

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

Agenda for Government and 3M Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, August 21, 2019

9:00 a.m.-12:00 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	9:00 am
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	10:00 am
5. Ten minute break		10:10 am
6. Conceptual project identification: progress-to-date and next steps	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Shalene Thomas – Wood Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood	10:20 am
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	11:50 am

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Government and 3M Working Group Meeting
August 21, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Karie Blomquist	Kirk Koudelka
David Brummel	Daniel Kylo
Kevin Chapdelaine	Ron Moorse
Bart Fischer	David Patton
Clint Gridley	Jess Richards
Kristina Handt	Monica Stiglich
Chris Hartzell	

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 August Citizen-Business Group meeting held yesterday.

First, Monica noted that the work group had voiced some concerns regarding the water supply improvement options screening results that were presented at yesterday's meeting and that some work group members did not remember seeing the initial list presented previously. She looked back at the presentations and confirmed that they were presented previously. She also mentioned that: (1) several work group members requested participation in the local governmental unit (LGU) meetings moving forward to have better knowledge on what is going on; (2) there was discussion about the 2040 timeline of the modeling and a concern that this wasn't long enough; and (3) the need to communicate with the larger community on PFAS.

Kevin noted that there was frustration that information could not be shared about the expedited projects and that conversations to date have been high-level, and there is a desire to start talking about specific solutions for the affected communities.

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) mentioned that they will try to support better communication between the work groups and Subgroup 1. As part of this, they sent the work group members the meeting times for the LGU meetings that are being held this week.

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 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."

One work group member expressed concern that this matrix does not incorporate their conversations with Wood. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) noted that this first step is a high-level screening of what is feasible and that community preferences are captured in the following steps. There was also discussion about the option related to the treatment of 3M containment water, and confirmation that this includes the 3M Woodbury site as well as the other disposal sites in the East Metro area.

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.

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.

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.

One work group member requested that Wood's presentation on the process and timeline be sent out to the work groups via email; Kirk confirmed that the State would do this. There was also a discussion about the timeline and content for the planned public meetings.

One work group member noted that there are three types of situations that need to be considered when treating drinking water supplies: (1) PFAS exceedances over health-based values (HBVs); (2) PFAS detected but not over HBVs; and (3) water protection. There was a discussion about what is covered under the 2007 Consent Order and the 2018 Settlement, and the need to have further discussion on how this will be addressed in the CDWSP.

Public Comments and Questions

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

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.

One work group member asked if Wood is considering project ideas from other communities. Shalene Thomas (Wood) mentioned that they are tracking treatment options that are currently being used or under development globally. Terill mentioned that Wood will be adding to the list of projects identified by the communities, and filling in gaps and looking for inter-community solutions as appropriate.

Another work group member asked about the status of the factsheet outlining the pros and cons of hooking up to municipal water. Karla Peterson (Minnesota Department of Health, MDH) said that the factsheet is still under development, but they hope to finalize it soon.

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. Terill mentioned that there was one criterion that 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.

One work group member requested that an online survey tool be used to receive input from the work groups on the weighting.

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.

There was a discussion about the \$20 million of the Settlement funds that is immediately available for natural resource projects under Priority 2. One work group member also asked whether the State would be setting up capacity grants for Subgroups 2 and 3. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) confirmed that this is something they will consider.

Next Steps

Terill Hollweg (Abt) revisited upcoming meetings and next steps.

The next Government and 3M Working Group meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 18th.

Next steps include:

- Work group members are encouraged to coordinate with their Subgroup 1 members to identify conceptual projects (by the end of August).
- Work group members may also submit project ideas via the online portal (by September 4th).
- The refined list of conceptual projects will be shared with the work groups for review and input in September.
- Work group members will have an opportunity to provide feedback on the Priority 1 criteria in September/October.

The work group members were asked if they had requests for upcoming agenda items. Specific items included:

- Update on Project 1007.
- Update on MDH's National Health Study.
- Guidance on PFAS health-based values from other states
 - Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) said that they will send out an email with two documents (i.e. ECOS and ITRC) that provide an overview of guidance values by state
- Other examples of drinking water systems. Some examples that were discussed included:
 - Parkersburg, West Virginia
 - Albertville-Hanover-St. Michael, MN (Joint Powers Agreement)
 - St. Louis Park, MN
 - Great Lakes.

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 – 20 August 2019

Citizen – Business Group November meeting report to the Government and 3M Working Group

Item #2 Updates

The passing of Oakdale representative, Bruce Johnson, was observed with a moment of silence.

Group noted that Webex meeting in July had both a limited agenda and very limited participation.

Item #3 Subgroup 1 update

The Water Supply Improvement Options handout was discussed with concerns about details included or excluded from the options listed. The Options handout included feasibilities (“Feasible”, “Low Feasibility”, “Not Applicable”) noted by affected community based on discussions the Wood conducted with the SG1 and LGU contacts for each community. There is a request that the Citizen representative(s) be invited to “live” Wood/SG1/LGU meeting(s) for their respective communities to stay apprised of options being considered and offer input based on discussions at Work Group meetings.

Post Meeting Information: Wood (Brian McBride) had given an overview of possible water supply options at the February 2019 Work Group meetings, but in the context of generic options which might be considered. This overview is attached to the Work Group meeting records on the respective webpages. The Conceptual Drinking Water Supply plans presentations at the April and May 2019 Work Group meetings (see webpage) included the same list of Water Supply Improvement Options as provided in this meeting’s handout.

Item #6 Discussion of Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan and Schedule/Milestones for Progress

Discussion on cost analysis basis for the conceptual projects questioned the use of a 20 year time period for the analysis. It was noted that the city / township 2040 Comprehensive Plans are the basis for current and best-estimate future growth and are therefore used.

The Conceptual Projects portal is now available for submissions until September 4.

General Discussion: Communications to the public were again discussed and challenges with people having current and factual information. The Washington County publication distributed in paper copy to all Washington County residents was viewed as a viable means to distribute Water Settlement information and identify other means for citizens to obtain specific information on this topic for their community.

Respectfully submitted,

Monica Stiglich

22 August 2019