

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

Agenda for Government and 3M Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, October 16, 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 the draft Priority 1 criteria evaluation framework
- 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. Email update follow-up c. Other questions?	Kirk Koudelka – MPCA Jess Richards – DNR	
3. Project 1007 update	Gary Krueger – MPCA	
4. Priority 1 criteria and draft evaluation framework: discussion on feedback	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	
5. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	10:30 am
6. Ten minute break		10:40 am
7. Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP) update a. Final conceptual project list b. Scenario development c. Modeling	Erin Daugherty – Wood Brian Hamrick – Wood	10:50 am
8. October public meeting materials	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates	
9. Next steps: upcoming activities and tasks, future meetings, and agenda items to request	Terill Hollweg – Abt Associates Milt Thomas – MPCA	
10. Public comments and questions	Milt Thomas – MPCA	11:50 am

Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

Government and 3M Working Group Meeting

October 16, 2019 - Meeting Notes

Group members in attendance:

Kevin Chapdelaine	Jim Kotsmith
Bart Fischer	Kirk Koudelka
Clint Gridley	Jennifer Levitt
Kristina Handt	Ron Moorse
Chris Hartzell	David Patton
Greg Johnson	Jess Richards
Lowell Johnson	Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- 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 Jess Richards (DNR) welcomed the work group.

Updates and follow-up

Monica Stiglich and Kevin Chapdelaine (liaisons) provided a report-out from yesterday's October Citizen-Business Group meeting. First, Monica provided an overview of key topics discussed, including:

- Spending more money now on capital costs vs. long-term operations and maintenance
- Feedback on the public meeting posters
- Project 1007 and what would happen if other sources were identified.

Kevin provided a few additional notes. First, he mentioned that there was a discussion on treating to non-detect and how that factors into spending decisions. Second, he noted that there was a difference of opinion on how to incorporate LGU support into evaluating and selecting projects.

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

- Whether the revised well factsheet was considered final. Kirk responded that it was.

- Additional clarification on treating to non-detect. There was discussion that there are two components to this – what areas you treat and what levels you treat to.

Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) also reminded the work group of the public meetings that are planned for next week.

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 about continued releases from existing sites. Gary noted that part of the study is to look at this, see if it is occurring, and, if so, what can be done about it. Another work group member asked to be informed if there is additional sampling within their community. There was also a discussion about differences in transport between wet periods and dry periods.

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
- What happens after the co-Trustees’ develop their recommendation.

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 work group member noted that it has been challenging to not be able to share information on the expedited projects, and asked

whether the agencies have thought about potential ways to share information on projects moving forward. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) responded that they have discussed this and will continue to look into it.

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.

There was a discussion on treating to non-detect levels and what this means. MDH noted that one PFAS compound, PFBA, is smaller and typically breaks through first. Given this, and that it's generally ubiquitous in the environment, they don't usually use this compound as a treatment objective.

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.

One work group member asked about the refinements Wood is making to the groundwater model. Another work group member asked about the resolution of the drinking water system model.

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:

- The community specific posters may be too detailed – suggest keeping the options higher-level
- Include a poster that provides an overview of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan and the general process that's being used to develop the plan
- Refine the map so the legend is clear
- Provide background information on PFAS, health-based values, and well advisories in the East Metropolitan Area
- Provide background information on the communities.

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 20, 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.