MEMORANDUM

Agenda Item No. 11(A)(6)

TO: Honorable Chairman Anthony Rodriguez
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE: November 17, 2026

FROM: Geri Bonzon-Keenan
County Attorney

SUBJECT: Resolution authorizing the County to participate in the proposed Class Action Settlements with Carrier Global Corporation; Archroma U.S., Inc.; Amerex Corporation; and Nation Ford Chemical Company in the Public Water Systems' portion of the Multi-District Litigation Matter, In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Product Liability Litigation, MDL 2:18-mn-2873-RMG, Case No. 2:23-cv-03230-RMG, relating to PFAS contamination of drinking water; authorizing the County Mayor, after consultation with the County Attorney's Office, to complete all documentation and execute all releases and agreements necessary to participate in the settlements with Carrier Global Corporation; Archroma U.S., Inc.; Amerex Corporation; and Nation Ford Chemical Company in the water providers' portion of the MDL; and authorizing the County Attorney and the County's outside counsel to continue to pursue litigation related to PFAS on behalf of the County

The accompanying resolution was prepared and placed on the agenda at the request of Prime Sponsor Commissioner Oliver G. Gilbert, III.

for
Geri Bonzon-Keenan
County Attorney

GBK/smm

Memorandum

Date: November 17, 2026

To: Honorable Chairman Anthony Rodriguez
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

From: Geri Bonzon-Keenan
County Attorney

Subject: Resolution Authorizing Miami-Dade County to Participate in the proposed Class Action Settlements with Defendant Carrier Global Corp; Defendant Archroma U.S., Inc.; Defendant Amerex Corporation; and Defendant Nation Ford Chemical Company in the Public Water Systems' portion of the In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Product Liability Litigation related to Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances ("PFAS") Contamination of Drinking Water and to Take Certain Other Related Actions

---

Recommendation

The County Attorney and the County's Outside Counsel[1] both recommend that the Board approve the attached resolution, which:

(1) authorizes the County to participate in the proposed Class Action Settlements with: (a) Carrier Global Corp. ("Carrier"); (b) Archroma U.S., Inc. ("Archroma"); (c) Amerex Corporation ("Amerex"); and (d) Nation Ford Chemical Company ("Nation Ford") (collectively, the "Settling Defendants") in the Public Water Systems' portion of the Multi-District Litigation ("MDL") matter, In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Product Liability Litigation, MDL 2:18-mn-2873-RMG, Case No. 2:23-cv-03230-RMG,[2] relating to PFAS contamination of drinking water;

(2) authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to, after consultation with the County Attorney's Office:

a. complete all documentation required to participate in the Settlements with the Settling Defendants, such as Claims Forms; and

[1] The County's outside counsel, chosen by this Board pursuant to Resolution No. R-688-20, consists of: Levin Papantonio Thomas Mitchell Rafferty & Proctor, P.A.; Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP; Douglas & London, P.C.; Kelley Drye & Warren LLP; SL Environmental Law Group PC; and Kennedy & Madonna, LLP (collectively, "County's Outside Counsel" or the "Levin Team").

[2] The County's individual case against various manufacturers and distributors of products containing PFAS was initially filed as part of the MDL in the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, Charleston Division, before Judge Richard Mark Gergel as Case No. 2:20-cv-4194-RMG and was subsequently merged with the other related cases into the overall MDL action, In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Product Liability Litigation, MDL 2:18-mn-2873-RMG, Case No. 2:23-cv-03230-RMG.

b. execute all releases and agreements necessary to finalize settlements of the Public Water Systems' portion of the MDL with the Settling Defendants; and

(3) authorizes the County Attorney and the County's Outside Counsel to:

a. continue litigating the County's claims against the defendants remaining in the Public Water Systems' portion of the MDL matter, In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Product Liability Litigation, MDL 2:18-mn-2873-RMG, Case No. 2:23-cv-03230-RMG; and

b. continue pursuing litigation against any and all defendants, including the Settling Defendants, that may be liable for damages to the County that extend beyond the County's drinking water supply.

Similar to the analysis previously conducted when the County Attorney and the County's Outside Counsel recommended that the County participate in the class action settlements with: (1) 3M and the DuPont Defendants,[3] and (2) Tyco and BASF,[4] the County Attorney and the County's Outside Counsel[5] weighed the pros and cons of accepting the settlements with the Settling Defendants versus continuing to litigate the claims for damage to the County's drinking water supply against these defendants. Unlike the County's claims against 3M and the DuPont Defendants where the County was able to easily link those particular defendants to the PFAS contamination within the County, the Settling Defendants were minor manufacturers of products containing AFFF and PFAS; therefore, the likelihood of prevailing against these particular defendants would be riskier, and Outside Counsel has strongly recommended that the County participate in these settlements.

The Settlements with the Settling Defendants will not prohibit the County from continuing to litigate its case for damages to the drinking water supply against any remaining defendants that have been sued in the County's current case nor from continuing to seek damages from the Settling Defendants for the costs needed to remediate property as a result of PFAS contamination at County properties, and/or to address PFAS in the County's wastewater treatment processes.

As explained in more detail below, the County's recovery from these settlements is expected to be approximately $3.1 million less the legal fees owed to the County's Outside Counsel.

[3] On November 7, 2023, the Board approved Resolution No. R-1015-23, which authorized the County to participate in the Class Action Settlements with Defendant 3M and Defendants The Chemours Company; The Chemours Company FC, LLC; DuPont de Nemours, Inc.; Corteva, Inc.; and E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company n/k/a EIDP, Inc. (collectively, the "DuPont Defendants").

[4] On September 4, 2024, the Board approved Resolution No. R-775-24, which authorized the County to participate in the Class Action Settlements with Tyco and BASF.

[5] The County's Outside Counsel has provided a letter setting forth its recommendation as to both settlements, which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

Background

1. The Federal and State Regulatory Landscape Regarding PFAS

PFAS are a group of man-made chemicals that were used for decades in industrial and household products, such as stain and water-repellant apparel and fabrics, food packaging, cleaning products, non-stick cookware, and Aqueous Film Forming Foam ("AFFF") used to extinguish fires. PFAS accumulate over time, do not break down easily, remain in and move through the environment for decades, and have been linked to certain health impacts, such as cancer and birth defects.

Historically, the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") recommended a Health Advisory Level ("HAL") of no more than 70 parts per trillion ("ppt") of PFAS in drinking water as a guidance figure and did not set a Maximum Containment Level ("MCL") or enact any regulations regarding these substances. However, in April 2024, the EPA issued a final rule that sets an MCL of 4 ppt for two forms of PFAS—PFOA and PFOS— in drinking water; sets a "hazard limit index" for several other forms of PFAS, including but not limited to, PFNA, PFHxS, HFPO-DA, and PFBS (the "Other PFAS Chemicals"); and requires water providers to bring their systems into compliance with the new MCL by 2029 (with some limited extensions that may be available for particular conditions). In addition, under the 2024 rule, water providers have to meet various reporting and monitoring requirements on a going forward basis. In the past, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection ("FDEP") indicated that it would set the State's MCL at the same level required by the EPA; however, to date, FDEP has not yet set a State MCL for PFAS.

Although the 2024 rule is still in effect, in 2026, EPA proposed two new rules related to PFAS regulation that are currently under review. If adopted, the first rule would allow water providers to seek up to two (2) additional years to come into compliance with enforceable PFAS limits. The second rule would rescind the hazard limit index set for the Other PFAS Chemicals and restart the evaluation process in order to set those numbers.

2. PFAS in the County's Water Supply

The County's water system, operated by the Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department ("WASD"), serves over 2.4 million customers, covers a 396 square mile service area, and produces over 330 million gallons of drinking water per day ("mgd") for the residents of the County. The County's system includes 111 wells, located geographically throughout the County, from which the County's drinking water supply is drawn. The water from the wellfields is treated at the County's three regional and five smaller water treatment plants before being distributed to the County's customers and its 15 wholesale municipal customers.

The County has been testing and monitoring its wells for PFAS on a quarterly basis since 2019. From the start of the testing, PFAS has been detected in the County's drinking water supply. WASD has been utilizing techniques to manage PFAS exposure. Since 2020, WASD has been working with consultants to analyze the extent of the contamination in the water supply and to

consider methods for treating PFAS in the County's system. WASD is still in the process of making a final decision as to the best technology and methods to utilize to treat the County's water supply; however, the current estimate provided by WASD and its consultants for addressing the PFAS contamination problem ranges from the high hundreds of millions of dollars to $3 billion.

3. Prior Board Action Related to PFAS

On February 4, 2020, this Board adopted Resolution No. R-146-20 in response to the discovery of PFAS within Miami-Dade County. Resolution No. R-146-20 directed the County Attorney's Office to assess whether the County should engage in litigation to recover costs and other damages associated with the existence of PFAS within the County. In doing so, the Board requested that the County Attorney evaluate the viability of legal claims against PFAS manufacturers and other culpable parties and recommend whether such claims may be brought by the County. The Board further directed the County Attorney, if advisable, to identify up to three law firms that could serve as outside counsel under the direction of the County Attorney's Office for PFAS litigation. The Board directed that such representation be on a contingency fee basis and at no cost to the County unless the County obtains a monetary recovery. Any payments to the outside counsel will thus come from the proceeds of the litigation itself.

On July 8, 2020, consistent with the recommendation of the County Attorney's Office, the Board adopted Resolution No. R-688-20 through which the Board selected the Levin Team to serve as the County's Outside Counsel for purposes of representing the County in PFAS litigation at the direction of the County Attorney; authorized the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to execute a retainer agreement with the Levin Team; and directed the County Attorney and the Levin Team to pursue litigation to recover costs and other damages associated with the discovery of PFAS within the County.

The retainer agreement with the Levin Team was executed by the County Mayor on July 23, 2020. It specifies that the Levin Team would prosecute the County's case on a contingency fee basis and would not receive any fees or costs if the County did not recover any damages. It also laid out a fee percentage and fee/cost cap schedule based on the stage of litigation at which the case resolved, which ranges from 9 percent to 20 percent, inclusive of both attorneys' fees and costs.

4. The Litigation

On December 3, 2020, the County filed its Complaint and Demand for Jury Trial in the MDL in order to: recover the costs necessary to protect the public health, safety, welfare, and the environment; to comply with applicable soil and groundwater cleanup target levels; and to prevent the contamination of drinking water resources by restoring the groundwater quality and eliminating contamination caused by PFAS in AFFF. The suit brought against various manufacturers and distributors of AFFF sought abatement of the contamination and damages for: strict product liability based on design defect and failure to warn; negligence; continuing trespass; and public nuisance.

In January 2021, the County completed and filed a Fact Information Sheet in the MDL that included basic information about the size of the County's water utility; the extent of the property and drinking water impacted by the Defendants' products containing PFAS; testing and monitoring data for the wells and sources of drinking water throughout the County; and potential sources of the PFAS contamination to the County's drinking water and property.

In 2021, during the bellwether selection process for the Public Water Systems' portion of the MDL, the County's case was considered but, ultimately, was not selected to be one of the first cases tried. Instead, the Bellwether Committee, comprised of attorneys representing both the Plaintiffs and Defendants, selected 10 other Public Water System cases to proceed as bellwethers, with the City of Stuart, Florida's case set as the first Public Water System case to proceed to trial.[6] After extensive discovery and briefing on a variety of issues, the City of Stuart case was set to begin trial in June 2023; however, several weeks before the start of trial, the class representatives for the overall MDL reached tentative settlements as to the Public Water Systems' portion of the MDL with both 3M and the DuPont Defendants. Each member of the class was given an opportunity to opt out of either or both settlements.

On November 7, 2023, the Board approved Resolution No. R-1015-23, which authorized the County to participate in the proposed settlements reached with both Defendant 3M and the DuPont Defendants. The settlement agreements with both defendants were approved by the MDL Court at fairness hearings in February 2024 and December 2023, respectively.

On June 7, 2024, the County filed its First Amended Complaint in the MDL, which added additional defendants to the case and introduced new facts and causes of action related to damages the County has suffered from PFAS beyond its impact on the County's drinking water supply, including assertion of claims based on strict product liability, continuing trespass and negligence for contamination of non-drinking water resources.

On September 4, 2024, the Board approved Resolution No. R-775-24, which authorized the County to participate in the proposed settlements reached with both Defendant Tyco and Defendant BASF for the drinking water portion of the MDL action. The settlement agreements were approved by the MDL Court at fairness hearings.

To date, the County has received payouts from the settlements with 3M, the DuPont Defendants, Tyco and BASF that total over $150 million, and more settlement funds are expected from several of these defendants in the coming years, including but not limited to, payouts from their Action Funds and Special Needs Funds.

[6] Although the County has continued to gather data regarding the extent of the PFAS problem in the County and has been working on potential treatment and remediation methods for the drinking water supply, because it was not selected as a bellwether case, the County's case has not progressed meaningfully beyond the filing of the Complaint, an Amended Complaint and Fact Information Sheet.

5. The Proposed Settlement with the Settling Defendants

The Settling Defendants have agreed to pay collectively $149,075,000 (the "Settlement Fund"), subject to the MDL Court's final approval of the proposed settlement agreements[7] and other conditions set forth in the proposed settlement agreements. The costs and expenses of the Claims Administrator, the Notice Administrator, the Special Master, the Escrow Agent and the Opt Out Administrator will be likely be deducted from the Settlement Fund as will approximately five-percent (5%) for the Common Benefit Holdback Assessment, which fund pays certain common attorneys' fees and costs. Additionally, some portion of the Settlement Fund will be set aside for the Supplemental Fund,[8] but unlike the prior settlements with other PFAS Defendants, a Special Needs Fund will not be established as part of these settlements.

As with the prior settlements, the County is considered a Qualifying Class Member[9] because it is an Active Public Water System that had one or more Impacted Water Sources as of May 15, 2024. In addition, because the County filed its lawsuit in 2020, and because the levels of PFAS in the County's drinking water supply wells are generally higher than the federal MCL, the County will be entitled to an additional 25 percent Litigation Bump and a 4X Regulatory Bump when calculating its potential recovery. The ultimate amount received, however, will depend on the number of Public Water Systems that participate in the Settlements and the number and characteristics of claims they submit for their impacted water. As a result, the sum the County will receive in the Settlements if it chooses to participate cannot be known in advance, though it can be estimated based on publicly available information about reported PFAS detections in water systems across the country and assumptions about the size of the sources in those systems.

Because the Settlement Fund here is $149,075,000, which is 48% of the amount set aside in the earlier BASF Settlement and the methodology for determining how the payouts will be made to Qualifying Class Members will be the same as that used in the BASF Settlement, the Levin Team believes the County's recovery will likely be at least $3 million if it chooses to participate in these Settlements, inclusive of the Litigation and Regulatory Bumps. This estimate does not deduct the amounts owed to the Levin Team, which, depending on the ultimate gross recovery by the County, will be 15-18 percent based on the fee/cost schedule in the retainer agreement. It is not yet known when the settlement proceeds will be distributed to the Class members.

---

[7] The Court will decide whether to grant final approval to the Settlement Fund at a Final Fairness Hearing on January 15, 2027.

[8] The Supplemental Fund is preserved for those sources in public water systems that do not have PFAS testing results at the time of the settlement that exceed their State and/or the Federal MCL.

[9] Because the volume of impacted drinking water and the degree of the impact are the main factors in calculating the cost of treating PFAS, the Settlement Fund will be allocated to Qualifying Class Members through a process that uses formulas to calculate each member's allocation. In addition, certain Qualifying Class Members may be entitled to additional bumps in their recovery based on the date of the initiation of their case (the "Litigation Bump") as well as the amount their impacted water exceeds federal and state Maximum Contaminant Levels ("MCLs") (the "Regulatory Bump").

In exchange for its allocation from the Settlement Fund, the County will be required to: (1) dismiss its claims against the Settling Defendants related to PFAS in its drinking water with prejudice, and (2) release the Settling Defendants from any liability to the County for claims related to PFAS in the County's drinking water, including but not limited to, all costs and rate increases needed to remediate the water supply and any actions brought against the County related to PFAS in the drinking water. Therefore, in the future, if the County is sued by a third party for anything related to PFAS in the County's drinking water, the County will not be able to look to the Settling Defendants for indemnification or assert that the Settling Defendants are liable for such damages. In addition, with regard to the County's remaining claims against the Settling Defendants for: (1) damage to the County's properties that require remediation and removal of PFAS contamination, and (2) damage to the County's wastewater treatment processes, the County will be limited strictly to pursuing claims against the Settling Defendants for costs associated with cleanup of the properties and remediating or removing PFAS from the wastewater. The terms of the Settlement Agreements with the Settling Defendants are non-negotiable.

If the County does not wish to participate in the Settlements with the Settling Defendants, it must notice Outside Counsel by no later than December 8, 2026.

SL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW GROUP

Kenneth A. Sansone, PARTNER
Direct: (415) 625-1733
Main: (415) 348-8300
ksansone@slenvironment.com

October 2, 2026

Geri Bonzon-Keenan, Esq.
County Attorney
Miami-Dade County
111 NW 1st Street, Suite 2810
Miami, Florida 33128

Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foam ("AFFF") MDL No. 2873
Informed Consent Letter re Additional PWS Settlements

Dear Geri:

We are pleased to inform you of four new proposed class action Public Water Provider settlements. These separate Settlement Agreements were reached with Carrier Global Corporation and related entities ("Carrier"), Archroma U.S., Inc. ("Archroma"), Amerex Corporation ("Amerex"), and Nation Ford Chemical Company ("Nation Ford") (collectively the "Settlements"), and were given preliminary approval by the U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina on September 10th, 2026. It appears that the County is eligible to participate in these Settlements and seek awards through the Claims Form submission process.

You are receiving this communication so that you are fully informed as to the essential terms of the Settlements, the basic eligibility requirements for participation, and the Allocation Procedures, which provide the assessment and compensation methodology for determining awards for eligible claimants.

Compared to other defendants who have settled PFAS claims with public water systems to date, Carrier, Archroma, Amerex, and Nation Ford each played a relatively minor role in the manufacture of aqueous-film forming foam that contained PFAS ("AFFF"), and were not involved in making any other PFAS-containing products. As a result, the aggregate value to be paid by all four of these manufacturers under the Settlements is a minimum of $149,075,000, or roughly 48% of the total value paid under the smallest of the four prior settlements to date, i.e., BASF Corporation ($312,500,000).

Unlike the prior settlements, no estimating tables for awards have been provided, so we are unable to provide a source-by-source estimate of your anticipated recovery under the new Settlements. However, because the new Settlements use Allocation Procedures that are virtually identical to those used under each of the prior settlements, you can use the above rough comparison to estimate that your award under these Settlements would be approximately 48% of your BASF award, as noted in your BASF First Payment Letter sent earlier this year (the "BASF First Payment Gross" figure). We can make no guarantees about the size of your awards from the new Settlements, which may vary from the estimate for a number of reasons.

The decision about whether to participate in the Settlements is yours, and each class member's situation is unique based on its particular circumstances and needs. Additionally, although the Settlements are intended, and have been preliminarily approved, to be administered on a coordinated basis for the purpose of conserving notice and administration costs, each Settlement is a separate agreement with each respective settling defendant and the decision about whether to participate must be made on a per-Settlement basis. A class member may decide to participate in all, some, or none of the Settlements.

However, we strongly recommend that you do participate in each of the Settlements. Because of the relatively minor role each of these manufacturers played in making AFFF, we believe it to be very unlikely that you would succeed in proving liability against these manufacturers – including proving that the PFAS in the County's water supplies originated in AFFF made by any of these manufacturers, as opposed to AFFF made by other manufacturers with much larger shares of the overall AFFF market, or other non-AFFF products. In our opinion, the Settlements are the best opportunity to receive fair and reasonable compensation for your claims against these manufacturers in the foreseeable future. Based upon Class Counsel's knowledge and experience gained through years of involvement in not just this MDL but in PFAS-related litigation, we believe that settling now and receiving payment for your claims is clearly in your best interest.

If you decline to enter the Settlement Program, you will need to affirmatively opt-out. If you opt-out, your claims against Carrier and Archroma will continue in the court system, and you will remain free to bring legal claims against Amerex and Nation Ford, if you have a basis to do so. This will involve substantial additional delay and expense to you, and you also run the risk of ultimately receiving nothing for your claims.

As your counsel, we believe that these Settlements are fair and reasonable and represent the best chance to recover meaningful compensation for your PFAS-related drinking water claims. We strongly encourage you to participate, and we remain available to answer any questions and to help you through the Claims Form submission process.

Thank you for the opportunity to represent you in this matter. We are extremely pleased to announce this favorable resolution and hope that we can be of assistance to you as the process unfolds.

Very truly yours,



Kenneth A. Sansone, Esq.
SL Environmental Law Group, P.C.

MEMORANDUM

(Revised)

TO: Honorable Chairman Anthony Rodriguez
and Members, Board of County Commissioners

DATE: November 17, 2026

FROM: Geri Bonzon-Keenan
County Attorney

SUBJECT: Agenda Item No. 11(A)(6)

Please note any items checked.

_____	**"3-Day Rule" for committees applicable if raised**
_____	**6 weeks required between first reading and public hearing**
_____	**4 weeks notification to municipal officials required prior to public hearing**
_____	**Decreases revenues or increases expenditures without balancing budget**
_____	**Budget required**
_____	**Statement of fiscal impact required**
_____	**Statement of social equity required**
_____	**Ordinance creating a new board requires detailed County Mayor's report for public hearing**
✓	**No committee review**
_____	**Requires more than a majority vote (i.e., 2/3's present ____, 2/3 membership ____, 3/5's ____, unanimous ____, majority plus one ____, CDMP 7 votes (majority of membership) ____, CDMP 2/3 members present but not less than 7 votes (majority of membership) ____, CDMP 9 votes (2/3 membership) _____) to approve**
_____	**Current information regarding funding source, index code and available balance, and available capacity (if debt is contemplated) required**

Approved _____ Mayor
Veto _____
Override _____

Agenda Item No. 11(A)(6)
11-17-26

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROPOSED CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENTS WITH CARRIER GLOBAL CORPORATION; ARCHROMA U.S., INC.; AMEREX CORPORATION; AND NATION FORD CHEMICAL COMPANY IN THE PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS' PORTION OF THE MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION MATTER, IN RE: AQUEOUS FILM-FORMING FOAMS PRODUCT LIABILITY LITIGATION, MDL 2:18-MN-2873-RMG, CASE NO. 2:23-CV-03230-RMG, RELATING TO PFAS CONTAMINATION OF DRINKING WATER; AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY MAYOR OR COUNTY MAYOR'S DESIGNEE, AFTER CONSULTATION WITH THE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, TO COMPLETE ALL DOCUMENTATION AND EXECUTE ALL RELEASES AND AGREEMENTS NECESSARY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SETTLEMENTS WITH CARRIER GLOBAL CORPORATION; ARCHROMA U.S., INC.; AMEREX CORPORATION; AND NATION FORD CHEMICAL COMPANY IN THE WATER PROVIDERS' PORTION OF THE MDL; AND AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY ATTORNEY AND THE COUNTY'S OUTSIDE COUNSEL TO CONTINUE TO PURSUE LITIGATION RELATED TO PFAS ON BEHALF OF THE COUNTY

WHEREAS, this Board desires to accomplish the purposes set forth in the accompanying memorandum, a copy of which is incorporated herein by reference,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA, that this Board:

Section 1. Approves and incorporates the foregoing recital as if fully set forth herein.

Section 2. Authorizes the County to participate in the proposed Class Action Settlements with: (a) Carrier Global Corp. ("Carrier"); (b) Archroma U.S., Inc. ("Archroma"); (c) Amerex Corporation ("Amerex"); and (d) Nation Ford Chemical Company ("Nation Ford") (collectively, the "Settling Defendants") in the Public Water Systems' portion of the Multi-District

Litigation matter, In Re: Aqueous Film-Forming Foams Product Liability Litigation, MDL 2:18-mn-2873-RMG, Case No. 2:23-cv-03230-RMG, relating to PFAS contamination of drinking water (hereinafter, the "MDL").

Section 3. Authorizes the County Mayor or County Mayor's designee to, after consultation with the County Attorney's Office: (a) complete all documentation required to participate in the Settlement Agreements with the Settling Defendants, such as Claims Forms; and (b) execute all releases and agreements necessary to finalize settlement of the Public Water Systems' portion of the MDL with the Settling Defendants.

Section 4. Authorizes the County Attorney and the County's Outside Counsel to: (a) continue litigating the County's claims against the defendants remaining in the Public Water Systems' portion of the MDL; and (b) continue pursuing litigation against any and all defendants, including the Settling Defendants, that may be liable for damages to the County that extend beyond the County's drinking water supply.

The Prime Sponsor of the foregoing resolution is Commissioner Oliver G. Gilbert, III. It was offered by Commissioner , who moved its adoption. The motion was seconded by Commissioner and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Anthony Rodriguez, Chairman
Kionne L. McGhee, Vice Chairman

Marleine Bastien	Juan Carlos Bermudez
Sen. René García	Oliver G. Gilbert, III
Roberto J. Gonzalez	Keon Hardemon
Danielle Cohen Higgins	Vicki L. Lopez
Natalie Milian Orbis	Raquel A. Regalado
Micky Steinberg	

The Chairperson thereupon declared this resolution duly passed and adopted this 17th day of November, 2026. This resolution shall become effective upon the earlier of (1) 10 days after the date of its adoption unless vetoed by the County Mayor, and if vetoed, shall become effective only upon an override by this Board, or (2) approval by the County Mayor of this resolution and the filing of this approval with the Clerk of the Board.

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA
BY ITS BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

JUAN FERNANDEZ-BARQUIN, CLERK

By:_____
Deputy Clerk

Approved by County Attorney as
to form and legal sufficiency. SED

Sarah E. Davis