

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement  
Government and 3M Working Group Meeting  
December 19, 2018 Meeting Notes**

Members in attendance:

Kristina Handt	Karie Blomquist
Shann Finwall	Daniel Kylo
Bart Fischer	Ron Moorse
Clint Gridley	Kirk Koudelka
Lowell Johnson	Barb Naramore
Jennifer Levitt	Monica Stiglich
Richard Hayek	Kevin Chapdelaine

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 Barb Naramore welcomed the work group.

Monica Stiglich and Kevin Chapdelaine provided a report-out from the previous day's Citizen-Business Group meeting, including (1) the importance for outreach and communication of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan; (2) the expedited project planning process being an area of interest for more discussion; and (3) the work group's interest in the presentation on treatment options. Kirk also noted that the work group discussed the importance of using clear language in the documents that are being developed.

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 this afternoon (December 19, 2018). Subgroup 2 will likely be stood up in the spring of 2019. Both of these subgroups 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.

Kirk provided an update on the capacity grants. The capacity grants are starting to be sent out to the communities. The work group discussed what the capacity grants will and will not cover. There was concern over the size of the capacity grants, and the co-Trustees said they would continue to re-evaluate the capacity grants as the planning process moves forward.

## **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. A work group member asked whether the co-Trustees have a perspective on groundwater vs. surface water as a drinking water source. The co-Trustees said they don't have an initial determination; instead, they want to take a comprehensive look at all of the options.

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 highlighted the importance of communicating with the public and local government, and recommended to indicate in the schedule where coordination with the local government could occur.

## **Public Comments and Questions**

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. The importance of public meetings and communication was re-emphasized, and different strategies for involvement were discussed.

## **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.

## **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. The co-Trustees suggested they send out a survey to capture this information.

### **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 16, 2019.

### **Public Comments and Questions**

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. A suggestion was made to pay particular attention to the disposal process for the different PFAS treatment technologies. It was also asked whether there will be a sunset clause to the expedited project process. The co-Trustees said they haven't made a decision at this point.

### **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