

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

Tuesday, August 20, 2019
 1:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.
 Cottage Grove City Hall — Training Room
 12800 Ravine Parkway South, Cottage Grove

Meeting Purpose:

- Achieve a common understanding of progress to date on Settlement activities
- Obtain work group input on the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP) process
- Clearly identify next steps.

1. Welcome	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR Milt Thomas – MPCA	1:00 pm
2. Updates and follow-up a. Liaison updates b. Email update follow-up c. Other questions?	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR	
3. Subgroup 1 update a. CDWSP process map and timeline	Shalene Thomas – Wood Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood	
4. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	2:00 pm
5. Ten minute break		2:10 pm
6. Conceptual project identification: progress-to-date and next steps	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Shalene Thomas – Wood Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood	2:20 pm
7. Priority 1 criteria: progress-to-date and next steps	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	
8. Work group meeting schedule for next 8 months	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	
9. Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	
10. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	3:50 pm

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Citizen-Business Group Meeting
August 20, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Julie Bunn	Kirk Koudelka
Kevin Chapdelaine	Jack Lavold
David Filipiak	Michael Madigan
Bob Fossum	Jess Richards
Jeff Holtz	Barbara Ronningen
Mark Jenkins	Amy Schall
David Johnson	Dave Schulenberg
Steven Johnson	Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Jess Richards, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Shalene Thomas, Wood
- Hannah Albertus-Benham, Wood
- Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Milt Thomas, facilitator, MPCA

Welcome

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Jess Richards (DNR) welcomed the work group. Kirk then asked for a moment of silence to remember Bruce Johnson, a Citizen-Business Group member from Oakdale.

Updates and Follow-up

Liaison updates

Kevin Chapdelaine and Monica Stiglich (liaisons) provided a report-out from the June Government and 3M Working Group meeting.

First, Kevin noted that there were a lot of questions and conversations around the expedited projects. For example, the work group discussed what constitutes an expedited project, whether road construction costs should be covered, whether incentives should be covered, and if there should be another round of expedited projects. Monica noted that the July work group call had poor attendance, and that it may be better to cancel or have a meeting in-person. She also mentioned that the St. Paul paper had an article on the list of expedited projects.

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) mentioned that the July conference call was to provide an update on the expedited projects. He also added that there will be an update on planned public meetings later in the agenda.

Email update follow-up

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) asked the work group members if they had any follow-up questions from the email updates. No members had questions.

Subgroup 1 Update: Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP) Process Map and Timeline

Hannah Albertus-Benham and Shalene Thomas (Wood) provided a Subgroup 1 update, specifically focused on Wood's development of a process and timeline for the completion of the CDWSP. There are four primary steps to this process, including: (1) the identification and screening of water supply improvement options; (2) the identification of conceptual projects; (3) the development and evaluation of scenarios; and (4) the completion of the CDWSP, which includes the co-Trustees' recommendations.

Water Supply Improvement Options: An initial list of 10 water supply improvement options were developed in early 2019 with input from the two work groups and Subgroup 1. Following this, Wood held a series of meetings with the local governmental units (LGUs) to understand what options were technically and administratively feasible in their communities. Based on this information, Wood screened the water supply improvement options using the Priority 1 screening criteria and developed a matrix of the water supply improvement options by each community, indicating which options are "feasible," "low feasibility," or "not applicable."

There was a concern by one work group member that the option to drill new wells in optimized locations was listed as not applicable to private well communities. Hannah noted that this option was intended for municipal wells, so it was suggested to clarify that in the name. There was also a suggestion to add another option to the list: drilling private wells in optimized locations. There was also discussion about the option related to the treatment of 3M containment water.

Many of the work group members noted that they did not remember seeing this list of water supply improvement options previously. Work group members also noted: (1) it would be helpful to clarify the descriptions (e.g., indicate what is municipal vs. private); (2) the option related to minimizing water well usage is more related to demand rather than supply; (3) some options are only applicable to portions of a given community (e.g., those on private wells vs. municipal water); (4) some of the options are more feasible for some communities than others; and (5) other factors (e.g., cost-effectiveness) need to be considered. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) noted that this first step is a high-level screening and that many of these details will get considered further in the process.

Conceptual Projects: Following the identification of water supply improvement options, the next step is the development of conceptual projects. Building off of the water supply improvement options matrix, Wood developed preliminary conceptual project summaries for each community, which was shared with the members of Subgroup 1. Wood is planning to hold meetings with Subgroup 1 members to discuss the conceptual project summaries and refine as needed. A request for project ideas has also been posted to the website, which Wood will review and capture relevant project ideas into the list as appropriate. A refined list of conceptual projects will be shared with the work groups and Subgroup 1 for another round of review in September.

There was a question from a work group member on whether private well communities are able to receive support from an engineering firm to develop project ideas. Kirk noted that Wood will be filling in gaps and looking at inter-community solutions for all communities, including private well communities.

Scenarios: The final list of conceptual projects will be bundled into 4 different scenarios, including: community-specific, regional supply, treatment, and integrated. Then the scenarios will be evaluated

using the drinking water system model and groundwater model. A preliminary results summary of the modeling will be developed in December, and shared with the work groups, Subgroup 1, and the public for review and comment.

There was a concern from one of the work group members regarding the language that described the community-specific scenario – the slide was revised during the meeting. Another work group member had concerns that the 2040 timeline of the modeling was too short. Kirk mentioned that 2040 is based on the communities' comprehensive plans. Looking beyond 2040 becomes highly speculative due to community planning. There was also a question as to how Wood will consider cost-sharing in the scenario evaluation. One work group member suggested that it would be helpful to include a Citizen-Business Group member in the LGU meetings when discussing the scenarios. Another work group member suggested it would be helpful to show how the scenarios link back to the water supply improvement options matrix presented previously.

Final CDWSP: Following the completion of the previous steps, the draft CDWSP will be compiled and shared with the work groups and Subgroup 1 for review. Once the draft is released for review, the co-Trustees will apply the Priority 1 evaluation criteria to the scenarios to develop a good/better/best ranking. The final CDWSP, with the co-Trustees' recommendations, will be released in March 2020.

During this agenda topic, there was also discussion about: (1) the expedited projects, the timeline for sharing the information, and the details of the contract language; (2) lifetime of PFAS in the system; and (3) the format of the public meetings.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One member of the public noted that the general public does not seem to be interested/engaged in this issue and wanted to understand why. Members of the work group provided some thoughts as to why this may be. There was a suggestion to provide information in Washington County's newsletter on PFAS, the 2018 Settlement, and progress-to-date on Settlement activities.

Conceptual Project Identification

Terill Hollweg (Abt) and Hannah Albertus-Benham (Wood) discussed progress-to-date and next steps on identifying conceptual projects.

Wood is currently developing preliminary conceptual project summaries for the 14 affected communities in the East Metro area. These conceptual project summaries are consistent with the list of water supply improvement options and were informed by discussions with the LGUs. Wood will also be filling in gaps and looking for inter-community solutions.

As a next step, the State will be requesting additional feedback/input from Subgroup 1, the work groups, and the public. Wood is holding a series of meetings this week with the Subgroup 1 members to discuss the preliminary conceptual project summaries and request feedback. Concurrently, the State is requesting project ideas via an online public portal (<https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/5124373/3M-PFC-Settlement-Conceptual-Project-Idea-Form>). This request was posted on August 6th, with a deadline for ideas by September 4th. Wood will be reviewing the list of submitted project ideas and incorporating them, as appropriate, into the refined list of projects. Work group members are encouraged to work with their Subgroup 1 member to submit projects. Work group members may also submit ideas via the online portal. A refined list of conceptual projects will be shared with the work groups and Subgroup 1 for review and feedback in September.

Terill also provided an update on the project idea submission via the online portal. To date, the State has received 13 project ideas, including 8 project ideas from the LGUs and 5 project ideas from the public.

There was a request from a work group member to share Wood's preliminary conceptual project summaries with the work group members for review.

Priority 1 Criteria

Terill Hollweg (Abt) discussed progress-to-date and next steps on the development of the Priority 1 criteria.

First, Terill reminded the work group that the Priority 1 criteria were being used in two points in the CDWSP process: (1) Wood used the screening criteria to screen the initial list of water supply improvement options; and (2) the co-Trustees will apply the evaluation criteria to the scenarios to develop their recommendations.

Second, Terill discussed the progress-to-date on developing the Priority 1 criteria. Terill reminded the work group that the Priority 1 criteria document was finalized in November 2018 with input from the two work groups. The work groups also provided input on the importance of each criterion (i.e., most important, more important, somewhat important) via an online survey. One work group member noted that there was one criterion missing from the survey results that were presented. Following the meeting, it was confirmed that the criterion was added between the October and November meetings, so it was not included in the survey.

At the next meeting, the State will be sharing a draft framework for applying the Priority 1 criteria, including proposed weightings of the criteria. Following the September meeting, work group members will be asked for feedback on:

- The draft framework for applying the Priority 1 criteria
- Additions/refinements to the list of Priority 1 criteria
- The weighting of the Priority 1 criteria.

There was a general agreement by the work group members that they were interested in providing feedback on the framework and weighting, but felt like it wasn't necessary to revisit the criteria in terms of additions/refinements. They noted that they had already spent a good amount of time coming up with the final draft. One work group member requested that the draft framework be shared prior to the meeting, so they have time to review.

Work Group Meeting Schedule for the Next 8 Months

Terill Hollweg (Abt) provided an overview of the work group schedule over the next 8 months, including key topics at work group meetings, points of input, and public engagement. One work group member requested that Chapters 1-3 of the CDWSP be shared when Chapters 4-6 are sent out for review. There was also a general request from the work group to share all materials prior to the monthly meeting.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. No questions or comments were offered at this time.

Liaison report - 8/21/19

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

3] Subgroup 1 update: CDWSP process map and timeline - Questions and conversation on the treating and re-using of PFAS contaminated water that has been pumped [ie: Woodbury dump site and others] for groundwater management etc? Also concerns that negative public perception alone would be enough to derail any plans for this kind of re-use. This is a large amount of water to be "wasted". Staff responded that this issue remains open and will continue to be studied.

Concern from one community that drinking water supply options for their residents are still on the table that are not feasible for their needs and infrastructure. Staff's response was this initial document is meant to be broad in scope and the process will vet all infeasible processes before time and monies are spent.

Questions and conversation about the use of Settlement vs Consent Order monies use as it applies to current vs future PFAS exceedances and costs? Staff explained the differences between the Settlement and Consent financial structures and how the process will answer these issues moving forward.

Comment made in support of all the future drinking water supply systems we plan should be designed to "no detect" PFAS limits.

7] Priority 1 criteria: Progress to date and next steps - Question, May Priority 2 [Natural resource recovery] monies be re-allocated to Priority 1 [Clean drinking water]? Answer – NO!

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine