

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Citizen-Business Group Meeting
September 17, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Julie Bunn	Steven Johnson
Kevin Chapdelaine	Kirk Koudelka
Steve Colvin	Jack Lavold
David Filipiak	Michael Madigan
Bob Fossum	Barbara Ronningen
Jeff Holtz	Dave Schulenberg
Mark Jenkins	Monica Stiglich

Presenters:

- Kirk Koudelka, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Steve Colvin, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Erin Daugherty, Wood
- Brian Hamrick, Wood
- Terill Hollweg, Abt Associates (Abt)
- Karla Peterson, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH)
- Milt Thomas, facilitator, MPCA

Welcome

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

Updates and Follow-up

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

- The expedited project list and when the approved projects will be shared with the work group members.
- The water supply improvement option related to the treatment and reuse of 3M containment water. The work group members thought this option should continue to be considered, and there is a need to look at the pros and cons of this option.
- A concern by one work group member that the list of water supply improvement options still included options that were not considered feasible by the local government unit (LGU). Wood explained that the list was a high-level screen, and there would be further evaluation of the conceptual projects later on.
- A desire to treat all water supplies to non-detect PFAS level.
- Whether the co-Trustees could move funds from Priority 2 (natural resources) to Priority 1 (drinking water). Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) explained the Settlement does not allow money to be reallocated in this way.

Monica noted that the work group members had questions about the 10 water supply improvement options and whether they were presented previously. She reviewed the presentations from previous

meetings, and found that the list of water supply improvement options was presented and discussed during the February meeting and included in presentations in April and May.

Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan update and discussion

Conceptual project list

Erin Daugherty (Wood) explained the process for developing the draft conceptual project list. There were three primary steps to this process, including: (1) Wood developing preliminary conceptual project summaries based on discussions with LGUs; (2) Wood meeting with Subgroup 1 members to discuss the preliminary conceptual project summaries; and (3) Receiving additional project ideas from the public, work group members, and Subgroup 1 members via an online portal. Once compiled, Wood distributed the draft conceptual project list to the work groups and Subgroup 1 via SharePoint for review. This list included all potential projects (none were eliminated at this point).

The work group members expressed concern that (1) they had trouble accessing SharePoint, and (2) they did not have adequate time to review the list before the meeting. Erin asked the work group members to speak with Carson Smith (Wood) regarding SharePoint issues. One work group member asked if future emails could clearly indicate in the subject line the contents of the message.

Erin presented the conceptual project list by (1) Source – Wood-submitted (which incorporated discussions with LGUs) or online-submitted; (2) Scale – regional, municipal, neighborhood, or individual; (3) Community; and (4) Water supply improvement option. Erin also presented the categories of potential conceptual projects, including: (1) Individuals on private wells and neighborhoods; (2) Local municipal; (3) Small-scale regional; and (4) Large-scale regional. She also described five projects that did not fit into any of the above categories.

Work group members provided a number of thoughts and comments, including:

- There were concerns about the redundancy in the list. Erin explained that Wood listed some projects multiple times if they were addressing multiple communities. But, they will consider a better way to present the project list in the future.
- It was noted that the nomenclature was confusing, and a suggestion was made to develop a glossary of common terms.
- There were questions about the different categories of projects.
- There was a discussion about the final decision-makers. It was noted that Wood is focusing on the technical aspects of the potential projects at this time.

Small break-out groups

The work group members broke into two groups and were asked to consider three questions: (1) Do the conceptual projects meet your expectations? (2) Are there projects that are missing that should be considered? (3) Are there any projects you are reconsidering?

The work group members provided feedback after the small group discussions, including:

- The importance of coordinating with Subgroup 1 and LGU representatives
- Looking at projects at the scenario-level to see how they are packaged
- Better summarizing and presenting the list of conceptual projects, such as reducing redundancy, summarizing by community, etc.
- Continuing to look at regional options at this point

- The importance of documenting decisions, such as why projects were eliminated or not considered feasible
- Addressing factual mistakes in the project list (Wood will go through the project list again and clean-up)
- Looking at treatment on all systems, both private and public.

Erin then showed work group members how to access the project summaries on the SharePoint site and walked through one as an example. Each summary provides information on the community and the conceptual project list.

Comments on the conceptual project list (including additional project ideas) should be sent to pfcinfo.pca@state.mn.com by September 25, 2019. The goal is to have a final list by the end of the month.

Next steps

Brian Hamrick (Wood) discussed next steps on the development of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan. Once the conceptual project list is finalized, the conceptual projects will be grouped into four scenarios: (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 and groundwater models. As part of this, Wood will meet with the LGUs to ensure they are appropriately modeling the drinking water supply infrastructure. Wood will also develop costs for each scenario. These results will inform the preliminary results summary developed in December. The work groups, Subgroup 1, and the public will be given the opportunity to review the preliminary results summary in January and February 2020. The Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan is anticipated to be finalized in March 2020.

Public comments and questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One public commenter appreciated the discussion on documentation.

Priority 1 criteria draft evaluation framework for scenarios

Terill Hollweg (Abt) discussed the draft framework for evaluating the scenarios using the established Priority 1 criteria. These criteria were classified into four general categories, including: focus, implementation, cost, and other/acceptance. Terill noted that of the 20 criteria that were originally developed, some criteria were considered not applicable at the scenario-level. In addition, some criteria were identified as more important than others based on the November 2018 work group survey, and thus given a higher priority in the draft framework.

Terill walked through the draft evaluation framework, which included the following steps: (1) For each scenario, a rank of +/0/- will be applied to each of the applicable criteria based on a set rubric. (2) The rankings will then be compiled and summarized for each scenario. (3) The co-Trustees will consider the ranking and relative priority of the criteria to inform the good/better/best scenario recommendations. The co-Trustees may also consider other factors in making their final recommendation.

The work group members encouraged the co-Trustees to identify all potential factors before the evaluation begins. There was also a discussion about how the framework will evaluate future growth and the treatment of all water supplies, and the possibility of splitting criteria if they're capturing too many components. Work group members were encouraged to submit their comments on the ranking of the criteria to ensure their ideas were captured.

Comments on the framework should be submitted via an online survey by September 30, 2019. Work group feedback will be discussed in more detail at the October work group meeting.

Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) update

Karla Peterson (MDH) provided an update on the MDH health study and well factsheet.

MDH health study

MDH has not yet been informed if their MDH health study was funded. However, if they are awarded, they can provide an update at one of the next meetings. MDH also developed a factsheet on the study which can be found on the MDH website:

<https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/environment/hazardous/docs/pfas/pfashealthimp.pdf>.

Well factsheet

MDH developed a draft factsheet on the costs and benefits of private well owners connecting to a public water supply system. The factsheet addresses both financial benefits and costs as well as non-financial benefits and costs.

Work group members provided comments and questions on the factsheet. Additional comments and questions should be emailed to Karla Peterson within the next two weeks.

Other water system examples

Terill Hollweg (Abt) discussed the list of other water system examples that was circulated before the meeting. Some of the examples had already been presented to the work group previously. There were no comments or questions from the work group on the other water system examples.

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

Terill Hollweg (Abt) presented upcoming steps and deadlines:

- Conceptual project list: provide feedback by September 25th
- Priority 1 criteria evaluation framework: provide feedback by September 30th
- If interested, participate in LGU and Wood meetings to review infrastructure for scenario modeling (October/November)
- Chapters 4-6 of the Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan: distribute for review during the end of October
- Public meetings: October 22nd and 24th

The next work group meeting will be held on October 15, 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

9/18/19

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

3] CDWSP update and discussion: Question – Is a surface water supply plan a viable option for South Washington County communities? And should surface water plans stay on the list as possible options moving forward? An argument was then made to drop surface water as an option. But many communities objected, some communities may benefit from a surface water supply plan in the future and some are using surface water presently.

There was interest among many communities' representatives to pare down the project list from 168 projects to a much more manageable and efficient level. Staff reiterated that this is the process and the number of potential projects will drop significantly as the process moves forward.

Conversation on PFAS HBV's in other states and how this may affect our projects final design. Discussed HBV's vs No Detect values.

6] Priority 1 criteria draft evaluation framework for scenarios: Suggestion – We should “test drive” the criteria framework with hypothetical projects to see how the system preforms and adjust as needed. Staff agreed this may be a good idea.

Concern was mentioned that items 19 and 20 are listed as a low priority, one community objected. Staff showed data from last years questionnaire to support their listing the priorities as they did.

7] MDH update: Conversation about the costs and benefits of CPWS vs PWS. Some communities took issue with MDH's reported costs. The possible unplanned costs of PWS [well failure etc.] were also discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin Chapdelaine