

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

Tuesday, June 18, 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 expedited projects and the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan process
- Clearly identify next steps.

|   |  |         |
|---|--|---------|
| 1. Welcome  | Kirk Koudelka – MPCA<br>Jess Richards – DNR<br>Milt Thomas – MPCA                                    | 1:00 pm |
| 2. Updates and follow-up<br>a. Liaison updates<br>b. May 29th LGU meeting<br>c. Email update follow-up<br>d. Status of planning activities<br>e. Other questions? | Kirk Koudelka – MPCA<br>Jess Richards – DNR<br>Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates                       |         |
| 3. Discussion and feedback on expedited projects  | Kirk Koudelka – MPCA<br>Jess Richards – DNR<br>Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates<br>Milt Thomas – MPCA |         |
| 4. Public comments and questions  | Milt Thomas – MPCA   | 2:10 pm |
| 5. Ten minute break   |  | 2:20 pm |
| 6. Discussion and feedback on expedited projects (cont'd)   | Kirk Koudelka – MPCA<br>Jess Richards – DNR<br>Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates<br>Milt Thomas – MPCA | 2:30 pm |
| 7. Update from Subgroup 1:<br>a. Modeling<br>b. Concept-level projects<br>c. Process map  | Jim Feild – Wood<br>Brian Hamrick – Wood<br>Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood<br>Shalene Thomas – Wood   |         |
| 8. Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request  | Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates<br>Milt Thomas – MPCA  |         |
| 9. Public comments and questions  | Milt Thomas – MPCA   | 3:50 pm |

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement  
Citizen-Business Group Meeting  
June 18, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

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

Presenters:

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

### **Welcome**

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Jess Richards (DNR) welcomed the work group.

### **Updates and Follow-up**

#### ***Liaison updates***

Kevin Chapdelaine and Monica Stiglich (liaisons) provided a report-out from the May Government and 3M Working Group meeting. First, Kevin noted additional topics that were discussed at this meeting than at the Citizen-Business Group meeting, including:

- There was a question about the criteria the agencies will use to evaluate projects for the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. The Co-Trustees (MPCA and DNR) responded that the Priority 1 criteria developed last year with input by the work groups will be used for the evaluation of projects.
- During the small group discussions, the work group discussed a number of topics including the public's view of drinking water, the need to set aside money for long-term operations and maintenance, and where Settlement funds should be held.

Monica noted that the work group received a presentation on Project 1007. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) added that there will continue to be updates on this project as it progresses.

### **Email update follow-up**

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) noted that the Co-Trustees are continuing to provide updates to the work groups via email rather than at the meetings. Work group members were asked if they had follow-up questions about the email updates. No members had questions.

### **Other updates**

Dave Schulenburg mentioned that the Minnesota Water Well Association is holding a half-day seminar on Minnesota's private water systems, including presentations on arsenic, PFAS, and private water systems in the state. The seminar will be held at Cottage Grove City Hall on August 9th from 8:30 am to 1 pm.

Jess Richards (DNR) mentioned that the semi-annual Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Governors' and Premiers' Leadership Summit was held over the weekend (June 14-16, 2019). Governor Tim Walz attended the summit, and mentioned this effort.

### **Status of planning activities**

Terill Hollweg (Abt) reviewed the project timeline. Upcoming planning activities were grouped into two categories:

- Expedited projects. The application window for projects was opened on April 10<sup>th</sup> and closed on May 25<sup>th</sup>. The State, work groups, and Subgroup 1 are currently reviewing the project applications and will discuss the projects at today's meeting. The Co-Trustees will make the final funding decisions in early July, and will share them with the work groups during the July meetings. The State will then begin setting up funding agreements for the approved projects.
- Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. Wood recently started to identify concept-level projects for consideration in the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan, including coordinating with the local governmental units (LGUs) for their input on projects. Once concept-level projects have been identified, the projects will be grouped into scenarios and evaluated using the models.

### **Other questions**

One work group member asked about the general process and protocol for installing and replacing granular activated carbon (GAC) filters within a household. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Karla Peterson (Minnesota Department of Health, MDH) provided some information on the topic, and suggested the MDH website as a good resource for more information.

### **Discussion and Feedback on Expedited Projects**

The Co-Trustees and work group members discussed the proposed expedited projects. First, Terill Hollweg (Abt) provided an update on the expedited project process. A request for expedited project applications was opened from April 10<sup>th</sup> to May 25<sup>th</sup>. A total of 18 applications were received by the deadline date, totaling approximately \$26.8 million. Applicants included the cities and communities within the East Metropolitan Area, Washington County, and other individuals and organizations.

The work group discussed a range of topics, including:

- Questions and clarifications on specific projects
- Thoughts or concerns with aspects of projects
- Components of projects that should be considered or not considered for funding under the 2018 Settlement Agreement

- General filters to use when applying the eligibility criteria to the proposed projects
- The importance of consistency in funding across projects.

The Co-Trustees will be making the final funding decisions on expedited projects in early July, and will be considering the input of the work groups and Subgroup 1. The Co-Trustees intend to share their decisions with the work groups during the July meeting.

### **Public Comments and Questions**

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One member of the public talked about his proposed expedited project (included as part of the discussion on expedited projects, above). Karla Peterson (MDH) mentioned that MDH is developing a factsheet on the pros and cons of hooking up to municipal water. A member of the public noted the importance for agencies to communicate that there is no such thing as contaminant-free water, and that water below health-based values (HBVs) is safe to drink.

### **Update from Subgroup 1**

Brian Hamrick, Jim Feild, Hannah Albertus-Benham, and Shalene Thomas (Wood) provided an update from Subgroup 1.

First, Brian Hamrick provided an update on the drinking water delivery system modeling effort (community modeling). Brian noted that the drinking water models are 90-95% complete. Currently, Wood is quality checking the community models. Once that is done, next steps include: sharing the models with the LGUs for their review of the assumptions; identifying and addressing any issues; combining community models into a regional model; incorporating expedited projects and future/proposed infrastructure; and using the model to evaluate the scenarios.

Second, Jim Feild provided an update on the groundwater modeling effort. Recently, Wood has submitted the geologic model to the Minnesota Geological Survey (MGS) and DNR for review. Wood also met with the watershed/conservation districts to learn more about available data. Current tasks include: revising the geological model based on MGS/DNR review; plotting groundwater model elevations; compiling pumping data; and plotting PFAS data by aquifer. There were a few questions on the capabilities and robustness of the model.

Third, Hannah Albertus-Benham provided an update on identifying concept-level projects. Hannah noted that Wood recently met with representatives from the communities to begin identifying concept-level projects. General topics of discussion included the community's preferences and objectives, types of projects that are more or less favorable, and municipal ordinances in place that may restrict options. They also discussed the water supply improvement options, expedited projects, and the process for evaluating projects and scenarios. As a next step, Wood plans to hold another set of meetings with the communities to continue the discussion.

Last, Shalene Thomas discussed the general process for completing the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. There are three primary activities to the process, including: (1) the screening of the water supply improvement options; (2) the evaluation of concept-level projects; and (3) the evaluation of scenarios. Wood is currently drafting the process for completing these activities, and plans to share this at the next work group meetings in July.

### **Next Steps**

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

The next Citizen-Business Group meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>.

Next steps include:

- Expedited projects
  - The work group members should submit feedback forms by June 20<sup>th</sup>.
  - MPCA and DNR anticipate making final funding decisions in early July, and will share those with the work groups during the July meeting.
- Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan
  - Work group members are encouraged to coordinate with their Subgroup 1 members to identify concept-level projects (June/July).
  - The initial list of concept-level projects will be shared with the work groups for review and input in July/August.

The work group members were asked if they had requests for upcoming agenda items. While no meeting topics were raised, work group members asked:

- If a public meeting will be held in July as planned. Terill Hollweg (Abt) replied that this public meeting is planned for August.
- If the work group will be meeting less than once a month in the near future. Terill replied that she imagines that meetings will be held monthly until the completion of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (scheduled for the end of 2019), but will likely be less frequent after that.
- If agenda topics for July could be shared. Terill noted that agenda items would likely include a discussion on expedited projects, the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan process map, and a discussion on HBVs of other states.

### **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 - 6/18/19

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

3] Discussion and feedback on expedited projects: Many questions and conversations ensued , I try to concisely paraphrase the intent and direction of the discourse. The conversations and questions were similar in both the Citizen/Business meeting and the 3M/Gov't meeting. I'm purposely not mentioning any specific projects or communities.

Question: What is expedited or is not expedited? The definition is being kept loose for now to allow for broad conversation and consideration.

Question: Should Studies qualify for expedited status? Probably some will and some won't. In support of allowing studies consideration it was mentioned that the information garnered from these studies should improve the efficient use of settlement funds.

Question: What percentage of road construction costs should/could be funded by settlement monies? There is an interest in consistency for this question. But, each situation is different and each project will be judged on it's merit using the information provided and the criteria.

Question: Should settlement funds be used to offer "enticements to hook up" to those homes being offered new municipal water service? The room seemed split 50/50 on this question.

Statement: Public infrastructure [water lines, etc] should be placed in the public ROW whenever possible.

Statement: When judging the merit of an expedited project application, both immediate HBV of PFAS detected and the efficient use of settlement finds should be considered. Example, If a community is already performing a road construction project in an affected area and would like to add water system infrastructure upgrades at the same time it should be considered.

Question: Should a second round of Expedited Project applications be considered? General feeling in the room was No. Unless and immediate need can be shown.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine