



Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund

M.L. 2022 Approved Work Plan

General Information

ID Number: 2022-296

Staff Lead: Michael Varien

Date this document submitted to LCCMR: August 26, 2022

Project Title: Leaded Gasoline Contamination Analysis

Project Budget: \$200,000

Project Manager Information

Name: Tariq Al-Rifai

Organization: City of Paynesville

Office Telephone: (320) 243-3714

Email: tariq@paynesvillemn.com

Web Address: <https://www.paynesvillemn.com>

Project Reporting

Date Work Plan Approved by LCCMR: August 30, 2022

Reporting Schedule: March 1 / September 1 of each year.

Project Completion: July 31, 2024

Final Report Due Date: September 14, 2024

Legal Information

Legal Citation: M.L. 2022, Chp. 94, Sec. 2, Subd. 10b

Appropriation Language: \$200,000 the second year is from the trust fund to the commissioner of administration for a grant to the city of Paynesville to procure an analysis of the extent of leaded gasoline contamination in or near the cities of Paynesville, Foley, Alexandria, and Blaine, and of the threat posed by the contamination to each city's drinking water supply. The vendor selected to perform the analysis must use the same methodology to conduct the analysis for each city and must produce findings that are comparable between cities. The cities must work cooperatively to select a vendor. By January 15, 2024, the city administrator of the city of Paynesville must report the results of the analysis to

the chairs and ranking minority members of the house of representatives and senate committees and divisions with jurisdiction over environment and natural resources.

Appropriation End Date: June 30, 2025

Narrative

Project Summary: The project involves completing a third party technical review of four contamination sites in the Cities of Paynesville, Alexandria, Blaine and Foley.

Describe the opportunity or problem your proposal seeks to address. Include any relevant background information.

The City of Paynesville, along with the Cities of Alexandria, Blaine, and Foley have contamination sites associated with historic leaded gasoline releases that previously impacted the water supply and remain a potential risk to the water supply. All of the sites had contamination detected in their water supply from different leak sites. The MPCA investigated each site and completed various levels of clean-up. None of the sites were excavated to completely remove the contamination source. Each of the Cities installed new wells to replace the water supply wells that were contaminated and/or add treatment systems to their water treatment facilities to remove the contaminants from the water. While all of the Cities are dealing with the contamination by either using new wells and/or treatment, the source of the contamination has never been removed. This project would consist of completing a third party review of the contamination sites in each of the four Cities to determine whether further remediation is necessary.

What is your proposed solution to the problem or opportunity discussed above? Introduce us to the work you are seeking funding to do. You will be asked to expand on this proposed solution in Activities & Milestones.

The City of Paynesville is using their City Engineer (Bolton & Menk, Inc.) and Barr Engineering to complete the third party review of each site. These firms have assisted the City in the past in dealing with the Midtown Site in Paynesville and Barr is familiar with one of the other sites as well. In addition, these firms assisted the City in requesting the funds and establishing a budget for the review. This familiarity will allow the review to be completed as efficiently as possible. The work would include integrating all available information, data, and historical reporting on the above listed sites, analyzing the extent of leaded gasoline contamination, and evaluating the threat posed to each City's drinking water supply. The consultant will use the same methodology for analysis for each city to the extent possible based on site-specific differences and produce findings that are comparable between cities. The technical review will assist in providing guidance for each site moving forward and help define whether further remediation is needed. The review will also help assess the risk to the drinking water supplies.

What are the specific project outcomes as they relate to the public purpose of protection, conservation, preservation, and enhancement of the state's natural resources?

The results of the analysis will be utilized to provide guidance for each of the contamination sites moving forward and will also identify the risk level associated with the drinking water supplies. For example, it may be determined that the extent of contamination on a is sufficiently known and previous actions are protective of human health; or additional investigation may be recommended to provide a benefit for understanding of the contamination at a site; or additional actions should be evaluated; etc. Each particular site will have an outcome regarding how best to move forward.

Project Location

What is the best scale for describing where your work will take place?

City(s): Paynesville

What is the best scale to describe the area impacted by your work?

City(s): Paynesville

When will the work impact occur?

In the Future

Activities and Milestones

Activity 1: Complete an Evaluation of each of the four contamination sites

Activity Budget: \$100,000

Activity Description:

The consultant will complete the following:

1. Review available reports in the MPCA's and each respective City's files, if available, to better understand and summarize the conditions and history for each site. Note that this may include file request and review for nearby sites for evaluation of potential sources and relevant hydrogeologic information. MPCA's files are likely extensive as the sites have been active since the 1980s. MPCA files for each individual site will be requested through the standard public file review process. The timeline for receiving MPCA files varies.
2. Complete a site walk for each site and meet with representatives of each City to better understand the site setting, history, current concerns, and any information relevant to the evaluations for each site.
3. Extract and organize available data from groundwater and soil investigation, sampling of municipal supply wells, and other relevant sampling. The data will be entered and organized into an environmental database to facilitate visualization, review and analysis.

Activity Milestones:

Description	Approximate Completion Date
Complete a Site Walk for each site	November 30, 2022
Complete File Review	January 31, 2023
Create Environmental Database	March 31, 2023

Activity 2: Prepare a Summary Report

Activity Budget: \$100,000

Activity Description:

The consultant will prepare a final summary report (draft and revised versions if needed) The summary report will include: discussion of site history (investigation, previous remedial actions, water supply treatment and usage, etc); analysis of the extent of leaded gas contamination; conceptual level discussion of potential remedial options if appropriate; and findings comparable across cities. In addition, the consultant will assist the Cities with providing a report of the results of the analysis to the members of the house of representatives and senate committees/divisions with jurisdiction over environmental and natural resources.

Activity Milestones:

Description	Approximate Completion Date
Complete Draft Report	May 31, 2023
MPCA Review and Comment	June 30, 2023
Complete Final Report	July 31, 2023

Dissemination

Describe your plans for dissemination, presentation, documentation, or sharing of data, results, samples, physical collections, and other products and how they will follow ENRTF Acknowledgement Requirements and Guidelines.

The results of the study will be reports to the members of the house of representatives and senate committees/divisions with jurisdiction over environmental and natural resources. This reporting will include at a minimum, the following attribution language: "Funding for this project was provided by the Minnesota Environment and Natural Resources Trust Fund as recommended by the Legislative-Citizen Commission on Minnesota Resources (LCCMR)."

Long-Term Implementation and Funding

Describe how the results will be implemented and how any ongoing effort will be funded. If not already addressed as part of the project, how will findings, results, and products developed be implemented after project completion? If additional work is needed, how will this work be funded?

Based on the results of the third party study, discussion will need to occur with the MPCA and stakeholders on developing a plan to move forward with the recommended actions. Funding will need to be secured from the MPCA or a special appropriation to implement the recommended actions.

Budget Summary

Category / Name	Subcategory or Type	Description	Purpose	Gen. Ineligible	% Benefits	# FTE	Classified Staff?	\$ Amount
Personnel								
							Sub Total	-
Contracts and Services								
Bolton & Menk, Inc. (Barr Engineering)	Professional or Technical Service Contract	Conducting Third Party Review				0		\$200,000
							Sub Total	\$200,000
Equipment, Tools, and Supplies								
							Sub Total	-
Capital Expenditures								
							Sub Total	-
Acquisitions and Stewardship								
							Sub Total	-
Travel In Minnesota								
							Sub Total	-
Travel Outside Minnesota								
							Sub Total	-
Printing and Publication								

							Sub Total	-
Other Expenses								
							Sub Total	-
							Grand Total	\$200,000

Classified Staff or Generally Ineligible Expenses

Category/Name	Subcategory or Type	Description	Justification Ineligible Expense or Classified Staff Request
---------------	---------------------	-------------	--

Non ENRTF Funds

Category	Specific Source	Use	Status	\$ Amount
State				
			State Sub Total	-
Non-State				
			Non State Sub Total	-
			Funds Total	-

Attachments

Required Attachments

Visual Component

File: [69f061d0-aab.pdf](#)

Alternate Text for Visual Component

Attached is a graphic showing the Paynesville Midtown Contamination Site and the locations of all of the monitoring wells....

Board Resolution or Letter

Title	File
City of Paynesville Letter	1bfb17f3-5ad.pdf

Optional Attachments

Support Letter or Other

Title	File
Signed Background Check Form	550e53fe-ec4.pdf

Difference between Proposal and Work Plan

Describe changes from Proposal to Work Plan Stage

There are no changes between the proposal and work plan.

Additional Acknowledgements and Conditions:

The following are acknowledgements and conditions beyond those already included in the above workplan:

Do you understand and acknowledge the ENRTF repayment requirements if the use of capital equipment changes?

N/A

Do you agree travel expenses must follow the "Commissioner's Plan" promulgated by the Commissioner of Management of Budget or, for University of Minnesota projects, the University of Minnesota plan?

N/A

Does your project have potential for royalties, copyrights, patents, or sale of products and assets?

No

Do you understand and acknowledge IP and revenue-return and sharing requirements in 116P.10?

N/A

Do you wish to request reinvestment of any revenues into your project instead of returning revenue to the ENRTF?

N/A

Does your project include original, hypothesis-driven research?

No

Does the organization have a fiscal agent for this project?

No

