DRAFT Meeting Notes for the State Water Plan Implementation Workgroup
August 10, 2021; 1:30 – 3:00PM

Zoom Meeting

**Members**: Virginia de Lima (Co-Chair), David Radka (Co-Chair), Dan Aubin (DPH Alternate), Ally Ayotte (PURA), Denise Savageau (SWCD), Tom Tyler (MDC), Lou Rosado Burch (CCE), Mike Dietz, Steve Rupar, Bruce Wittchen (OPM)

**Note Taker(s):** Ali Hibbard (DEEP)

**Public:** Iris Herz Kaminski (New Haven)

**Meeting Started: 1:30 p.m.**

**Topics of Discussion**

**Changes to Agenda**

* Agenda accepted

**Approval/Modification of Notes from previous meeting**

* Meeting minutes approved

**Water Planning Chief Draft Position Description**

* A red-lined version of the position description was e-mailed prior to this meeting
* At the last WPCAG meeting, it was discussed that this role should be broader
	+ It may have an increased chance of being accepted by the WPC if the scope is limited, focusing on implementation of the state water plan, and being a public facing position
	+ Feedback from the WPC is needed to go forward
* Some edits to the job description were discussed:
	+ Strike the bullet saying the job description would be for a non-regulatory member of the WPC
	+ Add in the language for duties “any and all additional assigned duties”
	+ Add language for this position to serve as a task master
	+ This is a single-person position, and the job description needs to be realistic with what a single resource can accomplish
	+ The job description does not explain what the authority of the role will be.
		- There was a divide between if this position should be senior level with the authority to drive things, or entry to mid-level. Two job descriptions may be needed to describe the roles of both options.
	+ This position could be filled by a consultant, which would provide diversity in the career levels of those doing the work.
* Consumer advocates may have something to add. Feedback from this sector should be sought
* The ability to obtain funding will be necessary for this to go forward
* There was discussion on how to present this to the WPC
	+ Should the job description be developed to a strong point we all agree with, and then presented to the WPC?
	+ There was a divide if language that is deemed non-starter should be removed before sending the job description to the WPC. One side is to tighten up the job description to limit the possibility of rejection. The other side of the discussion believed including all language allows the WPC to have a full conversation.
	+ Regardless, the WPC can edit and provide comments
* Agencies would still need to maintain commitment of staff that they already have. The Water Planning Chief would be a coordinating position
* The original next steps were to allow 2 weeks for changes to be made to the job description based on today’s discussion, then 1 week for comments, and present final version at the next WPC meeting.
* During the public comment period, a different approach for next steps was discussed and decided on:
	+ The IWG would propose a short-term workgroup to develop the Water Planning Chief job description
	+ The job description would skip the IWG review and be reviewed by the WPC instead
	+ The background included in the draft job description is the rationale for creating the position
	+ A workgroup proposal will be shared with the WPC at their next meeting

**Outreach & Education topical sub-workgroup (Denise Savageau and Lou Rosado Burch)**

* A new workplan was presented that includes less outreach activities due to previous concern of the workgroup giving presentation
	+ New workplan focuses on creating more educational supplies and branding
	+ Provide materials, and then people can decide how to use it
* Trying to create something to go out for Imagine a Day Without Water
* Potentially making a logo for the State Water Plan, take advantage of branding opportunities
* Updated workplan will go to WPC

**Alliance for Water Efficiency Rates Workshop Follow-up survey (Iris Herz Kaminski)**

* The draft survey was sent via e-mail prior to the meeting
* A comment was to include a question asking how participants attended the workshop (live vs. watched save version)
* Comments made on the WaterSense standards – CT and NH are the only New England states that have not adopted the WaterSense standards yet. Maybe this feedback can be used to push for adoption the standards

**Implementation Tracking Workgroup (Group Discussion)**

* Brainstorming session is taking place on Tuesday 9/28 at 1:30 p.m.
	+ A link to RSVP was also sent out. Those who plan to attend should fill out the form to receive pre-meeting materials
* Basic approach will be to use jam board. This will be a less technical discussion
* The point of the brainstorming session is not to finalize ideas, but to get ideas to the topical workgroup

**WPCAG**

* No Update

**Public Comment**

* An agenda item for next meeting should be to ask for feedback on a new topical workgroup. With the legislative session in winter, spring, and vacations in summer, this is the time to get something set up and in motion.
	+ Should a new approach be for these workgroups to be short-term?
	+ Workgroups somehow need to be made more engaging, and not just for creating reports
	+ Ask to approve a topical sub workgroup, share with them

**Meeting Adjourned:** 3:36 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** **Tuesday October 12, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.**