

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

Members in attendance:

Julie Bunn	Kevin Chapdelaine
Betsy Daub	David Filipiak
Bob Fossom	Jeff Holtz
Mark Jenkins	David Johnson
Steven Johnson	Katie Johnston-Goodstar
Kirk Koudelka	Jack Lavold
Michael Madigan	Steve Colvin
Barbara Ronningen	Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

- Diana Lane, Connie Travers, and Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Shalene Thomas, Wood
- Karla Peterson, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH)

Welcome and Updates

Kirk Koudelka and Steve Colvin (alternate for Barb Naramore) welcomed the work group.

Monica Stiglich and Kevin Chapdelaine provided a report-out from the Government and 3M Working Group meeting in November, including discussions on (1) the importance of communications and public input; (2) logistics for the development and implementation of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan; (3) the capacity grants that are being developed to support the subgroups; (4) other regional water systems; and (5) uncertainties around treatment options. Kirk noted that there will be a presentation on PFAS treatment alternatives for drinking water at the meeting today.

Kirk provided an update on Lakeland. To date, there have been two residential well advisories that have been issued in Lakeland due to PFAS contamination. However, there could be more advisories as testing continues. The co-Trustees have formally reached out to Lakeland to participate in the Government and 3M Working Group.

Kirk provided an update on the subgroups. Subgroup 1 will have their first meeting tomorrow (December 19, 2018). This subgroup will help support the development of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. The State has also hired Wood to support subgroup activities. Wood will be providing engineering support with an emphasis on modeling and treatment evaluation. Abt will continue to provide strategic support and planning. Capacity grants are also being provided to communities for additional assistance. There was a discussion about the membership of the subgroups.

Vision for Long-Term Planning and Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan Task Assignments

Kirk provided an overview of the co-Trustees' vision for long-term planning. The goal of the 3M Grant is to ensure safe drinking water in sufficient supply to residents and businesses in the East Metropolitan area to meet their current and future needs. To meet this goal, a collaborative approach is needed to thoroughly identify, evaluate, and select long-term solutions. While this planning process is going on,

funding is available for short-term fixes to ensure residents have safe drinking water in the interim. There was a discussion on how to balance the desire to move quickly and implement projects, especially if a localized preferred option has been identified, versus waiting to thoroughly evaluate additional options including some with a more regional focus. A work group member also requested to discuss the possibility of funding research projects during another meeting.

Connie Travers provided a presentation on the task assignments and timeline for developing the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan by December 2019. Subgroup 1 is tasked with helping to review and identify additional background information on the region and communities; review, identify (as needed), and evaluate the technical approaches; identify and provide technical input on concept-level projects; evaluate alternative project bundles, including rough costs, and recommend a preferred alternative. The work groups are tasked with providing additional review and input on the Subgroup activities. The co-Trustees, with support from Abt and Wood, will be responsible for writing the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan, with review and input from Subgroup 1 and the work groups. The work group members discussed the different types of needed information, the plan's scope, the timing of the public meetings and alternative ways to communicate with the public, the importance for using clear language, and how the communities will be involved in the decision-making process.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions.

Presentation on PFAS Treatment for Drinking Water and Uncertainties

Shalene Thomas (Wood) and Karla Peterson (MDH) provided a presentation on PFAS treatment options for drinking water and potential considerations when evaluating options.

First, Shalene provided an overview of how treatment technologies move through the stages of development, the current status of PFAS technologies, the key variables to consider in selecting a treatment option, and an overview of the three technologies currently in use to treat water with PFAS contamination (i.e. granular activated carbon, ion-exchange, and membrane filtration/reverse osmosis).

Karla provided additional input on considerations when evaluating these technologies, including public health, environment, capital costs, operation and management costs, and changing science. Karla also noted that while only granular activated carbon is currently approved by MDH to treat PFAS in MN for drinking water purposes, MDH plans to start evaluating other technologies for treating PFAS in the near future. The work group members asked about technical oversight required for the different technologies, the disposal process, and considerations when supplementing/replacing the current water treatment system.

Expedited Project Planning

Terill Hollweg presented the draft expedited project planning document. The purpose of this document is to propose draft criteria and information needed to select projects for funding under an expedited timeframe. This could include projects that are time-critical due to a current opportunity (e.g., hooking-up households to a municipal water supply during a planned road construction). However, this process would not apply to short-term drinking water projects covered under the 2007 Consent Order and \$40 million/5-year cap. The co-Trustees asked the work group members for their thoughts on the types of project that could fall under this expedited process, and the amount that should be set aside to cover these projects reflecting the initial desire of the communities to have an expedited option for considering projects.

Next Steps

MPCA and DNR will send out notes and materials discussed at this meeting. Work group members will be asked to provide input on the expedited project planning process.

The next meeting will be on January 15, 2019.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions.

Liaison report - 12/19/18

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

1d Updates and Follow ups - Capacity Grants – Woodbury Admin Clint Gridley raised an issue with the \$25,000 cap on Capacity Grants. He feels because of Woodbury's size and population their expenses for representation on the SG-1 committee could exceed the cap amount.

3 Vision for long term planning and Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan task assignments –

Question asked- Do the state agencies have preferences between surface water and/or ground water systems?

Answer – No. The studies and processes in place will best answer that question.

Discussion on best time and method to hold Public Meetings and best way to communicate with City Councils and Township Boards. Discussed Wash Co facilitating county wide update meetings.

6 Presentation on PFAS treatment – Very good presentation by Wood and MDH, similar conversations in both meetings.

7 Expedited project planning criteria and information needs – Similar language concerns in both meetings. Discussed what kind of projects are "Expedited Qualified"? What costs qualify? SG-1's role?

9 Public Comments – Comment on agenda item 6: Concern was raised about some of the filtration systems waste by-products and it's disposal. The commenter felt this was a very important issue to be considered moving forward.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine