



## ***City Council Memorandum***

**To:** Mayor Fasbender & City Council Members  
**From:** Ryan Stempski – Public Works Director  
**Date:** September 3, 2024  
**Item:** Receive Update on the Water Treatment Plant Siting Study

### **Council Action Requested:**

Council is requested to receive an update on the Water Treatment Plant (WTP) Siting Study. Staff recommends scheduling a follow up to this update at the September 16<sup>th</sup> City Council Meeting with a closed session pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 13D.05 subd 3(c) to develop offers for purchase of real property.

### **Background Information:**

A feasibility study determined 3 WTP's would be required to remove PFAS from the Hastings' municipal wells. The location of those plants within the study were a representation of locations near existing wells and within property owned by the City (to avoid acquisition costs and delays). These locations were never finalized and are subject to relocation. Public feedback was received, and the City Council communicated a strong preference for WTP No. 2 and WTP No. 3 to be located outside of residential neighborhoods. A WTP Siting Study was developed to include City Council's direction. The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of a given WTP site depends on several factors:

- Sufficient land area owned or available for acquisition
- Proximity to existing wells and raw water mains
- Proximity to trunk distribution water mains and storage tanks
- Proximity to pressure zone facilities (booster pumps/pressure reducing valves)
- Proximity to trunk sanitary sewers
- Proximity to transportation corridors
- Site topography

Some challenges to the study include factoring in the large amount of existing residential neighborhoods surrounding the wells, the future high-pressure zone planned on the west side of Hastings, finding property owners open to acquisition, and locating sites out of existing residential but into adjacent or future residential areas.

Note that WTP No. 1 is located in the Industrial Park surrounded by non-residential land use, therefore no additional sites were evaluated.

### **Financial Impact:**

To move the original site locations out of residential neighborhoods it required moving the WTPs further from the wells they were planned to treat and on property that needed to be acquired. For WTP No. 2, this resulted in a cost increase ranging from \$0.6M to \$4.5M depending on the site evaluated in the study. For WTP No. 3, this resulted in a cost increase ranging from \$2.8M to \$7.2M depending on the site evaluated in the study.

### **Attachments:**

- Presentation to be provided after the Council Meeting update