

**MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMON
COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF STAR VALLEY**

**Tuesday, July 18, 2023 at 5:15 pm
3675 East Highway 260, Star Valley, AZ
(Star Valley Town Hall)**

The Agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- PRAYER was offered by Pastor Dave Barber of Rim View Community Church.
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- CALL TO ORDER

- **ROLL CALL:**

Vice Mayor McKinney X, Council Member Armington X, Council Member Binney X, Council Member Dueker X, Council Member Highstreet X, Council Member McDaniel Absent, Mayor Davis X. Mayor Davis attended the meeting telephonically.

- **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

During this portion of the meeting, members of the public may address the Town Council on items that are not on the printed agenda. Any remarks shall be addressed to the Council as a whole and not to any individual member. Speakers are limited to three (3) minutes per person unless additional time is granted by the Mayor. The Council may not discuss or act upon matters raised during public comments.

The Mayor opened up this portion of the meeting for public comment.

Patty Ihle of 304 Cedar Mill Road in Star Valley reported that there was a serious accident on Highway 260 and Moonlight Drive that was due to speeding on the highway. ADOT needs to take care of this, stated Ms. Ihle, before it kills off all of our residents. She knows herself how difficult it is trying to get out on Highway 260 from Moonlight Drive. Ms. Ihle stated she is tired of the irresponsible people that come up here and are trying to destroy our town and our people. Speeding kills. We are seeing more accidents and ADOT needs to do something about it, concluded Ms. Ihle.

David Patino stated he is building a home on Mountain View Road in Star Valley. He reported he noticed a sinkhole starting in front of the home at 214 Mountain View Rd.

Janet Dean with APS stated she wanted to take the opportunity to mention an event that they have coming up. It is a Customer Care Open House in Payson on Tuesday, August 1st. Customer service advisors will sit down with customers and make sure they are connected to any assistance programs APS offers that might benefit them such as the crisis bill assistance or the E3 which gives customers a monthly discount off of their bill if they qualify financially.

There were no further comments and the Mayor closed the public comment portion.

- **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:**

All items listed under the Consent Agenda will be voted on with one motion. If discussion is desired regarding any Consent Agenda item, that item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and voted on separately.

A. Approval of the minutes from the Regular Council Meeting held on June 20, 2023.

B. Approval of Accounts Payable from June 16, 2023 through July 15, 2023 for the General Fund and for the Water Department.

A motion to approve consent agenda items A and B was made by Council Member Armington and was seconded by Council Member Highstreet.

A roll call vote was taken:

Vice Mayor McKinney X, Council Member Armington X, Council Member Binney X, Council Member Dueker X, Council Member Highstreet X, Council Member McDaniel Absent, Mayor Davis X.

The motion was voted on and passed 6 - 0.

- **DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

1. Discussion and possible action concerning a water issue with three town wells. Presentation by Matthew Olson, PFAS Project Manager with ADEQ.

On June 13, reported Town Manager Grier, the Town was contacted by Matthew Olson with ADEQ notifying us that three of our wells tested high for PFAS. PFAS are some of the forever chemicals that we are hearing about now. ADEQ started to test for PFAS and it is something we have never tested for before. As soon as the notification was received, reported Mr. Grier, he contacted Mayor Davis to notify him of the serious issue. They, along with Water Operator Dean Shaffer, met the next morning and came up with a strategy that all three of the affected wells could be taken off line. ADEQ was then notified that the three wells that tested high for PFAS had been taken off line. Mr. Grier stated he believes there is going to be a subsequent test ninety days after the May 4th test. Those three wells, concluded Mr. Grier, will be off line until a remedy is found so that it is not an issue for our water users.

Town Manager Grier introduced ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. Ms. Panzino stated she would like to share some information about PFAS, listen to any concerns and answer any questions council may have. She would like to begin with a video presentation and after the video she would like to talk about ADEQ's PFAS testing program and the Star Valley results.

The video presentation then began. *So you can understand what PFAS are, what ADEQ is doing to address these chemicals in our environment, and what steps to take now to protect your health. First, it's important to understand some basic facts about PFAS. PFAS are a large family of man-made chemicals that have been in use since the 1940's. PFAS have unique physical and chemical properties that make them very useful for a wide range of applications, most notably stain and water resistance. These same properties can make them highly stable and resistant to degradation in the environment – earning them the nickname “forever chemicals.” Some PFAS have been more commonly manufactured than others including two of the most widely used and studied PFAS molecules – PFOA and PFOS. Scientific studies have shown that exposure to some PFAS may be linked to harmful health effects in humans and animals. Depending on how much PFAS someone is exposed to and for how long, certain PFAS can have potential harmful effects. For example: Increasing the chance of getting some cancers, increasing cholesterol levels and affecting reproductive health and child development. Because of their*

unique and beneficial properties PFAS have been incorporated into many common consumer products including carpets, furnishings, food packaging, cosmetics, clothing, cookware and many others. In some cases consumers can choose to limit their exposure to PFAS. For example: By avoiding products labeled as water or stain resistant, avoiding food in contact with grease proof packaging and avoiding personal care products with fluorinated ingredients on the label. Drinking PFAS contaminated water is another potential source of exposure but one that for many is not easily avoided through personal choice alone. However, in most cases, exposure to contaminated drinking water can be eliminated through testing, regulation and treatment. The life cycle of PFAS starts when they are first manufactured by industry. Although Arizona has not historically been home to any PFAS manufacturers these PFAS can make their way to our state through the purchase of consumer products, the use of fire-fighting foams and as raw materials used in the production of other products. People may be exposed directly from using these products but as they are used or thrown away they also enter our landfills and our waste water treatment plants and in turn can be released into the environment where they can accumulate and do not easily break down. From there, they may end up in our food or our drinking water. With PFAS so common in the world today it is not surprising that we find these chemicals in our bodies as well. The CDC has measured PFAS in the U.S. population since 1999 and has found that PFAS are present in the blood of ninety nine percent of Americans. However, since 2002, the production and use of two of the most common PFAS, PFOA and PFOS, has declined. Researchers have seen a corresponding decline in blood levels. In the case of PFOS, by more than 85%. Therefore, despite their “forever chemical” nickname we can see that reducing exposure to these chemicals can have a positive impact on the levels in our bodies. PFAS are not currently regulated at the national level or in Arizona. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) first released provisional PFAS health advisories in 2009, which defined advisory levels for PFOA and PFOS. Since that time the advisory levels have been revised lower. First in 2016 and again in 2022 and were expanded to include additional compounds – PFBS and GenX chemicals. Health advisories are not legally enforceable. They identify the concentration of a contaminant in drinking water at which adverse health effects are not anticipated to occur over a lifetime. In March 2023 the EPA took the next step after many years of study and recent research and proposed a national primary drinking water regulation. The proposed regulation would create a maximum contaminant level (“MCL”) for six common PFAS. An MCL is the maximum concentration of a contaminant allowed in drinking water that can be delivered by a public water system. The EPA has proposed to regulate PFOA and PFOS at a level of four parts per trillion. Four other PFAS are proposed to be regulated as a mixture using a standard calculation and called a hazard index. These proposed MCL’s were developed by EPA to account for chronic exposures to low levels of PFAS over time. At concentrations typically found in drinking water, they are not dangerous in the same way as acute water contaminants like e-coli, which may be dangerous if consumed even once. It may be helpful to understand the unit of measure that is being used by EPA for the proposed regulation – one part per trillion is equivalent to a single drop of water in twenty Olympic sized swimming pools. This gives you an idea of just how small these numbers really are and also how cautious the EPA is being about the long term risks associated with exposure to PFAS in our drinking water. ADEQ is closely following PFAS developments at the federal level and EPA has developed a road map that lays out the commitment to take specific actions. It’s expected that EPA will finalize the proposed drinking water regulation within the next year. However, implementation of the final rule will occur three years later, giving states and water providers the time needed to address contamination. In addition to drinking water regulations, EPA has proposed designating certain PFAS as hazardous substances, which would allow the state and federal government to hold polluters accountable. EPA has also proposed aquatic life standards to help protect wildlife in our streams and rivers. These are all just a few of the many federal PFAS developments that

are expected over the next several years. So what is ADEQ doing about PFAS in Arizona? ADEQ is taking several steps to protect public health and help our state prepare for future EPA actions. Beginning in 2018 ADEQ conducted targeted screening efforts to understand the scope of PFAS impact in Arizona. This testing included drinking water, ground water, waste water and biosolids. In 2023 ADEQ began a comprehensive PFAS testing program to make sure that all of Arizona's regulated drinking water systems are sampled for PFAS in advance of federal regulations. If PFAS are detected, ADEQ can begin working right away with the affected water providers to collect more data, find solutions and identify funding to reduce exposure to PFAS. While we are actively working to protect drinking water we are also trying to identify the most effective ways to prevent more PFAS from entering our environment. ADEQ recently piloted a program to help Arizona fire departments stop their use of PFAS containing Aqueous Film Forming Foams known as AFFF. The program was allocated \$395,000 during fiscal year 2023, which allowed ADEQ to take back and replace foam from over fifty fire stations, removing over nine thousand gallons of PFAS containing foam from being used. ADEQ is currently engaged in a comprehensive statewide effort to ensure that all regulated water systems are tested for PFAS. EPA is currently requiring that systems serving 3,300 customers or more sample their drinking water for PFAS. However, in the state of Arizona, the majority of systems serve fewer than 3,300 people and will not be sampled under the EPA program. Therefore, ADEQ has committed to using three million dollars of federal Safe Drinking Water Act funds to sample these small water systems and help ensure that all regulated water systems in Arizona will be tested. Results are generally provided to water systems within two to four weeks of sampling and are posted to the ADEQ website. If PFAS are detected, ADEQ provides the system with a PFAS tool kit specially developed to help water systems meet the challenges this may cause. The tool kit includes information on funding, customer communication and potential next steps. Systems are asked to follow EPA recommendations to inform their customers of the results. ADEQ's program to test small drinking water systems has a number of benefits to the systems and their customers. First, it provides PFAS sampling to systems at no charge, potentially saving them thousands of dollars. These systems can then be notified of PFAS detection much earlier than if they wait until they are required to sample under forthcoming federal regulations. For those systems with PFAS concentrations higher than the EPA's proposed limits they can get a head start planning for expanded testing, evaluating potential solutions and applying for federal funding. With many systems across the nation facing similar challenges it's important that Arizona drinking water providers begin planning to meet the new rules as soon as possible. What can you do if PFAS is detected in your drinking water? If your water is confirmed to contain PFAS, in many cases action is not necessary immediately. You can choose to reduce your exposure as soon as possible by not using untreated water for activities like drinking, cooking, washing produce, brushing teeth or preparing formula. However, it's generally safe to continue using untreated water for activities like washing dishes, showering, laundry, swimming and watering your yard. If you have concerns about PFAS in your water, there are a number of at home treatments available such as activated carbon and reverse osmosis. You can check sources such as the National Science Foundation ("NSF") or your local filter installer for more information on effective treatment systems for your home. It should be noted that boiling water will not remove PFAS and bottled water providers are not required to test for PFAS, so use caution if you choose to drink bottled water. PFAS can be a complicated topic and this presentation is meant only as a brief introduction. If you'd like to learn more about PFAS in Arizona please visit our "My Community" web page. There you can find a map displaying the results of statewide PFAS screening and links to other helpful resources. If you'd like to talk with someone directly, we have staff available to speak with you and answer any questions you might have. That concluded the video presentation.

ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino asked if anyone had any questions Council Member Dueker asked if anybody makes a filter that is large enough to put on a pump going into a tank. Yes, answered Ms. Panzino. They do make granular activated carbon filters. There is a very specific type of carbon that needs to be used to remove PFAS compounds. They also make ion exchange media that will do the same thing. Both of them have pros and cons relative to operation and maintenance. Queried Council Member Dueker – Cost? It depends on your flow rate, replied Ms. Panzino. Tucson installed an ion exchange system that is treating 250 gallons per minute. The initial capital cost for installing that system was about \$1.7 million dollars and then it's about \$350,000 to maintain on an annual basis. Queried Council Member Armington – Is this related to landfill? It's possible that it could be from landfilled materials that have PFAS in them, answered Ms. Panzino. What happens with the landfill, if it's not lined properly, is water and rain water infiltrates through the landfill and goes through those products and then goes out the bottom of the landfill and then enters your ground water. It depends on the construction of your landfill and where it's located relative to your wells. Council Member Dueker stated he just read that these chemicals are found in rain water. Queried Council Member Dueker – Is that true? That is true, answered Ms. Panzino. Pretty much the whole globe, stated Council Member Dueker, has an issue with these chemicals now. Queried Council Member Dueker – Are they finding it in Antarctica? That is what that study said, replied Ms. Panzino. They found very low concentrations of PFAS compounds in rain water in very remote places. So when we talk about these chemicals being “forever chemicals” it is the way the molecule is structured that makes it very difficult to break down in the environment. And so we cycle it through our bodies, explained Ms. Panzino, and through manufacturing facilities. Right now, we don't have manufacturing facilities in Arizona that are emitting PFAS into the environment into the air. That's where it would come in contact with clouds and then come back out as rain.

Council Member Binney stated what he read about it is that it passes through the body and it doesn't accumulate in the body. Questioned Council Member Binney – If it is so dangerous why aren't you outlawing it? You've got to start somewhere, opined Council Member Binney, and that is the point of origin. And then you expect all these little water authorities to treat for it. Council Member Binney stated he's not against it – it's got to be done. Questioned Council Member Binney – Who pays for it? The customer pays for it, stated Council Member Binney. Questioned Council Member Binney – So why aren't you outlawing it now? The state of Arizona, responded ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino, is waiting for the federal regulations. They don't have to wait, responded Council Member Binney, they are their own entity. That is true, responded Ms. Panzino. Questioned Council Member Binney – How are you going to enforce this? Everyone can buy an RO filter, stated Council Member Binney, or water softener at home – a lot of people have that and it treats it out. Questioned Council Member Binney – But where does it put it? It puts it right back into our ground, stated Council Member Binney, because we all have septic systems and then it goes back into the water table. It has to be stopped at the source, concluded Council Member Binney.

Queried Council Member Dueker – If you are using a carbon filter, are you throwing the carbon filter away once it reaches a certain life span? Water Operator Dean Shaffer replied it would probably have to be taken to a Hazmat place that would accept it. You are hitting on a lot of really great issues, stated ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. This is why this compound is so difficult because it is so prevalent in our everyday homes, in our rain water and in our waste water. That is also why it is so difficult to tell whether or not your exposure is a result of your drinking water or if it's going to be as a result of the weather proofing in your carpet. Ms. Panzino stated she doesn't have those solutions and council is pointing out all of the things that make this such a difficult thing to talk about. From what he read, stated Council Member Binney, the EPA is going to mandate four parts per trillion. Queried

Council Member Binney – How much enters the body and leaves the body? And then he read, added Council Member Binney, at four parts per trillion, don't worry about it. If you get forty or fifty parts per trillion, start to worry about it. The EPA, replied Ms. Panzino, is taking a very conservative view on how PFAS may affect human health. The way that the toxicologists are describing it is that they set health advisories because they have studies that show PFAS affects your immune response system relative to COVID immunizations at very low levels. They set those health advisory levels at these concentrations that we cannot measure. Those health advisory levels, reported Ms. Panzino, are at .004 parts per trillion. What they are saying is that the lower the exposure to PFAS the better.

Queried Town Manager Grier – This isn't regulated by ADEQ? That is correct, responded ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. Queried Town Manager Grier – You don't see it being regulated by ADEQ for another three years or so? Three or four years, replied Ms. Panzino. In your words, stated Mr. Grier, it is based on the EPA being overly cautious with what harm the PFAS may do. The EPA is responding to the science, answered Ms. Panzino. The science is telling them, from the toxicological studies, that certain concentrations of PFAS in your blood serum and exposure can affect your health. Some of those calculations, explained Ms. Panzino, is exposure over seventy years. Children are a little less vulnerable but pregnant mothers are the most vulnerable relative to infant brain development. Queried Mr. Grier – Was it our option not to have the wells tested? You could have said no, replied Ms. Panzino. ADEQ says we're not regulating it, stated Mr. Grier, but ADEQ is going to tell the town to notify the public that these levels of PFAS were detected. Queried Mr. Grier – Isn't that regulating it? Did ADEQ contemplate these consequences and the costs to these small municipal water companies? Mr. Grier stated he thinks it's common knowledge that the issue with small water companies is that they are under-funded. The Town of Star Valley, reported Mr. Grier, has three million dollars of water pipes that we are looking to have to replace. We are bleeding red with just day to day operations. ADEQ comes along and says we're going to test for PFAS, that they really don't quite know what the science is on them, but towns and cities now have the burden to try to fix this. I hope that the answer isn't that you have WIFA, because WIFA is a loan. What ADEQ is saying, stated Mr. Grier, is that we want you to not only have the burden of a principal but also to have the debt service and somehow try to provide safe drinking water to the public. It seems to me that ADEQ is regulating it. Queried Mr. Grier – What will ADEQ do to assist the small towns? ADEQ's choices, responded Ms. Panzino, were they could sample small drinking water systems proactively and get an understanding of what the debt is going to be relative to PFAS in the state of Arizona or they could have waited until the EPA's MCL was complete and out. If ADEQ had waited, explained Ms. Panzino, then most of that available bill funding would be unused for this year and possibly next year. The choice of ADEQ was to be proactive and sample to better understand which small water systems in the state of Arizona are being impacted so that we can all ramp up and start figuring out how to access the federal funding that is available but might go away.

Queried Town Manager Grier – Isn't there an immediate need on this because we've already shut down our wells? Is it going to take a long time for the funding to catch up? With ADEQ's testing, stated Mr. Grier, it seems like the crisis has happened. Maybe it's a good preemptive strategy but we don't really get to ramp up because we had to take the wells off. His concern, stated Mr. Grier, is there is an immediate need now created by the testing. Queried Mr. Grier – Where's that funding? ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino responded that she understands what Mr. Grier is saying about the public pressure that is created by sharing the results. How would you feel, questioned Ms. Panzino, if we didn't share the results with you? Absolutely, stated Mr. Grier, you've got to share the results. But once you do that you're going to have a panic in the neighborhood or you're going to have to take those wells off system, as we were able to do in our case. People are not going to drink the water, concluded Mr. Grier, once you share the results. ADEQ does not have the authority, explained Ms. Panzino, to make you do

what you did. You saw the data and you took the action that you needed to take in order to protect your customers.

Council Member Dueker recalled reading something that said that once it's tested and you find out that you have it, ADEQ asks the town or water operator to come up with an idea or a plan. What ADEQ provides, explained ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino, is what they call a PFAS tool kit. The tool kit needs to have about two million dollars in it, stated Mr. Grier, to be a good tool kit. Council Member Binney stated he bets there are more wells in this town than there are water customers. He has three personal wells, reported Council Member Binney. Star Valley Water Operator Dean Shaffer reported the Town of Star Valley only serves about thirty percent of the community. The rest are on private wells. Council Member Binney stated PFAS need to be shut down now. Unfortunately, responded Council Member Dueker, ADEQ doesn't have the ability to do that. Two of the compounds, reported Ms. Panzino, have been phased out of use. The main source of PFAS in Arizona is from the use of AFFF foam. Water is the foundation of our town, stated Council Member Highstreet. There is a great deal of pride and concern when it comes to that. Questioned Council Member Highstreet – Do you have any basic recommendation how we should proceed with the information that we have available? The recommendation that she would make, answered Ms. Panzino, is to do what we have already done – to take the three wells offline. Depending on the Town's financial situation, added Ms. Panzino, the Town will want to avail itself of the WIFA funding to get treatment in place.

Vice Mayor McKinney stated he is trying to develop something in his head about the severity of the situation. Queried Vice Mayor McKinney – At four parts per trillion, how many cases of cancer can be expected per one hundred people of the population? ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino replied she doesn't know the answer to that and she would have to refer to an ADHS toxicologist. Queried Council Member Binney – Why don't you test the public to see what levels are in their blood? What level is dangerous to us? Two nanograms per milliliter, answered Ms. Panzino, is the level that you could expect to see potential health effects. Queried Council Member Binney – Would our levels achieve that? Ms. Panzino responded she does not know because she doesn't think any of our citizens have had their blood serum levels tested for PFAS. PFAS testing in blood serum, reported Ms. Panzino, is not available commercially. Queried Council Member Binney – What do citizens do about their private wells? Ms. Panzino responded she will get to that.

Just saying look toward WIFA funding, stated Town Manager Grier, doesn't work. That is a loan, it is a debt service and you are already looking at water systems that are struggling to be able to just provide good, reliable, potable water. That can't be ADEQ's answer for this. ADEQ has got to fight for these water companies so that there is funding that is not just an acquisition of a loan, opined Mr. Grier, because he thinks it is going to be an expensive fix. ADEQ is in the middle of continuing to sample small drinking water systems, reported ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. The next step after that, explained Ms. Panzino, is to prioritize those systems who may need assistance the most. She is not saying that there is no funding coming from the state government, but she can't commit to having funding right now because the budget just dropped. ADEQ is still trying to figure out how to prioritize, out of all the systems in the state of Arizona, which ones are going to need help the most.

Our town runs in the black, reported Council Member Binney, we don't run in the red. We have money in the bank. You would make us spend our emergency fund for this? And a town that is irresponsible in their spending would be taken care of? She can't make that decision, replied ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. One thing to keep in mind, for the larger cities and towns, the EPA is doing the sampling. That data will not be available until later on in the year. There are two methods for the sampling of drinking water, explained Ms. Panzino, method 533 and 537.1 that measure the total of twenty nine different PFAS compounds. The samples that were taken from Star Valley and through

ADEQ to all the small drinking water systems were sampled at your entry point to the distribution system (“EPDS”). All of your drinking water supply wells were not sampled individually. They were sampled at the point of entry to distribution to your customers. You may have multiple wells going into your entry point to the distribution system. We do not know what the PFAS concentrations are in each of your wells.

ADEQ has started testing in all fifteen counties, reported ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino, and these are the results so far. They have sampled 468 systems out of 735. They have results from 412 public water systems as they are waiting to get results back from the lab. 313 systems have come back with no PFAS; 60 have come back with PFAS detections that are below the proposed MCL; and 39 of those small drinking water systems with PFAS detection are above the proposed MCL. Star Valley, reported Ms. Panzino, is within that 39. The recommended actions are to continue to sample; inform your water system customers of the results so they can take precautions for themselves; provide information to help limit exposure; and plan ahead. If treatment is required, reported Ms. Panzino, there is funding available from WIFA. Some are loans and some are forgivable. The percentage of forgivable principle depends on where you are in line with WIFA on an annual basis. If they have a forgivable principal left to give you, they will offer it to you. WIFA offers many different types of assistance including low interest loans, technical assistance, they have engineers on staff and forgivable principal loans. The process for WIFA funding is initiated by contacting them, explained Ms. Panzino, and they will assign you a project manager who will walk you through their process.

Queried Council Member Dueker – Was Payson tested? Yes, answered ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. Queried Council Member Dueker – How are they doing? They are in the same boat as Star Valley, reported Ms. Panzino. Queried Water Operator Dean Shaffer – Is the number going to be the true final number? She really thinks that it is not going to change, answered Ms. Panzino. It’s out for public review right now so they are soliciting comments. EPA will go through the process of addressing those comments in the next six months and she believes they will settle on the numbers sometime at the end of the year or the beginning of 2024. There are four PFAS compounds, explained Ms. Panzino, that are regulated as a mixture. There are health based concentrations in the denominator for GenX, PFBS, PFNA and PFHxAs. Your concentration goes on the numerator (on the top) and then you use the health based concentration and then you add them all up. If it’s over one then it’s in exceedance of the MCL. Star Valley’s exceedances, reported Ms. Panzino, are mainly PFOA and PFOS. Again, one part per trillion is a very tiny amount. The sampling date was May 4th, reported Ms. Panzino, and these results are all from method 533. You can see the location of your entry points to the distribution system and the concentrations for PFOA and PFOS that were detected at each of those entry points. They weren’t tested at the well, clarified Council Member Dueker, they were tested at the entry point to the water system. Yes, confirmed Ms. Panzino. Questioned Council Member Dueker – Would it be a correct assumption that the wells that are serving these areas are going to be similar to the numbers from the location where it enters the water system? That could not be the case, replied Ms. Panzino. You may have one or two wells that are contributing those concentrations that are going into your EPDS. Questioned Council Member Dueker – How can we test each well? Those three sites are single wells, reported Water Operator Dean Shaffer, they are on their own EPDS. Questioned Council Member Dueker – Are the wells, pumps or pipes treated or coated with any kind of chemical product? No, answered Mr. Shaffer. If he had to guess, it is coming from the water. These wells are in the shallow water table, reported Mr. Shaffer.

Questioned Council Member Dueker – Is there any study on that as far as in the water table where you find a higher concentration of the chemicals? The higher concentration PFAS is found at the water table water soil interface, answered ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. These PFAS compounds tend to float. Questioned Council Member Dueker – Do we know how far we have to drill a

well to get back into numbers that are within regulation? Our deep wells aren't showing any, replied Mr. Shaffer. Questioned Council Member Dueker – Is there a study that shows how many feet we've got to go down to get a change in this concentration? A study could be done, but no, there is no study at this time, responded Ms. Panzino. What you could do, recommended Ms. Panzino, is build a cross sectional profile of all your wells and your intake depths and then note where your PFAS concentrations are entering and where they are not entering in your other wells. The other thing that you can do is depth specific testing along an extended screen interval so that you would know where the PFAS is entering your screen and then you can adjust your pump depths. Queried Council Member Dueker – Does ADEQ have any funding to help us with that testing? They have some funding, replied Ms. Panzino. ADEQ has not decided how they are going to use it yet. Queried Council Member Dueker – Could we be a pioneering project in that study for other towns to look at? ADEQ is sampling the whole state, answered Ms. Panzino. Once they have the results for the whole state they will prioritize and then they will use the money that they have to help those small drinking water systems that need it the most.

Queried Council Member Armington to Water Operator Dean Shaffer – When you say shallow wells, what's the depths of those wells? What he goes off of is the water table, answered Mr. Shaffer. Some of that water table is not twenty foot deep so when he says shallow, that is shallow water. It's not showing up in the Sky Run wells, reported Mr. Shaffer, but that static up there is over one hundred feet deep. The deep water, concluded Mr. Shaffer, is not showing it right now. Queried Council Member Dueker – Is Payson over the limit like we are? Are Payson's numbers higher or lower than ours? Council Member Dueker stated he is trying to figure out what's going on in this general area with contamination and trying to come up with an idea of how it can be handled. Payson's numbers are higher, answered Ms. Panzino, they are in the 30 to 40 parts per trillion range for each PFOA and PFOS. This is very preliminary, reported Ms. Panzino. Their concentrations are co-located with areas where they have been reinjecting their wastewater, and some locations are downstream of the airport. Some of the sources are going to be landfills, waste water treatment plants, septic systems, and an accident where AFFF was used on the highway, explained Ms. Panzino.

Queried Vice Mayor McKinney – How would a private well owner get their well tested? There is a list of household filtration devices provided by NSF which is a public health and safety organization, responded ADEQ Chief Science Officer Paula Panzino. The problem is that these household filtration devices, explained Ms. Panzino, will only reduce your PFAS concentrations by a certain amount. Because they are not built specially for removing PFAS, they have limitations. ADEQ has written a standard operating procedure (“SOP”) as to how a tap should be sampled. The problem with sampling the tap is that people can cross contaminate the sample, so they need to be very careful when sampling for PFAS. The SOP, reported Ms. Panzino, has a list of ADHS approved laboratories. You will need to reach out to the laboratory and they will send you bottles. Then you follow the sampling procedure and send the bottles back. They have to be kept at a certain temperature, explained Ms. Panzino, and they have to be analyzed quickly. Questioned Vice Mayor McKinney – Does ADEQ pick up the tab on that? No, answered Ms. Panzino. Questioned Vice Mayor McKinney – So that is up to the individual well owner to pay for that testing? That is correct, replied Ms. Panzino. Questioned Vice Mayor McKinney – How much does that cost? It can cost between \$500 and \$1,000 per sample, answered Ms. Panzino. There is an activist organization called EWG, reported Ms. Panzino, and they have an article out where they have gone and tested different PFAS water filters. You might find some information from them with regard to household water filters. The cheapest way out right now, stated Council Member Binney, is to outlaw them all. Not only outlawing, added Council Member Dueker, but educating the public to demand it. That concluded the presentation by ADEQ.

2. Discussion and possible action whether or not to continue with the street light project.

Town Manager Grier stated the street light project has been contemplated for three to four years now. The town has been working with APS on this project, reported Mr. Grier. Our contact with APS, Todd Wheeler, has been great for the town to work with. He has been patient with something that wasn't really our fault as we have been waiting for the development on the former Freegard property and whether or not those poles would have to be moved. The town put some \$59,000 into this project, reported Mr. Grier, and he thinks APS is willing to refund \$49,000 if the town decides not to go forward. We are really at a point in time where we need to make a decision on this. Unfortunately, stated Mr. Grier, there are still the same challenges in front of us in not knowing what's going to happen with the property development. That is what stalled the project in the first place, explained Mr. Grier, because the town wanted to work with the developer and not require them to do it. We still have that issue. We still really don't know what the developer is going to do over there. They do have an application in for rezoning to C3, reported Mr. Grier, with a Maverik proposal. The town did receive some negative reaction from some of the businesses such as the Spur Bar. Mr. Grier stated he does not know how many people the town will anger with the project. Another concern is the dark sky ordinance and whether or not the street lights will be able to accommodate that. There are pros and cons to it, concluded Mr. Grier. Queried Council Member Highstreet – What triggered the street light project? It was concern with safety issues, responded Vice Mayor McKinney. The idea was the town would have a visible notification for drivers that they are approaching an inhabited area and to slow down.

APS District Supervisor Mike Shaw reported that Todd Wheeler started this project in July of 2019. The town approached APS asking to get street lights up and down the corridor to provide some safety or some visibility for traffic coming and going from businesses in and out. At that time, explained Mr. Shaw, Todd designed and engineered a design based off of the lumen study provided by the town's engineer. Todd then asked if we wanted to move forward and at that time the town signed an extension agreement. The town then paid \$57,982.26 to APS. That started the ball rolling and a survey was completed. The stakes are now gone, reported Mr. Shaw, they have all been pulled or removed. If the town wishes not to proceed, reported Mr. Shaw, APS will refund the funds minus any APS costs – which is roughly \$8,800 for the costs incurred for surveying and Todd's time for engineering. If the town wishes to proceed, explained Mr. Shaw, the town will need to pay for another design re-staking fee. APS is willing to proceed with the project. There is some work that has to be done by the town regarding pole locations and tree trimming in front of the Lamplighter, concluded Mr. Shaw.

Town Manager Grier reiterated that what has held up the town is what should be done in front of the Mogollon Meadows development. It doesn't seem to him street lights would be needed if a Maverik is in that location because they are pretty well lit. Queried Mr. Grier – Would you interrupt the street lights on the south side of the highway? What problems does that pose? The distance between poles is a three hundred foot allowance, answered APS District Supervisor Mike Shaw. He has only seen preliminary designs for the Maverik coming in and there is a deceleration or turn lane which is in conflict with one of the 69 poles. They are going to have to have that pole relocated, stated Mr. Shaw. It goes back to the whole point of safety and APS would require the town provide another lumen study to show it is safe to move a pole to another location. Queried Council Member Highstreet – If the town decides to terminate this project now, will the program still be available in the future? Essentially it's going to be the same scenario, answered Mr. Shaw. The only difference is that costs are increasing. If it's going to be the same exact design then they would proceed with that design or relocate the poles accordingly. Essentially, added Mr. Shaw, the cost of the job would be re-estimated. If the project were to be canceled today, reported Mr. Shaw, the town would receive roughly about a \$49,000 refund.

Council Member Armington asked Mr. Grier if a meeting could be set up with the developer to see where they are at. That hasn't worked for four years, responded Mr. Grier. He likes Council Member Highstreet's suggestion to terminate and see what happens, concluded Mr. Grier.

A motion to terminate the street light project and review it in the future once progress has been made with the development next door was made by Council Member Highstreet and was seconded by Council Member Dueker.

Vice Mayor McKinney Yes, Council Member Armington Yes, Council Member Binney Yes, Council Member Dueker Yes, Council Member Highstreet Yes, Council Member McDaniel Absent, Mayor Davis Yes.

The motion was voted on and passed 6- 0.

• ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Council Member Highstreet.

All were in favor and the motion passed 6 – 0.

APPROVED:

Bobby Davis, Mayor

Date: _____

ATTEST:

Edie Chapin, Town Clerk

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Town Council of the Town of Star Valley held on the 18th day of July 2023. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held, and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 21st day of July 2023.

Edie Chapin, Town Clerk