



Water Supply District of Acton

693 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
P.O. BOX 953
ACTON, MASSACHUSETTS 01720

TELEPHONE (978) 263-9107

FAX (978) 264-0148

Board of Water Commissioners Meeting Agenda

Monday, April 29, 2024 @ 7:00 PM

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, meetings are being held virtually via Zoom

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89027500028>

Or One tap mobile :

+16469313860,, 89027500028# US, +19292056099,,89027500028# US (New York)

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

+1 646 931 3860 US, +1 929 205 6099 US (New York), +1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC), +1 305 224 1968 US

Webinar ID: 890 2750 0028

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89027500028>

- **Comments from the public**
- **Approve minutes from the meeting of 3/25/24**
- **Appoint one Commissioner to sign warrants while conducting meetings virtually**

OLD BUSINESS:

- Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)
 - Current sample data, if available
 - Discussion of PFAS Upgrades
 - Approve recommendation to award VFD contract for CAWTP PFAS Upgrades (DWSRF #12517) to Flow Tech, Inc. of South Windsor, CT for \$135,769
 - Bottled Water Rebate Update
 - US EPA Final PFAS Regulation
- US EPA Lead & Copper Rule Improvements

NEW BUSINESS:

- Discussion of Outdoor Water Use Restrictions for 2024
- 3rd Quarter Financial Update

EXECUTIVE SESSION: -- To discuss strategy with respect to litigation if an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the litigating position of the District. To consider the purchase, exchange, lease of real property as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the District.

Any agenda item(s) which did not come to the attention of the Board of Water Commissioners 48 hours prior to this meeting and were not reasonably anticipated.

Board of Water Commissioners

Meeting Agenda

Monday, March 25, 2024 @ 7:00 PM

AGENDA

- Comments from the public
- Approve minutes from the meetings of 3/9/2023 and 3/11/2024
- Appoint one Commissioner to sign warrants while conducting meetings virtually

OLD BUSINESS:

- Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)
- Current sample data, if available
- Discussion of Additional PFAS Upgrades
- Interview with Politico E&E News reporter
- US EPA Lead & Copper Rule Improvements

NEW BUSINESS:

- Review Annual District Meeting
- Discussion of Proposed Town of Acton Zoning Bylaw Changes

EXECUTIVE SESSION: -- To discuss strategy with respect to litigation if an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the litigating position of the District. To consider the purchase, exchange, lease of real property as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the District.

Present at Tonight's Meeting:

Commissioners: Erika Amir Lin (Chair), Barry Rosen, Stephen Stuntz

Finance Committee: John Petersen

District Manager: Matt Mostoller

District Treasurer: Christine McCarthy

District Counsel: Mary Bassett, Spencer Holland

Environmental Manager: Alexandra Wahlstrom

Members of the Public: Terra Friedrichs, Kim Kastens, Alissa Nicol, Ron Parenti, Bill Guthlein, Jennifer Venne

START OF MINUTES

Ms. Amir Lin opened meeting at 7:01 pm

Comments from the public

None at this time

Approve minutes from the meetings of 3/9/2023 and 3/11/2024

Mr. Rosen motioned to approve the minutes of the March 9th, 2023, meeting. Mr. Stuntz seconded and it was unanimously approved via a roll call vote, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Stuntz, Ms. Amir Lin.

Mr. Rosen motioned to approve the minutes of the March 11th, 2024, meeting. Mr. Stuntz seconded and it was unanimously approved via a roll call vote, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Stuntz, Ms. Amir Lin.

Appoint one Commissioner to sign warrants while conducting meetings virtually

Mr. Rosen motioned to appoint Ms. Amir Lin to sign warrants until the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Stuntz seconded and it was unanimously approved via a roll call vote, Mr. Stunts, Mr. Rosen, Ms. Amir Lin.

OLD BUSINESS:

Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS)

Current sample data, if available

Mr. Mostoller reported to the commissioners that earlier in the day an email update was sent to the PFAS email list, and the updated sample data was also posted to the website. South Acton results came in at 11.6 ppt, and Center Acton results came in at 6.2 ppt. North Acton is on and in the system. North Acton will be sampled later in the week. This is the first time all three treatment plants are in the system simultaneously in recent times. North Acton does not have the PFAS treatment installed yet, but the aim is for the PFAS system to be online in April.

Mr. Rosen asked if work can still be done on the PFAS equipment while the pumps are on. Mr. Mostoller responded that the plant is fully operational and construction is ongoing.

Discussion of Additional PFAS Upgrades

Mr. Mostoller indicated that there were two primary items of note. For North Acton, they continue to have issues with the treatment equipment provided by Veolia which they continue to work through. The General Contractor and District staff are assisting Veolia to get the equipment to reach the point where they can begin to put carbon into the system.

Mr. Stuntz asked if the carbon is on site. Mr. Mostoller replied it was, but a truck showed up and took the delivery back even though they were told the carbon had not been installed yet. There is no word from Veolia yet on this.

Mr. Mostoller estimated that if they are lucky on May 1st North will be fully in the system with PFAS equipment and have DEP approval.

Ms. Amir Lin asked if North Acton will have a similar schedule of going off and on like it did in the winter. Mr. Mostoller responded that that will depend on how fast the PFAS system goes in, the hope is to turn it on in March and have water running through PFAS treatment in April, so as to gradually increase output as we approach May.

The second item of notes is that the two pre-bid items, the GAC pressure vessels and the Building for South Acton, have been opened. It appears they do have an apparent low bidder, and both engineers recommend to award. These items do not have full DEP SRF approval yet, but Mr. Mostoller is asking the board for a motion to award as he doesn't believe waiting until April is in the District's best interests.

Mr. Rosen asked a brief question about the bids and if there is any relation to vendors from the North Acton Project. Mr. Mostoller reviewed the details of each vendor with the board.

Mr. Rosen motioned to recommend to award to Rubb, Inc. of Sanford Maine the contract for the Membrane Building at South Acton for the amount of \$623,958. Mr. Stuntz seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved via a roll call vote, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Stunts, Ms. Amir Lin.

Mr. Rosen motioned to recommend to award \$1.43 million for eight GAC vessels from Aqueous Vets, LLC. of Redding California. Mr. Stuntz seconded and it was unanimously approved via a roll call vote, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Stuntz, Ms. Amir Lin.

Mr. Mostoller informed the board that the South Acton electrical and HVAC subcontractor bids will be opened tomorrow.

Interview with *Politico E&E News* reporter

Mr. Mostoller informed the board that he accepted the opportunity to speak with Miranda Wilson, a Boston-based reporter for *Politico*. Ms. Wilson was doing an article on the costs communities are facing with PFAS and was particularly interested in Acton as there is not one lone responsible party assisting with the costs. This conversation happened a few weeks ago, and the article was recently published. Mr. Mostoller then provided details of his conversation with Ms. Wilson and told the board he is working to get the board a copy to read.

US EPA Lead & Copper Rule Improvements

Ms. Wahlstrom provided an update on the EPA Lead and Copper Rule service line inventory progress. They began work at the list of 73 locations to test the vac excavation and as of March 21st completed 51 locations from that list, 8 of which were in driveways, the rest were in lawns. Eight locations were not able to be completed due to large rocks, roots, because it was too deep for equipment to reach, or because it was too close to a septic system. The current rate of work is averaging about 10 a day, and they are scheduled to continue the work this week.

In the upcoming neighborhoods they expect to find goosenecks. Overall people have been receptive to the work, though with the heavy rains there have been calls about settling or wash-out

of the temporary restored holes. As expected, everything they found was copper, but they are very pleased with the work being completed and the speed of completion.

Ms. Amir Lin asked what size the excavations are, Ms. Wahlstrom replied they are about two ft by two ft. Ms. Amir Lin asked about the process for the next phase of work. Ms. Wahlstrom replied that they may briefly pause before the next phase to regroup and assess the pace, and to wait until after spring water main flushing is complete.

NEW BUSINESS:

Review Annual District Meeting

Ms. Amir Lin directed the board to discuss and review feedback from the Annual District Meeting on March 20th, 2024. Mr. Mostoller provided his insights, that all the articles passed, nearly unanimously except for one that only had two votes opposed. He noted that attendance was lower than he expected given the article on the cell tower.

Mr. Rosen then shared his thoughts on the Annual Meeting, noting the public comment on the exact salaries of Article 1 being listed in the warrant, equipment purchases being explained or shown to those in attendance, as well as explaining how financial Articles relate to the budget being passed.

Mr. Parenti provided three comments to the board about the Annual Meeting. He expressed support for the Finance Committee's presentation at the top of the meeting. He also noted a small procedural change in the Commissioner's verbal recommendations that could be made to make their annual meetings match the Acton Town Meeting format, which the public is more familiar with. Finally, Mr. Parenti noted some in attendance wanted the motion language projected on the screen, as is done at Acton Town Meeting.

Ms. Friedrichs appealed to the board to not sign off on the cell tower lease at Nagog Hill until the neighbors have been informed, as she believes if they are informed during the permitting process it will be too late for them to express meaningful input.

Ms. Kastens commented that the feedback from Annual Meeting about clarifying information about the Articles, could be addressed if the board pursued Mr. Petersen's earlier suggestion of putting a summary of Warrant Articles in plain language and distributing it at the Annual Meeting.

Mr. Petersen shared his feedback with the board. He noted several suggestions of import, the first that having the District's actions and direct motions captured in agenda language, proposed motions, and minutes, could enhance their communication strategy. He noted the structure of motions, and better explanations of the warrant would dispel many of the clarification questions they receive. He also commented that a handout covering the totality of the District's financial commitment, and a meeting score card similar to the Acton Town Meeting score card could aid in understanding complex financial articles.

Ms. Amir Lin thanked the board and everyone else who shared their input and feedback.

Discussion of Proposed Town of Acton Zoning Bylaw Changes

Mr. Mostoller provided background on this agenda item. Mr. Mostoller summarized that the Town of Acton has several proposed Zoning Bylaw changes, that in his view are aiming to make an easier

path for development, higher density, and mixed-use development. The three zoning articles are the Powder Mill Article, the South Acton Village Amendment, and the MBTA Zoning initiative. The board then opened discussion.

Mr. Stuntz first shared his thoughts on the state's requirements for the MBTA Zoning, and that since zoning is the responsibility of the Town, the District is usually expected to support the decision they come to.

Mr. Rosen shared his thoughts, noting that the type of development this zoning encourages tends to be high water users on the street level of multi-use projects, and there seems to be little consideration for the impact on water given to the proposals. Mr. Rosen expressed general concern towards the proposed zoning changes, and that these proposed zoning changes did not reflect good dialogue between the District and Town of Acton.

Ms. Amir Lin noted that just because the zoning is considered high density, does not mean the District cannot support it. She did pose a question about the wastewater provision, and questioned if major changes to infrastructure in these areas would be paid for by the developer to do the last mile, or if the District would be asked to support this. She asked Mr. Mostoller if these questions had been raised.

Mr. Mostoller replied that early on in the planning process he did participate in the dialogue, communicating the infrastructure constraints. Mr. Mostoller agreed with the comment that just because zoning allows that type of development, does not guarantee it will come to fruition. The District has a standing policy to evaluate proposed projects as they are submitted. He noted that given the current state of development timelines, these hypothetical developments could be six years out. Mr. Mostoller then continued to point out some nuances of the MBTA requirements, and said the District needs clarity on whether infrastructure obligations will be put on the developers or not.

The board then briefly discussed the proposed Powder Mill Place development, and when they had last communicated with that developer about infrastructure constraints.

Ms. Friedrichs shared her thoughts with the board. She asked if the board might consider these zoning changes not on a case-by-case basis, but as a consideration of long-term capacity. She then asked that the board take a position on the matter and share their thoughts with the Town of Acton so they can coordinate before major zoning changes are approved.

Ms. Friedrichs continued to share her thoughts, highlighting several key issues. She expressed concern at the effects increased density may have on water sources and that an impact study should be done on these proposed zoning changes. She added that if the District got involved in the conversation about these changes it would better inform the public's understanding of the proposed changes. She asked the commissioners to send their thoughts on the proposed changes in writing to the Selectboard, as it is her understanding that the Selectboard is not concerned about the effects on water capacity from these zoning changes.

Ms. Amir Lin asked Ms. Friedrichs when she thought the District should share their feedback on the issue, if it would be prior to Acton Town Meeting. Ms. Friedrichs responded that this could happen at any time, her concern is more focused on getting the process to slow down and consider the

impact of drawing developers to these types of projects in Acton. She clarified that her two major concerns are the effects of this on tenant displacement and water health.

Mr. Parenti then shared his thoughts on the topic. He agreed with Ms. Friedrichs on several points. Given that the District evaluates submitted proposals he questioned whose responsibility it would be to do this longer-term capacity planning, if this falls to the District or the WRAC committee. Mr. Rosen agreed that there should be more partnership between the District and the Town when it comes to this type of long-term planning and re-zoning, and what the development implications are. He also noted he understands the pressure the Town must feel with regards to the MBTA zoning.

Ms. Kastens shared her thoughts, expressing concern that the District plans on a case-by-case basis, and asked the board to communicate any warning signs about capacity and supply if the Town encourages development.

Mr. Mostoller clarified that the District does have a multipronged long-term planning process, but when it comes to the approval of connection permits, each one is evaluated on a case-by-case basis. He explained that the District just renewed their Water Management Act Permit, which included several long-term planning processes. When asked about communicating this information to the Town Mr. Mostoller responded that in the past the feedback from the Town on long-term capacity has been viewed only with regards to the Water Management Permit. He explained that if the District does not exceed the constraints of the permit, then the Town does not believe there to be a capacity constraint.

Ms. Nicol, Selectboard liaison to the Water District, asked Mr. Mostoller about how close to the water draw limit Acton is. Mr. Mostoller responded that they are not passing the limit as of now, but the State is not looking favorably on requests to increase draw limits as they have concerns about increased runoff, intensity of storms, and other factors that affect the recharge of the aquifer. Mr. Mostoller and Ms. Nicol continued this discussion noting that the Planning Board hearing on this topic operated on the assumption that there was available water capacity. Mr. Mostoller shared the specific numbers of the 2022 average day demand for water, noting changes in the number before and after PFAS. Mr. Mostoller continued to share information on the Districts Permit allocation, and the state's current stance on increased water draw, and the availability of water for new zoning.

Ms. Friedrichs commented on the affordable housing aspect of the MBTA Zoning requirement, and the current lawsuit underway to determine if this law is constitutional. She then pointed to several other communities who had done impact studies on similar work, expressed concern for the potential impact on water quality from these zoning changes, and urged for improved coordination between the Town and the District on zoning.

Ms. Amir Lin thanked everyone who participated for their input in the discussion.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Ms. Amir Lin motioned to close the regular open meeting currently in session, and have the Commissioners enter an executive session pursuant to General Law chapter 30A section 21 9 to discuss strategy with respects to litigation as an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on

litigating position of the district; and to not reconvene in open session. Mr. Stuntz seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved via a roll call vote, Mr. Rosen, Mr. Stuntz, Ms. Amir Lin.

Meeting closed at 8:27 pm

DRAFT

Abatements for 4 Quarters

	Jun-23	Count	Sep-23	Count	Dec-23	Count	Mar-24	Count
Bottled Water	\$ 7,035.00	159	\$ 7,110.00	160	\$ 7,245.00	165	\$ 7,515.00	168
Toilet	\$ 1,200.00	6	\$ 700.00	6	\$ 800.00	7	\$ 600.00	4
Clothes Washer	\$ 600.00	6	\$ 900.00	6	\$ 1,200.00	8	\$ 300.00	2
Fixtures	\$ 50.62	2	\$ -	0	\$ 288.24	3	\$ -	0
Elderly Abatement	\$ 486.34	7	\$ 586.64	8	\$ 722.70	10	\$ 817.40	11
Total	\$ 9,371.96	180	\$ 9,296.64	180	\$ 10,255.94	193	\$ 9,232.40	185

Bottled Water rebate totals include payments sent directly to tenants

Matt Mostoller

From: Matt Mostoller
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 3:54 PM
To: AWD Commissioners; AWD entire staff
Cc: Finance Committee; william.charles.mullin@gmail.com; Mullin, William; sb@actonma.gov; boh@actonma.gov; Spencer Holland
Subject: US EPA PFAS Standards Released
Attachments: pfas-npdwr_fact-sheet_general_4.9.24v1.pdf; pfas-npdwr_fact-sheet_hazard-index_4.8.24.pdf

Good afternoon,

As some of you may be aware, this morning the US EPA released the long anticipated federal PFAS drinking water regulations. They will be hosting a general webinar on April 16th if you are interested in hearing directly from them about these regulations (link below). Highlights include the 4 ppt standard for PFOA and PFOS as individual contaminants, which is unchanged from the proposed regulation issued in March 2023. They also retained the Hazard Index (HI) MCL for a combination of two or more of four target compounds. A new MCL was established for three of the four HI compounds as individual contaminants in addition to the HI MCL; this was not anticipated but does not appear to impact our treated water from a future compliance perspective. Alex reviewed our data set against the table of standards below and we remain focused on the PFOA and PFOS targets. Center and South Acton are both greater than 4 ppt for PFOA and PFOS, while North Acton is greater than 4 ppt for PFOA. None of our treatment facilities trip the HI or the new MCLs for the 3 additional compounds. As a reminder, Clapp/Whitcomb has effectively removed PFAS to meet both the state and federal standards, however, MassDEP will not allow us to use that facility until we make significant improvements.

In this final rule, EPA is setting limits for five individual PFAS: PFOA, PFOS, PFNA, PFHxS, and HFPO-DA (known as GenX Chemicals). EPA is also setting a Hazard Index level for two or more of four PFAS as a mixture: PFNA, PFHxS, HFPO-DA, and PFBS.

Chemical	Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG)	Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL)
PFOA	0	4.0 ppt
PFOS	0	4.0 ppt
PFNA	10 ppt	10 ppt
PFHxS	10 ppt	10 ppt
HFPO-DA (GenX chemicals)	10 ppt	10 ppt
Mixture of two or more: PFNA, PFHxS, HFPO-DA, and PFBS	Hazard Index of 1	Hazard Index of 1

Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG): The level of a contaminant in drinking water below which there is no known or expected risk to health. MCLGs allow for a margin of safety and are non-enforceable public health goals.

The biggest take away for Acton at this time is that our current PFAS response plans are anticipated to address the new federal standards and we should be well positioned to meet the implementation timelines (2029). It is anticipated that our media replacements would need to more frequent than the estimates in the pilot reports to maintain compliance with the lower standards. However, the federal compliance schedules are currently more favorable than MassDEP's. As we do not have full scale operational data, it is challenging to predict how this will manifest. MassDEP must adopt the new regulations and it is unclear how they will do that as they are allowed to make the regulations more stringent. At this time, I have not seen any public statements from MassDEP, other

than a commitment from the Commissioner in January of this year to conduct stakeholder engagement around adopting the federal PFAS standards. Hopefully, I will have more to say on this at our April 29th meeting.

Resources from the US EPA are attached and the link to register for the webinar on 4/16 is below. We will be working on a PFAS web update to be published this week. Please reach out with any questions.

- April 16, 2024 (2:00-3:00 pm EDT) [Webinar Registration: General Overview of PFAS NDPWR for Communities](#)

Thank you,
Matt

Matthew Mostoller

District Manager

Water Supply District of Acton

693 Massachusetts Avenue

P.O. Box 953 Acton, MA 01720

P 978-263-9107 F 978-264-0148

Follow us on Facebook and Twitter!



PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation

Introduction

Safe drinking water is fundamental to healthy people and thriving communities. President Biden believes that all people in the United States should have access to clean, safe drinking water. Since the beginning of the Biden-Harris Administration, EPA has been delivering on the promise to protect communities from the harmful effects of toxic substances, including carcinogens. PFAS are a series of man-made chemical compounds that persist in the environment for long periods of time. They are often called “forever chemicals.” For decades PFAS chemicals have been used in industry and consumer products such as nonstick cookware, waterproof clothing, and stain resistant furniture. These chemicals have been important for certain industries and uses. And the latest science shows that these chemicals are harmful to our health.

PFAS exposure over a long period of time can cause cancer and other serious illnesses that decrease quality of life or result in death. PFAS exposure during critical life stages such as pregnancy or early childhood can also result in adverse health impacts. EPA’s responsibility through the Safe Drinking Water Act is to protect people’s drinking water, and the Biden-Harris Administration is taking action to protect public health by establishing nationwide, legally enforceable drinking water limits for several well-researched PFAS chemicals and reduce PFAS exposure for approximately 100 million Americans served by public drinking water systems.

The Rule

As the lead federal agency responsible for protecting America’s drinking water, EPA is using the best available science on PFAS to set national standards. PFAS can often be found together in water and in varying combinations as mixtures. Decades of research shows mixtures of different chemicals can have additive health effects, even if the individual chemicals are each present at lower levels.

In this final rule, EPA is setting limits for five individual PFAS: PFOA, PFOS, PFNA, PFHxS, and HFPO-DA (known as GenX Chemicals). And EPA is also setting a Hazard Index level for two or more of four PFAS as a mixture: PFNA, PFHxS, HFPO-DA, and PFBS.

Chemical	Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG)	Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL)
PFOA	0	4.0 ppt
PFOS	0	4.0 ppt
PFNA	10 ppt	10 ppt
PFHxS	10 ppt	10 ppt
HFPO-DA (GenX chemicals)	10 ppt	10 ppt
Mixture of two or more: PFNA, PFHxS, HFPO-DA, and PFBS	Hazard Index of 1	Hazard Index of 1

Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG): The level of a contaminant in drinking water below which there is no known or expected risk to health. MCLGs allow for a margin of safety and are non-enforceable public health goals.

Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL): The highest level of a contaminant that is allowed in drinking water. MCLs are set as close to MCLGs as feasible using the best available treatment technology and taking cost into consideration. MCLs are enforceable standards.

ppt: parts per trillion

Hazard Index (HI): The Hazard Index is a long-established approach that EPA regularly uses to understand health risk from a chemical mixture (i.e., exposure to multiple chemicals). The HI is made up of a sum of fractions. Each fraction compares the level of each PFAS measured in the water to the health-based water concentration.

This new rule will significantly reduce the level of PFAS in drinking water across the United States. Many states have worked to monitor for and reduce PFAS exposure in drinking water through state-specific regulations. This rule builds on these efforts by incorporating the latest science and establishing a nationwide, long-term health-protective level for these specific PFAS in drinking water. Communities and states will need to determine whether PFAS is in their drinking water and take actions such as notifying consumers and reducing the levels of PFAS, as needed.

Water systems must take action to reduce the levels of these PFAS in drinking water if the level of PFAS in their drinking water exceeds regulatory standards. Regulated public water systems have three years to complete their initial monitoring for these chemicals. Systems must include their results in their Annual Water Quality reports to customers. Systems that detect PFAS above the new standards will have five years to implement solutions that reduce PFAS in their drinking water. Water systems must also notify the public if levels of regulated PFAS exceed these new standards.

Impacts and Costs of the Rule

People will live longer, healthier lives because of this action, and the benefits justify the costs. Once implemented, these limits will reduce tens of thousands of PFAS-attributable illnesses or deaths. EPA estimates that once implemented, this regulation will reduce PFAS exposure for approximately 100 million Americans served by public drinking water systems. EPA considered all available information and analyses for costs and benefits, quantifiable and non-quantifiable, of this rule and determined that the benefits justify the costs.

Fewer people will get cancer or liver disease, pregnant women will have reduced risks, and more and children and infants will be stronger and grow healthier. EPA calculated measurable health benefits based on fewer cancers, lower incidents of heart attacks and strokes, and reduced birth complications. These benefits are estimated to be approximately \$1.5 billion per year, and include avoided costs of medical bills, income lost to illness, and death. Additionally, EPA could not quantify all the health benefits, including developmental, cardiovascular, liver, immune, endocrine, metabolic, reproductive, musculoskeletal, and carcinogenic effects, and therefore the benefit estimates are likely greater than \$1.5 billion.

Compliance with this rule is estimated to cost approximately \$1.5 billion annually. The Biden-Harris Administration has dedicated \$9 billion through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to help communities impacted by PFAS pollution in drinking water. In addition, another \$12 billion in Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funding is available to communities to make general drinking water improvements, including addressing PFAS chemicals. Estimated costs include water system monitoring, communicating with customers, and – if necessary – installing treatment technologies.

Implementation and Funding

The rule is achievable and implementable. Drinking water utilities will be able to implement these new requirements as control technologies exist and are in use today. Water treatment technologies exist to remove PFAS from drinking water including granular activated carbon, reverse osmosis, and ion exchange systems. EPA's

final rule does not dictate how water systems remove these contaminants. The rule is flexible, allowing systems to determine the best solutions for their community. Public water systems can choose from multiple proven treatment options. In some cases, systems can close contaminated wells or obtain a new uncontaminated source of drinking water.

There is unprecedented funding for drinking water systems impacted by PFAS and other emerging contaminants to provide safe water to communities. We know that PFAS pollution can have a disproportionate impact on small, disadvantaged, and rural communities, and there is federal funding available specifically for these water systems. With today's announcement of the rule, EPA is also announcing nearly \$1 billion for states and territories, through the [Emerging Contaminants in Small or Disadvantaged Communities Grant Program](#), which can be used for initial testing and treatment at both public water systems and to help owners of private wells address PFAS contamination. The nearly \$1 billion announced today is part of the dedicated \$9 billion of Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) funding for communities with drinking water impacted by PFAS and other emerging contaminants. An additional \$12 billion in Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funding is available to communities to make general drinking water improvements, including addressing PFAS pollution. This funding is available through EPA programs that are part of President Biden's [Justice40 Initiative](#), which set the goal that 40 percent of the overall benefits of certain federal investments flow to disadvantaged communities that are marginalized by underinvestment and overburdened by pollution.

EPA's free [Water Technical Assistance program](#) (WaterTA) is ensuring that disadvantaged communities can access federal funding. Too many communities across America face challenges providing safe drinking water services to their residents, and WaterTA supports communities to identify water challenges; develop plans; build technical, managerial, and financial capacity; and develop application materials to access water infrastructure funding. EPA collaborates with state, Tribes, territories, community partners, and other key stakeholders to implement WaterTA efforts and the end result is more communities with applications for federal funding, quality water infrastructure, and reliable water services. [Learn more here.](#)

Additional Resources

Learn more about water infrastructure funding opportunities by visiting EPA's [water infrastructure page](#).

If you are concerned about PFAS in drinking water, there are key actions you can take. People who are concerned about PFAS in their drinking water should first contact their drinking water utility to find out more about their drinking water, including what contaminants may be present, if the utility is monitoring for PFAS, what the levels are, and to see whether any actions are being taken.

If you remain concerned after talking to your utility, then consider using or installing in-home water treatment (e.g., filters) that is certified to lower the levels of PFAS in your water and/or contact your health care provider as well as your state or local health department. You can find more information about water filters that help reduce PFAS [here](#). If you get your water from a home drinking water well, then EPA recommends you conduct regular testing. If PFAS are found, you can take steps to lower the levels of PFAS. For more visit: EPA's website [here](#).



Understanding the Final PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation Hazard Index Maximum Contaminant Level

What is a Hazard Index Maximum Contaminant Level?

Decades of research show mixtures of different chemicals can have additive health effects, even if the individual chemicals are each present at lower levels. This means that low levels of multiple PFAS that individually would not likely result in adverse health effects may pose health concerns when combined in a mixture. The Hazard Index is a long-established approach that EPA regularly uses, for example in the Superfund program, to determine the health concerns associated with exposure to chemical mixtures. EPA's Hazard Index Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) is set at 1 and applies to any mixture containing two or more of PFNA, PFHxS, PFBS, and HFPO-DA (known as "GenX chemicals"). These PFAS can often be found together in different mixtures and research shows that exposure to mixtures of these chemicals may have additive health impacts.

How do I calculate the Hazard Index?

The Hazard Index is made up of a sum of fractions. Each fraction compares the level of each PFAS measured in the water to the highest level below which there is no risk of health effects. EPA is currently developing an online calculator to assist water systems in determining their Hazard Index result. The online calculator will perform the calculation explained in this fact sheet.

- Step 1.** Divide the measured concentration of Gen X by its health-based value of 10 ppt.
- Step 2.** Divide the measured concentration of PFBS by its health-based value of 2000 ppt.
- Step 3.** Divide the measured concentration of PFNA by its health-based value of 10 ppt.
- Step 4.** Divide the measured concentration of PFHxS by its health-based value of 10 ppt.
- Step 5.** Add the ratios from steps 1, 2, 3 and 4 together.

Equation:

$$\text{Hazard Index (1 unitless)} = \left(\frac{[\text{HFPO-DA}_{\text{ppt}}]}{[10 \text{ ppt}]} \right) + \left(\frac{[\text{PFBS}_{\text{ppt}}]}{[2000 \text{ ppt}]} \right) + \left(\frac{[\text{PFNA}_{\text{ppt}}]}{[10 \text{ ppt}]} \right) + \left(\frac{[\text{PFHxS}_{\text{ppt}}]}{[10 \text{ ppt}]} \right)$$

- Step 6.** Compliance with the Hazard Index MCL is determined by a running annual average. To determine the running annual average, repeat

steps 1-5 for each quarterly sample collected in the past year and calculate the average of these quarterly Hazard Index results.

Step 7. If the running annual average Hazard Index is greater than the MCL of 1, it is a violation of the Hazard Index MCL (see Table for example).

Chemical	Sample	Quarter 1		Quarter 2		Quarter 3		Quarter 4	
		Q1 Formula	Sample	Q2 Formula	Sample	Q3 Formula	Sample	Q4 Formula	
HFPO-DA (ppt)	5 ppt	5 ppt/10 ppt = 0.5	5 ppt	5 ppt/10 ppt = 0.5	Not detected	Not detected	0 ppt/10 ppt = 0	Not detected	0 ppt/10 ppt = 0
PFBS (ppt)	5 ppt	5 ppt/2000 ppt = 0.0025	5 ppt	5 ppt/2000 ppt = 0.0025	Not detected	Not detected	0 ppt/2000 ppt = 0	Not detected	5 ppt/2000 ppt = 0.0025
PFNA (ppt)	Not detected	0 ppt/10 ppt = 0	Not detected	0 ppt/10 ppt = 0	4 ppt	4 ppt	4 ppt/10 ppt = 0.4	Not detected	0 ppt/10 ppt = 0
PFHxS (ppt)	3 ppt	3 ppt/10 ppt = 0.3	Not detected	0 ppt/10 ppt = 0	4 ppt	4 ppt	4 ppt/10 ppt = 0.4	6 ppt	6 ppt/10 ppt = 0.6
Hazard Index (unitless)	0.5 + 0.0025 + 0 + 0.3 = 0.8025		0.5 + 0.0025 + 0 + 0 = 0.5025		0 + 0 + 0.4 + 0.4 = 0.8		0 + 0.0025 + 0 + 0.6 = 0.6025		

$$\text{Running Annual Average} = \left(\frac{0.8025 + 0.5025 + 0.8 + 0.6025}{4} \right) = 0.6769 = 0.7$$

The Hazard Index Running Annual Average result is 0.7 (rounded to one significant digit). Because this result does not exceed 1, the water system has not exceeded the MCL. Therefore, no violation of the Hazard Index MCL has occurred.

FY 2024 Budget vs. Actual as of 03.31.2024

	Actual FY 22	Actual FY 23	Budget FY 24	FY 24			Variance to Annual Budget	%	Projections
				1st Qtr Actual	2nd Qtr Actual	3rd Qtr Actual			
EXPENSES									
Audit/Accounting	17,800	16,000	20,000	8,300	15,800	15,800	(4,200)	79%	15,800
Auto Maint & Fuel	50,000	38,197	52,000	4,030	11,964	22,409	(29,591)	43%	40,000
Short Term Debt	505,000	215,986	-	6,100	24,408	383,054	383,054	100%	383,554
Long Term Debt	1,459,219	1,661,539	2,752,416	458,878	458,878	2,137,481	(614,935)	78%	2,137,481
Chemicals	91,772	101,504	160,000	23,934	68,146	96,481	(63,519)	60%	102,000
DEP Withdrawal	4,958	5,121	5,000	-	-	4,967	(33)	99%	4,967
Employee Education	11,695	9,627	17,500	1,909	4,893	8,847	(8,653)	51%	12,000
Engineering	50,000	30,319	60,000	-	2,165	2,165	(57,835)	4%	40,000
Health/Life Insurance Active	281,469	236,718	267,896	55,676	103,857	154,208	(113,688)	58%	267,896
Health/Life Insurance Retiree	-	-	108,899	25,146	54,406	82,199	(26,700)	75%	-
Information Reports	31,897	34,130	50,000	26,793	28,362	32,292	(17,708)	65%	50,000
Insurance	93,476	97,644	118,800	99,922	98,781	98,781	(20,019)	83%	98,781
Laboratory Analysis	80,000	83,991	100,000	9,644	35,199	52,301	(47,699)	52%	85,000
Legal	58,247	55,170	75,000	11,351	29,545	57,203	(17,797)	76%	75,000
Lights/Power/Fuel	390,000	454,572	600,000	39,176	155,041	331,466	(268,534)	55%	575,000
Maintenance & Operations	347,667	466,116	420,000	105,070	218,985	308,139	(111,861)	73%	420,000
Middlesex Retirement	268,502	288,240	330,838	330,838	330,838	330,838	-	100%	330,838
Meters	46,035	75,000	125,000	69,409	77,641	77,641	(47,359)	62%	125,000
Office Supplies	72,747	82,576	96,000	7,223	27,821	41,823	(54,177)	44%	83,000
Revenue Fund	30,000	100,000	100,000	-	-	83,106	(16,894)	83%	100,000
Salaries & Wages	1,462,763	1,552,117	1,727,988	372,914	705,045	1,100,268	(627,720)	64%	1,454,556
Total	5,353,247	5,604,568	7,187,338	1,656,312	2,451,773	5,421,469	(1,765,869)	75%	6,400,873
REVENUE									
Water Revenue	2,697,721	3,070,585	3,084,795	789,970	1,596,341	2,220,723	(864,071)	72%	2,605,679
Service Fee	528,960	538,005	544,500	134,340	268,815	403,365	(141,135)	74%	537,645
Debt Fee	2,115,840	2,152,020	2,752,629	537,360	1,187,323	1,837,648	(914,981)	67%	2,486,668
Total Water Revenue	5,342,521	5,760,610	6,381,924	1,461,670	3,052,479	4,461,736	(1,920,187)	70%	5,629,992
Fire Protection Sprinklers	41,643	40,931	41,000	32,008	41,210	41,503	503	101%	42,000
Rent/lease	122,364	655,092	493,570	59,054	92,754	499,024	5,454	101%	566,523
Repairs/Installation	64,623	57,314	50,000	13,715	20,850	26,561	(23,439)	53%	50,000
Cross Connection	23,634	18,285	21,000	13,639	15,955	24,414	3,414	116%	25,000
Demand Fees	563,300	263,000	300,000	4,800	14,800	14,800	(285,200)	5%	40,000
Mitigation Fees	125,000	66,776	100,000	6,742	6,742	6,742	(93,258)	7%	10,000
New Services Meter Installation RF	0	0	25,000	7,248	12,665	13,590	(11,410)	54%	25,000
Total Other Revenue	940,564	1,101,398	1,005,570	137,206	204,975	626,634	(378,936)	62%	758,523
Total	6,283,085	6,862,008	7,387,494	1,598,876	3,257,454	5,088,370	(2,299,123)	69%	6,388,515

Bank Reconciliations							March-24
<u>Bank</u>	<u>Opening</u>	<u>Deposits</u>	<u>Warrants</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Closing Balance</u>	
MMDT	85,802.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	404.56	86,207.02	
Santander Check	124,266.35	1,500,000.00	74,375.45	0.00	7.63	1,549,898.53	
Santander MM	85,335.97	336,756.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	422,092.92	
UniBank UniPay	203,775.26	23,278.97	0.00	0.00	42.00	227,096.23	
Unibank Bond proceeds	1,107,645.69	6,104,290.00	339,088.19	-5,900,657.08	682.14	972,872.56	
UniBank Checking	446,216.81	0.00	339,745.27	657.08	2.75	107,131.37	
Enterprise Bank MM	1,916,570.99	0.00	0.00	-150,000.00	4,952.47	1,771,523.46	
Enterprise Bank Checking	178,863.42	32,904.97	214,192.86	150,000.00	1.65	147,577.18	
	4,148,476.95	7,997,230.89	967,401.77	-5,900,000.00	6,093.20	<u>5,284,399.27</u>	
MMDT: Grace	208,543.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	983.25	209,526.62	
MMDT: Article 97 Stabilization Fund	26,307.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	124.05	26,432.01	
Grace at Cost	523,912.81					533,122.12	
Grace at Market	623,327.93					631,111.66	
OPEB at Cost	1,088,913.57					1,108,328.20	
OPEB at Market	1,477,596.29					1,491,813.35	

Treasurer/Collector Monthly Report

Mar-24

		<u>Opening Cash</u>	<u>4,383,328.28</u>
Water Deposits		56,183.94	
Mitigation Fees	14110	0.00	
New Service Meter Install RF	14120	0.00	
Lease Income	11260	11,256.95	
Solar Lease	11270	325,500.00	
Retirees Med/Life	15220	0.00	
Ford Motor Company Refund	15130	0.00	
ARPA reimbursement	14130	0.00	
MVP Grant Proceeds	11280	1,500,000.00	
<hr/>			
Grace Interest		983.25	
Article 97 Interest		124.05	
Interest Income		6,093.20	
Bond Funds Rec		204,290.00	
Article 97 Transfer		0.00	
Grace Transfer		0.00	
	Total Deposits		<u>2,104,431.39</u>
Budgeted Warrants		288,568.31	
Bond Warrants		678,833.46	
Grace Warrants		0.00	
	Total		<u>967,401.77</u>
	Total Warrants		<u>967,401.77</u>
		Ending Cash	<u>5,520,357.90</u>
		Total Cash	<u>5,520,357.90</u>

Accounts Receivable

		<u>Opening Balance</u>	<u>276,736.92</u>
		Payments	392,940.89
Billing		337,923.23	
Interest		4,296.25	
NSF charges		30.00	
		Total Charges	342,249.48
		Abatements -	8,377.40
		Adjustments -	0.00
		Refunds +	<u>3,557.68</u>
		Ending Balance	<u>221,225.79</u>

Water Supply District of Action Cash Flow Forecast General Fund FY2024

1 BEGINNING BALANCE	ACTUAL		ACTUAL											
	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun		
3,562,518	5,603,989	5,543,078	10,322,883	10,779,087	10,826,504	5,446,290	4,247,135	4,148,476	5,284,398	5,284,398	5,643,784	5,658,170		
RECEIPTS														
Water Deposits	900,675	547,792	77,366	1,074,535	467,554	77,371	863,928	503,609	56,184	800,000	475,000	100,000		
Mitigation Fees	2,540	3,320	882	0	0	0	0	0	0	20,000	0	0		
New Service Meter Revenue	2,533	0	4,714	1,802	2,714	901	925	0	0	2,000	2,000	2,000		
Lease Income	36,611	11,115	11,328	11,186	11,257	11,257	11,257	58,257	336,757	11,257	11,257	11,257		
Retirees Medical/Life	1,935	1,494	2,375	1,935	1,788	5,256	2,180	4,259	0	2,129	2,129	2,129		
Interest Income	7,720	7,156	8,811	14,036	13,457	12,620	8,305	5,200	6,093	0	0	0		
Bond Proceeds	2,185,009	58,175	4,925,676	0	260,819	83,125	0	68,875	204,290	50,000	25,000	15,000		
Other/misc	0	53	557	(27,047)	60,109	(32,421)	0	83,932	1,500,000	0	0	0		
Total receipts	3,137,022	629,105	5,031,710	1,076,447	817,698	158,109	886,595	724,132	2,103,324	885,386	515,386	130,386		
EXPENSES														
Payroll warrants	66,636	85,355	73,010	63,846	76,832	70,059	84,916	78,654	61,422	70,000	70,000	70,000		
Vendor warrants	1,000,106	451,351	178,895	271,801	300,084	220,732	1,816,620	254,594	227,146	306,000	306,000	306,000		
Bond Warrants	28,809	153,310	0	284,595	393,365	5,247,532	184,214	489,543	678,833	150,000	125,000	15,000		
Total expenses	1,095,551	690,016	251,905	620,242	770,281	5,538,323	2,085,750	822,791	967,402	526,000	501,000	391,000		
Cash forecast (1+2-3)	5,603,989	5,543,078	10,322,883	10,779,087	10,826,504	5,446,290	4,247,135	4,148,476	5,284,398	5,643,784	5,658,170	5,397,556		

- 5 RAN Short term borrowing (+)
- 6 interest repayment (-)
- 7 principal repayment (-)

8 Cash balance (4+5-6-7)	5,603,989	5,543,078	10,322,883	10,779,087	10,826,504	5,446,290	4,247,135	4,148,476	5,284,398	5,643,784	5,658,170	5,397,556
Water Supply District of Action	Cash Flow Forecast											
	Grace Fund (MMMDT)											
	FY2024											

1 BEGINNING BALANCE	ACTUAL		ACTUAL											
	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun		
94,195	63,472	184,345	162,770	190,623	172,084	206,640	207,625	207,625	208,543	209,527	198,527	187,527		
RECEIPTS														
Interest Income	368	557	789	806	791	844	985	918	983	0	0	0		
Other/misc	36,956	125,000	0	27,047	14,382	33,712	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Total receipts	37,325	125,557	789	27,853	15,173	34,556	985	918	983	0	0	0		
EXPENSES														
Vendor warrants	68,048	4,683	22,364	0	33,712	0	0	0	0	11,000	11,000	11,000		
Total expenses	68,048	4,683	22,364	0	33,712	0	0	0	0	11,000	11,000	11,000		
Cash forecast (1+2-3)	63,472	184,345	162,770	190,623	172,084	206,640	207,625	208,543	209,527	198,527	187,527	176,527		
RAN Short term borrowing (+)														
interest repayment (-)														
principal repayment (-)														
Cash balance (4+5-6-7)	63,472	184,345	162,770	190,623	172,084	206,640	207,625	208,543	209,527	198,527	187,527	176,527		

Water Supply District of Acton Cash Flow Forecast Article 97 Stabilization Fund FY2024

	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
BEGINNING BALANCE	25,350	25,465	25,586	25,703	25,825	25,944	26,068	26,192	26,308	26,432	26,432	26,432
RECEIPTS												
Interest Income	116	120	117	122	119	124	124	116	124	0	0	0
Other/misc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total receipts	116	120	117	122	119	124	124	116	124	0	0	0
EXPENSES												
Vendor warrants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total expenses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cash forecast (1+2-3)	25,465	25,586	25,703	25,825	25,944	26,068	26,192	26,308	26,432	26,432	26,432	26,432
RAN Short term borrowing (+) Interest repayment (-) principal repayment (-)												
Cash balance (4+5-6-7)	25,465	25,586	25,703	25,825	25,944	26,068	26,192	26,308	26,432	26,432	26,432	26,432