

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Citizen-Business Group Meeting
April 16, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Julie Bunn	Kirk Koudelka
Kevin Chapdelaine	Jack Lavold
Betsy Daub	Jess Richards
David Filipiak	Barbara Ronningen
Jeff Holtz	Amy Schall
Bruce Johnson	Dave Schulenberg
Steven Johnson	Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Jess Richards, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Erin Daugherty, Wood
- Jim Feild, Wood
- Milt Thomas, facilitator, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)

Welcome and Updates

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Jess Richards (DNR) welcomed the Work Group.

Monica Stiglich (liaison) provided a report-out from February's Government and 3M Working Group meeting. Ms. Stiglich noted that the Working Group received presentations from St. Paul Regional Water Services and Lincoln Pipestone.

Jim Kelly (Minnesota Department of Health; MDH) provided MDH updates to the Work Group, including: (1) MDH issued new health-based guidance values for PFOS and PFHxS; (2) MDH is working on methodology to provide detection limits that are below this new value; and (3) MDH is preparing to submit an application to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) looking at the connection between PFAS and health.

Kirk Koudelka provided updates to the Work Group on a wide range of topics, including:

- Cottage Grove, in partnership with MPCA and MDH, is proposing to conduct a pilot study at their temporary treatment facility to explore the use of ion exchange as a treatment technology.
- The Co-Trustees (MPCA and DNR) submitted the Settlement Legislative priority report to the legislator on April 5th, 2019. The purpose of this report was to determine how the priorities in the Settlement Agreement will be met and how the spending will move from the first priority to the second priority and from the second priority to the third priority, as outlined in the Settlement Agreement. In the report, the Co-Trustees noted that at this time they do not have a complete picture of everything that is needed to fulfill the goals of the first priority, and will develop this at a future date. The report is on the Settlement website.

- The April 11th Local Government Unit (LGU) meeting was canceled due to weather conditions. The Work Group members discussed rescheduling the meeting for May or July.
- Well advisories have been issued in Lakeland Shores. The Co-Trustees have formally invited Lakeland Shores to participate in the Government and 3M Working Group.
- As a result of the well advisories issued to Lake Elmo and St. Paul Park in 2017, MPCA and MDH are working to find alternative drinking water sources for these two communities. For Lake Elmo, it was decided that the best and most cost-effective alternative is to drill a new municipal well. This project is proposed to be funded by the 2018 Settlement because it is a long-term solution (with the exception of a portion of the project cost that would be covered by Lake Elmo for the increased capacity of the well). For St. Paul Park, options are still being evaluated. In addition, Cottage Grove is seeking reimbursement for a well that was put in last year.
- The Co-Trustees are currently in discussions with 3M about which funding source – 2007 Consent Order or 2018 Settlement Grant – should be used to reimburse some of the work that has been completed in the East Metropolitan Area to date.

Gary Krueger (MPCA) provided a status update on the feasibility study for Project 1007 (which was included in the 2018 Settlement Agreement). AECOM has been retained to help with this project, with close coordination with the Valley Branch Watershed District.

Drinking water supply examples: thoughts and questions from February presentations

Jess Richards (DNR) discussed the February Work Group presentations that provided examples of regional water systems, including St. Paul Regional Water Services (SPRWS; urban example) and Lincoln Pipestone (rural example). Following these presentations in February, some communities expressed concerns that they would be forced to connect to SPRWS. Jess Richards emphasized that the Co-Trustees will not force communities to connect to SPRWS. The Co-Trustees have no plan to push specific options on any given community.

As a follow-up, Jess Richards asked if the Work Group members had any additional questions, comments, or concerns. The Work Group discussed the option to raise additional project concepts later and the use of models to evaluate options.

Expedited project planning process

Terill Hollweg (Abt) provided an update on the expedited project planning process, including walking through the eligibility criteria and online application form, and discussing next steps. The Work Group members had a wide range of discussions about the expedited project planning process, including:

- How to share the application with the public and non-governmental entities. Terill Hollweg noted that the application form was posted to the website, shared with the communities and work groups, and announced in local newspapers and via GovDelivery.
- The format of the application, with a request for a word document that lists all the application questions. Terill Hollweg noted that the online application form lists all the questions on one-page, which allows applicants to review all questions before starting. In addition, applicants can save their application at any time and continue filling in the application or revising the application at a later date; applicants can revise the application until the close of the application window.
- How to include more than one point of contact on the application. The Work Group members noted that additional points of contact can be added in the “who contributed to the application” or “additional comments” sections of the application form.

- The need for applicants to note any potential conflict of interest. All applicants are required to disclose any relationships with MPCA, DNR, or the Work Group members that would prevent their ability to objectively evaluate the application. Having a relationship does not result in a rejection of a proposed project; instead, it simply notifies MPCA/DNR to take appropriate steps as needed to avoid a potential conflict (e.g., recusal of evaluating a specific project). The Co-Trustees noted that this requirement is part of the State's overall conflict mitigation plan for implementing the Settlement.

Terill Hollweg noted that the Work Group members will be given the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the submitted project applications by the June Work Group meeting.

Public Comments and Questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. A member of the public asked for clarification on the types of projects that can be submitted under the expedited process, such as technology development. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) indicated that expedited projects should be ready to implement, and that there will be a request for other project ideas later this summer. Another member of the public asked for additional information about the ATSDR study. Jim Kelly (MDH) responded that the ATSDR protocol is available online and provides details on what will be collected as part of the study.

Update on Drinking Water Supply Technical Subgroup 1

The Work Group received two updates on the Drinking Water Supply Technical Subgroup 1, including: (1) an update on the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP); and (2) an update on the models that are being developed to support the CDWSP.

Terill Hollweg (Abt) provided an overview of the CDWSP, including an outline of the plan, the timeline, and an overview of the first three chapters. MPCA/DNR will send the CDWSP to the Work Group members next week for their review and comment. Terill Hollweg noted that if the Work Group members are available and interested, their high-level review of the chapters would be appreciated. All comments on the CDWSP should be documented in an excel comment form, with comments sent to Walker Smith (MPCA) by May 10th.

Erin Daugherty and Jim Feild (Wood) provided updates on the drinking water and groundwater models that are under development. Erin Daugherty provided an overview of the objectives and timeline for the drinking water model, and described the information Wood is collecting from communities to populate the base model. Erin Daugherty expects that the initial base model will be completed in early May 2019, and then Wood will begin evaluating projects and scenarios. In responding to questions, Erin Daugherty explained that the MPCA, DNR, and communities would retain the model once complete and that the 2040 build-out date corresponds to the communities' water supply plans. Jim Feild presented on the groundwater model and discussed how this model is incorporating previous groundwater models (e.g., Metro Model 3) and using new information to support the evaluation of scenarios for the CDWSP. He also mentioned that he and Rebecca Higgins (MPCA) developed a definitions list for groundwater modeling that is available to the Work Group members. In responding to questions, Jim Field explained that they will test the model by comparing the model results to actual observations, with an expected error rate of 5 to 10% and that they expect the model resolution will be about 30 x 30 meters.

There was no update on the April 3 planning meeting with watershed districts because of limited time.

Public Comments and Questions

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

Kirk Koudelka and Jess Richards described possible agenda items for the May Work Group meeting, including the types of preferred alternatives, level of preventative measures, long-term operations and maintenance (O&M), and expedited projects. Work Group members asked about an update on changes to the health-based values and the plume movement.

Liaison report - 4/17/19

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

3] Drinking water supply February presentations questions: Multiple questions on the decision making process for deciding each community's best drinking water system and who makes these decisions were asked. Concern State agencies may "impose" one system over another were expressed. MPCA and DNR both responded that each community will be very involved in all decisions and the State agencies will not impose any system upon any community.

4] Expedited project planning process and timeline: Many questions on this process and timeline. Concern with the process not being "expedited enough". Feelings from many that Oct/Nov bid timing for 2020 projects will not be efficient and cost effective. An Aug/Sept timeline was preferred for potentially better bid outcomes. This conversation will continue. Both Woodbury and Cottage Grove requested meetings with MPCA/DNR Staff for further discussion.

7b] Subgroup 1 update - Drinking water and Groundwater modeling: Multiple questions on the technical planning of how each community's groundwater plans could affect the plumes movement and therefore affect neighboring communities water system. Staff agreed on the complexities of this process but feels confident it can be well managed with partnership of MDH and MPCA. This conversation will continue.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine