

Property Water Report — Clifton Park, New York

Prepared for: a property in Clifton Park, NY · **Report date:** 2026-09-20

Water system: Clifton Park Water Authority (PWSID NY4500175), serving 35,000 people

Data period: utility-published record read 2024-09-20

Prepared by: TapWaterData · every figure below carries its source and the date we read it

This is the sample Property Water Report. It is written from the same data, by the same method, as a purchased one: we read one system's published record, check every figure against its source, and say plainly where the record cannot answer a question. If anything here is wrong, reply to the email and we refund you in full.

1 · Your water, in one sentence

Clifton Park Water Authority has seven MCL violations on record, the most recent dated 2024-01-01, and none of them is currently unresolved — while the panel it publishes today shows four results above a health goal, every one of them at a goal of zero.

Those two facts pull in opposite directions and both belong in a purchase decision. Section 6 is the compliance history; section 3 is the current panel. A system's past is not its present, and neither is the other's evidence.

2 · What matters for you

The record holds 147 substances. **20 were detected at all and 4 sit above a health-based goal.** For someone buying a house here, three things are worth a decision and the rest are not.

Worth a decision

1 · Lead — 0.01 PPM, and this is the one the system's data cannot answer for your address. Lead is not a source-water problem. It comes from the service line and the building's own plumbing, which means a system-wide result tells you about the system and almost nothing about the house you are buying. The published figure is below the EPA's 15 ppb action level and above its health goal of zero. What matters is the pipe between the main and the property, and no published dataset knows what that pipe is made of. Section 8 says what to do about it, and it is the one test we would insist on.

2 · Hardness — 123 mg/L, which is "hard", and is a recurring cost rather than a health finding. It will not hurt anyone. It will shorten the life of a water heater and a dishwasher, and it is a line item the sums you are already doing should carry. Section 7 prices it.

3 · The compliance history — seven violations, all resolved. A system that has been out of compliance before is a different proposition from one that never has, even when it is compliant today. Section 6 is what the record does and does not say about them.

Worth knowing, not worth acting on

Sodium at 49.3 PPM. There is no enforceable limit for sodium in drinking water. The EPA publishes a drinking-water advisory of 20 mg/L for people on a physician-ordered 500 mg/day sodium restriction, and this water is above it. For everyone else it is not a finding — it is below the level at which sodium is usually tasted.

Disinfection byproducts. Bromodichloromethane at 3.7 PPB and dichloroacetic acid at 0.0068 PPM. Both sit above a goal of zero and both are far inside their group limits; total trihalomethanes measure 31 PPB against a group limit of 80, and total haloacetic acids 0.0185 PPM against 0.060. Section 9 covers the filter if you want the number lower, and explains why we are not pushing one.

Radium. Combined radium-226 and -228 at 1.15 pCi/L against an enforceable limit of 5 pCi/L.

Not worth your attention

The remaining detections are minerals and treatment residuals at levels with no health-based concern here: chloride at 86.6 PPM and sulfate at 43.3 PPM against secondary standards of 250 each, fluoride at 0.139 PPM against a limit of 4, barium at 0.101 PPM against 2, copper at 0.113 PPM against an action level of 1.3, and nitrate at 0.0977 PPM against a limit of 45 on the basis this system reports it. **We are not going to list them individually to pad this report.** None would change a decision you make about this property.

3 • The four findings, explained

The thing nobody explains: a goal of zero

All four are "above the health goal" because **the goal is zero**. The EPA publishes two numbers for many contaminants: the **MCL**, an enforceable legal maximum, and the **MCLG**, a non-enforceable health target set without regard to cost or feasibility. For substances treated as probable human carcinogens the agency sets the goal to zero — not because any detection is dangerous, but because it declines to name a dose it considers risk-free.

So "above the health goal" here means **"detected at all."** The number that tells you whether to act is the distance to the *limit*.

3.1 • Lead — 0.01 PPM

Published level	0.01 PPM (10 ppb)
Health goal (MCLG)	0
Enforceable limit	none — lead is a treatment technique with an action level of 0.015 PPM (15 ppb)
Record read	2024-09-20

What the record does not say, and it matters more than the number. Lead results under the Lead and Copper Rule are normally a 90th-percentile figure across a sample of household taps, not a single measurement, and our source record does not state which this is. Either way it describes a set of other people's houses. Lead enters water from the service line and from solder and fixtures inside the building, so the result for the property you are buying is a function of that property's plumbing.

Who it matters more for: infants, children and anyone pregnant. There is no known safe level, which is why the goal is zero and why section 8 recommends the test whatever the published figure says.

3.2 · Bromodichloromethane — 3.7 PPB

Published level	3.7 PPB
Health goal (MCLG)	0
Enforceable limit	none individually; counted in TTHM, group limit 80 PPB
This system's total THMs	31 PPB
Record read	2024-09-20

One of four trihalomethanes formed when chlorine reacts with natural organic matter. This system disinfects with hypochlorite and filters, so some level is expected and is the direct consequence of the water being disinfected — a trade that is overwhelmingly worth making. Classed a probable human carcinogen; the risk is chronic and lifetime, not acute.

3.3 · Dichloroacetic acid — 0.0068 PPM

Published level	0.0068 PPM (6.8 ppb)
Health goal (MCLG)	0
Enforceable limit	counted in HAA5, group limit 0.060 PPM
This system's total HAA5	0.0185 PPM
Record read	2024-09-20

The same story from the same cause, a different chemical family. **Grouped with 3.2 deliberately:** one cause, one filter, one decision — not two.

3.4 · Radium, combined (-226 & -228) — 1.15 pCi/L

Published level	1.15 pCi/L
Health goal (MCLG)	0
Enforceable limit (MCL)	5 pCi/L
Record read	2024-09-20

Naturally occurring radionuclides from rock and soil. At 1.15 pCi/L this system is at roughly a quarter of the enforceable limit. It is listed here because its goal is zero, not because it is close to anything.

4 · What this data does not tell you

The most important section, and the one no compliance report contains.

- **This is the system, not your tap.** Every figure is measured in the distribution system or across a sample of other homes. For lead and copper that distinction is the whole finding — see 3.1.
- **This system does not make its own water.** The record lists its source as *"Surface water purchased"*, which means it buys treated water from another utility and distributes it. **Our record does not name the producing system**, so the treatment and the source protection behind these numbers belong to a system we cannot identify from this data. We will name it on request if the authority will tell us.
- **All 147 rows carry the same date.** Every substance in the record is dated 2024-09-20, which is also the date the record itself was last updated. That is the date we READ the data, not 147 separate sampling dates. We do not know when any individual analyte was actually sampled, and we are not going to present a read date as a sampling date.
- **PFAS coverage is partial, and this is an absence, not a clean result.** The record holds two PFAS compounds — PFOA and PFOS — and both were measured at zero, which is a real non-detect. But the EPA's 2024 PFAS rule regulates five compounds individually, so **PFHxS, PFNA and HFPO-DA (GenX) are not in this record at all.** No row is not the same as no detection.
- **Detection limits are not zero.** "Not detected" means "not found above the laboratory's reporting threshold", which varies by substance.
- **We hold one reporting period.** See section 5.

5 · Direction of travel

Clifton Park Water Authority's published record, as we hold it, is a **single reporting period read 2024-09-20. We do not have a multi-year series for this system that we would stand behind**, so we are not going to draw a trend line through one point.

What we can say is in section 6: the compliance record is not a single point, and it is the closest thing to a trend this report can honestly offer.

A purchased report includes the multi-year series wherever the system publishes one. Where it does not, it says so — as here.

6 • The system's compliance history

This section is the reason the Property Water Report exists. A current panel tells you about today; a buyer is committing for years.

MCL violations on record	7
Most recent	2024-01-01
Unresolved today	0
Record read	2024-09-20

What that means, precisely. Seven times, this system exceeded an enforceable federal limit, and each of those is closed. The most recent is dated 2024-01-01, which is recent enough to be the current management's record rather than history.

And what this record does NOT contain, stated plainly. Our source holds a **count**, a **latest date** and an **unresolved count** — not a per-violation enforcement history. We cannot tell you from this data which contaminant each violation was for, how long each lasted, or what the state required in response. Those exist in the state primacy agency's files and in the system's own annual reports. Section 10 turns that into a question you can ask while you still have leverage.

We are not going to describe seven violations we cannot characterise as though we could.

7 • Hardness, and what it will cost you

Not a health finding. A recurring cost, and one that belongs in the sums you are already doing.

Hardness	123 mg/L (7.19 grains per gallon)
Band	hard
Basis	utility-reported for this system (our highest-confidence tier)
Source date	2024-09-20
County ambient, for context	88.3 mg/L across 343 samples

At 7.19 grains per gallon, a four-person household needs about 2,157 grains of softening a day, which sizes to a **24,000-grain** softener regenerating weekly.

What that costs, installed. Our published national cost band for a standard-build 24,000-grain system is **\$952 to \$1,228, with a midpoint of \$1,075**. That figure is modelled from labour rates and equipment pricing rather than observed from invoices in this specific area, and we mark it as modelled rather than presenting it as a quote. There is no New York-specific band, so this is the national one.

Whether you need one at all is a preference, not a health decision. Hard water at this level shortens water-heater life and leaves scale on fixtures. If the property already has a softener, section 10 tells you what to ask about it.

8 · What to test at your own tap

Recommended: one test, and we would not waive it.

Test	Why	Roughly
Lead at the tap, first draw	The one risk this system's data genuinely cannot answer, because it comes from the service line and the building's plumbing rather than the source. It is also the one finding that would change your offer	\$50–60

Ask the seller when the service line was last identified, and whether the property has ever been part of the authority's lead sampling pool. A house built before the 1986 federal ban on lead solder should be treated as unknown until tested.

Not recommended for this address:

- **A PFAS test.** The two compounds the system measures came back at zero, and a household test would not tell you about the three it does not measure any more cheaply than asking the utility to.
- **A full multi-analyte panel.** The system publishes 147 substances. Paying around \$260 to re-measure them is money spent on reassurance you already have.
- **A hardness test.** We already know: 123 mg/L. A test kit would confirm a number you have.
- **A radium test.** At roughly a quarter of the enforceable limit, and from a source the property owner cannot change.

9 • What to install — and what would be overkill

If you want the disinfection byproducts lower: a carbon filter certified to NSF/ANSI 53

A pitcher, faucet-mount or under-sink carbon filter **certified to NSF/ANSI 53** addresses both bromodichloromethane and dichloroacetic acid. Expect **\$30–120** plus cartridges. Check the certification, not the marketing: "filters 99% of contaminants" means nothing, and a genuinely certified product lists the standard.

If the lead test comes back high

That is a different decision and a bigger one — a certified lead-reduction filter at the point of use is a mitigation, and replacing the service line is the fix. Price the service line before you close, not after. NSF/ANSI 53 also covers lead reduction, and a filter certified for it is the interim answer while the pipe is dealt with.

What would be overkill here

- **Reverse osmosis (\$200–500).** RO is the right answer for high TDS, nitrate, arsenic or a PFAS problem. This system has none of those.
- **A whole-house carbon system (\$1,500–3,000).** Nothing in this record justifies treating the water you shower and wash with.
- **A softener bought for water quality.** A softener addresses hardness, which is a cost question and not a contaminant one. Buy it for the water heater if you buy it at all — see section 7.

And the legitimate answer nobody sells you

For everything except lead: **nothing**. Test the lead, and if it comes back clean you can close this report and spend the money on the roof.

Disclosure. We earn a commission when readers buy filters or test kits through our links. That is exactly why this section names a certification standard rather than a brand, and why "nothing" appears above as a real option.

10 • What to ask before you close

Each of these exists because this report could not answer it from published data. They are worth asking while you still have leverage.

- **Of the seller or their agent:** what is the service line between the main and the house made of, and is there documentation? Has the property ever had a lead test, and can you see the result?
- **Of the seller:** is there a softener or any treatment equipment, how old is it, and is it included in the sale? Hard water at 123 mg/L means whatever is installed has been working.

- **Of Clifton Park Water Authority (518-371-3552):** which system do you purchase treated water from? Our record says the source is purchased surface water and does not name the producer.
- **Of the authority or the state primacy agency:** what were the seven violations for, and when were they resolved? Our record holds the count and the latest date but not the detail.
- **Of the authority:** have you sampled for PFHxS, PFNA or HFPO-DA, and if so where are the results published? The 2024 rule regulates them and our record holds only PFOA and PFOS.
- **Of the home inspector:** photograph the service line entry and the interior supply piping.

11 • Sources

Figure	Source	Read
System identity, PWSID NY4500175, 35,000 served, purchased surface water, hypochlorite disinfection	Utility-published system record	2024-09-20
147 substances in the record, 20 detected, 4 above a health goal	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
7 MCL violations, latest 2024-01-01, 0 unresolved	Utility-published compliance record	2024-09-20
Lead 0.01 PPM · Copper 0.113 PPM	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
Bromodichloromethane 3.7 PPB · Total THMs 31 PPB	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
Dichloroacetic acid 0.0068 PPM (6.8 ppb) · Total HAA5 0.0185 PPM	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
Radium combined (-226 & -228) 1.15 pCi/L	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
Sodium 49.3 PPM · Chloride 86.6 PPM · Sulfate 43.3 PPM	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
Fluoride 0.139 PPM · Barium 0.101 PPM · Nitrate (as NO ₃) 0.0977 PPM	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
PFOA 0 PPB · PFOS 0 PPB — the only two PFAS compounds in the record	Utility-published results	2024-09-20
Hardness 123 mg/L (7.19 gpg), band "hard", utility-reported tier	TapWaterData hardness index, tier T1	2024-09-20
County ambient hardness 88.3 mg/L across 343 samples	EPA/USGS Water Quality Portal, via our hardness index's county context for this city	2024-09-20
24,000-grain sizing at 7.19 gpg for a four-person household	TapWaterData softener sizing model	2026-09-20
Installed cost band \$952–\$1,228 (midpoint \$1,075), national, standard build, modelled	TapWaterData published water-softener cost bands	2026-09-20
Lead action level 0.015 PPM (15 ppb), MCLG 0, treatment technique	EPA Lead and Copper Rule	2026-09-20
TTHM group limit 80 PPB · HAA5 group limit 0.060 PPM	EPA National Primary Drinking Water Regulations	2026-09-20
Combined radium-226/228 MCL 5 pCi/L	EPA National Primary Drinking Water Regulations	2026-09-20

Figure	Source	Read
Fluoride MCL 4 PPM · Barium MCL 2 PPM · Copper action level 1.3 PPM	EPA National Primary Drinking Water Regulations	2026-09-20
Nitrate MCL 45 PPM as NO ₃ , equivalently 10 PPM as N	EPA National Primary Drinking Water Regulations	2026-09-20
Chloride and sulfate secondary standards 250 PPM	EPA National Secondary Drinking Water Regulations	2026-09-20
Sodium drinking-water advisory 20 mg/L for restricted-sodium diets	EPA drinking water advisory	2026-09-20
PFOA and PFOS MCL 4 ppt; PFHxS, PFNA and HFPO-DA also regulated	EPA 2024 PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation	2026-09-20
NSF/ANSI 53 as the applicable standard for DBP and lead reduction	NSF/ANSI standard scope	2026-09-20
1986 federal ban on lead solder in potable plumbing	Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1986	2026-09-20

What this report is. An interpretation of one water system's published record and the EPA's published limits, prepared by TapWaterData against a documented method, with every figure checked against its source and dated.

What it is not. A laboratory test of the water at the property, a plumbing inspection, or a survey. It cannot tell you what that building's own pipes add — which is why section 8 recommends the one test it does.

If anything here is wrong, or it simply was not useful to you, reply to the email and we refund you in full.