical support, that can be arranged separately. MPCA requested that an authorized representative be identified by November 21, so that draft agreements can be prepared.

Discussion of other relevant planning efforts

Mark Lorie provided a presentation on four 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. The group had discussions about these organizational structures.

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. A comment was made that discussed the need for emergency capacity in case of contamination of a primary source or a drought.

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 role of cities in the plan, noting that buy-in from the cities is necessary and that there will need to be water supply plans developed or revised to address the uncertainties surrounding PFAS. The proposed work flow envisions a process where the cities are involved at each step of the process both in the subgroup technical work and the Work Group review.

The group discussed expedited projects (such as adding new pipes that we know will be necessary during road work) and the need for a separate process – the agencies are working on this. There will

need to be criteria for what projects would be fast-tracked in this way. Members of the public want to know if progress is being made.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. A suggestion was made to develop a timeline figure that indicates progress and update it regularly.

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. Kirk asked if the group would like a short technical presentation on what technical alternatives there are for treating PFAS in drinking water and a desire to have a conversation on uncertainties and treatment options other than granular activated carbon (GAC) was expressed.

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, December 19.

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

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