

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
 Agenda for the Citizen – Business Group Meeting

Tuesday, February 18, 2020

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 feedback on the scenario results and cost information
- 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	1:10 pm
3. Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan: Discuss scenario results and cost information	Shalene Thomas – Wood Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood Brian Hamrick – Wood Jim Feild – Wood	1:20 pm
4. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	2:20 pm
5. Ten minute break		2:30 pm
6. Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan: Discuss scenario results and cost information (cont'd)	Shalene Thomas – Wood Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood Brian Hamrick – Wood Jim Feild – Wood	2:40 pm
7. Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request	Mark Lorie – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	3:40 pm
8. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	3:50 pm

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Notes from the Citizen – Business Group Meeting

Tuesday, February 18, 2020

1:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.

Cottage Grove City Hall — Training Room
12800 Ravine Parkway South, Cottage Grove

Group members in attendance:

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

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Jess Richards, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Milt Thomas, MPCA
- Shalene Thomas, Wood
- Hannah Albertus-Benham, Wood
- Brian Hamrick, Wood
- Erin Daugherty, Wood
- Jim Feild, Wood
- Mark Lorie, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Milt Thomas, facilitator, MPCA

Welcome

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Jess Richards (DNR) welcomed the work group. Milt Thomas (MPCA) began by introducing the goals of the meeting: to achieve a common understanding of progress to date on Settlement activities; obtain work group feedback on the scenario results and cost information; and clearly identify next steps.

Updates and follow-up

Kevin Chapdelaine and Monica Stiglich (liaisons) provided a report-out from the January Government and 3M Working Group meeting. Monica provided an overview of key topics discussed, including:

- Woodbury gaining a temporary treatment system.
- Costs for the disposal of filters from any scenario is built into the cost assumptions.
- Concerns with the appearance of foam in surface water samples collected in the East Metro Area.
- Discussion about the use of social media for public outreach and engagement.

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) then provided a few additional updates and notes, including:

- Notices of upcoming public meetings have been sent to local papers and local governments, and some people have posted notices on NextDoor.
- MPCA has provided a legislative update, sharing information about the process so far, emphasizing that the process is in the information collection stage and not the decision or recommendation stage.
- Upcoming one-on-one meetings with local government units (LGUs).
- The discussion today is for information and feedback with very preliminary draft numbers.
- The work group meeting in March will focus on feedback on the scenarios.

Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan

Shalene Thomas, Hannah Albertus-Benham, Brian Hamrick, and Jim Feild (Wood) presented on the scenarios results and cost information for the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. Shalene emphasized that these results are preliminary and this is not a presentation of recommendations. Modeling and refining of the scenarios are on-going, with the good/better/best recommendations to follow. The effort right now is focused on determining which projects to include in the different scenarios, evaluating the feasibility of the projects and scenarios based on the modeling results, and developing costs.

The Wood team first discussed the drinking water modeling, the groundwater modeling, and the basis for the cost estimates. The drinking water modeling was based on the community profile information, engagement with LGUs, the one-on-one meetings with LGUs, and additional follow-up meetings. They developed multiple models across the different scenarios. Wood is currently meeting one-on-one with the communities to further vet the scenarios and the modeling assumptions.

The groundwater model relied on existing data and assumptions from partners including the Minnesota Geological Survey (MGS), the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), MPCA, DNR, and Metropolitan Council. The model was calibrated to average groundwater elevations over a three year time period (2016-2018) and the scenarios were simulated under static, constant (steady-state) conditions. The 2016-2018 time period was used because of the wealth of data available and the wet conditions during that time period most closely match what climatologists expect for the next 20 years. Wood looked at other periods for calibration, including dry conditions (2006-2009) and even a dust bowl drought situation (although there is limited data available for this time period). Wood found that the drier conditions resulted in more pumping from the wells and modeled those conditions.

The basis of costs comes from previous bids to cities in the region for similar work (e.g., water main installations, storage tanks, etc.) dating back to almost 2005. The outputs are for general screening as they do not include any on-site data collection or analysis.

Wood then presented the preliminary results for the community-specific, regional, treatment, and integrated scenarios.

One work group member asked if Wood examined the impact of turning off all municipal wells on the water table and the resulting effects on backyard or basement flooding. With a regional model, Wood was not able to achieve that level of specificity. The analysis for the scenarios is at a high-level and for screening purposes. Any on-the-ground projects will go through the usual analysis, testing, and examination required for a drinking water project.

The work group also asked for clarification on the differences in the implementation and efficacy of granular activated carbon (GAC) and ion exchange (IX) treatment methods. Wood explained that typically the IX residence time is shorter than with GAC, so the capital cost is lower and IX also has a lower operating cost. For disposal, GAC generally is returned to the original provider while IX is incinerated. Both treatment methods achieve non-detect levels based on current technology although IX is considered slightly better for short-chain PFAS. Right now IX is not an approved treatment in Minnesota, but MDH has it under consideration and there is currently an ongoing pilot study. The infrastructure for GAC and IX could also theoretically be transformed from one to the other.

The cost estimates depend somewhat on the assumed future demands. The demand used for Woodbury was 19.5 million gallons per day (mgd) but the new comprehensive plan approved by the Metropolitan Council has demand for Woodbury at 28 mgd (~45% higher). The updated demand for Woodbury was provided in 2019 but the modeling process had already begun. Wood and the Co-Trustees will need to discuss how best to update demand numbers.

Work group members asked Wood for information on uncertainty in the model. Wood addressed uncertainty by using vetted and collaborative data sources, making conservative assumptions, and treating areas as potentially contaminated even if they might otherwise be thought not to have PFAS present.

An overarching discussion among the work group concerned equity. Working group members expressed concerns regarding how to best plan for communities that may not currently have an exceedance or an anticipated future exceedance given the uncertainties involved in modeling the future. There was also a discussion of the differences in the Health Index (HI) used for communities under the community-specific and integrated scenarios, as well as concerns with the water demand estimates used in the analysis. It was reiterated that this analysis focused on feasibility and cost-effectiveness. The Priority 1 criteria are intended in part to address other considerations such as long-term benefits, potential adverse impacts, acceptability to the public, and future uncertainties. Feedback from the work group will be critical.

Public comments and questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One member of the public asked for additional information on the costs of planning and modeling work being done during this process. That information can be found in the regular reports to the legislature and the overall cost for this effort is a very small proportion of the total settlement.

Next steps

Shalene Thomas (Wood) presented on Wood's next steps:

- Meet with LGUs next week for the one-on-one meetings
- Refine existing scenarios as needed
- Potentially model new scenarios.

Mark Lorie (Abt) presented upcoming steps and deadlines, including:

- Work group members were asked to provide feedback on Chapter 7 and Appendix E, as well as provide input on the scenarios regarding the Priority 1 Criteria that focus on regional planning, local planning, and public acceptance (input can be provided via a spreadsheet shared with the work group).

- Co-Trustees will hold the informational and listening sessions on Wednesday, February 26th (Lake Elmo), Thursday, February 27th (Cottage Grove), and Wednesday, March 4th (Woodbury).

Work group members were asked to reflect on what they would like to focus on for the March meeting.

Liaison report - 2/19/20

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

3] Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan: Discuss scenario results and cost information.

Discussions during both the Citizen/Business group meeting and 3M/Government group meeting were very similar with a few exceptions.

Woodbury explained in depth the difference between the water supply design numbers in it's 2040 Comp Plan and its water supply design requests in this process. The takeaway explanation is the Comp Plan numbers include future water conservation goals and desires. Their actual design parameters are based on peak requirements without the conservation goals being met.

Question: Is it possible in the future to see Ion Exchange systems used as POET's for single family homes? Answer: Maybe, but the one fallback to Ion Exchange is some taste issues arise with the lower flows that are common in residential systems.

Newport questioned why their requests for Drinking Water System interconnects with neighboring communities were not included in Wood's findings. Wood explained that the Groundwater Model shows Newport with minor impacts from PFAS through 2040 that can be managed with POETS. Newport objected to the reliance of the model as the "end all" answer and strongly feels the very small expense of interconnecting with its neighboring communities protected drinking water systems is a very inexpensive insurance policy for Newport moving forward. Newport also feels that regardless how accurate the model is, it's not 100%. And that is a gamble it's not willing to take with the health of its citizens.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine