

Pig's Eye Dump Task Force

Notes for Pig's Eye Dump Task Force Meeting #13

Tuesday, December 2, 2025

9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Virtual and in person 2nd floor - MPCA 520 Lafayette Road, St. Paul, MN 55155

Members in Attendance

- Dan Scollan, Water Resources Ecologist, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
- Sam Paske, Metropolitan Council
- Melanie McMahan, Executive Project Lead – Mayor's Staff, City of Saint Paul
- Victoria Reinhardt, Ramsey County
- Dave Magnuson, Waste Regulation Supervisor, Dakota County
- Caleb Johnson, Environmental Program Manager, Washington County
- Nathan Wallerstedt, Project Management Branch Chief, Army Corps of Engineers - Saint Paul District
- Kirk Koudelka, Assistant Commissioner, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA)
- David Bell, Environmental Research Scientist, Minnesota Department of Health (MDH)
- Jimmy Francis, Mayor, City of South Saint Paul
- Bill Sumner, Council Member, City of Newport

Other Contributors

- Pam Anderson, MPCA
- Hans Neve, MPCA
- Stephen Mikkelson, MPCA
- Corinne Stremmel, MPCA
- Kara Van Lerberghe, Zan Associates
- Ashley Thompson, Zan Associates

Presenters

- Hans Neve, MPCA
- Pam Anderson, MPCA

1. Welcome, introductions, agenda

Hans Neve (MPCA) kicked off the meeting, thanked everyone for being in attendance, introduced himself, and went over the agenda. Task force members and consultants followed by introducing themselves.

2. Final report timeline and plan for remaining meetings

Hans Neve (MPCA) went over the goal of this meeting and the schedule for upcoming meetings. He shared that they will be going over the comments received from the task force on the initial draft report during this meeting. He went over the timeline for when the next draft report will be ready for review and the timeline for receiving comments.

3. Overview of Task Force report comments

Hans Neve (MPCA) provided an overview of the comments on the report received from the task force. He shared that there were no conflicting comments or additions of substantial comments. Most comments involved wording changes, rewrites when reviewers had more background information, or simple changes that can be made without discussion. There will be a few comments that need discussion by the task force during this meeting. Hans provided a few examples of comments that can be resolved on their own. Melanie McMahon (City of Saint Paul) added that if there is any reference to the Saint Paul 2040 Comprehensive Plan it should be kept high level because it is still going through final adoption. After sharing comments that could be resolved on their own, Hans shared comments that needed task force discussion. The first comment involved adding a specific reference to the volume of waste in Pig's Eye Dump in one of the recommendations. Hans added that they don't have an exact number but can share that it is estimated to be approximately 4.5 million cubic yards. Jimmy Francis (City of South St. Paul) asked for clarification on why there is hesitation to put in a number and Hans responded that they don't know for sure how deep the waste is at the site. The task force discussed changing the language to say "estimated to be at least 4.5 million cubic yards" to address concerns about the waste potentially being larger. The next comment involved separating one of the recommendations to separate the impact to potential community revenues and the impact to remaining waste capacity for the metro area. Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County) added that this was a comment she suggested because it felt stronger to have them separate. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) wondered if it may be confusing for the reader if you separate the recommendations because you lose some context. Melanie suggested keeping it in one recommendation but separating them so they are two clear statements. Victoria agreed that separation would help address her concerns. The next comment for discussion was to separate the recommendation about the Metropolitan Water Resource Recovery Facility and the Environmental Wood Supply, and the task force agreed with the comment and had a couple grammatical changes. The next comment is about whether they want to specifically say "dig and haul" or "dig and haul no backfill" in the recommendations. The task force agreed that they should be consistent throughout and say, "dig and haul no backfill". The next comment is about whether parties would be paying twice if they are covered under the voluntary partnership recommendation and the waste disposal fee. The task force discussed whether to change the language to recommend exploring these funding options or if they want to be more definitive. They agreed to keep the recommendations separate. The next comment is about changing the language to recommend that if they are using the MLCAT account to fund Pig's Eye Dump, it needs to be paired with additional funds. The task force discussed adding more to the recommendation to clarify that state funding should be pursued through new state funding mechanisms as well as the existing state funding options. The next comment edited the restoration funding recommendation to list out potential funding sources as well as new or existing sources. Hans shared a comment from the background section of the report about Pool 2. Sam Paske (Met Council) added that the language may be confusing because the criteria only applies to a portion of Pool 2 not the larger Pool 2 area. The task force decided to leave the language as is for now. Hans went over the final comment for discussion which was about how much detail to put in the appendix of the report. David Bell (MDH) asked if the files about contamination details are available to the public somewhere and Hans confirmed they are. Dave Magnuson (Dakota County) said that it is better to keep it simpler because the more you add the more there is a chance you on accidentally leave something out. The task force agreed to leave the appendix as is.

5. Break

The task force took a 10-minute break.

5. Public comment

Hans Neve (MPCA) kicked off the public comment portion of the meeting. A member of the public had a question about a map and Hans responded that he would follow up with them. They asked about the fish hatchery site and if that was part of the legislation for this project and Hans confirmed it is a separate site. Another member of the public added that it would be helpful to identify other areas nearby that are polluted to also address during this project. They shared concerns about the wood chipping site and its impact on the environment. Kirk Koudelka (MPCA) responded and clarified that none of the recommendations say that the local planning process is overturned or discounts that process. Any changes to the facility would need to go through that process still. The member of the public responded that they have concerns that the report gives the wood chipping site more validity. The task force clarified that the report acknowledges that the wood chipping facility is a neighbor of the site. Another member of the public shared concerns about other contamination in the Saint Paul area, specifically PFAS. They mentioned other groups that could be involved and other impacts to pollution of the Pig's Eye area that are not mentioned in the report. Another member of the public emphasized that the report doesn't do enough to address the contamination plume and contamination coming from the north of the site. Kirk and Hans responded that the feasibility study would investigate many of those types of details and the best order of addressing them. Hans asked if there were any comments from people online and there were not. Another member of the public shared appreciation for the task force and project team for considering their input.

5. Recommendations discussion

Hans Neve (MPCA) asked the task force if there were any final comments or topics of discussion. Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County) shared that she is proud of the work the task force has done and that this should help guide next steps for the site. Jimmy Francis (City of South St. Paul) asked if the report includes how the money was spent for this effort and Hans added that they are included in the LCCMR annual reports which will be referenced in the final report. Dan Scollan (DNR) requested that the contamination story section of the report be expanded on some to include information about other contamination sources around the site. Caleb Johnson (Washington County) emphasized that this is an unprecedented situation and that he wants to make sure the people at the table and the public encourage movement on the project after the final report is submitted to the legislature.

6. Adjourn

Hans Neve (MPCA) adjourned the meeting.