

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
 Agenda for Citizen-Business Group Meeting

Tuesday, October 15, 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 the draft Priority 1 criteria evaluation framework
- Clearly identify next steps.

1. Welcome	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR Milt Thomas – MPCA	1:00 pm / 10 min
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 / 10 min
3. Project 1007 update	Gary Krueger – MPCA	1:20 pm / 10 min
4. Priority 1 criteria and draft evaluation framework: discussion on feedback	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	1:30 pm / 60 min
5. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	2:30 pm / 10 min
6. Ten minute break		2:40 pm / 10 min
7. Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP) update a. Final conceptual project list b. Scenario development c. Modeling	Erin Daugherty – Wood Brian Hamrick – Wood	2:50 pm / 20 min
8. October public meeting materials	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	3:10 pm / 30 min
9. Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	3:40 pm / 10 min
10. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	3:50 pm / 10 min

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

Citizen-Business Group Meeting

October 15, 2019 - Meeting Notes

Group members in attendance:

Julie Bunn	Jack Lavold
Kevin Chapdelaine	Michael Madigan
Steve Colvin	Jess Richards
Jeff Holtz	Amy Schall
Steven Johnson	Dave Schulenberg
Kirk Koudelka	Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Steve Colvin and Jess Richards, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Gary Krueger, DNR
- Erin Daugherty, Wood
- Brian Hamrick, Wood
- Hannah Albertus-Benham, Wood
- Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Milt Thomas, facilitator, MPCA

Welcome

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) and Steve Colvin (DNR) welcomed the work group.

Updates and follow-up

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) reminded the work group of the public meetings planned for next week. One work group member asked about the format of the public meetings. Kirk responded that the meetings are intended to be more informational, with an open house at the beginning of the meeting, then a presentation by Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) on PFAS in drinking water and an update on well testing, followed by a presentation by MPCA and DNR on the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan and what's coming up next.

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

- A discussion by the work group members on whether surface water is a viable option for the communities. While some members thought this option should be removed, others thought that it was a potential option for their community and should continue to be considered at this time.
- An interest to refine the conceptual project list to make it more manageable and efficient to review (e.g., removing duplicate projects).
- A discussion of PFAS health-based values of other states, and treating all water supplies vs. only those above health-based values.

- A discussion of the Priority 1 criteria evaluation framework. It was suggested to test the framework with a hypothetical project. There was also the recommendation that criteria #19 and #20 should be a higher priority.
- A discussion of public water systems and private wells, and the costs and benefits of the different options.

Monica provided a few additional notes. First, she noted that the work group members did a similar break out session to review the conceptual project list to determine if any projects were missing. As a follow-up, it was suggested that the work group and Subgroup 1 members from the same community meet to review the list together. Second, she noted that she used the evaluation framework to evaluate some example projects.

The work group members asked a few follow-up questions, including:

- Whether the revised well factsheet was considered final. Kirk noted that much of the language in the factsheet is already being included in the contracts moving forward for the expedited projects.
- What would happen if a house does not connect during a neighborhood hook-up as identified in the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan? The revised well factsheet specifies it's the Co-Trustee's expectation that after two years, residents who do not connect to a public water system will assume all costs for granular activated carbon (GAC) maintenance. Kirk also noted that they are working with the Minnesota Association of Realtors to refine their questionnaire to make sure information on well testing is properly disclosed.

Project 1007 update

Gary Krueger (MPCA) provided an update on Project 1007. This project is included in the 2018 Settlement, which states: "the MPCA shall conduct a source assessment and feasibility study regarding the role of the Valley Branch Water District's project known as Project 1007 in the conveyance of PFCs in the environment." To conduct this study, MPCA has retained AECOM and is also coordinating efforts with Valley Branch and MDH.

Gary discussed PFAS transport pathways in the East Metropolitan Area, and provided an overview of Project 1007 and an update on the source assessment investigation progress. To date, a baseline sampling event was conducted in August 2019, with results expected by the end of October. Future efforts will include an additional sampling event in November/December 2019, focused site investigations in Spring/Summer 2020, and the development of a conceptual site model for the Project 1007 area.

One work group member asked how the study will be affected if other sources of PFAS are identified. Gary noted that the study was agreed to in the 2018 Settlement, so the study would proceed as planned. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) also noted that they did an extensive look at other potential sources already, but if they do find the possibility of other sources, the MPCA will look into it.

Priority 1 criteria and draft evaluation framework: discussion of feedback

Terill Hollweg (Abt) discussed the feedback on the draft Priority 1 criteria evaluation framework. This draft evaluation framework was developed to support the evaluation of the scenarios and to inform the co-Trustees' good/better/best scenario recommendation. The draft evaluation framework was presented to the work groups during last month's meeting, and circulated to the work groups for further review and feedback.

The work group members discussed a number of topics, including:

- How to incorporate local government unit (LGU) support
- Treating all water supplies vs. only those above health-based values

- Treating to non-detect
- Allocating funds for capital costs vs. operations and maintenance costs
- How to consider future population growth and development
- How to incorporate the potential for unintended adverse health impacts.

The revised framework will be shared with the work group members next month and discussed at the November work group meetings.

Public comments and questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One member of the public had a question regarding how the State may go about identifying different sources of PFAS. Kirk explained a statewide pilot project at MPCA is currently working to inventory potential PFAS sources in the state.

Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan update and discussion

Final conceptual project list

Erin Daugherty (Wood) provided an update on the conceptual project list. Following the last meeting, Wood has (1) updated the conceptual project memorandums; and (2) finalized and distributed the conceptual project list. Changes to the conceptual project list included removing duplicate projects and adding two new conceptual projects. Erin then presented an overview of the projects by (1) community; (2) source – Wood/LGU-projects or online submittals; and (3) scale – individual, neighborhood, municipal, and regional.

Scenario development and modeling

Brian Hamrick (Wood) discussed the next steps for the development of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. Now that the conceptual project list has been finalized, the conceptual projects are being grouped into four scenarios, including (1) community-specific; (2) regional supply; (3) treatment; and (4) integrated. Over the next two months, Wood will evaluate the scenarios using their drinking water system and groundwater models. As part of this, Wood is meeting with the LGUs to discuss the scenario groupings and ensure they are appropriately modeling the drinking water supply infrastructure. A progress update will be provided in November to the work groups and Subgroup 1. Brian also shared a preliminary map of one community that included drinking water supply infrastructure, well advisories, and potential projects.

Hannah Albertus-Benham (Wood) then provided an update on the groundwater model. Wood has drafted the conceptual site model, and shared it with MPCA and DNR for review. Model construction is anticipated to be finished by the end of October. Model calibration is anticipated to be finished by mid-November and ready for running the scenarios.

There was a discussion about the components and capabilities of the models.

October public meeting materials

Terill Hollweg (Abt) discussed the format of the public meetings that are planned for next week, and asked the work group members for input on the draft posters that are proposed to be shared. After the work group members reviewed the posters, they provided the following comments:

- Refine the map so the legend is clear
- Include a poster that shows PFAS concentrations in the East Metropolitan Area
- Include a poster that shows the grouping of projects by the four scenarios
- Include a poster that shows the general process that's being used to develop the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan

- Provide additional handouts, such as an overview of PFAS, the State's health-based values, and key websites for more information.

One work group member suggested to circulate the draft posters via email to the work group members for additional feedback.

Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request

Terill Hollweg (Abt) presented upcoming steps and deadlines, including:

- If interested, work group members can participate in LGU and Wood meetings to discuss the scenarios (October/November)
- Draft chapters 4-6 of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan will be distributed in November for work group review and discussed at the November meeting
- The revised Priority 1 criteria evaluation framework will be distributed in November for work group review and discussed at the November meeting.

The next work group meeting will be held on November 19, 2019.

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 - 10/16/19

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

3] Project 1007 update: Question – Is PFAS still leaking from either of the two dump sites? Staff response – As far as they know, No.

4] Priority 1 criteria and draft evaluation framework: Discussion and feedback - An extensive discussion on the two questions below ensued.

Should the criteria require affected LGU approval for each scenario put forth by the trustees?

Should criteria line items 18,19 and 20 be upgraded to a medium or high priority?

There was general agreement on the importance of requiring LGU approval for all scenario's put forth by the trustees, and also on the importance of recognizing the Comp Plan development efforts of each community and the ultimate approval of neighboring communities, Washington County and Met Council of these plans. Opinions differed on if upgrading the priority of lines 18,19 and 20 would be necessary but again the importance of these line items was agreed upon.

Line item 7 discussion: It was reiterated and agreed upon that new development should pay for itself and settlement dollars should not be used to defer any new development costs.

Line item 11 discussion: Equity discussion lead to this question – Considering the many unknowns and with the importance of long term planning in mind, should we treat all water in South Washington County regardless of detect levels? The support of this idea grew during the discussion and I'm sure the discussion will continue.

Open question: Is staff considering seeking legislative changes or exemptions to current data privacy law to allow public disclosure of projects being considered before their approval? Discussion on the problems being caused by current data privacy law ensued. Staff's response – Yes, they will look into the options on this question.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine