**PPFAS Treatment Technologies Subgroup**

Virginia Department of Health Office of Drinking Water

Final Meeting Minutes

May 27, 2021

Scheduled for 1.5 hours (10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.)

1. **Meeting Opening**

ODW Southeast Virginia Field Office (SEVFO) Director, Dan Horne called the meeting to order at 10:03 am. The meeting was by electronic communication means because of the ongoing public health emergency. Dan reminded everyone attending the meeting that it would be conducted as a public meeting under FOIA guidance, and would be recorded. Minutes and meeting materials will be posted on Town Hall.

Dan welcomed all Subgroup members and members of the public to the Treatment Technologies meeting and called roll. Members attending the meeting who answered the roll call were:

1. Henry Bryndza (Dupont)
2. Wendy Eikenberry (Augusta County Service Authority)
3. Mike Hotaling (Newport News Water Works)
4. Russ Navratil (VA AWWA)
5. Kelly Ryan (Virginia American Water)
6. Dan Horne (ODW)

Others noted as being present:

Marie Ann

VDH:

Christine Latino (ODW)

1. **Review Meeting Agenda**

Dan reviewed the agenda proposed for the meeting.

1. Call to order – Member roll-call – Review Agenda – Review draft minutes from last meeting
2. Report on assignments from last meeting
3. Update on resources
4. Upcoming Meeting and webinars
5. Preparing for next meeting
6. Public Comments
7. Next Meeting

Dan asked if there were any additions to the proposed agenda. There were no proposed additions. Hearing nothing, he advised that the agenda was accepted as proposed.

Dan also noted that the meeting would be a short one, for reasons that would become obvious as we work through the agenda.

1. **Review of the Draft Summary from Last Meeting**

Dan noted that he had forwarded the draft minutes from the April meeting by email on May 25. There were no proposed edits or changes. The group agreed to accept the minutes as final.

1. **Report on Assignments from Last Meeting**

* General assignment for all members:
  + Be prepared to start synthetizing information and preparing summaries to present to Full Workgroup and other subgroups
  + Specific assignments
  + Dan Horne – work with Henry to develop template for technology summaries (suggestion – follow the Minnesota Blueprint)
  + VDH will contact DEQ about handling PFAS wastes (GAC, resin, RO concentrate)

Specific Assignments:

VDH was to contact DEQ regarding disposal of PFAS wastes. This has not yet happened. VDH has a plan of action and a path forward. Wendy stated that she attended the DEQ Triennial Water Quality Standards Review Regulatory Advisory Panel meeting last week. DEQ advised that they have no intention of addressing PFAS at this time; instead, they will be working in tandem with the VDH workgroup to stay ahead of the curve, depending on the results from the PFAS sampling study.

Dan was going to work with Henry on a template for the Technology Assessment summaries. Dan noted that he had not yet been in contact with Henry to work on the template. He will contact Henry next week, to start that work. Once a potential template is developed, he will share with the group. A suggestion was previously made to look at the Minnesota Blueprint as a possible starting point.

1. **Update on resources**

Dan thanked Wendy for providing a link to the Minnesota Blueprint. Dan has downloaded the document to the Sharepoint site, but hasn’t read it yet (it is 191 pages long).

Dan noted that Mark had shared information from ECT2 at the April meeting (a product info sheet and a case history on the Robinson Elementary School in Michigan). Those items are posted in the April meeting folder on Sharepoint.

1. **Upcoming meetings and webinars**

The only meeting noted is the next meeting of the Full Workgroup, scheduled for July (exact date to be announced).

1. **Preparing for next meeting, assignments**

There was significant discussion of the gaps that need to be filled in order to create the necessary summaries. Most of the discussion centered on cost issues. At least six members of the subgroup have expressed concerns about cost impacts – capital costs, operational costs, and disposal costs.

Russ asked about limitations on these technologies. Henry noted that GAC does fine with removing long chain PFAS, but not so well on short chain species. He also noted that GAC removes the sulfonic species more readily than the acid species.

Wendy noted that so far, Minnesota has not approved any IX or RO facilities for removing PFAS. She was not able to find a reason for that choice. Basically, they have only accepted GAC treatment.

It was noted that in other states, many systems are going to IX systems. There apparently is a long lead time on the shells (the steel containers which hold both IX and GAC materials), because of supply chain issues and high demands.

Henry expressed concern about the environmental life cycle impacts, including greenhouse gas emissions, and suggested that we include these concerns.

Dan asked what other concerns do people have – what knowledge gaps do we need to identify and fill?

Dan will contact Henry next week and try to work out a sample template to circulate to the group for review. Russ and Henry volunteered to write summaries. We will need additional people to help write the summaries.

Dan will recruit someone to speak at the next subgroup meeting about cost issues.

1. **Public Comments**

There were no comments from members of the public.

1. **Next Meeting:**

The next meeting will be Thursday, June 24, at 10:00 a.m. The meeting will last no more than 90 minutes.

Dan adjourned the meeting at 10:27 a.m.

NOTE: Posted in the “meeting chat”: Passing along this link from ECOS: https://www.ecos.org/documents/ecos-white-paper-processes-and-considerations-for-setting-state-pfas-standards/ It's an excellent resource which was developed to help states avoid wasting time and resources on duplication of efforts.