

Pig's Eye Dump Task Force

Notes for Pig's Eye Dump Task Force Meeting #14

Tuesday, January 13, 2025

9:00 a.m.-10:30 a.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
- Stephanie Souter, Senior Program Manager, Washington County
- Nathan Wallerstedt, Project Management Branch Chief, Army Corps of Engineers - Saint Paul District
- Pam Anderson, Remediation Division Director, 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

- Hans Neve, MPCA
- Stephen Mikkelson, MPCA
- Corinne Stremmel, MPCA
- Kara Van Lerberghe, Zan Associates
- Megan Ryan, 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. Summarize task force comments

Hans Neve (MPCA) shared that they received comments from the task force and the Prairie Island Indian Community. The comments from Prairie Island Indian Community shared that they would like to see more emphasis on the impact to the Mississippi River and downstream communities and some language changes around contaminant concentrations to emphasize the severity of some contamination. Hans reviewed the changes they made to the report to address their comments. Bill Sumner (City of Newport) asked if the

comments from downstream communities were limited to Minnesota or if it was shared with communities farther down the river. Hans responded that they did not, and Pam Anderson (MPCA) added that they reached out to Prairie Island Indian Community after the task force asked that feedback be gathered from tribal members.

3. Task force discussion of report edits and final approval

Hans Neve (MPCA) then transitioned to comments received from the task force. The comments added more detail to some sections or relocated a section to a better area within the report. Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County) shared appreciation to the project team and the task force. Melanie McMahon (City of St. Paul) added that she would change one of the edits in the report to more generally refer to the City of St. Paul's 2040 Comprehensive Plan instead of a specific chapter. The task force did not have any concerns about this change. Victoria made a motion to approve the report, and the task force officially approved the report.

5. Public comment

Hans Neve (MPCA) kicked off the public comment portion of the meeting. A member of the public shared that they would like to see contamination levels compared to different water standards included in the report. Hans said their team would take another look at the levels. Another member of the public emphasized that they want to see future development be consistent with other plans for the area and concern about the waste footprint and its proximity to the environmental wood supply. Hans responded that they would gather more information about this site during the feasibility study. The member of the public shared concern about the facility being on parkland and it being within a floodplain. They added concern about the pollution and the impact to nearby vulnerable communities. Another member of the public shared that they would like to see more discussion on the national level and environmental education. Another member of the public shared that they would like to see more experimental treatment options for the contamination in the report. Another member of the public shared that they would like to see a health study for residents in the area, the environmental justice impact, pollinator habitat, and that residents in District 1 would like to see the waste removed.

5. Feasibility study

Stephen Mikkelson (MPCA) introduced the engineering teams who would be working on the future feasibility study. Narayanan Raghupathi (WSP) shared that they are continuing information gathering through this year which includes deep monitoring well installations, groundwater/surface water sampling, a transducer study, and then updating hydrogeologic data analysis and modeling. He added that they will then start to look at risk evaluation for human health and eco risk. They would also do preliminary engineering evaluations of the two options the task force recommended which would feed into the feasibility study. Once the feasibility study is done, they will do additional investigations to support the remedial design process. After the remedial design process, they would start implementing a remedial action plan. David Bell (MDH) asked what they will be looking for in the groundwater and surface water sampling. Narayanan responded that they would be looking at concentrations and migration in Battle Creek, Pig's Eye Lake and sediments. A member of the public asked how the public would be kept up to date during this process and Narayanan responded that there would be public input opportunities when implementing the remedial action plan. David asked if they could make sure that the task force website links to any new resources for people to keep up to date. A member of public shared concern about the amount of time it would take the look at multiple options compared to choosing one method and moving forward with it. Hans Neve (MPCA) shared that a typical feasibility study will look at a range of options. A member of the public asked at what point they choose which method to implement. The task force discussed that the recommendations would move forward to the legislature to evaluate but it ultimately depends on the

results of the feasibility study. A member of the public shared concern about the dig-and-line option. A member of the public asked for clarification on the funding process for the feasibility study and Hans responded that it would be funded by the Metropolitan Landfill Contingency Action Trust (MLCAT).

Next steps and reflection

Hans Neve (MPCA) shared that the report will go through the internal agency process to finalize the report before submitting to the legislature. The report will then be posted on the website for review. The project team will also look at attending some community events to share the results of the task force effort. David Bell (MDH) asked if they knew which committee within the legislature it is being submitted to and Hans responded that they will share the exact committee with the task force after the meeting. Victoria Reinhardt (Ramsey County) asked how the task force members will be informed during the process. Hans asked for feedback from the task force on how involved they want to be. Sam Paske (Met Council) shared that as a neighbor to the site, they would like to be very involved to stay up to speed. Pam Anderson (MPCA) shared that the typical process is submitting the report to the legislature and if they invite them over for a hearing, they can share it with task force members. Melanie McMahon (City of St. Paul) said that she would like the MPCA to continue to use the email updates to keep both task force members and the public up to speed. Jimmy Francis (City of South St. Paul) offered their council meetings and community events as a platform to share any updates as needed and thanked the members of the public in the room for showing up as a voice for the community. Pam Anderson wrapped the meeting up by thanking the task force and the public and saying that they will be reaching out when there are updates available.

6. Adjourn

Hans Neve (MPCA) adjourned the meeting.