

**Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement
Government and 3M Working Group Meeting
September 18, 2019 Meeting Notes**

Group members in attendance:

Ryan Burfeind	Lowell Johnson
Kevin Chapdelaine	Kirk Koudelka
Shann Finwall	Ron Moore
Bart Fischer	Jess Richards
Clint Gridley	Monica Stiglich
Kristina Handt	Jessica Stolle
Chris Hartzell	Chris Bryan

Presenters:

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

Updates and Follow-up

Kevin Chapdelaine and Monica Stiglich (liaisons) provided a report-out from the Citizen-Business Group meeting from the day before. First, Monica noted that one key issue was the size of the conceptual project list and its redundancies. She said it may be easiest for each work group member to look at the projects unique to their community. Kevin noted there were also discussions about reaching non-detect PFAS levels in all water systems. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) encouraged work group members to meet with their representatives from the other working groups.

Conceptual Drinking Water Supply Plan (CDWSP) 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 local government units (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).

Erin presented an example conceptual project summary for one of the communities. Each summary provides information on the community and the conceptual project list.

The work group members did not seem to have problems accessing SharePoint, but only a few members had a chance to look at the list ahead of the meeting. Erin asked the work group members to speak with Carson Smith (Wood) regarding SharePoint issues.

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:

- One work group member asked about the duplication in the conceptual project 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.
- One work group member asked about projects that many LGUs considered not feasible (e.g., surface water use) and whether it is worth keeping them on the list. Erin explained the list was comprehensive and each project would be analyzed to an extent, with the decisions documented on whether it would be considered further or not. Another work group member expressed interest to explore surface water as an option for their community.

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:

- Looking at surface water to recharge aquifers
- Looking at groundwater sustainability
- Looking at a variety of options and water sources
- Better refining and summarizing the conceptual project list. Erin encouraged members to look at the project summaries for a more narrative perspective of the project options.
- Using GIS maps and overlays to present projects
- Looking at the feasibility of surface water where it makes sense
- Considering project complexity and cost
- Removing projects that aren't feasible/applicable

There was also a question on how to consider/cover future development.

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 member of the public noted she had attended the recent Senate hearings on PFAS in Washington, DC. She explained Minnesota was of interest at those meetings, and noted other states now have PFAS health levels lower than Minnesota.

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 +/O/- 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 suggested that a trial run be conducted to see how the criteria are applied to an example scenario. Another work group member thought Criteria 19 and 20 should be given a higher priority.

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 16, 2019.

Work group members expressed the importance of public outreach ahead of the public meetings.

Public comments and questions

Members of the public were given the opportunity to ask questions. One MDH staff member noted that he thought the criteria related to unintended adverse health impacts should be considered at a scenario-level within the draft evaluation framework.