

1 STATE OF CONNECTICUT
2 PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
3 DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
4 OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT
5 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

6
7
8 STATE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL
9

10
11 VIA ZOOM AND TELECONFERENCE
12

13 Regular Meeting held on Tuesday, March 1, 2022,
14 beginning at 1:33 p.m. via remote access.
15

16 H e l d B e f o r e:

17 JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, Chair and Vice
18 Chairman of the Public Utilities Regulatory
19 Authority
20

21
22
23
24
25 Reporter: Lisa Warner, CSR #061

1 **A p p e a r a n c e s :**

2 **Council members present:**

3 JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, CHAIRMAN (PURA)

4 MARTIN HEFT (OPM)

5 GRAHAM STEVENS (DEEP)

6
7 **Council member absent:**

8 LORI MATHIEU (DPH)

9 **Department of Public Health:**

10 DAN AUBIN

11 ERIC McPHEE

12
13 **Water Planning Council Advisory Group:**

14 VIRGINIA de LIMA

15 DENISE SAVAGEAU

16 KAREN BURNASKA

17 ALICEA CHARAMUT

18 MARGARET MINER

19 **PURA:**

20 Alyson Ayotte

21
22 **Other attendees (on record):**

23 DAVID RADKA

24 DAVE KUZMINSKI

25 ****All participants were present via remote access.**

1 THE CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call this
2 meeting of the Water Planning Council to order for
3 March 1st. And before I begin, please, if you're
4 not talking, put your mic on mute, please.

5 The meeting for March 1st is called to
6 order. The first order of business is the
7 approval of the February 1, 2022 transcript.

8 Do I have a motion?

9 MARTIN HEFT: So moved. Martin Heft.

10 GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Moved, and seconded, by
12 Martin Heft. Any questions on the motion?

13 If not, all those in favor signify by
14 saying aye.

15 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion is carried. I
17 just want to let everybody know that Lori Mathieu,
18 I spoke to her earlier this morning -- late this
19 morning. She's been called over to the
20 Appropriations Committee at the Capitol, and we're
21 happy to have Dan Aubin from DPH sitting in her
22 place this afternoon.

23 So good afternoon, Dan.

24 DAN AUBIN: Good afternoon. Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: I will move on to public

1 comment. Any public comment?

2 (No response.)

3 THE CHAIRMAN: No public comment.

4 We'll move on to correspondence received. The
5 only thing I did receive, Martin, we can talk
6 about this later on, was how we go about
7 notifications of subgroup meetings and compliance
8 of FOI and that kind of thing. So we can talk
9 about that.

10 MARTIN HEFT: I believe it's on the
11 agenda, Mr. Chair.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: It is, Item 6, very
13 good.

14 Okay. Let's go right to the State
15 Water Plan. And Virginia and Dave, you've been
16 very busy.

17 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Good afternoon,
18 Jack, and everybody else. Yeah, a couple of
19 things that you've got in writing. We have the
20 Outreach and Education Group has put together two
21 proposed workshops for later on this spring, which
22 there was a write-up, and if Denise is on the call
23 she can answer any questions that you might have.

24 Then also we'll be talking in a few
25 minutes about the water chief position. We came

1 up with a list of duties for that.

2 And then the third thing that we've
3 been working on is the -- I'm blanking -- the
4 reporting group, and that's been moving along
5 nicely as well. They hope to wrap up fairly
6 shortly this spring. And that doesn't have any
7 specific updates to it.

8 But if you want to focus now on the
9 water chief, or if you have questions for Denise
10 on the Outreach and Education Group, feel free to
11 ask those, and then we'll go into the water chief.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions for
13 Denise?

14 DAVID RADKA: This is David, Jack.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

16 DAVID RADKA: One thing that we
17 discussed at our last meeting pursuant to outreach
18 and education, they were -- one of the things that
19 they had been tasked with was to assist the
20 planning council with branding. And we had a
21 discussion at our last meeting looking to get
22 additional clarification from you all as to what
23 specifically you would like their assistance with.
24 And I think Denise is here. So Denise can help
25 clarify that, but again, before they go off and

1 start working on something, just a little bit more
2 direction from you would be appreciated.

3 Denise, did you want to add anything to
4 that?

5 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Yeah. So we had
6 looked at a couple of things related to branding.
7 As you know, we were looking at branding the State
8 Water Plan, not necessarily the Water Planning
9 Council. When we first started, there was a
10 discussion at one of the meetings talking about
11 letterhead, per se. We were looking at more, you
12 know, the type of thing like we had said that DEP
13 was using for their No Child Left Inside. I kind
14 of used that as a model where it's not a new logo
15 for DEEP, it's just kind of branding the program.
16 And so we were looking at how we might set up some
17 type of a branding so that every time we put
18 something out of the State Water Plan it says
19 that.

20 That said, some of the feedback we
21 received is they wanted to make sure that the
22 State Water Plan was perceived as an initiative of
23 the Water Planning Council, which we did in our --
24 without branding we did put that in any of the
25 public relations we had on the wetlands and

1 watercourses stuff that went out. So we've kind
2 of incorporated that in. But we still think, you
3 know, in the long run we need to do some type of
4 branding for the whole State Water Plan.

5 But there was that kind of inference to
6 look at, and there was like, for example, talking
7 about the letterhead and whatever, and I think
8 people were looking at the letterhead, so I guess
9 we were looking at direction. One of the things,
10 we had presented a few things to the
11 Implementation Workgroup. We said we would bring
12 that back to our workgroup and incorporate some of
13 the comments we heard there. So we're not ready
14 to present anything, but we were talking about
15 this at the Implementation Workgroup that we
16 needed a little bit more clarification.

17 So any thoughts you have on that would
18 be helpful because we don't -- and it kind of gets
19 into the discussion on the water chief. We don't
20 want to jump ahead with branding everything.
21 You're going to have a water chief hopefully that
22 will come onboard and do a lot of staff work for
23 the Water Planning Council and oversee the
24 implementation of the State Water Plan, and we
25 think that they'll probably have some bigger input

1 on that larger stuff. But we do want to start
2 with, at least, you know, get the ball rolling on
3 the branding for the State Water Plan. So we just
4 want, like I said, clarification on that effort.

5 And then if anybody has any questions
6 on what we're proposing, and I can go over that if
7 you want, what we're proposing for the wetlands
8 and watercourses, I can pull that up if you want
9 to go over that at all.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: I'd like to hear what
11 you have proposed for the inland and watercourses
12 coming up later on, why don't you talk about that
13 for a minute, and then we'll talk about the
14 branding, please.

15 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Okay. So this is
16 what we had proposed. As you know, when we
17 brought the inland wetlands and watercourses theme
18 to you, it's the 50th anniversary, and we said
19 that this would be over the course of the year, it
20 would our theme for the year. And we started off
21 in February with a successful kickoff for Wetlands
22 Day, which is February 2nd, but we also identified
23 in that proposal that May was American Wetlands
24 Month and that June was National Rivers Month,
25 which fits right in with the Inland Wetlands and

1 Watercourses Act. So we're proposing a similar
2 format, two luncheon hour-long formats, noon to 1,
3 one in May and one in June. I'll just scroll this
4 up a little bit so you can see the content here.

5 So with American Wetlands Month, and of
6 course we always want to relate this to the State
7 Water Plan, so that's where it would be a
8 continuation of the celebration of the Inland
9 Wetlands Watercourses Act and its relationship to
10 the State Water Plan. And the thought here was to
11 look at Connecticut's experience in changing
12 precipitation patterns and intense rainfall
13 periods -- intense rainfall and periods of
14 extended drought. So basically looking at the
15 ecosystem services provided by Inland Wetlands and
16 Watercourses relating to flooding and drought and
17 something that's near and dear to what we're
18 working on, obviously, with the State Water Plan
19 and particularly with that whole resiliency piece,
20 the whole idea of the drought that we're looking
21 at.

22 So the idea was to be a little bit more
23 technical with this one, not as policy, but it's
24 like, okay, how do wetlands function, what do they
25 do in terms of this need that we have where we're

1 seeing more intense rainfall, we're seeing
2 extended period droughts. And so we've got a
3 potential speaker. We were looking at CIRCA,
4 NRCS, UConn, DEEP, maybe somebody from the
5 Connecticut General Assembly, if it works in here,
6 maybe a little bit of policy, but we were really
7 looking at, you know, what we wanted to say in
8 terms of the more technical aspects. So that's
9 the May session on wetlands.

10 The June session we thought we would
11 focus on protecting riparian zones as it's so
12 important to protection of our public drinking
13 water supplies and the health of our streams and
14 whatever. So again, this session would focus on
15 the functions and values of riparian zones in
16 protecting water quality. And this relates to the
17 inland wetlands in terms of, well, what does
18 Inland Wetlands and Watercourses, how does the
19 agency really handle riparian zones, how do they
20 handle buffers and upland review areas in the
21 Inland Wetlands Act, so again, relating that to
22 the State Water Plan.

23 And similarly, we've kind of identified
24 potential speakers here that are familiar with
25 buffers and the riparian zones and what we need to

1 do there. So we've kind of identified some
2 speakers, some who are involved with -- you know,
3 a lot of the speakers could possibly come from the
4 Water Planning Council Advisory Group or the
5 agencies involved who have served with the State
6 Water Plan. So those are the two proposals we
7 have. And we have our meeting on Thursday to go
8 forward with these, but we wanted to see if you
9 had any thoughts or changes or if you're
10 comfortable with us moving forward with these two
11 areas of thought for the next workshops.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Denise.

13 Any comments from Martin, Dan or
14 Graham?

15 MARTIN HEFT: I would just say, Denise,
16 those look great and appreciate the follow-up on
17 this. Because I remember when you provided all
18 this originally, so these look like great
19 workshops coming up for those two months.

20 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Thank you.

21 GRAHAM STEVENS: I'd second that,
22 Martin. This looks good. Certainly on the
23 riparian buffers I'd be certainly interested in
24 hearing from, you know, municipal folks on that
25 issue. I know that it's something that's dealt

1 with differently, maybe some examples of some best
2 practices and some lessons learned, but these look
3 great. Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Dan?

5 DAN AUBIN: It looks good to me. I sit
6 on the Education Outreach Workgroup, so I support
7 this.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. I think it
9 looks really good. Thank you very much, Denise.
10 I appreciate your leadership on this.

11 Okay. So let's talk a little bit about
12 the branding. I'm wondering, I'm just going to
13 throw it out that, you know, perhaps we should
14 wait until we get, if -- "when," I'm not going to
15 say "if," when we get a water chief. But if we do
16 that, it's going to be at least July, I would say,
17 before that happens. We might want to do it
18 sooner. But I think that, when you look at
19 branding, I think we should be branding the whole
20 council, not just the -- I think we had talked
21 about it. Because we do the water plan, and of
22 course that's really the foundation of what we do,
23 but we do other things as well. So I think we
24 want to look at branding our goals and mission as
25 a council. I'm just throwing that out for

1 discussion.

2 GRAHAM STEVENS: I would agree with
3 you, Jack. I think that it would make sense if
4 there were some common themes between the branding
5 on the State Water Plan and the Water Planning
6 Council potentially. I'm not a graphic design
7 artist, but we do have one of those folks at DEEP
8 now in our communications office who might be
9 helpful in this endeavor. And with respect to now
10 or wait, you know, I think it would be valuable
11 to, you know, see some ideas, and maybe the water
12 chief could be part of the decision-making team,
13 but it's always easier to make a decision if you
14 have some ideas, you know.

15 So, if at all possible, it would be
16 great to see something in the next, you know,
17 month or so, so that our future water chief or
18 executive director, whatever we're going to call
19 them, will be onboard, hopefully, and have some
20 good decisions to start off with. That will
21 certainly excite people. I will certainly be
22 excited when we can have some commonality. It
23 brings together the agencies, it brings together
24 the stakeholders. Branding isn't just for selling
25 of cell phones or, you know, jeans anymore. So

1 very supportive.

2 DENISE SAVAGEAU: So what I'm hearing
3 is that you do want to brand both, you want to
4 make sure it's integrated. So one of the things
5 that we'll do as a committee, I will say our next
6 meeting is going to focus on probably this wetland
7 theme and getting these workshops, make sure
8 they're in place. So we probably won't get
9 heavily into the branding. We'll obviously have
10 this discussion and take that information back,
11 and then we can start up with that, you know, at
12 our March meeting in terms of -- or I should say
13 our April meeting because the March meeting is
14 going to be Thursday. So, like I said, we're
15 going to be setting up those workshops and
16 whatever.

17 But we'll certainly then maybe, and
18 Graham, if you could put us in touch with who does
19 some of your work, we can start having that
20 discussion and start maybe bringing the players
21 together who need to do that branding, and that
22 will be maybe some of the work we could do so that
23 then we would have something to take a look at,
24 say, okay, here's what the Water Planning Council
25 branding could be, and then as an outreach of that

1 how does that fit into branding for the State
2 Water Plan, is it different, how does it match,
3 you know, those types of things, we can start
4 having that discussion.

5 And I just want to make sure, you know,
6 our role at this point had been as the outreach
7 and education for the State Water Plan
8 Implementation Group and as we kind of came out of
9 that. That said, there have been discussions,
10 like does outreach and education need to be just a
11 standing committee that's bigger than that and
12 actually part of the Water Planning Council as
13 well. So there's been not just the State Water
14 Plan, so that's one of the things that might come
15 out of this. So we will have that discussion and
16 bring some thoughts. And again, if you could
17 share, Graham, with Aly, who sits on our
18 committee, that contact, that would be great.

19 GRAHAM STEVENS: I will. I'll reach
20 out to our communications team and then connect
21 her.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent. Thank you
23 very much.

24 Virginia, do you want to continue with
25 the -- first of all, again, I've read this. A lot

1 of work went into this. Great framework, great
2 effort, and maybe you want to just kind of run
3 through it for us, please.

4 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Certainly. Well, as
5 you can see, we put in background information. We
6 also put in a discussion information section. And
7 the reason for that was that there was some
8 concern that came up in an earlier Water Planning
9 Council meeting of the term "liaison" which we had
10 used in the original proposal for the workgroup.
11 And that was used in the typical English language
12 sense of the word just sort of as somebody
13 coordinating between other groups rather than the
14 more specific sense of the word that the state
15 agencies use for their legislative liaisons. And
16 so that's one of the things that was in the
17 discussion section. As I said, I'm just
18 highlighting the things that may have been a bit
19 of a surprise that were included.

20 Also in that discussion section was
21 include the conversation that we had in the group
22 in terms of whether the water planning chief
23 should chair the Implementation Workgroup or
24 whether we should continue having the cochairs, as
25 we do now, as a separate group. To nobody's

1 surprise, David and I were the big proponents of
2 having them chair the board group, and that was
3 not something that was agreed with, with the whole
4 committee. So those are the things that were
5 either explanations or things that need further
6 discussion.

7 But in terms of the actual list of what
8 we felt were the primary duties, I don't want to
9 read it to you. Hopefully you all have a copy of
10 it. But we did feel that it should be not just an
11 administrative position but rather a leadership
12 type of position and that some of the
13 administrative tasks would appropriately be
14 carried out by the person in the chief's position
15 but not all of them. There were some truly
16 administrative tasks that we would propose be done
17 either by an administrative assistant to this
18 position or with existing personnel in the
19 agencies sort of as it's done now. But we didn't
20 want that to be the sum total of the job. We do
21 acknowledge that we have a need for that kind of
22 support and would not want somebody in the
23 leadership position to be spending a lot of time
24 loading files onto the internet and those kinds of
25 things.

1 So as I said, I don't want to read
2 through all the duties. It's seen as a, what
3 would I say, right now the water planning -- I'm
4 trying to figure out a way of saying that we see
5 this position as being supportive to you all, that
6 it would be doing, taking on some of the
7 responsibilities, as it says, like drafting
8 correspondence. It would also be highlighting
9 things that had come to whoever is in this
10 position, their attention. It would be really a
11 support to the Water Planning Council as well as a
12 support to the State Water Plan itself.

13 So I think if you have specific
14 questions, and I know Lori indicated in an email
15 that she has specific questions. Dan, I don't
16 know whether she shared those concerns with you.
17 That's too bad because I would hate to delay
18 actually moving forward with this because she's
19 not able to participate in this discussion.

20 Dave, I was sort of rambling. Do you
21 want to add to that?

22 DAVID RADKA: I think the only thing
23 that I would think of adding maybe for your all
24 benefit is the process that we went through. And,
25 as you know, the State Water Plan is relatively

1 weak in its references to a water planning chief,
2 maybe two or three locations, a sentence here or
3 there. So what we did do is go through the State
4 Water Plan with an eye towards where could this
5 individual take either a leadership position on
6 following through on some of these recommendations
7 or lend support to the Water Planning Council
8 fulfilling the recommendations that are in the
9 State Water Plan.

10 And so if you look at some of the
11 position description duties and responsibilities,
12 you will see essentially a direct quotation, as it
13 were, of items that are recommended in the State
14 Water Plan. But as I said, these were things that
15 are by and large in the plan, they're recommended.
16 They're just where we thought this person could
17 really be supportive. There's a lot there.
18 There's a lot on this individual's plate
19 potentially, and I think that's now for you to
20 parse out what really makes sense. We hope we
21 move forward with it. It was a great team effort.
22 We got it done quickly since you wanted it as soon
23 as possible, and everybody participated. And it
24 was a good process, a very good process.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dave.

1 Graham, Martin, Dan?

2 GRAHAM STEVENS: I just want to thank
3 you, Jack, and I just want to say I really
4 appreciate the write-up. I also really
5 appreciate, first off it's comprehensive, which I
6 enjoy, and it was quick. They're usually not
7 things that go together. So much thanks.

8 And as far as, you know, the speed at
9 which the Water Planning Council addressed this
10 matter, believe me when I -- I think I speak for
11 everyone here, this is our top priority to get
12 this done. And, you know, we've been individually
13 speaking about this probably every time I speak to
14 Jack, Martin or DPH, this comes up individually,
15 because it's something that we're all, you know,
16 excited about as water planning councilors as well
17 as individuals. I think this position is really
18 going to put the State Water Plan and the Water
19 Planning Council into a new realm.

20 And I did speak with Lori last week. I
21 don't think any of her comments are issues. You
22 know, I think she shared some general thoughts
23 with me, which may be in line with her comments,
24 and she's excited as well. And she can correct me
25 next month if I'm wrong. But we're definitely,

1 you know, very eager to move this forward. So I
2 just want everyone who put the time and energy
3 into this to know that this is a top priority.

4 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Is there anything
5 else you would like from us at this point?

6 MARTIN HEFT: So, Mr. Chair, may I?

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course.

8 MARTIN HEFT: Sure. So again, I echo
9 Graham's comments there because I think, you know,
10 you've done a wonderful job with this. Just a
11 quick question whether or not -- and just because
12 it's out there and I wanted to see if your
13 workgroup discussed it at all. The Commission on
14 Connecticut's Development and Future is looking at
15 all state plans, municipal plans as one of the
16 tasks that they have to do. Obviously, the State
17 Water Plan is part of that with a state plan. The
18 workgroup hasn't begun to meet yet. Their first
19 meeting is Thursday morning where they're going to
20 start going over the State Plan of Conservation
21 and Development. We're also, you know, part of
22 this whole thing of looking at, as we know, we
23 have a State Plan of C&D for short, but we also
24 have, you know, 20, 30 other plans out there,
25 including the Water Planning Council, you know,

1 and our State Water Plan and how they all tie
2 together and everything else that way.

3 So I just wanted to know if there was
4 any consideration or any thought with combining
5 anything with the commission's work that they're
6 going to be doing, if you guys had discussed that
7 at all. And you may not have because obviously
8 it's a new commission starting up, but they are
9 going to be reviewing all the plans and how they
10 tie together so there may be some, you know,
11 indirect effects of everything depending upon what
12 legislation comes out on that side.

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Actually, that's
14 very good news because one of the duties that we
15 have in this description was to try and coordinate
16 with the other state plans and to make sure that
17 they are -- to help resolve any inconsistencies
18 that might be there. If the commission is doing
19 that, that would be some -- a lot of those details
20 would not fall on the shoulders of the water
21 planning chief, but the chief could work in
22 concert with those folks and make sure that those
23 consistencies or inconsistencies were cleaned up.
24 So I think that's actually a great benefit. And
25 perhaps this individual that we have as a water

1 planning chief could be part of that commission.

2 MARTIN HEFT: Perfect. Thank you,
3 Virginia.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Dan, do you have
5 anything additional?

6 DAN AUBIN: I just want to thank David
7 for bringing all the work and doing it timely and
8 bringing it to all the workgroups such as the
9 Implementation Workgroup and the Advisory Group to
10 review. For many of us who might not have been
11 able to attend that particular sub-workgroup, it
12 was great that there was an opportunity to review
13 that information. So thanks for the excellent
14 work. And I echo the comment that, regardless of
15 the questions that may be out there, we definitely
16 would like to see this position. Thank you.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I thank
18 everybody. It's a great document, excellent work,
19 and thank everybody. The bottom line, we've got
20 to figure out how we're going to pay for it, how
21 we're going to do this, are we going to do it as a
22 position, as a private contractor. We just don't
23 quite know. I'm going to lean on our good friend
24 over at the Office of Policy and Management,
25 Undersecretary Heft, to give us some direction in

1 what would be the least difficult for us to do in
2 terms of get this put together. I don't know, can
3 you -- I'm just throwing this out. Do we have to
4 have an MOU between the four agencies to give us
5 the authority to go out and hire an individual?
6 Martin has, I think in the CEQ, or Graham, how do
7 they operate? You're on mute.

8 GRAHAM STEVENS: The old double mute.
9 So CEQ is actually an agency in the budget that
10 has the authority to hire staff. So they, unlike
11 the Water Planning Council, have that authority.
12 I think, you know, from my perspective, and I'm
13 just going to throw this out there for general,
14 you know, feedback and thoughts of the various
15 members of the Water Planning Council, it might be
16 an interesting approach to start with a contract,
17 to bring on a contractor, you know, potentially
18 someone who has extensive experience in this arena
19 who maybe, you know, is still working, closer to
20 retirement, but would be interested in taking on
21 this task who has those skill sets and knows folks
22 in this area who could dedicate, you know, say, 25
23 hours a week or maybe even less, you know,
24 explicitly to working for the Water Planning
25 Council and on its behalf. That might, you know,

1 expedite the process of bringing on this resource,
2 you know, at least for the first year which could
3 then be, people could see the value of this
4 position and then possibly in the future it could
5 be, you know, a state employee position. Whether
6 it be, you know, classified or unclassified, I'm
7 not certain, that would be something that would be
8 a longer conversation, so kind of hence why I'm
9 suggesting, you know, going out for a contracted
10 resource.

11 It might also be easier with respect
12 to, Jack, your comments about the MOU and how we
13 manage as four agencies the joint oversight and
14 payment for a contractor. I think there is
15 different pots of money that might make sense to
16 evaluate for payment purposes for this position.
17 And I'm certainly willing to look into DEEP's
18 coffers to see if we can help fund the position.
19 Certainly, you know, if there's other funds
20 available at any other agency, I'm happy to see
21 those funds being used as well, but that will be
22 an ongoing dialogue, I think, between water
23 planning councilors.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Martin, historically
25 Dave LeVasseur somehow got us a lot of money out

1 of OPM or through OPM to do this plan initially.
2 So I'm wondering, I know that, I mean, the obvious
3 thing that we would do is look into PUC funds, and
4 Graham, that's something you and I could do as
5 part of DEEP. But I don't know, Martin, if you
6 had any suggestions.

7 MARTIN HEFT: Thanks, Jack. I think we
8 need to look at, I mean, I think there's a couple
9 options as Graham has kind of alluded to. You
10 know, it could be something, you know, if we're
11 doing it as hiring it as an employee, it needs to
12 be staffed under an agency, you know, as an
13 employee. Then there can be an MOU for sharing,
14 you know, services, expenses or whatever else in
15 that sense, but it's still got to be housed under
16 one agency as an employee because as an employee
17 they can't be under four separate agencies, per
18 se. It could be that it starts out as an outside
19 contractor hire type of services to be done, so
20 there's an option there.

21 So I think we first will need to
22 determine, you know, how we want the person to be
23 employed or contracted on it, knowing the, you
24 know, the funding source obviously that comes down
25 into the MOU, if it's going to be funded out of

1 all four agencies, if it's going to be funded out
2 of one agency under a separate line item for Water
3 Planning Council. I mean, there's a couple of
4 different options for that whether it it's going
5 to be a general fund line item budget or if it's
6 going to be, you know, setting up a separate
7 account that certain funds are going into in order
8 to fund this.

9 So I think there's a number of, a
10 variety of things that just has to be, you know,
11 open discussion about it of how we want to handle
12 it and also the supervisory management, if you
13 will, of the position because that ties into it as
14 well. So I think that's all kind of the next
15 steps once we kind of have, you know, now the job
16 description, the outline of what we're looking
17 for, this is kind of the next step process for us
18 to go through and say, okay, how is this going to
19 work on the administrative side, if you will, you
20 know, the administrative and budget side.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Dan, do you have any
22 comments?

23 DAN AUBIN: No, no comments.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: So, I mean, I think,
25 back to Virginia, Virginia, what do you more

1 specifically -- this is your final report to us,
2 correct?

3 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Correct.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: And has it gone before
5 the Water Planning Council Advisory Group?

6 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Yes. As you may
7 remember, our process is that when a topical
8 sub-workgroup completes their work, it goes to the
9 Implementation Workgroup who reviews it and makes
10 suggestions and then to the advisory group as
11 well. And the advisory group's comments were
12 included as an appendix to the report. Their
13 comments were not included, were not integrated
14 into the report, but they were included there, and
15 certainly we would want your input on that. And
16 if there were items that you thought were
17 appropriately to be implemented -- incorporated
18 into the report, we would certainly do that. But
19 yeah, so it was reviewed by both of those groups.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: I see, appendix 2.
21 Appendix 2 you have right there. Thank you.

22 Alicea, do you want to say anything
23 about this even though we haven't gotten to you
24 yet since we're on this subject?

25 ALICEA CHARAMUT: Our comments on it

1 are in the appendix and, you know, I think that,
2 you know, the advisory group was very much in
3 support of the recommendations made. And, you
4 know, there were just a few small tweaks that came
5 from the advisory group members, but overall we're
6 really looking forward to potentially having
7 someone be a hub between the Water Planning
8 Council and all of the volunteers that are working
9 on various projects.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm going to
11 suggest that between now and the next meeting,
12 which will be April 5th, that we come -- I'm going
13 to be really aggressive here -- that we come up
14 with a recommendation as to how we're going to
15 fund this position, and I think that's doable. I
16 absolutely think we can do that. So we can talk
17 to each other off, you know, I could call Martin
18 and Graham and speak with Lori and see how we can
19 do this and come up with a recommendation so we
20 can move ahead.

21 VIRGINIA de LIMA: And if you have any
22 recommendations on the report itself, please
23 forward those through to us. Not to be any more
24 aggressive than you were, Jack, but the
25 Implementation Workgroup meets next week and so if

1 there were things that you took issue with in the
2 report and you wanted us to take another look at,
3 we would certainly do that.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And Dan, please
5 let Lori know that.

6 DAN AUBIN: Yes, I definitely will.
7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay.
9 Anything else on this? Thank you. I mean, I
10 think it's, again, a great document, and I'm very
11 excited about this. And it's going to happen,
12 somehow it's going to happen.

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Good. Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: We should be able to.
15 The state is flushed with money now. We have
16 plenty of money, so money is not -- I don't want
17 to hear any, oh, it's a budget problem. We have
18 no budget problems in the state right now, so
19 we'll find the money somewhere.

20 Okay. Anything else before we move on?

21 (No response.)

22 THE CHAIRMAN: So we're going to move
23 on to Alicea.

24 ALICEA CHARAMUT: Thank you. So, of
25 course, we discussed the water chief report at our

1 last meeting, and you can see our recommendations
2 there in appendix 2 of the report. And we've also
3 had some discussions around sort of looking at
4 water planning priorities. And it really just
5 kind of brought us back to revisiting the State
6 Water Plan. The advisory group has been given
7 homework to review the executive summary again as
8 well as the list of tasks that's in the State
9 Water Plan because, you know, we have had some new
10 folks come on who weren't here during the water
11 planning process and should familiarize themselves
12 as far as why we're here and give thoughts on, you
13 know, where we should be going. So we'll be
14 discussing that a little bit more at our next
15 meeting.

16 We also had a conversation, we had
17 brought a conservation and ratemaking barriers
18 workgroup proposal to the Water Planning Council,
19 and this was about the time that the Alliance for
20 Water Efficiency had started its work. And so we
21 put that on hold. And the Alliance for Water
22 Efficiency brought utilities a lot of great tools
23 for, you know, coming up with rates that can help
24 them also meet their conservation goals without
25 undermining the revenue.

1 And the original proposal was
2 essentially to put information together as to what
3 barriers exist to the various labors of water
4 utilities we have in Connecticut being able to use
5 those tools. So we had a very long discussion
6 about this, and we're going to revisit it again
7 next, at the next meeting. I'm going to make some
8 tweaks to the proposal, we're going to talk about
9 it again, and hopefully you'll see it at your next
10 meeting.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Great.

12 ALICEA CHARAMUT: And the solar siting
13 workgroup got together, and I can't remember if I
14 reported on this at the last meeting, I'm losing
15 track of time, but we decided we're going to send
16 a letter to DEEP in advance of the STEPs process
17 being reinitiated with the full report that the
18 Water Planning Advisory Group had put together
19 from the work that the Watershed Lands Group did
20 and the Water Planning Council approved, I think
21 that was probably about a year ago. So the STEPs
22 process has the full report and the
23 recommendations made by the Watershed Lands Group.

24 And Denise and I are moving forward on
25 the white paper for the source water protection.

1 We've had some discussions with a few more people
2 in a more efficient way of getting this done. And
3 other than, I think that's everything. And Dan
4 couldn't be here, so I don't have my person to
5 remind me of things that I might have forgotten.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Alicea, thank you very
7 much.

8 Any questions for Alicea?

9 GRAHAM STEVENS: No.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is Karen going to
11 give us an update?

12 KAREN BURNASKA: Sure. Just quickly to
13 let everyone know that the Watershed Lands
14 Workgroup will be meeting a week from Friday on
15 March 11th, 9 a.m., via Zoom. You're all invited.
16 Hopefully, the agenda will go out, if not at the
17 end of the week, very beginning of next week. But
18 some of the things that we hope to put on the
19 agenda, one is an update from the WUCC land use
20 planning and Watershed Lands Workgroup, the story
21 map that Aaron Budris was spearheading. We'd like
22 to get some, you know, see if it's finalized and
23 any more information that he had.

24 We will, of course, because the
25 legislative session has started, we will have a

1 section on legislative issues. The supplement to
2 the CGA land conveyance questionnaire that would
3 provide additional environmental information is
4 still alive. We are hoping, we've been told that
5 those conveyance questionnaires or conveyance
6 requests come in later during the session, but we
7 had a request for a little bit of information
8 about a couple weeks ago. I will go back with
9 them. So that is still alive.

10 We also hope, the other additional
11 legislative information we would like would be to
12 ask DEEP or DPH if they have any specific bills
13 that they think would be of interest to the
14 members of the Watershed Lands Workgroup and ask
15 the members who are present for their input.

16 Just a couple other things that we
17 would like to discuss. And one is the STEPs, the
18 letter to DEEP on the STEPs program with solar
19 siting, we wanted to look at that. I don't think,
20 we won't change our mind, but look at it one more
21 time.

22 And also, I believe Margaret brought
23 this up to the Water Planning Council before, and
24 that is the concern for watershed lands that have
25 AA water on them that are near water company lands

1 but the water is not hooked up, it's not being
2 used right now, and how can we protect that for
3 possible future use. So it should be a good
4 meeting week from Friday. Hope you can join us.

5 And Margaret is on the line, so I'm
6 going to give Margaret an opportunity to say a few
7 words.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Hello, Margaret.

9 MARGARET MINER: Hi, guys. Thank you.
10 I'm on the road. And I'm so glad that Karen and
11 Alicea did everything. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: I hope you're not
13 driving and talking, Margaret.

14 MARGARET MINER: I could if I wanted
15 to. No, I'm not.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Good.

17 MARGARET MINER: Thank you, Jack.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Karen, you
19 said something that caught my ear in terms of
20 abandoned water pipes, water, you're looking at
21 that, something?

22 KAREN BURNASKA: If I said that, or if
23 that's what you heard, I don't think that's what I
24 said. That's not what I meant to say.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, is there source,

1 supplies that are abandoned and pipes are still in
2 the ground, that's an issue that got some
3 inquiries about here, I know.

4 KAREN BURNASKA: No. Actually, that is
5 a very -- something really to look at. No, what I
6 was talking about is there are currently, and
7 we've seen -- and this is why Margaret is the
8 expert here -- across the state for many years
9 with areas literally AA water, great water right
10 adjacent to drinking water watersheds.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay.

12 KAREN BURNASKA: And we would like to
13 discuss amongst us is there anything we can do, or
14 how can we protect them for possible future use.
15 This water is not connected right now, but who
16 knows what will happen in the future.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: My apologies. I
18 understand now. Okay. Thank you. Very good
19 report.

20 Any questions for Karen or Margaret?

21 Okay. On to other business. I don't
22 think we have a WUCC or private well update today.
23 Dan?

24 DAN AUBIN: Just one second. I'd like
25 to, as we all know, the legislative session is

1 underway, and some of us, most of us are probably
2 tied up with that. That's why Lori is currently
3 at an appropriations meeting. I'd like to pull in
4 Eric McPhee, who is our supervisor of the source
5 assessment protection unit here at DPH, for a WUCC
6 update. Eric.

7 ERIC MCPHEE: Thanks, Dan. So nice
8 segue from Karen's question. One of the items
9 we're talking about in the WUCCs right now is the
10 High Quality Source List. High Quality Source
11 List is a statutory compilation required by
12 statute for us to compile a list of all current
13 and future drinking water supplies that require
14 protection. It doesn't have any real statutory
15 teeth other than to make the list, but it is a
16 good tool to sort of see what's out there, and
17 it's another way for people to sort of make smart
18 planning decisions about where we might develop
19 water supplies in the future. And I think that
20 might have some linkages to the issue that Karen
21 has brought up.

22 It's updated annually. In previous
23 years it was linked to the WUCCs through the
24 coordinated plans. We're going to separate it
25 back out and do it as a separate list which we'll

1 publish. Right now we've asked water utilities,
2 planning organizations, municipalities, state
3 agencies and anyone else to chime in if they have
4 any changes or additions or deletions for what's
5 on the High Quality Source List. So there's a
6 circular letter that provides all the links on our
7 website. There's also a dedicated webpage on our
8 website for the High Quality Source List. The
9 statutory reference is 25-33q.

10 As far as the WUCCs go, the WUCCs, as
11 you all know, it's about smart planning, it's
12 about making smart planning decisions. And what
13 we're really in the weeds with now is to make sure
14 that we're formalizing the partnerships and
15 formalizing the information sharing with all the
16 people that make decisions related to a
17 development that would need water supply or a
18 development that occurs in one of our source
19 protection areas. So it's working with state
20 agencies and municipalities and local health
21 departments to develop easy to follow guidance
22 documents and materials that they can use to make
23 informed decisions to know what they're being
24 asked, why they're being asked it, and then our
25 agency, DPH, we have a lot to do with completely

1 reformatting our website and developing online
2 mapping that provides the information they need.
3 So that's an ongoing effort with the WUCCs.

4 Another piece of that that we're
5 working on is to try to encourage emergency
6 interconnections so that water systems have these
7 redundancies in place when they do need them. In
8 part, what we're doing is trying to streamline the
9 permitting process and working with DEEP on making
10 sure that the diversion permitting and sale of
11 excess water permitting for emergency
12 interconnections is not too burdensome. And I
13 know there's some rumblings that there might be
14 some legislative (inaudible) into that. That's it
15 for me. Thank you.

16 DAN AUBIN: Thank you, Eric.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Eric.

18 Dan, did you want to, with the private
19 well update?

20 DAN AUBIN: So for private wells --
21 thank you -- for private wells we still have no
22 official update that we're allowed to share. The
23 Department is still going through its review
24 process. And when we know and have permission, we
25 will definitely make sure that this group is

1 updated. Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thanks very
3 much, Dan. Appreciate you being here.

4 Interagency Drought Working Group.

5 MARTIN HEFT: There's no drought
6 (Laughter).

7 THE CHAIRMAN: We've got lots of water.

8 MARTIN HEFT: Lots of water going on.
9 The Interagency Drought Workgroup meets March 3rd
10 at 2 o'clock will be our next meeting. As kind
11 of, I sound like a broken record, I apologize, but
12 we, you know, continue to review the conditions
13 throughout the month and at each of our monthly
14 meetings. We are continuing the review of the
15 workgroup recommendations. We are kind of going
16 through currently, and we'll be working on this
17 Thursday, setting up kind of three categories, if
18 you will, things that can be done immediately,
19 things that might just need some language type
20 changes, and things that are going to be in the
21 future.

22 So we're kind of prioritizing. We have
23 a list of probably a half dozen items that are
24 coming back to us as the Water Planning Council
25 which are actually items that we as a Water

1 Planning Council have to do versus the drought
2 workgroup. So that will be forthcoming as well.
3 That's where we're at with that process. That's
4 my report on that piece for interagency drought.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks. Any questions
6 for Martin?

7 So let's go right into the FOIA
8 requirements and responsibilities with groups. We
9 have right on the agenda a chart. Martin, why
10 don't you talk a little bit about this, please.

11 MARTIN HEFT: Sure. Thank you. So
12 this is just kind of a thing that we've been
13 trying to work on with our different agencies. As
14 we know, and I've discussed it before in our
15 meetings, that obviously as a state agency and
16 subcommittees and workgroups we are responsible
17 for Freedom of Information Act and our
18 requirements for meeting requirements, posting of
19 the minutes, having it available to the public on
20 the Secretary of State's website.

21 The chart, which is on the second page
22 of the agenda, is actually very helpful because it
23 shows the group or the sub-workgroup, which agency
24 is responsible for posting the public meeting
25 calendar and the information, and then also we

1 added in, you know, is it a permanent or temporary
2 group because we know some workgroups are set up
3 for a specific purpose and then once they're done
4 they're dissolved. We have some workgroups that
5 we've got, you know, that we do not have an agency
6 listed as kind of the one overseeing who is the
7 agency responsible for posting this information
8 onto the state websites.

9 As you can see on the agenda, PURA,
10 OPM, DEEP are on here for different ones. Here we
11 still have like source water protection, the solar
12 workgroup, the water chief job duties, which is
13 completing, and the proposed conservation rates.
14 I think we have to be very careful as, you know,
15 when we either establish any new workgroups or
16 anything, we have to be able to identify what
17 agency is going to be the one to making sure that
18 we're in compliance with these workgroups on it,
19 and that's kind of the reason why it's on the
20 agenda was to make sure that everybody is aware.

21 Obviously, we want to be transparent
22 and accountable to the public, as we are with, you
23 know, our parent, if you will, is the WPC, but
24 then with all of workgroups making sure as we're
25 talking about, you know, potentially hiring

1 someone, you know, and not wanting them to be the
2 ones responsible for, you know, posting everything
3 on the websites and everything else. Well, it has
4 to be done, someone has to be responsible, whether
5 it be that official that we might be hiring or an
6 agency has to be responsible.

7 And my recommendation is, you know, as
8 we set up any additional workgroups, that an
9 agency be, you know, assigned, if you will, to
10 this so we know who is the agency responsible for
11 this, and that's also who is sending the notices
12 out and everything for that, keeping us aware of
13 what's going or invites to meetings, everything,
14 it encompasses all of those pieces. So that kind
15 of a -- sorry I was a little long winded there
16 but --

17 THE CHAIRMAN: I just want to be clear
18 on this. For example, Karen has a watershed group
19 coming up on March 11th at 9 a.m. If I'm
20 understanding you correctly, she should send out,
21 that committee should sent out a notice with an
22 agenda?

23 MARTIN HEFT: They should be. It is a
24 workgroup of our agency, and under FOI it's
25 considered that. And they do, they do send out,

1 because I get the email notices for certain ones,
2 you know, on here. I know my staff, you know,
3 Bruce handles some of those, and I get the notice
4 saying here's the meeting and here's the notice
5 for the meeting. I mean, it's that simple. It
6 doesn't have to -- you know, it can be an email
7 agenda on it, but, you know, and it may be that,
8 you know, as Chair you want to included on all
9 those so you know what's going on for that or any
10 of us members be included so if we want to attend
11 any of those meetings as well. But, you know,
12 they are public meetings, they are part of us as
13 the parent organization.

14 And I think we are doing well. Most of
15 ours are covered. You know, as you can see on the
16 list, we have a couple of workgroups. When we set
17 up the water chief one, we didn't put someone
18 assigned to who is doing that, so that kind of
19 went by the wayside of not knowing who, you know,
20 when they were meeting, anything else. Obviously,
21 those working on it knew when they were meeting on
22 that sub-workgroup, but everybody else didn't, you
23 know, and now we don't have any record of it any
24 place.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Karen, I see your hand

1 up.

2 KAREN BURNASKA: I just wanted to thank
3 Bruce Wittchen or Eric Lindquist. I send him,
4 Margaret or I send him the agenda, he distributes
5 it, the meeting via Zoom. He will then send out
6 the notes. We don't have official minutes, but we
7 have notes for every meeting, plus it's recorded.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. I think
9 that's what Martin is looking for. I can tell
10 you're both former first selectpeople because you
11 probably both were subject to FOI, I'm sure, in
12 your respective towns.

13 KAREN BURNASKA: Oh, yeah.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: And I get it, I
15 appreciate what Martin is doing. I mean, people
16 are probably saying why do we have to do it,
17 because there's always that instance where
18 somebody is going to be looking for it, and we
19 need to have a paper trail.

20 So does anybody have any -- Graham, do
21 you have any questions?

22 GRAHAM STEVENS: No, no questions at
23 this point, Jack. Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Dan?

25 DAN AUBIN: No, no questions. I

1 appreciate though that the list was pulled
2 together. I think it does show the work that's
3 being done collectively in one spot and that
4 there's a need, too, across all the agencies to
5 make sure that someone is doing that. Whether
6 that translates up to the water chief or not is
7 yet to be seen, but there's definitely a need when
8 you look at that list of someone to be doing, at
9 least pushing those documents and those calendar
10 updates and notifications. So I appreciate that
11 this was pulled together. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: And Alicea just chatted
13 it's essential to keep the public engaged, and
14 this is the way, really this is the roadmap, the
15 framework for doing that. So, I mean, it's what
16 we're all about. So we've been that way since the
17 beginning in terms of putting together the plan,
18 going out, getting stakeholder involvement, input
19 into the process, and now that we have the plan we
20 want to make sure people can weigh in on it.

21 Okay.

22 Go ahead, Denise.

23 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Jack, if I could just
24 weigh in.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Of course.

1 DENISE SAVAGEAU: The outreach and
2 education group also identified having a website
3 as one of the tools. And obviously this
4 notification is an important part of it, but
5 there's other documents and whatever. So really
6 looking at how we utilize the website is really
7 important for making sure that we're really
8 transparent, not just being the letter of FOI,
9 which is important, but this outreach and
10 education piece that we're really, you know, we're
11 looking at that webinar -- excuse me, that website
12 stuff that we need to have, and I think it's an
13 important piece of it. So I just wanted to put
14 that in there as well.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Any other
16 questions or comments on this?

17 Karen, back to you. Don't you want to
18 make an -- don't you have some, you have room, you
19 have another one of your lunch hour events coming
20 up?

21 KAREN BURNASKA: Yes, that was going to
22 be public participation. Yes, I hope, and I'd
23 like to thank you and the Water Planning Council
24 for sending out the notices. There was one, and
25 one just went out again today, so with the

1 registration link on it, so please do so. Yes,
2 World Water Day, it's March 22nd this year. On
3 March 21st there will be an online program. The
4 theme of this year's UN World Water Day is
5 "Groundwater - Making the invisible visible." So
6 we hope to have an hour-long 12 to 1 on March
7 21st, some very much good speakers and a panel
8 discussion.

9 And then on World Water Day itself we
10 are in the process of finalizing a press
11 conference to bring together legislators, the
12 public and anyone else who's interested to talk
13 about Connecticut legislation that will help
14 ensure that our water is clean now and in the
15 future.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that going to be at
17 the Capitol?

18 KAREN BURNASKA: We're hoping so, yes.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: And it's open, right?

20 KAREN BURNASKA: We believe it will.
21 If not, it will be outside.

22 GRAHAM STEVENS: On the second floor
23 only, Jack.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: It's the second floor,
25 okay.

1 KAREN BURNASKA: That's what we're
2 working on. You have to stay tuned for specifics
3 on that. And I may be giving you a call tomorrow,
4 Jack, to help us out there.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, good. Thank you
6 so much.

7 KAREN BURNASKA: Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other public
9 comment? I'll open it up to public comment.

10 Alicea, you have your hand up.

11 ALICEA CHARAMUT: So I'm taking off my
12 advisory cochair group cochair hat and I'm putting
13 on my Rivers Alliance executive director hat. So
14 I heard some folks ask me, or I've had several
15 folks ask me so what is the Water Planning Council
16 collectively looking at and discussing as far as
17 what is coming down for federal funds, you know,
18 the infrastructure funds and a lot of the other
19 funds that can be utilized for, you know, drinking
20 water, you know, habitat improvement, that sort of
21 thing, is the Water Planning Council looking
22 collectively at these funds and how they can be
23 utilized to meet recommendations in the State
24 Water Plan. And I'm just putting it out there to
25 you as a question and with possible potential as

1 some sort of report going forward at Water
2 Planning Council meetings.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to ask both
4 Graham and Dan to comment.

5 GRAHAM STEVENS: I can tackle this one,
6 Jack.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

8 GRAHAM STEVENS: It's a great question.
9 And, you know, we've been getting a lot of
10 inquiries, you know, regarding the Bipartisan
11 Infrastructure Law and, you know, as well as we
12 did with respect to ARPA funds which also were
13 permitted for certain water related projects. And
14 as it stands now, there's not a tremendous amount
15 of guidance available for all of the various pots
16 of money that could be utilized. A lot of the
17 federal agencies are taking feedback on various
18 aspects of how they roll this money out. So there
19 is definitely a perception that the money is here
20 and we're just, like, picking projects.

21 I think, and Dan would agree that, you
22 know, DPH and DEEP, for example, are engaged with
23 EPA on weekly conference calls. You know, we are
24 speaking with NOAA, we're speaking with FEMA,
25 we're speaking with other agencies that are our

1 primary funding agencies when it comes to the
2 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. We have a
3 significant amount of time invested in tracking
4 these various pots of money, looking at various
5 policy objectives that we would like to tackle
6 with these funds, but almost in every single case,
7 maybe with the exception of the base funding under
8 the State Revolving Fund for Clean Water and
9 Drinking Water which have their prescribed
10 methodologies in which they can be, you know,
11 utilized, requiring us to have our intended use
12 plan and priority list, we're still tracking and
13 waiting for the federal guidance. Certainly
14 something that the Water Planning Council might
15 play an important role in, but as far as it stands
16 at this point, I think the various component
17 agencies are trying to get a better handle on, you
18 know, what is the final guidance and therefore,
19 you know, how can we best utilize those funds.

20 I do know that we're obviously, there's
21 overarching initiatives with respect to any EPA
22 funds and other funds that we're looking at,
23 Justice40 issues, we're trying to provide an
24 equity and health equity lens when it comes to the
25 distribution of these funds as far as, you know,

1 how we can serve communities that have been
2 traditionally overburdened or underrepresented
3 with these funds as is the objective of the Biden
4 administration as well as the Lamont
5 administration.

6 So more to come at this point. We're
7 doing all the prework we can to get ready. I know
8 that a lot of NGOs have been reaching out to us
9 and providing us with their thoughts and guidance
10 on how we should best utilize these funds, and we
11 welcome that. And we certainly will, you know, be
12 seeking additional feedback, additional call for
13 projects, but the big pot of money that we have,
14 although it's biggest on the state side, not on
15 the federal side and particularly not on the
16 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law side, is the Clean
17 Water State Revolving Fund. You know, there have
18 been a call for projects, and there will be a
19 draft priority list put out for public comment and
20 a hearing soon so that we will be ready in
21 Connecticut to utilize those additional funds when
22 they are made available.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Graham.

24 Martin, would you like to -- now,
25 Martin, is all this money going to go into OPM and

1 you're going to be the gatekeepers over there,
2 what agency it's going to go to, isn't that
3 usually how it works?

4 MARTIN HEFT: Typically, yes. The ARPA
5 funds come through OPM. As we know, last
6 legislative session the legislature has a hand in
7 it for approving how the funds are going to be
8 utilized, so there's kind of a, you know, two-tier
9 process, at least on funds that are coming
10 directly to the state. And, you know, with what
11 those uses are, there were some items approved,
12 you know, some broadband type stuff, everything
13 that wasn't necessarily sewage use items that were
14 approved with the ARPA funds. This previous cycle
15 the Governor does have a plan out there, so any
16 recommendations would go through, go through the
17 legislative process for them to approve those
18 expenditures.

19 Then there is other funding, as Graham
20 was speaking of, that may come directly from the
21 federal government of other opportunities that are
22 out there through infrastructure through the ARPA,
23 you know, on that. The infrastructure, you know,
24 piece we're still waiting on guidance on how
25 that's going to administered and everything else,

1 as Graham alluded to, so we're not sure how that
2 whole process is going to work with the
3 infrastructure piece.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Dan, anything over at
5 DPH?

6 DAN AUBIN: It's a very good question,
7 and I have no way to really top the answers from
8 Graham or Martin because that's really everything
9 that's out there. And I would say, and there's
10 only certain portions that I can speak for, but
11 there has been some confusion too on some of the
12 preexisting federal dollars that would come. So
13 there hasn't been as much guidance as we would
14 like. The agencies -- I'll speak for DPH, for
15 example -- we continue to ask for guidance, but
16 there hasn't been a lot of clarity yet. All eyes
17 too I think should be on the legislative session
18 as we're seeing that evolve and it's moving fast,
19 but other than that, I mean, every other comment
20 that was mentioned from Graham or Martin I think
21 is 100 percent accurate.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And a very
23 good question, Alicea. I mean, it's something
24 that we certainly have to stay on top of because
25 there's a great deal of money coming in. We just

1 have to figure out how we're going to use it, and
2 of course a lot of items in the plan can certainly
3 use money.

4 Denise.

5 DENISE SAVAGEAU: I just wanted to add
6 in that, as was alluded to, a lot of this money is
7 going to be coming directly from federal agencies
8 in the form of grants or other things that can be
9 applied for, and one of the challenges, of course,
10 is match, how do we match the dollars. Now, some
11 of the dollars are coming out with not the same
12 kind of match, they actually have recognized that
13 match is a problem. But I think that how do we
14 leverage the dollars that are federal dollars
15 coming in that aren't just going directly into the
16 State of Connecticut like the, you know, Clean
17 Water Revolving Fund or the State Drinking Water
18 Revolving Fund. I think that there is, you know,
19 there's money coming from USDA, there's money
20 going to be out there from NOAA. There's a lot of
21 federal agencies. And they don't always know how,
22 you know, some of them are better than others at
23 getting those dollars out. So I think really
24 tracking the types of grants that are available,
25 what's going to be happening, and looking at how

1 the Water Planning Council can support figuring
2 out how to get match, how do we get those state
3 dollars, how do we leverage the federal dollars.

4 And the last thing I'm going to say is,
5 you know, I mentioned a couple of agencies, but
6 whether it be EPA, NOAA, everything that's coming
7 in for Long Island Sound, there's millions of
8 dollars coming into Long Island Sound, and I've
9 been a big proponent of "One Water." If we're
10 taking care of a public drinking water supply
11 watershed that has a nitrogen problem, that helps
12 with nitrogen problems in Long Island Sound. So
13 we can leverage dollars by looking at, you know,
14 dollars that are targeted for Long Island Sound,
15 but they also benefit public drinking water supply
16 watersheds, particularly from a nitrogen
17 perspective, when we know that nitrogen is a major
18 issue for algal blooms in public drinking supply
19 water watersheds as well as in Long Island Sound.

20 So I'm just putting that out there that
21 there's ways for us to leverage these dollars,
22 think about how we benefit, we think about the One
23 Water concept, and also, again, really paying
24 attention how do we as the state folks lobby for
25 the match. Because it may be that you have a

1 Bridgeport or a Hartford that wants to do the
2 right thing and wants to apply for some of those
3 dollars that are coming in from a federal
4 perspective, but a lot of times we'll see,
5 particularly the most vulnerable communities, the
6 EJ communities, they don't have the match. And if
7 they don't have the match, that's a problem. So
8 how do we as an agency work and make sure we have
9 a match through the Green Bank, through, you know,
10 what's the public-private partnership route to get
11 those matching dollars.

12 So I'm putting that out there because
13 there's the potential for Connecticut not to be
14 able to use those funds. We've got funds coming
15 in very specific for certain things, and how do we
16 make sure that the funds are being utilized in
17 Connecticut and making sure we have the match to
18 leverage those. So thank you.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Martin, thank you,
20 Denise.

21 GRAHAM STEVENS: Can I just follow up
22 on that, Jack, real quick?

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

24 GRAHAM STEVENS: It's a really good
25 point, Denise. And a lot of these funds, if you

1 look at the law, which I have, it's a fun read, a
2 lot of these funds are competitive and not all of
3 the funds are flowing to state actors. They could
4 be to municipalities, they could be to NGOs. So,
5 you know, what we are doing at DEEP, and I'm sure
6 other agencies are doing, is trying to mobilize
7 those parties to ensure that they have the best
8 opportunity to receive those funds, whether it be
9 through outreach and education, through
10 partnerships, or whether it be through trying to
11 secure matching funds.

12 I know there's a bill right now at the
13 legislature about this. I also know that the
14 administration has been budgeting for the need for
15 a match, the need for state resources to be able
16 to administer these funds. This is going to be on
17 a different scale than the American Recovery and
18 Reinvestment Act of 2009. And what we don't want
19 to end up doing is, you know, picking projects
20 that are ready to go. We want to pick the best
21 projects that will have the best long-term impact
22 for Connecticut. So, you know, we are in the
23 thick of it, and, you know, we certainly will be
24 relying upon our NGO, municipal and other partners
25 to ensure that we put forward good applications

1 and bring as many of these dollars to Connecticut
2 as possible.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Any other
4 public comment?

5 MARTIN HEFT: Jack, the only thing I'd
6 like to mention is I put in the chat just an
7 interesting blog post from California WaterBlog
8 about "Approaches to Water Planning." It's a
9 short little blog but an interesting read just to
10 share with everybody.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.
12 Anything else to come before us?

13 Dave Kuzminski, you're going to start
14 doing your podcast, right?

15 DAVE KUZMINSKI: Any time, Jack. We've
16 got to get the rest of your Water Planning Council
17 on there. We've got episode two under our belt.
18 You say the word, and we'll get episode three out
19 there.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very good. Thank
21 you. Anything else to come before us today?

22 (No response.)

23 THE CHAIRMAN: If not --

24 MARTIN HEFT: I'll make a motion to
25 adjourn.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favor,
signify by saying aye.

THE COUNCIL: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: The meeting is
adjourned. Thank you all very much for all your
participation. Appreciate it. And we'll see you
soon. Be safe.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at
2:45 p.m.)

1 CERTIFICATE FOR REMOTE HEARING

2
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing 60 pages
4 are a complete and accurate computer-aided
5 transcription of my original stenotype notes taken
6 of the Regular Meeting held by Remote Access of
7 the WATER PLANNING COUNCIL, which was held
8 remotely before JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, CHAIR, and
9 PURA VICE CHAIRMAN, on March 1, 2022.
10
11
12
13

14 

15 -----
16 Lisa L. Warner, CSR 061
17 Court Reporter
18 BCT REPORTING LLC
19 55 WHITING STREET, SUITE 1A
20 PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT 06062
21
22
23
24
25