

## Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

### Agenda for Government and 3M Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, June 19, 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 expedited projects and the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan 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. May 29th LGU meeting c. Email update follow-up d. Status of planning activities e. Other questions?	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	
3. Discussion and feedback on expedited projects	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	
4. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	10:10 am
5. Ten minute break		10:20 am
6. Discussion and feedback on expedited projects (cont'd)	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	10:30 am
7. Update from Subgroup 1: a. Modeling b. Concept-level projects c. Process map	Jim Feild – Wood Brian Hamrick – Wood Hannah Albertus-Benham – Wood Shalene Thomas – Wood	
8. Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	
9. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	11:50 am

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement  
Government and 3M Working Group Meeting  
June 19, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Kevin Chapdelaine	Jim Kotsmith
Jeff Dionisopoulos	Kirk Koudelka
Shann Finwall	Jennifer Levitt
Bart Fischer	David Patton
Kristina Handt	Jess Richards
Chris Hartzell	Monica Stiglich
Lowell Johnson	

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 yesterday's Citizen-Business Group meeting. First, Monica noted that there was an in-depth discussion on the expedited project proposals and an acknowledgment that this could be setting precedent for the bigger projects later on. Monica also mentioned that one work group member announced that the Minnesota Water Well Association is holding a half-day seminar on Minnesota's private water systems. The seminar will be held at Cottage Grove City Hall on August 9th from 8:30 am to 1 pm. Kevin added that there was discussion regarding whether some of the projects met the criteria of being expedited.

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

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) noted that the Co-Trustees (MPCA and DNR) 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 or the May 29<sup>th</sup> meeting. No members had questions.

### **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.

### **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
- 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). There was a question regarding the feasibility studies that were proposed as expedited projects and what would happen if they were not funded through the expedited process. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) replied that the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan is looking at long-term options and there could be other mechanisms to fund these types of studies (if not funded under the expedited process).

### **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 service delivery modeling effort (community model). Brian noted that the drinking water models are 90-95% complete. Currently, Wood

is quality checking (QCing) 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.

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. The work group members acknowledged that these meetings were very valuable. One work group member suggested that there is a group meeting for the rural water communities to collectively discuss options.

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 Government and 3M Working Group meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 17<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.

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) suggested upcoming agenda topics could include an update on Project 1007, a discussion on HBVs by state, and a discussion on the criteria document. The work group members were asked if they had additional agenda items to request. No additional meeting topics were raised.

One work group member noted that MDH submitted an application to conduct a PFAS study to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). If approved, this would be separate funding from the 2018 Settlement Agreement.

### **Public Comments and Questions**

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One member of the public provided more information on his proposed expedited project. Another member of the public asked about costs that would be passed onto the homeowner. One work group member asked about how the state is going to engage the communities on the scoring and weighting of criteria.