

# Minnesota 3M PFC Settlement

## Notes for Technical Subgroup 1 Meeting

Wednesday, October 20, 2021

1 – 4 p.m.

Virtual Webex meeting

### Group members in attendance

- Brian Bachmeier
- Brian Davis
- Dan DeRudder
- Gary Krueger
- Greg Johnson
- Jim Westerman
- Jon Herdegen
- Karla Peterson
- Marian Appelt
- Paul Schoenecker
- Richard Thron
- Stephanie Souter
- Stu Grubb

### Presenters

- Gary Krueger, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- Mark Lorie, Abt Associates

### Welcome

Mark Lorie (Abt Associates) welcomed Subgroup 1 members to the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to provide Subgroup 1 members an opportunity to ask questions about the grant process and the online grant form. Gary Krueger (MPCA) also welcomed the subgroup and provided some brief updates:

1. The State has hosted and attended public meetings since the release of the Plan. On October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2021, the Co-Trustees presented to West Lakeland Township residents.
2. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency recently released a national PFAS testing strategy to learn more about PFAS. The details of the strategy and other EPA PFAS documents are [available online](#).

### Open Forum Discussion

Mark and Gary facilitated discussion on the Plan and the current online grant form for the planning and design phase of projects included in the Final Plan. Key discussion topics included:

1. **Locating the grant application.** One subgroup member stated it was difficult to find the online grant application. The form is available on the 3M Settlement website: <https://3msettlement.state.mn.us/investing-east-metro-drinking-water>
2. **The grant approval process timeline.** One subgroup member asked how long it would take the State agencies to approve grants. Gary explained that the timeline is dependent on the size and scope of each project. While the State will be using contractors and internal staff to review grant requests, it could take 4-6 weeks or more to approve larger projects. The level of detail the communities can provide may also affect the timeline. The approval process may move faster if internal staff and Co-Trustees have

fewer questions on the grant materials submitted. It may assist the process if the community can meet with the State as they fill out the application, and if the community provides robust details within their grant application.

3. **A subgroup member asked if they could have confirmation from the State that their grant application is under review.** Marks said that the State would add an additional step in their workflow to send confirmation emails to the communities that submit grant applications.
4. **Communities will move forward on different timelines.** One subgroup member explained that they had not looked at the grant application yet and will not for another few months. They explained that their community is currently working on their city capital improvement plan. The community is currently identifying funding sources and undergoing necessary community outreach and approval steps. This process will continue for the next few months and then they will be able to utilize the grant application.
5. **The grant application identification number.** The grant form requests submitters to enter a grant number if the current application is a continuation of a previous project funded by the State. This allows the State to better track funding through a project's life cycle. One subgroup member pointed out that some communities have multiple grant agreements with the State (e.g., Woodbury has grant agreements from purchasing land under the Settlement and building a temporary treatment system). They asked if the State has a preference on which past grant agreement identification number they use. Gary explained that land purchases are a singular event and any building or design that occurs on the purchased property would be completely separate. He reiterated that if communities have questions when filling out the grant application, they should contact the State, who will help clarify and answer questions.
6. **Future technology.** One subgroup member asked when the State would reject or approve ion exchange (IX) as a technology to remove PFAS from drinking water. They explained that the decision to approve IX could influence how their community designs their projects and encouraged the State to inform communities of their decision as soon as possible. Gary explained that the State expects the final report on the IX pilot study in early 2022 and will share it with communities at that time.