

---

# CFD2 | Special Meeting

05.16.2022 via Zoom 5:30-8:23pm

---

## Attendees

Polly Allen  
Jonathan Ashley (Dubois & King)  
Farley Brown  
Gina Campoli (President)  
Nicole Civita (Board Member)  
Lori Collins-Hall  
Paula Davidson (Treasurer)  
Christina Finkelstein (Secretary)  
George Hall (Board Member)  
Norm Hanson (Board Member)

Susan Houston  
John Kiernan (RCAP Solutions)  
Dana Nagy (DEC)  
Bryan Redmond (DEC)  
Renee Rossi (Board Member)  
Rep. Katherine Sims  
Steve Smith (Systems Operator)  
Sarah Vose (DEC)  
John Zaber  
Terry Martin

ABSENT:

Ian Baldwin (Board Member)

## Agenda

Representatives from the Department of Environment Conservation and the Vermont Department of Health to discuss topics including:

- Information about PFAS and the Vermont regulations to protect drinking water for human consumption and gardening
- Steps CFD2 must take before the current Do Not Drink order is lifted
- What's next in finding a new water source that meets state required quantity and quality
- Federal and state funding available to support these efforts

## Changes/Additions to the Agenda

- Addition: Introductions
-

---

## Introductions

- Bryan Redmond - Director of Vermont's Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC), Drinking Water and Groundwater Protection Division (DWGPD)
- Dana Nagy - Drinking Water Community Operations Section Supervisor, DWGPD
- Sarah Vose, Ph.D. - State Toxicologist for Vermont Department of Health
- Jon Ashley - Director of Public Works and Facilities Division, Dubois & King (D&K); CFD2's consultant engineer
- Katherine Sims - Representative for Orleans-Caledonia
- Board members present
- Community members present

---

**Clarification re these Minutes:** When participants spoke of "blending" or "blended water" they were almost always referring to the monitoring requirements to LIFT the Do Not Drink Order. Until a new source well is in place, the water flowing into CFD2 homes and institutions is a blend of water from WL-01 (contaminated) and WL-04 (not contaminated).

---

## Background re CFD2's Do Not Drink Order (Bryan Redmond)

- Expressed appreciation for being at the meeting to communicate this important information and misses being able to attend the public meetings in person
- Wants to (1) acknowledge the impact of the PFAS contamination and the Do Not Drink Order has had on the community and (2) recognize the service of an all-volunteer board, especially during these difficult times, and that it is very engaged and taking the situation very seriously
- Bryan reviewed the regulatory history and requirements of PFAS sampling throughout the state and DWGPD's efforts to actively work through remediation at identified sites

- Almost all other identified sites have gone to on-site treatment. This comes with substantial long-term costs [that are not reimbursable or forgivable by any current or potential state or federal funding programs]. DWGPD continues to encourage CFD2 to invest in a new source well as quickly as possible.
- The science around PFAS is rapidly evolving with new information coming to light all the time and the regulations will evolve concurrently.
- It's likely that the state is heading in a direction of stricter regulations as more PFAS compounds are added to the existing list of five and a lower maximum contamination level (MCL) than the current 20 ppt is expected to be put in place.
- Bryan noted that DWGPD has been working closely with CFD2 regarding monitoring since it exceeded the MCL in December. The first step after a water system exceeds the MCL is a Do Not Drink Order. The second step is determining the necessary next steps. This was initially addressed in the Alternative Analysis, [a study produced by D&K] which presented the state with a range of alternative options for CFD2 to meet regulatory requirements.
- In consultation with DWGPD, CFD2 proposed pursuing a 2-prong approach:
  - (1) interim solution – Blend water from WL-01 (contaminated) and WL-04 (PFAS-free, but insufficient yield) [using equipment to control the percentage contribution of each well into the blended water]
  - (2) permanent solution - Identify, permit, drill, and test a new source well that is PFAS free and of sufficient yield
- DWGPD had concerns about the blending program as new information became available to them regarding the system equipment and operation. DWGPD subsequently issued a set of requirements for CFD2 in order for the Do Not Drink to be lifted. CFD2's Board expressed its concern [subject of meeting on] in a formal letter to DWGPD sent on May 2nd.
- Bryan and his team at DWGPD met to review CFD2's request and subsequently modified some of the requirements [including raising the MCL from 15 to 20 ppt] but the additional monitoring requirements remain.

## PFAS Toxicity (Sarah Vose, PhD)

- PFAS are an interesting group of chemicals. There are thousands. VT is regulating only five of them now. Sarah commended DEC for regulating PFAS and not turning a blind-eye.
- The two most common and well known PFAS are PFOA and PFOS

- PFAS attach directly to your plasma, allowing them to circulate around our body and have an opportunity to affect every organ
- To date, there are known or elevated risks affecting the immune systems, liver, endocrine, cancer
- Developing fetuses are particularly at risk
- The equation the Vermont Department of Health used for the MCL is based on how potent the chemical is and how much people drink.
- Research is leading scientists to realize that PFAS are more toxic than previously thought. Scientists and the EPA are considering recommendations that would lower the way PFAS potency is considered by a magnitude of four (4). So 10,000 times lower than current considerations.
- There is no formula for how much [PFAS-contaminated] water should be in the soil. It's known that PFAS are very mobile and that plants take them up. The different PFAS compounds have different [cellular?] lengths and functional groups which affect how much vegetables take up PFAS. Furthermore, for some produce we consume the leaves (e.g., lettuce) and in others we consume the fruit (e.g., tomatoes) and it's thought this may affect the potency.
- In 2016, when this question about PFAS-contaminated water and garden soil first came up, the state's recommendation was to not use the water in gardens. There are several factors affecting how much PFAS an individual may consume from garden sources since some may be growing a whole year's worth of food and preserving it and others merely supplementing produce during the growing season.
- It's known that drinking and digesting PFAS-contaminated water is a more direct way to raise toxicity levels than consuming vegetables watered with PFAS contaminated water. But we also know PFAS has serious health consequences so the best thing to do is to limit exposure.
- So if the PFAS is above 20ppt, the Department of Health still recommends that people not use the water in their gardens.

### Questions/Comments

**Q/Comment:** (Renee) Does the state have an educational program to educate consumers? PFAS seems to be ubiquitous (the soil, dryer sheets, wax used for skis) and if the federal government and the state have plans to lower the acceptable levels of PFAS then people need to learn more about this issue.

---

**A:** Direct answer: No. PFAS is ubiquitous (food packaging, clothing, dental floss) but currently there is no good way to regulate and monitor all the ways these items are produced as there are no federal requirements to label. Any food that is processed is likely to have some degree of PFAS contamination. Vermont recently passed legislation to make rugs and food packaging PFAS-free, but there is also no oversight on labeling (i.e., anything can be labeled “PFAS-free”). DEC does not have a lot of control over the food source and how they are packaged. DEC is focused where they can help, which is what people drink. Gina added that the manufacture of ski wax with PFAS has been banned by EPA and the European Union.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) Given that there are customers who face food insecurity if they are unable to grow their own food, how should they think about the current situation and the aggregate PFAS exposure from other sources. Adding food insecurity to water insecurity is a significant burden especially when, based on D&K’s modeling of the blended water, the level of PFAS is likely much lower now than at any point since testing started.

**A:** Sarah noted that it’s hard to reconcile being able to drink the water when it’s 19ppt but not okay if it’s 21ppt. However, regulation has to draw a clear line. DEC’s recommendation not to water the garden is truly a recommendation. It is not something that they can/will regulate. Whether someone chooses to water their garden is a personal choice much like someone may be wanting to avoid any and all contaminants for health reasons. So some of it comes down to personal choice.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) People need to get adequate information to make those decisions because there are food security implications for the customers.

**Q/Comment:** (Lori Collins-Hall) Given that Sterling is in a unique position compared to an individual choosing to water or not their garden for personal food consumption, [Lori] needs to have a clear understanding of what is being regulated by the state and what is being recommended by the state. On site farm production is part of Sterling’s education model and a significant food source for the dining hall. Sterling also offers a CSA to many community members on a sliding scale based on income. So this is food insecurity at a different level than referenced earlier. There are many individuals who depend on the Sterling CSA who would otherwise be food insecure. This could also potentially translate to thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars in food replacement costs for the school. So really needs to understand the regulations so [Lori] can move the school forward as the implication is they would need to find another source of water for their crops.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) Not all of Sterling’s crops are irrigated, but greenhouse crops are or when there is a dry period. So PFAS uptake is not consistent.

---

**Q/Comment:** (Gina) Question for Bryan, what is the regulatory status of watering and what is the risk to CFD2? That is, if DEC is saying the gardens shouldn't be watered and we're allowing it to happen, does that put a potential legal burden on CFD2?

**A:** (Bryan) Sarah's [Department of Health] recommendations stand on their own. As a regulatory agency, DEC regulates the public water system and any public notice about the water needs to include specific public health language about washing and watering produce, brushing teeth, etc. As for potential exposure specific to CFD2, that's a question [Bryan] can't answer.

**A:** (Sarah) To answer Lori's question, wants to pull in the Agency of Agriculture because they regulate farming and CSAs.

- Sarah said she would connect Sterling to Agency of Agriculture after the meeting

**Q/Comment:** (Lori) Looking to clarify that if consistently under 20 ppt, then they can be watering with it because that's what Sarah just said and what the regulations say.

**A:** (Sarah) Advice since 2016 has been if the water exceeds the MCL, then would recommend not watering garden at that point

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) What about people who need municipal water not just for personal consumption, but for sale or barter of either produce or livestock. There are no existing guidelines. Should there be a conversation with Agency of Agriculture so that these community members better understand any implications? This is a gray space that requires more guidance and would be helpful to get clarity.

**A:** (Sarah) Yes, that needs to be part of the conversation. [Sarah] will connect Lori and Nicole with Agency of Agriculture.

**Q/Comment:** (Gina) If we stay on the Do Not Drink Order, who is responsible for compliance? Is it up to each customer to decide to water their plants anyway or will CFD2 have to bear the responsibility? Some things required of CFD2 have come as a surprise. For example, a school cannot transport water from one source to another and that CFD2 may be responsible for that?

**A:** (Bryan) DEC regulates the public water supplier and is related to the MCL. Once the MCL is reached, DEC requires CFD2 to issue a mandatory notification that includes very specific information to the customers so that they are warned and can make their own decisions. In

---

addition to the mandatory notification, there's additional mandatory sampling and a plan for a long-term solution.

**Q/Comment:** (Gina) So if Sterling wants to water their plants under the Do Not Drink order water, that's their decision.

**A:** (Bryan) Having a conversation with the Agency of Agriculture is a good next step so everyone can make an informed decision.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) Going back to Gina's comment re any potential liability exposure and understanding that that is not a question that DEC can answer, is there anything from a regulatory standpoint that CFD2 that should be doing that they have not done (i.e., issue the Do Not Drink Order, supply bottled water, submit an Alternative Analysis, execute plan)? Does CFD2 have a regulatory obligation to monitor compliance or send additional communication beyond the Do Not Drink Order?

**A:** (Bryan) Did not conduct a complete compliance review, but yes as far as sampling requirements and working in good faith with DWGPD to develop a plan, CFD2 is taking this seriously and has taken any required actions. Suggest that the CFD2 and DWGPD agree to a schedule that will be noted in an operating permit [for WL-05].

## State Requirements to Lift CFD2's Do Not Drink Order (Bryan Redmond)

- Reiterate that DWGPD takes the recommendations of Sarah and her colleagues at the Department of Health very seriously. The number one goal is to protect public health.
- A long-term solution is one of two things—a new water source or a centralized treatment source.
- In the Alternative Analysis plan, CFD2 submitted an Interim Solution, but as Bryan and his team learned more about the process, DWGPD had concerns. Specifically, water from each well is not flow paced equally. Rather, the water from WL-01 is turned on after the water from WL-04 gets to a certain point. So on high-demand days, there are days when the MCL might exceed 20ppt. DWGPD is not comfortable with this procedure because there is insufficient assurance that the water will be below 20ppt reliably and consistently. To meet this concern, DWGPD asked for a sampling procedure that would show the water was below 15ppt. Per Vermont regulations, DWGPD can require additional monitoring when levels are above 15ppt

- DWGPD has concerns about the sampling procedure as sampling just the blended water provides no assurance that the actual contamination level in WL-01 has not increased.
- CFD2 requested an explanation or reconsideration in its letter to DWGPD on May 2. Since that letter and a number of informal conversations among the Special Projects subcommittee, DWGPD, and D&K, the current requirements have been modified and discussions are ongoing.
- DWGPD will require a great deal of data collection and analysis. Specifically, CFD2 will need to:
  - (1) collect the relative source concentrations daily
  - (2) evaluate the highest flow days between Jan and May to determine the day of week when demand is highest
  - (3) On day of week when demand is highest, collect and test for PFAS from WL-01, WL-04, and the blended water every two weeks
  - (4) Results must be back no later than 14 days
  - (5) If the calculated PFAS is greater than 20ppt for two consecutive days, CFD2 will go back on a Do Not Drink immediately and stay on the Do Not Drink until a permanent source is operational
- DWGPD learned from CFD2 and D&K that PFAS results can be rushed and available within 5-7 days, not the usual 30.
- The CFD2 permit application for WL-05 was not administratively complete, but Jon Ashley has provided the additional information and it now seems to be complete. DWGPD is committed to giving full attention to the speedy review of the application.
- DWGPD would like to see an administratively complete application as soon as possible. A blending solution is not ideal in terms of effort and expense.

## Potential Sources of Funding (Bryan Redmond)

- In response to the PFAS contamination in the state, there is now a Contaminants of Emerging Concern Fund that DWGPD has available for PFAS response. Under this Fund, the current grant allowed is 50% of project-related costs.
- The more recent Infrastructure law passed by Congress includes a significant level of funding for Vermont, especially for water infrastructure. Over the next five years, there will be \$400M available to VT from the federal government.

- There is also a Contaminants of Emerging Concern Fund – \$8M/year over the next five years — that is federal EPA money for PFAS. These funds go to systems for PFAS remediation. These are not in the form of grants but rather 100% loan forgiveness. This funding is expected on October 1.
- Some of the federal dollars have limitations and restrictions. Some costs, such as monitoring, may not be eligible. Bryan noted that between funding from the EPA and the CCEF, most expenditures related to the CFD2's efforts to mitigate and resolve the PFAS contamination will be reimbursed or forgiven.
- Long-term operations will not be reimbursed. [So while at-source treatment can be funded, the expensive operations over time are not reimbursable.]

## Discussion & Next Steps

**Q/Comment:** (Gina) Would like to learn more about feasibility and cost of the state's recommended interim solution from Steve and Jon.

**A:** (Jon) The most difficult part of what the state has outlined is getting a raw water sample from WL-01. The only way to get such a sample is turn off WL-04 and pump just from WL-01.

**A:** (Steve) We did this and it came out 24.9. If the test has to be repeated every 2 weeks then at whose cost? That's a significant cost. Jon asked if the testing costs would be reimbursable since it's part of the interim solution. [See Potential Sources of Funding below]

**A:** (Bryan) To be clear, the wildcard in the blending is the PFAS level in WL-01. The concern over the raw water samples from WL-01 is because there is a general trend up over time in other contaminated sites as well. So additional samples are needed.

**Q/Comment:** (Christina) In order to test WL-01, doesn't WL-04 need to be turned off and cycled through the tank and thus water flowing into taps will not be blended? And what are the associated costs?

**A:** (Dana) Per an email sent by D&K (Jeremy Rathbun; March 3) re the protocol to test WL-01 it is to shut off the water from WL-04 and purge the line. Dana suggested possibly installing a separate pipe devoted to water testing. There was additional discussion about the technical aspects [i.e., not as easy as cutting out and installing a new spigot] and the related costs. Jon added a dedicated testing pipe is not in place now because the pipes are below

---

ground so would require digging. Jon also suggested a flushing hydrant assembly as an option.

Bryan thinks there will be interest by Waste Management in long-term monitoring so it could be in the state's interest [to invest in a solution] to have an easy way to collect samples. Will follow up with colleagues. Dana added in addition to Waste Management as a source of funding, the sample tap could be part of the funded interim solution.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) Appreciates the need for raw water samples as there is a general upward trend around the state, but why are the additional raw samples required at the same frequency (every 2-weeks) when you can see the PFAS level in the blended sample based on D&K's modeling? Couldn't we do raw samples at a longer interval and still protect public health? Concern over the significant cost of rush sampling three sources every two weeks for a system that has already had significant expenditures.

**A:** (Bryan) Recognizes that this is an onerous and financially heavy lift but these requirements are not long-term. At this time, DWGPD does not have sufficient and necessary data to have full confidence in the calculated PFAS level in the blended water but once they have more data that show consistent and reliable levels, then they can be more confident in the model and can then reassess the monitoring requirements.

**Q/Comment:** (Dana) Another solution is to stay on the bottled water thus protecting public health until a new source well is operational. These proposed monitoring requirements are to protect public health and for CFD2 to get off the Do Not Drink Order.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) Staying on bottled water may be the best solution given the amount of effort and expense involved, but people still can't garden or farm, and Sterling is at risk of not being able to deliver their program. Taken together these have serious long-term consequences for the community. So it is hard to make a decision about the best interests of the community.

**A:** (Dana) If the cost of the additional tests is an issue, then Sterling College could pay for some of the testing and take a bit of burden off of CFD2. Nicole said she didn't the college was in a position to take that on.

**Q/Comment:** (Lori) Customers are caught in the middle here. The college is a customer and pays for water supplied by CFD2 and is not in a position to take on the additional financial burden of testing. Nicole's proposal above is a workable strategy that benefits both CFD2 and the college. Sterling is just a customer of CFD2.

---

**A:** (Bryan) Clarification. Potentially drop one sample a month. Would never drop all raw water samples. Testing costs are relatively insignificant compared to the much bigger ticket items ahead.

**Q/Comment:** (Steve) Sending data daily to the state and the blended PFAS came back at 6.05 on April 11 so why does CFD2 need to keep testing? Frustrated that we're not in compliance.

**A:** (Bryan) This monitoring schedule is an initial schedule. If the numbers are consistently and reliably low then the monitoring requirements will be modified. Additional discussion about the data available to the state. State is not interested in modeled or theoretical calculations. In the original email [sent to D&K in April], DWGPD laid out a specific plan for required testing. Those requirements have not changed and if CFD2 meets those requirements, the Do Not Drink Order can be lifted. CFD2 asked for an explanation or reconsideration and that's where we are now.

**Q/Comment:** (Nicole) Are there updated graphics with the PFAS levels of the blended water? Because in the last two weeks there have been particularly high use days (with graduation) and lower use days (after students left). Would like to see that data. Student capacity will not be full again until August.

**A:** (Jon) D&K are in receipt of the data from Steve but have not been compiled yet for graphing.

**Q/Comment:** (Gina) Can't make any decisions until we have a better understanding of how much things are going to cost. Nicole added that we also need more data and feedback from Agency of Agriculture.

#### Decision Points

- How do we react to the DWGPD's blending proposal?
- Do we abandon the blending proposal and go full steam ahead with the new source?

(Gina) Defers to state on all things health and complying with state law and regulation and defers to Jon and Steve on how the system operates and ways to comply with state mandates. The challenge is understanding the health and regulatory issues and finding a reasonable and cost-effective path forward. The state needs to help CFD2 comply with the

---

regulations. Jon and Steve will inform feasibility. Board will decide on acceptable costs and timing.

**Q/Comment:** (Paula) Confused because she heard earlier that the state wants CFD2 to pursue WL-05, but just a few months ago it was told not to pursue WL-05 because it's too close to WL-04. So as a matter of timing, if we're trying to pursue WL-06, we need to be moving on that.

**A:** (Jon) State had hesitation about that location because they were under impression that CFD2 would use both WL-04 and WL-05 concurrently and there would be interference between the two. But if we drill WL-05, for which we already we have an easment in place, we would shut off WL-04 so there is no risk of inference.

**A:** (Gina) Reiterated Board's desire to plan for contingencies, future growth and long-term resilience so in addition to WL-05, it would also pursue WL-06. Paula asked if there was funding for the additional well. Bryan confirmed that with the new federal infrastructure funding over the next five years, it's possible for CFD2 to have both wells funded.

**Q/Comment:** (John Zabar) If CFD2 does proceed with WL-05 would like to learn details regarding location and impact.

**A:** (Gina) Looking to Jon and Steve to coordinate and communicate with affected landowners in a timely manner. Extremely important.

Bryan reported that the permit review for WL-05 has been elevated to the highest priority. Now that all the administrative elements of the permit are complete, he hopes that the permit can be issued as quickly as possible.

**Q/Comment:** (Christina) CFD2 must pursue WL-05 and WL-06. The interim period between now and when the Board must make a decision regarding whether or not CFD2 will follow the state's interim solution recommendations is short. It's unlikely during this time the Agency of Agriculture will come back and make any assertion about whether or not customers should use the water to garden or farm beyond what is already recommended by the Department of Health.

Rather than expend the time and energy on meeting the state's monitoring requirements, CFD2 might stay on the Do Not Drink and provide all available PFAS data and graphs to customers so that they can make their own decisions about whether or not to use the water.

The state's position of getting additional raw samples of WL-01 to validate existing data and strengthen the modeling used to calculate blended PFAS-level is strongly supported.

---

**A:** (Gina) She is uncomfortable having CFD2 interpret any numbers for the public. For some the raw data may inform their decisions regarding water use.

**A:** (Nicole) With additional information people will be more confident in their decisions. Christina added that CFD2 would not be offering advice or guidance. Just additional information/data.

**Q/Comment:** (Lori) There have been comments made during this meeting that suggest Sterling wants to make decisions that are not in the best interest of its community and that would not be an accurate representation of anything said by Lori or Nicole. Critically important to recognize that they are at the meeting as a customer and representative of the school in order to seek additional information and better understand the current status. Formal request that the minutes reflect that Sterling takes their responsibility to its community seriously and that they are not trying to make any decisions that would negatively impact anyone's health. They are at the meeting to gather information.

**A:** (Gina/Christina) No one is suggesting that.

**A:** (Nicole) Sterling is operating at the intersection of drinking water requirements under CFD2 and any agricultural requirements as well as obligations to its community members.

**Q/Comment:** (Paula) Sounds like some on the Board are okay with staying on the Do Not Drink for now and ask Steve to test WL-01 again?

**A:** (Gina) In regard to testing separate from what the state is mandating - to what end? She is interested in satisfying the state's requirements in order to lift the Do Not Drink Order and does not want to get into interpreting data separately from what is the state's role. The Board's role is to facilitate projects as required, use funds wisely and get off the Do Not Drink order by meeting state requirements.

**A:** (Dana) DWGPD has given CFD2 a path forward. Can stay on the Do Not Drink. If it wants to come off of it, there are certain monitoring requirements as discussed. Also it's important to note that they are talking about and regulating drinking water. They are not regulating agricultural water use.

**A:** (Gina) The next steps are for Sterling to reach out to the Agency of Agriculture for guidance in the next two weeks prior to our next meeting. The Infrastructure Committee will work with Jon to better understand the costs necessary to comply with the DWGPD's monitoring requirements. This will help facilitate a decision at the next meeting (on May 31) regarding FD2 either complying with the state's interim blending requirements or simply staying on the Do Not Drink until a new source is established. Christina asked why the decision is contingent on the Agriculture Agency. Gina said because Sterling has asked for more information before they can make a decision. Nicole agreed.

---

**A:** (Bryan) the big pieces of information that need to be evaluated going forward are: (1) monitoring data to date, (2) costs, and (3) timeframe for WL-05. Well drillers are very hard to come by and there is a massive backlog so this will be a critical piece of information for decision-making. Steve added that he spoke with Jon a few days ago and he was looking into drillers and getting on a schedule.

**Q/Comment:** How much does rush testing cost vs. regular?

**A:** Rush is \$712 and regular is \$75

**Q/Comment:** (Paula) Is the state saying it's okay for CFD2 to stay on the Do Not Drink Order (and continue to pay for water for many more months) or should CFD2 try to get the well mixing done right.

**A:** (Bryan) The interim blending solution [and the state's monitoring requirements] require a lot of time and expense, but for an interim solution for the community DWGPD supports it. Recognizing how complicated the situation is, DWGPD will allow the Do Not Drink Order to stay in place especially since the immediate protection of public health is in place via recurring notices to Do Not Drink to all customers. It's not an ideal situation, especially in the long term. Finding a long-term solution is the best option.

**A:** (Nicole) Having additional information regarding drilling schedules and availability will help with decision making.

**Q/Comment:** (Christina) there are many contingencies in the decision-making and different responsible parties and it would be helpful or nice to have a flow chart to help summarize the process and decision points going forward. Will also help to identify gaps.

**A:** (Gina) Everyone could do their part to help complete if this is pursued.

**A:** (Bryan) As everyone absorbs all the information he suggests that the Board take some time to think through the details and any additional data before making a decision about whether to pursue meeting the state's requirements for lifting the Do Not Drink Order or to stay on the Do Not Drink Order.

**Q/Comment:** (Christina) Rather than waiting to decide when we next meet, should the Board move forward with testing the raw sample of WL-01 so we have additional data regarding the blended water. [Currently, the calculated blended PFAS levels are based on the highest sampled result of 24.9 in WL-01. However, the PFAS level has fluctuated over time but is trending up.]

---

**A:** (Gina) We need to decide whether CFD2 is going to go with the state's monitoring schedule first.

**A:** (Nicole) We want to validate the model and gain some confidence.

**A:** (Bryan) One sample is not really going to gain anything. We'd laid out the requirements. If CFD2 wants to expedite it should sample on the highest use day.

**A:** (Steve) WL-01 has been running three hours a day consistently since March.

**A:** (Gina) We should hold off this conversation until we've decided whether we're going to go with the state's monitoring requirements. Bryan added that a lot of information has been shared and a lot to digest.

**Q/Comment:** Paula noted that we need to clarify the blending program because we've always been blending the water. That is, stay on the DND Order and keep blending (not per the state's monitoring requirements). Staying on the Do Not Drink is less expensive than complying with the DWGPD's monitoring requirements.

**Q/Comment:** (Gina) How would this testing fit into the Do Not Drink scheme?

**A:** (Bryan) We've laid out the requirements.

**A:** (Nicole) Not asking to meet the requirements but rather gather an important data point.

**A:** (Gina) This is good information to have, but doesn't help CFD2's goal to get off the Do Not Drink Order

**MOTION: Nicole made a motion to authorize Steve to collect a sample for rush testing for PFAS of the blended water. Norm seconded the motion. Gina abstained from voting. The remaining Board members approved the motion. Motion passed.**

**Q/Comment:** (Polly Allen) Gina introduced Polly Allen and asked her to state the question she had posted in the Zoom chat. Polly thanked Board Members for their service [and we thank Polly for her service!] and asked what compliance was like among community members. Is bottled water being used at the same rate?

**A:** (Nicole) There has been a slowing down of bottled water retrieval.

**A:** (Renee) She suggested surveying customers about bottled water usage to better inform the next meeting and any decision-making

**A:** (Christina) Best not to ask a survey question unless the Board plans to act on the data (i.e., will it use compliance as a factor in its decision-making?).

---

**A:** (Nicole) Hold on survey suggestion until next meeting

**MOTION: Paula made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Nicole seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.**

## Next Meetings

A **Special Meeting** is scheduled for **Monday, May 31st**. An announcement with the Zoom link (<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87324152544>) will be posted on Front Porch Forum.

The next **Regular Meeting** is scheduled for **Monday, June 6th**. A reminder announcement with the Zoom link (<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87324152544>) will be posted on Front Porch Forum.

NOTE: The Zoom link and call-in details are the same for both (and all remaining 2022) meetings.

Call in Details:

Meeting ID: 873 2415 2544

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,87324152544# US (Washington DC)

+13126266799,,87324152544# US (Chicago)

Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 876 9923 US (New York)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 408 638 0968 US (San Jose)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 873 2415 2544