

Inver Grove Heights Environmental Advisory Commission
8150 Barbara Avenue
Thursday, August 24, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order

The Environmental Advisory Commission of Inver Grove Heights met in City Council Chambers on Thursday, August 24, 2023. Chair Sara Goodman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: Chair Sara Goodman; Commissioners: Nichole Boehmke, Nick Ruiz, Ted Trenzeluk, George Fell, Marjorie Savage, Kevin Sethre, Brian Barner, Patti Mikulski
Environmental Specialist Ally Sutherland

Also Present: Aaron Janusz, Environmental Manager, Pine Bend Landfill

Absent:

3. Presentations

A. Operational and Gas Migration Updates at Pine Bend Landfill

Aaron Janusz, Environmental Manager, Pine Bend Landfill, provided the following presentation:

Pine Bend Team:

Katie Lindholm, Operation Manager
Ross Ziegenhagen, Operations Supervisor
Megan Goldstein, Environmental Specialist

The landfill has 8 Operators, 1 Mechanic, 3 Scalehouse/Lab/Laborers

Consultants: Ethan Ketelsen and Tom Schuster from Stantec

Landfill History/Development:

- Municipal Solid Waste Landfill (MPCA Permit - SW-45)
- License and Host Agreement with Dakota County
- Agreements with the City of Inver Grove Heights:
 - Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
 - Non-Conditional Use Permit (NCUC)
 - Host Agreement
- Landfill began in September 1971
 - Vertical expansion - 2005 and 2019

Landfill Information:

- 358 acres
- Permitted landfill: 192 acres
- Current footprint: 188.9 acres
- Final cover area: 23 acres
- 1,300 tons of MSW (municipal solid waste) is brought in per day
- 3,000 cubic feet per minute of landfill gas
 - RNG Plant (Renewable Natural Gas)
- 10,000,000 gallons of leachate per year
 - Leachate is water that has made its way down through the landfill to the bottom.
 - Collected and pumped through on-site storage tanks.

- Hauled out to MCES (Metropolitan Council Environmental Services) Plant in St. Paul for treatment and then out to the Mississippi River once clean.

Landfill Cross Sections:

- Bottom Liner, layer of clay, 60 mil geosynthetic liner, 1 foot of sand, gas wells.
- Groundwater protection (groundwater wells) monitored 3 times a year per MPCA permit.
- Landfills are designed to shed stormwater.

Project Updates:

- Phase 6A Cell Construction - Sideslope Expansion
- Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) Plant - Opal (Formerly Fortistar)
- Vertical Expansion (application was submitted to expand the landfill vertically)
- Gas Migration

Cell Construction Cell 6A:

- Changed the access road. New cell is in the old road footprint. The road was shifted to the west side of the landfill.
- Building slideslope cells
 - 1st step is to strip soil off the top to get to clay
 - GCL is placed on top of the clay (clay substitute, fabric)
 - On top of that 60 mil is placed
 - 2 are being built
 - Construction started in May, close to completion

Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) Plant:

- Opal Fuels is the plant owner/operator. Built in 2022.
- Moved the flare, it should not be running. When the flare is running it means the natural gas plant is not working correctly.
- Cleaning up the gas to make it pipeline quality
- 6.3 million gasoline gallons equivalent of RNG per year
- Saving 44,000 tons of Carbon Monoxide per year

Vertical Expansion:

- Application was submitted to the MPCA on June 2, 2022
 - Copies were provided to the City of IGH and Dakota County
- Expansion is to maximize the existing footprint as much as possible; vertically, about 85 feet higher in the middle of the landfill
- Provides 8.2 million cubic yards of additional airspace, 10-12 years of life
- Draft Environmental Assessment Worksheet was submitted to the MPCA

Commissioner Trenzeluk asked if the 10-12 years of life starts today or the current life.

Mr. Janusz replied the site would be full in 4-5 years if they do not receive the expansion. This would be another 10-12 years on top of that.

Commissioner Sethre asked if this was currently permitted.

Mr. Janusz replied as currently permitted, there is 4-5 years of life left.

Commissioner Fell mentioned the current closing date was going to be 2024. He said it seems they were talking about 20-30 years with the current volume coming in. The volume varies year by year. He said he looked at the MPCA Draft Policy Plan, all 7 County Master Plans have Pine Bend as the landfill they would use. He asked what the date would be assuming they receive the expansion. He questioned

if they take the numbers from the landfill or numbers the state recommends. He noted the four previous expansion timeframes keep moving backwards and forwards. He asked if there was ever going to be an end date.

Mr. Janusz replied the vertical expansion is over the existing liner/footprint. Nothing would be built to put volume in. The expansion allows for flexibility and the ability to manage increases or decreases. Regarding an end date, it would be until there is a true alternative for managing waste.

Mr. Janusz discussed Vertical Expansion:

- An Environmental Review is done by the MPCA consisting of a worksheet addressing:
 - Impacts to air, water, community, traffic.
 - Public comment period out on the EAW (Environmental Assessment Worksheet) by the end of September.
- Permit and Application submitted to the MPCA. Barr Engineering is reviewing.
- Once the EAW is done and approved, the city and county take review of the application.
- City process would begin with two reviews by the EAC, two by the Planning Commission, and three times before the City Council. This process begins at the beginning of the year.
- Three approvals are required (city, county, and the MPCA).
- Certificate of Need (CON). Demonstrate there is a need for the airspace.

Gas Migration: The concentration of any explosive gas must not exceed its lower explosion limit at the property boundary or 25% of its lower explosion limit in and around facility structures or any other on-site monitoring point.

- Do not want to see anything greater than 5% methane at landfill boundaries
 - This is done by having a gas collection system
 - Gas monitoring probes are used to monitor
- Probe Monitoring
 - 39 probes
 - Probes with exceedances are monitored monthly
 - There are historical exceedances on the east, south, and west side of the landfill
 - Unlined area. Narrow buffer area.
 - Working with the MPCA and the city
 - Off-site work has been done. Building monitors are in all on site buildings and at the Recycling Center next door.
- Source Controls (Keeping gas inside of the landfill)
 - 230 collection points (gas wells, horizontals, leachate risers)
 - In 2022 and 2023: putting in additional gas wells, redrilling wells, dewater wells
- Phase 6 Slideslope Expansion
 - Additional liner/cover and gas wells
- IGH CUP (Conditional Use Permit)
 - Complete by January 1, 2025
 - Annual updates to the Environmental Commission
 - Progress reports annually
 - City review and comments on work plans and reports
 - Finalizing the latest work plan and report. Will be finished early next week.
- Timeline:

August 24, 2023

- 2006 Geoprobe investigation. No detections across the railroad tracks and recycling center
- 2012 Probe evacuation. Apply vacuum to two probes, no decrease in methane concentration
- 2013/2014 Geoprobe investigation. East and west side
- 2015 Geoprobe investigation and work plan. Proposed installation of a passive vent
- 2017 Passive vents and work plan. Turbines installed at MMP17
 - Probes with passive vents
 - Connect passive vents to a vacuum source and mini flare. Recommended use of a radon fan.
- 2022 Passive vent vacuum and geoprobe investigation
 - Installed radon fans on existing passive vents
 - Requires electricity. Only one location has electricity. Will place electrical hookups at all vents.

Not at 100% yet with cleanup. Electricity and additional vents should provide better data.

Commissioner Barner asked if there was a way to flare it.

Mr. Janusz replied there is not enough gas there to sustain a flare; there is no odor.

Mr. Janusz discussed Gas Migration – MMP25 Relocation:

- Moved further west. Everything is fine in this location.

Commissioner Trenzeluk questioned how Mr. Janusz felt with the way things were going.

Mr. Janusz replied they are on the right path. He believes they will have better results if consistently running the fans.

Commissioner Boehmke asked if other industries have been consulted regarding similar patterns.

Mr. Janusz responded that they always speak with the MPCA who have noticed this at other similar type sites. Because those sites are not as large as Pine Bend, it will take more time.

Commissioner Fell stated methane gas coming off the landfill and diverted to the RNG plant has to be viable. The old part was shut down because it was not viable. He mentioned that the business is not a philanthropical company, they are in business to make a profit for shareholders.

Mr. Janusz replied it was not viable due to the price of electricity and two large turbines that were out of its life. He agreed they were in business to make a profit but also to serve the community and provide a safe place for waste to go until there were disincentives to put garbage in the landfill.

Commissioner Sethre stated the landfill generates revenue/income for the city by means of the Host City Fund. He was unsure how much it was. The VMCC has received approximately \$1 million dollars' worth of subsidy.

Commissioner Trenzeluk said if the landfill is closed down it would be a bad thing for all with waste having to be hauled elsewhere, hauling prices will go up. It is in the city's interest for the landfill to succeed.

Mr. Janusz said there are constraints; it is heavily regulated by the MPCA, city, and county.

Commissioner Fell mentioned the city will have that landfill in perpetuity. That is why there is a Host Community Fee, so it's to the benefit of the community. He said every generation coming out of the high school will live here and bring their own children here. It is important to recognize that and all of the requirements that go with it.

Mr. Janusz mentioned once they say they are done at Pine Bend, the cover would be put on and there would be a hill. They have at least a minimum of 30 years as a company to take care of it. At the end of 30 years if gas and leachate are still being collected, their company would still have to maintain it.

Commissioner Sethre questioned if the city would still receive funds once done.

Mr. Janusz replied minimum language is included. There is a per ton charge; a portion would go to the city, county, and state.

Commissioner Fell asked if they were still getting around 10 million gallons of leachate a year.

Mr. Janusz responded this year was higher due to a bad winter with record snow. It would be closer to 12 or 13 million gallons.

Commissioner Barner asked if there were plans for 30 years from now.

Mr. Janusz replied he has noticed former landfills with solar panels in the area.

Commissioner Ruiz asked if there has been any impact from the organics recycling being collected.

Mr. Janusz replied the organics space just opened. In a couple of years there may be less organics in the waste stream. Organics would drive landfill gas, there could be less gas over time.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of Minutes from the Thursday, July 27, 2023, Environmental Advisory Commission Meeting

Motion by Commissioner Boehmke, seconded by Commissioner Trenzeluk, to approve the minutes from Thursday, July 27, 2023, as submitted.

Ayes: 9

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

5. Regular Agenda

A. 2024 Environmental Advisory Commission Work Plan

Environmental Specialist Ally Sutherland presented on the 2024 Environmental Commission Work Plan. This is the Commission's 2nd Work Plan.

EAC Action Requested:

- Provide feedback on the draft 2024 EAC Work Plan

The 2023 and 2024 Work Plans are based off the duties of the Environmental Commission as defined in the city code. Duties include:

- A. Advise City Council on environmental issues
- B. Review land alteration permits and wetland replacement applications as they come in
- C. To review and advise Council on matters relating to landfills located in the city:

Environmental Advisory Commission Minutes

August 24, 2023

- a. Pine Bend Landfill
- b. Dawn Way Landfill (active)
- c. SKB Rich Valley Landfill (not active, actively permitted)
- D. Monitor, review, and make recommendations to the Council relative to aircraft noise
- E. Same as Item D. relating to the MSP Airport and aircraft noise
- F. To promote public awareness and understanding of local environmental issues

Background from the 2023 Work Plan Feedback:

- Helpful to City Council and staff to have awareness and general support of the work plan
- Staff from other departments had an opportunity to weigh in
- Align future work plans with the budget process (2025+). This begins around May.
- Assigned an EAC member to each item last year (some items did not need a representative)
- Receive City Council approval prior to the actual year
 - This year it was received in February of 2023
 - Bring before the City Council in November 2023

2023 Environmental Advisory Commission Work Plan:

1. Extend the Partners In Energy Memorandum of Understanding
2. Organics Drop Site (Opened in August)
 - a. Great turnout. Approximately 500 households have signed up since July 1st.
3. Join the SolSmart Program
 - a. Expect to see a city code update, Planning Commission will review
4. Business and Recognition Program (City Council approval was received)
 - a. Program will be opened in Spring 2024
 - b. Deadline for application would be on Earth Day, April 22nd
5. Continue to explore how the city can support Electric Vehicle readiness
 - a. Work with businesses and residents; education
 - b. Update city codes, internal operations

Draft 2024 Work Plan. Defines 2023 Environmental Priorities:

Goals were developed by staff based on:

- 2023 work plan progress
- Regional trends
- Community requests
- Existing city environmental programming
- Achievable by December 2024 with Environmental Specialist, EAC, and technical assistance

Next Steps:

- August 2023: EAC discussion on the 2024 Work Plan
- October 2023: Add additional details to the work plan
- November 2024: City Council agenda for approval and feedback
- January 2024: EAC begins work plan

Items that would be in the Work Plan (Draft):

1. Extending the MOU (done on an annual basis)
2. Sustainable IGH (recognition program)
3. Pollinator lawns and native landscaping
 - a. A state law was passed to allow property owners and occupants to be able to install and maintain managed natural landscapes. Effective July 1, 2023.

- b. Anticipating there to be conflicts with city code weed/lawn ordinance. Need to meet with staff regarding the city code.
 - c. Goal is to have a new ordinance by next spring.
 - d. How to educate residents on this topic.
- 4. Develop and support an annual litter cleanup event
 - a. Begins in 2025
 - b. City wide clean up event. Designated areas for groups to clean up.
 - c. Requires budget support (include in the budget process for next year)
- 5. Electronic Vehicle Readiness
- 6. Items related to the anticipated Pine Bend Landfill expansion request
- 7. Duties relating to the City Code

Commissioner Barner asked if there were any MS4 applications or wetlands coming up.

Specialist Sutherland replied no. There has not been any wetland applications. The only other item coming up would be regarding airport noise (presentation).

Commissioner Sethre referenced surface water handling and stormwater and asked if there have been any discussions.

Specialist Sutherland replied that is handled by the Public Works Engineering Department. She could get information from the department and get back to the Commission or could ask a staff member to present at an upcoming meeting.

Commissioner Sethre mentioned it was a big topic that could impact pavement management.

Specialist Sutherland recommended the Commission make a motion on this request. There could be questions as to how the Environmental Advisory Commission could support this.

Chair Goodman asked if that was something Dakota County Soil and Conservation would do.

Specialist Sutherland replied the Soil and Water Conservation District does public awareness programming. Engineering staff partners with those agencies.

Commissioner Fell mentioned the MPCA recently came out with a new plan geared towards watershed areas. The city watershed is split in two directions, the major portion is the Lower Mississippi watershed. He asked for interface with the Lower Mississippi and Eagan watersheds. He requested this because they have grant money and programs, it is something the city should be aware of and behind. He said there was reference to raingardens and encouraging them. Watershed districts are trying to encourage not having lawns but raingardens and no impervious surfaces for driveways. Grant money is available to encourage this. He requested seeing more input from them that could be passed on to residents. He said this goes to the Planning Commission because that is who developers go to. He suggested the EAC have involvement to let developers know of other things to take into account.

Commissioner Sethre agreed there needs to be education with developers. Developers are required to provide a certain amount of greenspace within the development.

Chair Goodman suggested Item #3 have the following additions: stormwater management, raingarden development, ways to improve the natural landscape, groundwater infiltration in a clean way, and native lawns. She said a part of this could be to bring in different organizations.

Specialist Sutherland suggested going back to the function of this Commission. Education to developers does not come at the Planning Commission level. By the time it gets to the Planning Commission it has had a site review process. There needs to be an understanding of what engineering staff and the Planning Commission are discussing with the applicant during site plan review.

Commissioner Fell mentioned if the Planning Commission was not aware of it, additional homes and businesses would still continue in that manner and follow normal procedures.

Specialist Sutherland replied if the application is per city code the Planning Commission cannot deny for any reason. She asked Commissioner Fell if his request was to update city ordinances to be more progressive in protecting stormwater.

Commissioner Fell asked if there could be dialog to let them know, from an environmental point of view, they would not suggest lawns and concrete driveways.

Specialist Sutherland questioned if Commissioner Fell's request was to update city code to reflect better stormwater practices.

Commissioner Fell's agreed.

Specialist Sutherland shared when an application comes into the city, it goes through a long staff and engineering review based off city code. If wanting to developers to implement better practices would be to update the city code.

Chair Goodman questioned why they would not be involved in major developments if the EAC's job is to review and advise the City Council on environmental issues. Developments should come before the Environmental Commission for a first review.

Specialist Sutherland was unsure what everyone knew about the existing development requirements. She said the northwest area has high stormwater standards.

Commissioner Sethre said when the northwest area was developed, stormwater fees were proposed to be higher than the rest of the city.

Commissioner Trenzeluk liked the Chair's recommendation that this discussion with raingardens and stormwater is included with the plan. He has a raingarden, it was funded by the city/county and is now a part of his deed which is a major turn off factor. He suggested it be explored. He suggests staying away from the ordinance and having this discussion captured in the bullet. He recommends there be an education component before changing ordinances.

Commissioner Sethre agreed.

Specialist Sutherland said she was not just talking about fees, but also development standards that have to be in place. There are higher standards and practices that developers need to follow in the northwest area. Other communities have restrictive or incentive based ordinances. She recommends the Commission become more aware of the stormwater space, learn about what is going on, and understand where the Environmental Commission can become involved and make recommendations. She suggested getting in touch with other boards such as the Lower Mississippi and the Soil and Conservation District.

Commissioner Fell would table the item because he thinks it would be beneficial to have someone in from the Lower Mississippi who would share what they are planning in surface water, surface water

impacts, and stormwater, such as state and federal impacts to the city. That information would allow the Commission to be better educated to make recommendations.

Specialist Sutherland said if a speaker were to come to an Environmental Commission Meeting, the Planning Commission could be invited to attend, or at least be made aware of it.

Chair Goodman suggested having the Parks Commission attend.

Specialist Sutherland agreed that could be another point, becoming more engaged with other Commissioners. She said it does not need to be in the work plan but could be a takeaway presented to the Council when this idea is brought forward.

Commissioner Fell referenced a paragraph stating staff time in the budget has already been established. He said a budget has already been submitted to the Council. He asked what happens if looking at the landfill and advice is needed from the University on emergent chemicals. They receive an honorarium for doing that. He felt it would be critical to have someone of that stature advise the Commission on how they could advise the City Council. He referenced the Non-Conforming Use of the landfill and asked what they could ask the landfill to do as far as additional requirements. He shared for example, that he wrote to the City Council regarding the forever chemical called PFAS. After 2 months he met with Engineering, the City Attorney, and staff members. He said Barr Engineering does an annual review of the landfill that includes a risk analysis of their financial standings. He suggested at that time, that Barr Engineering should be allowed to test for new chemicals coming out of the landfill. He asked if that was ever approved.

Specialist Sutherland replied it was approved.

Commissioner Fell said he would like access to experts when questions are asked of the landfill regarding safeguards in place, PFAS are a big one. He suggested when the Commission makes a request of Specialist Sutherland that it stays within her budget confines.

Specialist Sutherland replied that one portion of her job is to be the staff liaison for this Commission. Research is within her existing duties. She addressed speaker fees stating it could not be included at this time, but something to think about in the 2025 plan and budget process. She recommends instead of a Professor, the city continue to work with their hired consultants at Barr Engineering. Not all speakers require a fee, for example the city could invite other government entities like the county, or the MPCA.

Commissioner Fell said he would give the Commission the documentation he gathered if interested. He stressed the seriousness of forever chemicals as stated by the Minnesota Department of Health and the Pollution Control Agency which asked the legislature for more money to do risk analysis. He mentioned the landfill moved over 1.5 million tons of waste with one complaint. The complaint arrived because the Commission had people come in who specialize in future emissions coming out of the landfill, how they are identified, and how to address them.

Chair Goodman was concerned about new developments and invasive species such as Emerald Ash Trees. She requested having someone come in who looks at grants regarding this to speak about emerald ash borer, urban deforestation, and how the Commission could help. She said there was not much education about how much it would cost to treat the trees.

Specialist Sutherland replied treatment delays the inevitable. The waste industry has been talking about this too. Yard waste facilities were reaching capacity. She said Emerald Ash Borer Education could be added, staff could be invited to come and see how the Commission can help and support.

Commissioner Sethre mentioned that Brian Swoboda is the City Forester. This was a significant part of the Parks Commission because it affected a lot of trees within parks.

Chair Goodman suggested adding review of Right of Way requirements, what planting requirements are, and how that could be shared with residents.

She referenced bike trails and bikability because there is a lot more use of electric bicycles. She mentioned there is not a bike rack outside of City Hall or within the city in general.

Commissioner Boehmke requested information regarding Xcel Energy's MOU and what was achieved in the city last year. For example, if any of the 1 year plans were achieved, if all were longer than 1 year plans, and any rebates. She shared when Xcel Energy works with a city, MOU plans are laid out, if achieving a plan a bonus/rebate comes to the city.

Specialist Sutherland replied what was being referring to was not housed within the MOU. The MOU is more focused on community and business outreach and education. The Partners in Energy program provides the city with biannual data. She would present that information at an upcoming meeting.

Commissioner Fell referenced EV Electric Stations and what could be explored for the future. He asked if staff had any idea what the Commission should be exploring and how to advise/improve residents understanding about what is available within the city.

Specialist Sutherland responded that is a goal. It consists of letting the City Council know that the Environmental Commission is interested in the topic. It is up to staff to determine how the city can be involved. There are grants that can be looked into.

Chair Goodman mentioned annual litter cleanup could be done in the spring around Earth Day, and in the fall, around Inver Grove Heights Days.

Specialist Sutherland replied she would like to research dates to see what other communities have done. Others do it around Earth Day but the weather is always questionable around that time. She suggested looking into a different timeframe for better participation.

Specialist Sutherland summarized the Commission's suggestions:

- Stormwater education
 - Getting speakers to come in to educate the Commission
 - Inviting other Commissions to be a part of those discussions
- Inviting professional speakers (regardless of fee/no fee) to educate on topics
 - Such as landfill contamination, ground water contamination
 - Outside of existing advisors such as Barr Engineering and the state
- EAB (Emerald Ash Borer) Education
 - Park staff providing education to the Commission regarding possible involvement
- Bikeability
 - Bike friendly at City Hall and the VMCC (bike racks)

These items will be brought back to the Commission for final review in October.

B. Comments on Draft Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Policy Plan 2022-2042

Environmental Specialist Sutherland stated action by the EAC is to review and discuss the draft comments and consider recommending City Council approval. Additional comments will be noted as a separate recommendation.

Background:

- MPA prepares a Solid Waste Management Plan every six years
- Encompasses the 7 counties in the metro area
- Provides framework for solid waste management for the next 20 years
- 70 broad regional strategies
 - There are required strategies and optional strategies
 - Counties would develop their own plans incorporating the required/optional strategies
- Public comments are accepted by September 17th
- The city reviewed the MPCA solid waste plan
 - While keeping in mind an anticipated expansion and recent CON
- EAC and City Council reviews and approves
- Dakota County must update the Solid Waste Plan within 9 months
 - Cities will have an opportunity to be involved in stakeholder engagement and be more specific on optional strategies

Comments:

1. Define mandatory preprocessing (required strategy to establish mandatory preprocessing of waste by 2025)

Commissioner Sethre asked if looking for a clarified definition of mandatory preprocessing.

Specialist Sutherland replied landfilling is the least preferred disposal method. This is more focused on re-use and recycling/waste abatement. Due to that, they want to withdraw any useful material from the garbage.

Specialist Sutherland continued with Comments:

2. MPCA develop and require PFAS removal and treatment options at landfills
 - There are over 5,000+ of these human made chemicals
 - Invented in the 1930's
 - "Forever Chemicals"
 - Extremely resistant to degrading in the environment
 - Resistant to destruction in wastewater treatment plants, landfills, and incinerators
 - Bioaccumulation (within bodies, does not degrade, accumulates over time)
 - Still commonly used in the industry for water and grease resistance properties
 - Carpet, waterproof clothing, upholstery, food paper wrapping, fire-fighting foams, cookware
 - Many PFAS are known to be health hazards to humans. Linked to increased risk for cancer, liver disease, and other negative health impacts
 - MN Department of Health (MDH) completed toxicity assessments of many PFAS
 - Determine the negative health impacts that could be caused from exposure
 - What level of exposure is needed to affect health
 - Calculate guidance and regulatory values for drinking water, surface water, fish, and soil
- Stated in the Policy Plan:

- When items are landfilled, PFAS migrate to leachate
- Leachate is treated at the MCES (Metropolitan Council of Environmental Services) water treatment facility
- No removal systems for PFAS are installed at landfills or wastewater plants
- Discharged by the MCES into sludge and surface water
- Waste industry is identifying ways to address the unusual type of chemical

Suggested the MPCA continue to work hard to develop PFAS removal/treatment at landfills.

Incorporate into the permitting process as soon as possible.

- Has been proven to be cost prohibitive to remove at the waste treatment plant
 - Barr Engineering reviewed and focused on where PFAS are concentrated at
 - At the landfill, in leachate
3. MPCA require landfills to address PFAS in their industrial waste management plans
 4. MPCA update the CON review and issuance process so that it is streamlined and consistent year-over-year

EAC Action Requested: Discussion and/or additional items to add or a motion to approve as is.

Commissioner Fell mentioned the industry is looking for the federal government to come up with a new standard regarding an acceptable health level for PFAS. He provided an example of organics composting. Compost after composting has a residual. It is being encouraged to use it in parks. He asked if it still has PFAS, who is liable. Excluding materials would be difficult as it involves carpeting, makeup containers, and toilet paper. A treatment process to remove would cost \$24 billion dollars. He questioned how to stop the materials coming into the landfill that creates the PFAS in the first place. He shared three proposed treatment processes: 1. Incineration. 2. Deep Well Injection. 3. MPCA is testing on ground water from money received from 3M. He questioned if they should tell Pine Bend Landfill when coming for expansion, if they are going to treat the leachate on site, and if they do, up the price, or ignore it and hope the state and feds come in with funding to treat it.

Specialist Sutherland stated staff is looking for additional comments to add to the list of comments that will be submitted on behalf of the city to the state. If there are no additions, a motion would be made to approve the existing comments.

Additional comments can be made on items impacting local government when Dakota County has a stakeholder process.

Chair Goodman referenced Comment #3 stating that the only way to remove PFAS was through leachate. She was unsure how everything could be tested for total content.

Commissioner Fell mentioned his comments were directed to the Draft letter put together referencing comments. It was recommended the MPCA do more research and that there should be treatment. He said the MPCA is already doing that.

Specialist Sutherland agreed and said the MPCA's policy plan states they need to continue their research. The city is stating the need for continued research and encouraging additional funding.

Chair Goodman said that PFAS gets into wastewater through makeup and washing clothes. She did not want this to be left off in the future, it will be an issue that will have to happen at wastewater facilities.

Specialist Sutherland replied when talking with Barr Engineering, the focus was on the landfill because it is in the community.

Motion by Commissioner Mikulski, second by Commissioner Barner, to approve the comments/notes as presented.

Ayes: 8
Nays: 1 (Fell) Motion carried.

Specialist Sutherland said when there is a denial a reason why is specified.

Commissioner Fell responded that he denied because he did not understand. He could not grasp the recommendation as he understands the problem.

Commissioner Sethre mentioned that a public comment period will take place.

Specialist Sutherland replied that anyone can make comments through September 17th. There will be another comment period process when Dakota County updates their plan.

6. Public Comment

7. Commission Comments

Environmental Specialist Sutherland shared that September 6th is the Commission Appreciation Dinner at the Fall Food Fest at the VMCC beginning at 4:30. The public is also invited.

8. Adjourn

Motion by Commissioner Sethre, seconded by Commissioner Barner, to adjourn the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

Ayes: 9
Nays: 0 Motion carried.

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary Sheri Yourczek