

Discussion of Criteria (Priority 1)

- Approach to Project Evaluation
 - Overview of approach
 - Project proposals
 - Criteria
- Cost Sharing
- Work Group discussion
- Public comments and questions on criteria



Approach to Project Evaluation

Co-Trustees' Approach to Project Evaluation for Priority 1

- Consider a **range of alternatives** for projects
- **Screen and evaluate project ideas objectively** using a set of established criteria
- Maintain focus on Priority 1 goal: To enhance the quality, quantity, and sustainability of drinking water and to ensure clean drinking water in sufficient supply to residents and businesses in the East Metropolitan Area to meet their current and future water needs

Explore and Evaluate a Range of Alternatives for Priority 1

- Smaller expedited projects (e.g. private well hook-ups to municipal systems)
- Broad, multi-community projects
- Individual community-level projects
- Aquifer recharge and protection projects

Project Proposals

- Project proposal framework will be developed based on information needed for screening and evaluation criteria
- Typically project proposals include elements like:
 - Description
 - Location
 - Purpose and benefits
 - Schedule
 - General cost information
 - Potential negative impacts

Proposals for Expedited Projects

- Would likely require a more detailed proposal and justification for expedited project status, might include:
 - Demonstration that the project is time-critical
 - Explanation of importance
 - Demonstration that project is capable of being completed within a short timeframe
- If proposal not approved for expedited projects, could be shifted to general project idea pool.

Slide 7

JP12 Added slide if we want to talk about expedited projects - realize that this will require some input from leadership.

Jennifer Peers, 9/13/2018

KE(3 Yes - I like where you're going, but let's discuss on Monday.

Kaufenberg, Elizabeth (MPCA), 9/14/2018

Project Screening Criteria

- Used to screen in or out project ideas for future consideration, based on critical elements
- Examples:
 - Consistency with Agreement
 - Ability to comply with applicable/relevant laws, regulations, rules, policies
 - Technical feasibility
 - Geographic relevance

Project Evaluation Criteria

- Used to help evaluate project ideas given multiple alternative options
- Examples
 - Addresses water supplies with PFAS contamination
 - More reliable methods/technologies
 - Avoid or minimize adverse environmental, remedial and/or social impacts
 - Provide long-term benefits
 - Cost-effectiveness (ratio of benefits to costs, all else being equal)



Cost Sharing

Why Cost Sharing?

- Need to ensure grant is spent according to priorities
- Fairness
- Good, efficient projects may include other components – don't want to reject them just because there is not full alignment
- Want to take advantage of opportunities to leverage grant funding as appropriate

Thoughts on When Cost Sharing Might be Appropriate

- Project is required to happen regardless of PFAS contamination
 - Incremental costs to address PFAS covered by grant
- Project partially addresses water supply in areas not affected by PFAS contamination
 - Proportion of costs to address PFAS covered by grant
- Project has an alternate funding source/matching funds
 - Non-funded proportion of costs (that address PFAS) covered by grant



Discussion

Discussion

- Reactions to overall process?
- Draft Criteria Handout
 - Reactions to criteria (e.g. refinements, clarifications, dislikes, likes)?
 - Additional criteria?
 - Criteria that should be moved to a different category?
- Thoughts on cost sharing? Other instances when cost sharing would be appropriate?



Public Comments and Questions on Criteria

Discussion of Subgroup Processes and Tasks

Outline

- Subgroup process and participation
- Subgroup 1 startup and planning tasks
- Work Group discussion
- Public comments and questions on subgroup process and tasks



Subgroup Process and Participation

Slide 18

JS(15 Add a few more slides of explanation. Thoughts: Who will participate for SG1 and SG2. Purpose of SG2 according to the structure document.

Johnson, Susan (MPCA), 9/11/2018

Subgroup Process (1 of 2)

- Relationships between co-Trustees, work groups, and subgroups
 - The co-Trustees will give direction and provide a list of priority tasks with advice from the work groups to the Subgroup
 - Subgroups will collect and review necessary background information
 - Subgroups will provide technical input on potential project ideas to work groups and the co-Trustees
 - Potential project ideas can come from co-trustees and work groups, as well as subgroups
 - Subgroups will provide input on potential project ideas using screening criteria developed by co-Trustees and based on input from work groups
 - Subgroups will provide support for technical questions to relevant to evaluation criteria for potential project ideas that pass screening criteria

Subgroup Process (2 of 2)

- Subgroups will report back to the work groups and co-Trustees
 - Work groups and co-Trustees will provide input on evaluation criteria based on information provided by Subgroups
- Further refinement and technical review may be requested from the Subgroup

Subgroup Participation

- Subgroup 1 (Drinking Water Supply)
 - Technical experts from agencies, 3M, Metropolitan Council, and Washington County
 - Representatives from cities and townships
- Subgroup 2 (Groundwater)
 - Technical experts from agencies, 3M, Metropolitan Council, Washington County, Washington Conservation District, South Washington Watershed District, Ramsey-Washington Metro Watershed District, and the Valley Branch Watershed District
 - Representatives from cities and townships
- Other involvement (both groups)
 - Technical experts not affiliated with the subgroup may be invited to consult on topics
 - Meetings open to the public



Subgroup 1 Startup and Planning Tasks

JS(15 Add a few more slides of explanation. Thoughts: Who will participate for SG1 and SG2. Purpose of SG2 according to the structure document.

Johnson, Susan (MPCA), 9/11/2018

Thoughts on Subgroup 1 Startup Tasks

- Co-Trustees develop charter with input from work groups
- Understand type and magnitude of problem, e.g.
 - Compiling map data in GIS (wells with PFAS, PFAS concentrations, aquifers, other contamination in area)
 - Understanding water sources for water supply systems and affected populations
- Gather information on drinking water systems characteristics
 - Characteristics of municipal systems
 - Future water demand
 - Future plans
 - Data gaps
 - Obstacles
- Compile applicable/relevant laws, regulations, rules, and policies

Thoughts on Subgroup 1 Planning Tasks

- Identify potential expedited projects
- Develop an array of potential projects
- Provide input on project ideas using screening criteria
- Provide support for technical questions regarding projects
- Conduct peer reviews of detailed project designs



Discussion

Discussion

- Thoughts on overall Subgroup process?
- Thoughts on submitting potential project ideas (both work groups and subgroups)?
- Thoughts on best way for Subgroups to communicate with work groups (briefings at meetings, presentations, written reports, other)?



Public Comments and Questions on Subgroup Process and Tasks

Next Steps

Next Steps

- Upcoming Meetings

- October

- Tuesday October 16 (Citizen-Business) / Wednesday October 17 (Government & 3M)

- November options?

- Tuesday November 20 – both groups
 - Tuesday November 13 (Citizen-Business) / Wednesday November 14 (Government & 3M)
 - No meeting

- Agenda Topic requests?