## CERTIFIED

1	COPY	,
2		
3		
4		
5	STATE OF CONNECTICUT	
6	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND	
7	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	
8	PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY	
9		
10	STATE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL	
11		
12	Regular Meeting held Via Teleconference on	
13	May 3, 2022, beginning at 1:30 p.m.	
14		
15	Held Before:	
16	JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, CHAIRMAN,	
17	and PURA VICE-CHAIRMAN	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1

1	Appearances:
2	WATER PLANNING COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
3	JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, CHAIRMAN (PURA)
4	MARTIN HEFT (OPM)
5	LORI MATHIEU (DPH)
6	GRAHAM STEVENS (DEEP)
7	
8	ALSO PRESENT (on record):
9	ALICEA CHARAMUT
10	MARGARET MINER
11	KAREN BURNASKA
12	DAVID RADKA
13	DAN LAWRENCE
14	ERIC McPHEE
15	
16	Staff:
17	LAURA LUPOLI
18	ALYSON AYOTTE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to			
2	the Water Planning Council meeting from May 3,			
3	2022. I call this meeting to order.			
4	The first order of minutes will be to accept			
5	the April 5, 2022, transcript. Do I have a motion			
6	to accept?			
7	MARTIN HEFT: So moved.			
8	THE CHAIRMAN: Second?			
9	GRAHAM STEVENS: Motion made and seconded that the			
10	3/5/'22 transcript be accepted.			
11	Any questions?			
12				
13	(No response.)			
14				
15	THE CHAIRMAN: If not, all those in favor signify by			
16	saying, aye.			
17	THE COUNCIL: Aye.			
18	THE CHAIRMAN: The motion carries.			
19	Public comment I'm going to call on Lori			
20	to wish everyone a happy, happy drinking water,			
21	state drinking water week.			
22	LORI MATHIEU: Yes. So thank you, Jack. It is			
23	drinking water week. Typically the Health			
24	Department, to celebrate the national drinking			
25	water week, we typically prior to COVID were			

working on a number of different initiatives to present awards to operators and to water systems across our state that had essentially achievement awards and are doing good work to sustain their systems -- or water systems, and operators that are doing great work over their career.

This is now the third year that we have suspended that because of COVID. We hope to be able to kick start that up again next year and be able to get that moving forward again.

To celebrate, what Jack and I have decided to do is to is to initiate -- and we've talked about this before with Dave Kuzminski. We, Jack and I recently -- well, probably six weeks ago or so ago -- Jack, we did a podcast.

THE CHAIRMAN: Uh-huh.

LORI MATHIEU: But we're going to do -- Dave has asked us again to go back as part, to represent the Water Planning Council and to kick off maybe a series of podcasts on behalf of the Water Planning Council. Jack and I are looking for a date for next week or the week after to talk about our initiatives and priorities moving forward to update the state water plan and our budget, and the water chief, and everything that we've been

talking about.

So I know that's not the best of all celebrations and not what we're used to, but COVID has certainly interrupted what we have typically done. But we want to say to celebrate this week -- it's important to celebrate all of your work out there, all of your volunteers, and to celebrate all of us in the work that we've been working so hard to do.

Not even five years ago we didn't have a state water plan. So all of our efforts are moving in the right direction. So congratulations. Thank you, Jack.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now I want to put Alecia

Charamut on the spot, and ask how her rowing went

last week. How did your rowing -- which I thought

was a really novel approach you had to raising

money and I'm curious how it went?

ALICEA CHARAMUT: Well, I decided to torture myself to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Act as well as Rivers Alliance's 30th anniversary over the two days of Connecticut community foundations Give Local.

So on my rowing machine, my erg, I rowed 50K on the first day, and 30K on the second day -- not

1 all at once, in pieces. 2 I actually only needed a day of alternating 3 between Tylenol and Motrin, and that by Friday I 4 no longer needed that. But it was not as bad as I 5 thought -- and it was effective, and it was fun. 6 It was really fun. 7 So thanks. Thanks, Jack for --8 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, well done. And she donated part 9 of that whole effort to the inception of the state 10 water plan, and we thank her for that. 11 appreciate that. 12 I got tired just reading what you were doing. 13 I said, oh, my goodness. So well done. 14 ALICEA CHARAMUT: And podcasts, listened to a lot of 15 podcasts. 16 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I'm sure. Any other public comment 17 or correspondence before we move on? 18 19 (No response.) 20 21 THE CHAIRMAN: So let's get right to the implementation 22 workgroup. David or Virginia? 23 DAVID RADKA: I don't believe Virginia is available, so 24 I'll do it quick --25 THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think she's with us today.

DAVID RADKA: Okay. We last met in April. We had all of our members present, both continuing and newly appointed. So we just want to thank you for doing so at the last regular meeting.

I think you're fairly familiar with the ongoing work of the outreach and education topical sub workgroup, but to quickly recap for everyone else, they've been planning two webinars.

The first is on -- the next upcoming one is on May 11th. So a little over a week from today. We'll be on wetlands and climate change resiliency, and registration is now open. I think Laura sent out a link to that.

I believe as of yesterday there were 40 registrations, which is good for online registration. The next webinar will be June 8th on rivers and watercourses, and it's still being finalized. They're also working on a story board developing that around historic wetland protection work up to and including the state water plan adoption and some implementation efforts.

Joe Cunningham from DEEP did create some branding design concepts for both the state water plan and the Planning Council. I think those have been forwarded to you -- but we did review those

at our last meeting. And we took a bit of a straw poll, I guess. And overwhelmingly all liked the -- I guess it was number two of the two.

I don't have those in front of me, but I do believe that you have copies of those.

Finally, I guess the workgroup will be looking at a state website, because they've been trying to work on with outreach and education on fixes to what they see as their problems. So they're going to develop, like, a one-pager on what those problems are and what they see as -- would like to see those fixes, which I think will flow nicely into hopefully some water chief responsibilities.

And for anyone who's interested, their next meeting is on May 5th, 9:30 in the morning.

The implementation tracking reporting workgroup has completed their draft report. This has been forwarded to both the implementation workgroup and the advisory group, and both of those we'll do at our respective meetings and provide comments back to the workgroup.

At this point I anticipate we would be getting you the final report with recommendations in maybe a month or so.

And I guess lastly I would say one thing the implementation workgroup does do at our monthly meetings is we do spend time discussing and updating members who don't really sit in on these meetings in the status of what some of our prior recommendations are such as, you know, OPM's work to update the drought plan processes, DPH efforts to move domestic well language forward, the water planning chief position, things like that.

And I just want to say members really appreciate seeing how the work that we do is being moved forward, and it's being acted on by the Council. So it's really, you know, on behalf of all of us it's very gratifying and in some ways very energizing to see that move forward. So thank you for that.

So our next meeting is next week at one o'clock for anyone that's interested.

THE CHAIRMAN: And thank you, Dave. Any questions for Dave? I know Virginia sent out the information for the meeting on the 10th already.

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you and Virginia, and the group

for your continuing support and efforts on behalf of Water Planning Council. We appreciate that.

Moving on to Water Planning Council advisory group update. Dan or Alecia?

DAN LAWRENCE: Hey, Jack. It's Dan. I just got in -- so give me two seconds.

So we had a meeting and a good one. We've been continuing to talk through things that have come through the WUCC. And so we focused on this past meeting the emergency interconnections and interconnections.

So we had a presentation that Sam did around the interconnection roadmap in the WUCC, what the WUCC was working on, talked about that a bit.

Much of the conversation revolved around a proposal from Connecticut DEEP on a general permit category for emergency interconnections; lots of questions.

Doug Hodgkins presented, and I thought he did a nice job laying out what the permit would allow someone to do, and what it would not allow someone to do. And then he left with a handful of questions to think about from the group, but it was a lengthy conversation. And I didn't jot down everyone's particular questions, but a lot of them

1 had to do with, you know, which sources can be 2 used, timing of, you know, getting approvals and 3 those kind of things. 4 So I did see Lori Mathieu sent over a letter 5 supporting it, so I appreciate that. And then we 6 did some general business overall, and that's kind 7 of how we ended -- is that was a pretty lengthy 8 session overall. 9 Any questions on that? 10 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dan. 11 You're welcome. DAN LAWRENCE: 12 THE CHAIRMAN: Ouestions for Dan from Councilmembers? 13 14 (No response.) 15 16 THE CHAIRMAN: Karen Burnaska, watershed lands group 17 update. 18 Sure. And I will start and the KAREN BURNASKA: 19 cleanup will be Margaret, who generally has more 20 information than I do. One update I'd like to 21 give the Water Planning Council today is in your 22 support and our support of the supplement to the 23 GAE land conveyance questionnaire. 24 It was used this year. It was sent out with 25 the questionnaire in the supplement that had

information, requested information on environmental issues regarding the parcel of land.

Both the questionnaire and the supplement were posted on the CGA's website, however I am not sure and never received an answer if the information was up prior to the deadline to submit written testimony for the public hearing.

I will say that when I questioned the GAE clerk, she did tell me that testimony can be submitted after the public hearing if we wanted, but I don't know if that information was up prior to having to submit the written testimony.

While that was all good and we appreciate their help, we still have concerns about the specificity of the information -- or really, the lack of information that is included in the GAE conveyance bills. It does not always have the use of the land. A lot of the information that we felt -- that we feel is very important is not included in the bill.

So we will be continuing our discussion of this at the watershed lands workgroup meeting on June 10th. We did have specific concerns over one particular conveyance, and that was a very small parcel of land. It was a small parcel of land

that was taken from the state forest, and it was conveyed.

And that was approved by both the GAE committee and with the bare minimum Of votes, two thirds votes needed from the Senate -- however, it is still moving forward. But I think Margaret has been doing a lot of reconnaissance on some of these bills, and I'm going to turn the floor over to her.

## Margaret?

MARGARET MINER: Oh. Hi, Karen. "E" is on 491. One thing I think we learned. We did appreciate that GAE responded to our request for an enhanced questionnaire. That's true, but we learned that if the questionnaire -- if the information in the questionnaire doesn't appear in the bill, its usefulness is somewhat limited.

With 491 it was one of those -- it comes under the constitutional amendment because it involved conservation land, Housatonic Meadows State Park, which has been in the news quite a lot, anyway. And it was a small piece, under an acre with some dispute as to how small. DEEP came up with a different measurement than the applicant.

No use was described in the bill, but in the application form, which was from Craig Miner, it was specified that the current use is open space and the future use is open space. There was no reverter clause.

It is one of those little pieces that will make a presently nonconforming lot owned by St. Brigid's Church into a conforming lot -- and we're told that the church has some interest in selling that piece.

So we're not -- it's impossible to tell at this point what would eventually appear on the sole conforming lot whether, you know, how you calculate open space is, you know, it varies. But the designation "open space" isn't even in the bill. So it's basically a blank check.

Now it passed with exactly two thirds
majority in the Senate -- which I congratulate
leadership on their counting skills. And Karen is
right, it's now in the House and where people are
trying to draw attention to it, I think
successfully.

It certainly highlights that if we want to talk about -- if we want to succeed in having true scrutiny of conveyances of land designed to

protect natural resources, we are not there yet. So that's something, as Karen said, we'll be talking about.

Some other issues that came up this session that we'll be taking up in the group, I believe we want to be sure we understand the underlying law. We want to be sure DPH is always the DPH we know.

And I would like to thank Dan; the discussion on interconnections which sometimes becomes relevant to watershed lands has been extremely helpful. So this session so far has given us some important questions to go back to and discuss again.

That's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Margaret.

Any questions for Margaret?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Karen, does that conclude your report?

MARGARET MINER: Oh, wait. Let me add one thing. In

the GAE vote there was no testimony in favor of

giving away any part of Housatonic Meadows lands.

All the testimony including Connecticut Forests

And Parks, Connecticut Land Conservation Council,

Rivers Alliance was against it.

The committee had no questions of Connecticut Forest and park Association, no discussion of the act or of doing it -- maybe amending the bill. It passed unanimously in about four seconds.

THE CHAIRMAN: Government at its best.

Right, Margaret?

MARGARET MINER: I will say that some of the members of GAE voted against it in the house -- I mean, in the Senate when they had a chance to look at it.

And if I haven't mixed up the votes, originally it was unanimous. Is that right, Karen?

And then in the Senate they were ten votes against. And we wrote and thanked all those people who went out on a limb and voted, voted against the conveyance.

KAREN BURNASKA: My only other comment, Jack -- not on this, but on another piece of legislation that I hope Lori will bring up is that the watershed lands group was following the DPH recommendation on the testing of private wells. I believe there was a change, there was a strike-all amendment last Friday, last Friday afternoon.

I don't exactly know where it stands right now. I don't know if, you know, Lori has any more

1 information on it, but that was a bill that the 2 watershed lands group was interested in, as was 3 the use of road salt bill, which I believe is 4 moving forward also. 5 So that's it, Jack. Thank you. 6 Thank you very much. That's a nice THE CHAIRMAN: 7 segue actually into other businesses. We're going 8 to hear a WUCC update, and private well update. 9 Lori? 10 LORI MATHIEU: Thank you, Jack. Yes. So I hope my 11 colleague Eric McPhee is on to talk about the 12 WUCC. 13 THE CHAIRMAN: He is. 14 LORI MATHIEU: Eric? 15 ERIC McPHEE: I am here. I've got my scribbles here. 16 So just a quick update. We are in full swing with 17 meetings. The eastern WUCC has a meeting on May 18th at one o'clock, on Zoom. That will be on the 18 19 website, and an e-mail will go out to the 20 interested party list. If you're not on that 21 list, we can certainly add you -- but it will post 22 on our website. 23 And then WUCC implementation continues its

discussion on May 19th at one o'clock.

be on Teams. And again, please spread the word.

24

25

That will

We can put anyone on that list. And it's an open discussion, not just for WUCC members. The more the merrier, and hoping to have a continued discussion on some of our outreach efforts both for municipalities for interconnections.

I forgot to mention one of the things on the Eastern WUCC agenda is elections. We continue to struggle with leadership roles in the WUCCs and also getting younger people involved. So you know, the idea would be to bring a younger person along with you to these meetings and let them start to get involved and aware of the things that we talk about and sort of these bigger picture issues that are important for the state.

And then, finally -- I think Dan mentioned this already -- is we're going to continue our discussion with Water Planning Council advisory group on May 17th at one o'clock to talk about our municipal outreach efforts.

That's it for me. Thank you.

LORI MATHIEU: Thank you, Eric. And as we'd like to say versus younger people -- newer people to meetings. And a point well taken; in the eastern WUCC we're struggling to replace the people that have left and have retired, the leadership there.

```
1
              And we want -- there is still chairs,
2
         correct? In the Eastern WUCC, Eric?
3
    ERIC McPHEE: The eastern WUCC is fine. The central
4
         WUCC -- as I look at Mr. Radka, the central WUCC
5
         is struggling with finding new faces for --
         there's one potential, but obviously we have to go
6
7
         through the standard electric process. We
8
         probably need two additional positions that no one
9
         has stepped up for in the central WUCC.
10
              Western WUCC is fine.
11
    LORI MATHIEU: Western WUCC is what?
12
    ERIC McPHEE: Fine, we have no issues.
13
    LORI MATHIEU: It's fine?
14
    ERIC McPHEE: Yes.
15
    LORI MATHIEU: So the eastern WUCC is fine?
16
    ERIC McPHEE: Currently it is. It is, yeah, but
17
         they're going through the election process at the
18
         next meeting.
19
    LORI MATHIEU: Okay.
20
    ERIC McPHEE: The place that we're struggling most is
21
         in central.
22
    LORI MATHIEU: Is central?
23
    ERIC McPHEE: Yeah.
    LORI MATHIEU: All right. And again, Eric -- what Eric
24
25
         could do, we could -- Chair Betkoski, if you'd
```

like, maybe take this e-mail list of everyone who's on this e-mail list, which is extensive, and invite everyone to the WUCC meetings -- if you're okay with that?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's great. You kind of reading my mind. So give us a little bit of a refresher on who's on the WUCC committee?

I mean, I know you kind of --

LORI MATHIEU: Well, the WUCC is by statute there, the membership are public water systems and the council of governments. So there's three areas.

Right? You've got the central core and then you have the east and the west, and they are aligned with the nine council of governments.

so in the east you have -- what the eastern is made up of is the northeast and the southeast COG. Right? Essentially that's the boundary.

In the central core there's three council of governments, and in the central part of Connecticut -- and in the West it's made up of the four council of governments.

You know you've got the Northwest Hills and in the west, and then you've got the Bridgeport -- I'm forgetting the other one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Naugatuck Valley?

LORI MATHIEU: Right, the one that you live in, Jack.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't forget the Naugatuck Valley now.

LORI MATHIEU: Sorry. Sorry. Naugatuck Valley. So

those are the boundaries. So you have the

members -- but everyone is welcome. It's open to

the public. We publicize the information.

People are allowed to come and speak, but we have an agenda. We have the agenda set. What Eric is tasked with doing within our team is to implement the WUCC plans. The WUCC plans were signed off on and approved by Commissioner Pino back in -- I want to say the Year '18 -- if that's correct, Eric?

You can update me on the date -- but at the tail end of the Year '18 I think Commissioner Pino had signed off.

January of '18?

ERIC McPHEE: January of 2019.

LORI MATHIEU: 2019. January of 2019 Commissioner Pino signed off and approved all three WUCC plans.

What we're doing now is implementing. So we're highlighting priorities, which is within each one of the structured WUCC meetings.

And we need leadership. Right? We need chairs. We need cochairs. We need people to

attend and to talk in those regions about the regional issues and tee up those items that are important.

Interconnections, emergency interconnections has been a prevalent discussion and there's a lot of great work that's ongoing there. So --

ERIC McPHEE: Am I permitted to add something? Can I add something to that?

LORI MATHIEU: Yeah, absolutely.

ERIC McPHEE: Just for people that aren't super familiar with the WUCCs. You know, most of the effort now is focused on WUCC implementation and taking the recommendations from the coordinated plans, you know, and implementing them.

The three regional WUCCs for the most part these days are doing the day-to-day work that the WUCCs are tasked with, approving a new water system or doing regional work to, you know, assess how a need is met in terms of water supply needs, and things like that.

So you know, sort of the nuts and bolts of the regions are still done by the individual WUCC. Part of the reason we're having difficulty with leadership is that so much of the effort is focused on the WUCC implementation, which is a statewide effort.

So in effect, there's four, four entities.

There's the three regional WUCCs and then the

broader WUCC implementation group that has a lot

more involvement with implementation.

LORI MATHIEU: That implementation group is something where at the tail end of the WUCC process we wanted to tee up a summary document that summarized everything. Because for a lot of people, those documents are literally this thick, like, eight inches thick. Right? So no one in their right mind is going to read all that.

So we produced -- with a consultant we produced a nice ten-page summary document and then a two-pager which describes the process. So if anyone is interested, Eric could maybe throw it into the Zoom's chat here to show these documents. So if you're interested in knowing more about the WUCC, you could read the two-page or the ten-pager which does a great job of summarizing the process.

And again, if you want involvement in any one of these processes, please, you're more than welcome to attend.

And Jack, if you're okay with it, Eric can utilize this e-mail, all this, this bundle of

1 e-mails that we have here for all the people that 2 are part of this team and share the information 3 and send the invites? 4 THE CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. And Eric and Lori, thank 5 I mean, the WUCC is a very important 6 component of what we do in the water business. 7 And we've had issues over the years, as Lori 8 knows, in Southeastern Connecticut where the WUCC 9 was very much a decision maker, if you will, when 10 it was like a water war down in that part of the 11 state. 12 And it was -- I remember it was one of the 13 first WUCC meetings I went to. It was rather 14 contentious. 15 So they do have a lot of authority when it 16 comes to water supply in the state of Connecticut. 17 And Eric, thank you for spearheading that effort, for sure. 18 19 So any other comments on WUCCs before we move 20 onto private well update? 21 22 (No response.) 23 24 THE CHAIRMAN: Lori? Karen talked a little bit about 25 that.

LORI MATHIEU: So next up is private wells.

So yes, House Bill 5500 -- as Karen mentioned, there was a strike-all amendment.

Essentially, you know when you work in the Legislature you don't always get what you would like. So I can talk about this more once it passes, because the language is still draft.

We hope that it passes as part of 5500.

House Bill 5500 is the various revisions bill on behalf of the Department of Public Health.

There's been a lot of discussion with various groups about the proposal for mandatory testing on property transfer as came through Dr. Dietz's workgroup and the white paper that was written -- and it came through all of us.

And we said, yes, this is a great idea on property transfer to test. Make it a mandatory test for private wells.

Well, it apparently is not working out in getting everything that we wanted. It's now speaking to this idea of on property transfer, or potential property transfer, that educational information would be provided to the potential buyer.

And so again, it's language that we can work

with. It's not everything that we were moving forward with, but it's language that we can work with, that we can make work for us. And again, it's not a mandatory test on property transfer.

The one -- another big effort as Karen mentioned that tie in on the other efforts and the concerns that many legislators have had with private well contamination, and just coming to our department, our local health departments about, what are the issues? Where do you know the issues are for private wells?

How many private wells -- the questions we got, very prevalent questions -- how many wells are contaminated with sodium chloride and where are they? And what are the solutions to help them out?

Right? What are the sources of contamination? Where is it coming from? You know our colleagues at DEEP -- and Graham will know as we get involved and work together on all of these issues. But the questions we get at the Health Department is, give us the data system that tells us where you're tracking all of this.

Well, we don't have it. Right? And there's 62 local health districts, and they have various

levels of information. So one of the big efforts out of this, this change is to get support by a staff person as well as a data system so that we can start to gather the information.

One of the requirements would be that information would start to come to us through state certified laboratories. That's a big part of the effort, is to educate people about using state certified laboratories to do the tests when you do a test. And that if that test is done, that that information is shared with the Department of Public Health electronically.

So it's an important effort. It's not ideal, but again that is what is moving forward through House Bill 5500.

That's all I have. And next, the next meeting in June when all of this moves forward I can talk about what has passed and be more definitive on the details.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks, Lori.

Any questions for Lori or comments?

GRAHAM STEVENS: Sorry, Jack. I had to just jump off there for a second. I'm sure Lori covered it, but did you mention, Lori, the sodium chloride bill, the --

LORI MATHIEU: I did not, because we're not part of that, Graham. So I just gave an update on private wells.

GRAHAM STEVENS: Quite strangely, you're not part of that.

LORI MATHIEU: Yeah, that is strange.

GRAHAM STEVENS: But just for folks' general awareness, there's a bill that deals with UConn's Green SnowPro training, which is like an SFP process for ensuring that there's not an over application of salt to our roadways -- which can result in an impact to private drinking water wells, which is currently available for municipal public works departments.

And as part of their process of complying with the MS4 permit, as is the case for DOT's MS4 permits, there was an attempt to expand that to private applicators which would result in some liability relief if someone were to have an accident that was potentially related to too little of -- you know, not enough application of salt to sidewalks and parking lots.

That bill did not make it through this session, but pieces of it are incorporated into the budget implementer.

1 Thank you, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: 2 Any questions for Graham? 3 4 (No response.) 5 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, let's move onto the interagency 6 7 drink -- or agency drought working group well 8 update. I'm transposing my words here. 9 GRAHAM STEVENS: Yeah. Well, you know you can drink 10 because we're not in a drought. 11 So you can drink the water. 12 THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good thing. 13 MARTIN HEFT: Good afternoon, everyone. So we did --14 it was mentioned at our last meeting we did not 15 have a meeting last month in April. We do have a 16 meeting this Thursday at two o'clock, which we 17 will review the conditions. And we'll also be 18 going over our first proposed language revisions 19 to the drought plan that we've been going through 20 over the past few months. 21 So we've got the whole document with a bunch 22 of revisions that's been sent out to all of the 23 members. We'll start reviewing that document and 24 going through those changes that we're 25 recommending as part of the entire review process.

1 And that's where we're at with the interagency 2 drought workgroup. 3 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions? 4 Thank you, Martin. Any questions for Martin? 5 6 (No response.) 7 8 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, we'll move onto state and 9 federal funding update. And Martin and I will 10 cover this. I want to again thank Martin and 11 Denise Savageau for really working quickly and 12 efficiently to get the application in to Senator 13 Murphy's office. 14 And you want to talk a little bit about that, 15 Martin. 16 MARTIN HEFT: Sure. So thank you. 17 And again, I just echo, Jack. 18 Denise, thank you very much for all your hard 19 work in getting the draft for us done. 20 And Graham, for your work as well, for some 21 of those additional pieces we needed at last 22 minute. And after three attempts of trying to put 23 it through to their portal system I finally got it 24 to go; a few little errors in that process, but we 25 did get it submitted on time.

1 So that we had asked for a grant of \$1.5 2 million to update the state water plan by hiring 3 consultants, a durational project manager to 4 oversee it. Part of that would be 300,000 that 5 would be in-kind services or cash from the State 6 for a total of 1.8 million for a total project 7 that we submitted in for that. 8 So that's pretty much it, and we're just now 9 waiting on appropriations from Murphy's office. 10 And any responses, we have not -- I have not heard 11 anything back if they needed any additional 12 information or anything at this time. So it's 13 kind of a sit-and-wait process as of now. 14 But Jack, I don't know if you have anything 15 else you want to add, or Graham? 16 THE CHAIRMAN: (Unintelligible.) 17 MARTIN HEFT: You were cutting in and out, Jack. So I 18 didn't catch that. 19 THE CHAIRMAN: (Unintelligible.) 20 THE REPORTER: This is the Reporter. I didn't get 21 that. 22 Yeah. It looked like Jack was frozen up MARTIN HEFT: 23 So it might be a connection issue. on the screen. I don't know if he's logging off and coming 24 25 back on.

1 GRAHAM STEVENS: I just want to say, Martin, thanks. 2 Thanks for your effort on your planned vacation to 3 finish up that task for the benefit of the Water 4 Planning council and all of us -- if we are 5 successful in receiving those funds. 6 DAVID RADKA: This is David. May I ask a question 7 while we're waiting for Jack? 8 I was curious. Martin, is there a 9 possibility that funding would be a portion of 10 what you requested? Or is it an all or nothing? 11 Or is it, you know, 50 percent perhaps? Or a 12 portion? 13 It looks like Martin is also -- I GRAHAM STEVENS: 14 don't know. 15 I feel like Water Planning Councilors are 16 falling down left and -- oh, he's back. 17 MARTIN HEFT: Yeah, I don't know. Yeah. All of Zoom 18 just cut out on me and then came back in. 19 GRAHAM STEVENS: David had asked the question, Martin, about whether there's the likelihood that we -- is 20 21 it a yes or no for funding? Or is there a 22 potential that we could be provided with some 23 portion thereof? 24 MARTIN HEFT: Okay. Thanks, Graham. So we did put in 25 that if we were unable to get the full funding,

1 they asked if there was any amount we could drop 2 down. And I think we did drop it down by, I 3 believe, 300,000. I don't have it here in front 4 of me -- where we took out some of the 5 administrative pieces and some of the printing 6 costs of it, but that we still need the majority 7 to do the work. 8 So that was the only provision asking if we 9 were awarded less, what would the minimum be? And 10 that was our response to that. So thank you. 11 THE CHAIRMAN: My apologies. I was just knocked off 12 here for a few seconds. So you're still talking 13 about the federal grant. Are you going to talk 14 about state monies yet? Or did you? 15 MARTIN HEFT: No, we did -- I did not. We're still 16 just answering one question that David had on it, 17 and so we just did that. 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. So any other 19 questions on the federal? 20 21 (No response.) 22 23 THE CHAIRMAN: If not -- so Martin, why don't you give 24 a little update. So I should preface before 25 Martin talks, we talked about the possibility

maybe using WICA funds to -- at least we need some money to get us through to July 1 of 2023.

Because what's going to happen, hopefully we're going to be, just like the State of Connecticut is now, flush with cash July 1st of 2023 when we will have an operating budget from the State. We also get the federal funds then.

But in the meantime, by statute the Office of Policy and Management -- and that's how it was originally when we did the plan -- is responsible for, is the state agency that's responsible for getting funds into the development and implementation of state water plan.

So Martin, why don't you, if you could, please, just give a little update in terms of how we originally got the grant and -- the bonding money, I should say?

MARTIN HEFT: Sure. So just thanks, Jack.

Going back through some of the statutes when this process all originally started to develop the state water plan, everything; currently now it's Section 22a-354 which was an appropriation of bond proceeds, of 1,500,000 of bond proceeds to be used at the discretion to do these previous sections -- which all those sections are the state water plan

for that.

I am inquiring to see if all those funds were used. I'm assuming they were on it, but I am checking with our bonding unit here at OPM budget just to see if there was any funds left over from that appropriation on there.

And obviously, the next steps would be as would be for us to either look at making an amendment to that appropriation of bond proceeds to ask for other bonding funds to do this project if we're not able to get federal funds; or the second piece, as Jack alluded to, would be that the Water Planning Council for the next biennium budget actually submits a requested budget in as an agency of the state for, whether it be for administration, whether it be for updating the state water plan, whether it be for positions for that.

And we actually do that as per our purview, because each year we're supposed to do our annual report to the General Assembly. We're supposed to, by statutes, set up and update the plan.

Obviously, this is all contingent upon available funds. They are. So basically, if we're not asking for any funds as a Water Planning Council,

obviously they're not going to even consider it or give us any on that.

So the statutes are there to back us up for the funding piece of it. We've just got to develop a budget and go through the process as every other agency does in submitting a request with the appropriate backup. So that would be my recommendation to do.

Regardless, even if we get the federal funds, we should get something in budgetary purposes for the Water Planning Council, especially as we know we've kind of talked at one of our past special meetings -- is looking at we should be doing an update to the water plan probably every five years.

And so we, you know -- or just minor pieces to it. If not full -- maybe it's five years. In ten years you do a full one, or whatever schedule we come up with, but that means every year there has to be funds in a budget and we need to establish that.

So that would be, you know, kind of the State way of looking at it versus the federal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Martin.

Martin, so when it comes to if we wanted to

M

re-up the previous authorization on the bonding, which was where the money came from for the original plan, how would we go about doing that?

MARTIN HEFT: Yeah. So that's -- obviously, it's a change. You have to have bond approval, which is a legislative process. So I would have to go through the next legislative session requesting a change to that.

And then that's the only way the Bond

Commission can authorize funds, is once it's been approved on the legislative side. So it would have to be part of the bond package bill, if you will. But they would amend that section as they do with other ones for like -- such as town aid road or local capital improvement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Got it.

MARTIN HEFT: Each year they up the number and change it to be able to allot more that way. It may be something they may not want to do through bonding, and they may want to just do it through general funds. So I think we can present, here's a couple of options.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. So we're going to be -- I mean, a year from July hopefully one of the three is going to come through for us.

MARTIN HEFT: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that's optimistic -- and I'm still optimistic we're going to do something prior to around July 1st of this year. I've got some ideas. I'm just not at liberty to share at this moment.

But any questions, Martin?

Again, thank you for all your efforts and helping us. It's nice to have the Office of Policy and Management part of this Council, for sure.

Any questions for Martin?

And we did have a meeting -- especially last Friday. And Rob very nicely got the 23 pages to us. And at the end of it, he really does very nicely kind of summarize what we did in terms of the topics of discussion, and who said what.

And back to Martin, we're talking about the whole, the update and the funding -- which really when you think about it is kind of the foundation of the whole funding aspect of the Water Planning Council; where we're going to go is really one of our priorities.

Lori talked about the our conservation efforts and the fixtures. I want to get some

legislation passed around that next year infrastructure funding and source protection. Graham talked about strategic action moving 4 forward with source protection as well, and USGS funding.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And Virginia had a question, about the process question.

And Graham at one point, USGS funding. Ι mean, there was dollars coming from DEEP to them. Is that all gone now?

GRAHAM STEVENS: No, we continue to fund, gauging around the state as part of our water quality and quantity programs. And as you can imagine with any item that requires operation and maintenance and labor, the costs have continued to go up.

And it's something that that DEEP is very interested in trying to find sustainable funding Jack, as you know, we've brought sources for. this up as an issue in certain rate cases and mergers about the need for gauging of streams where diversions are taking place.

And one of the things that DEEP is looking at is trying to partner with USGS to upgrade, upgrade of the gauging so that more of these stations can be monitored remotely, as opposed to having to

send USGS folks from out of state around

Connecticut to collect this information. So that
you know, hopefully that will cut down on some of
the operational and human resources costs.

And also we have asked USGS for a draft proposal to look at expanding water gauging and monitoring statewide. That could really play into a lot of the different functions that our agencies take collectively as part of the state water plan. That could be looking at drought with new groundwater monitoring wells, some more monitoring of surface water in Connecticut, whether those be streams or lakes.

And obviously, we're also looking at additional help with respect to the work that we're doing within the Long Island Sound. So there's a lot of need for funding both from the capital side as well as just a funding source to continue that monitoring going forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other comments about our mini priority workshop from Lori or Martin from last week?

MARTIN HEFT: No. I was just going to say, Jack, that
I think that captured a good overview of
priorities and everything from our workshop. And

I think we've got that, the good list there on our notes that can help move us forward.

LORI MATHIEU: And Jack, I think I would add I didn't I think I heard you say drinking water quality and quantity. Obviously, it's critical and important to the Department of Public Health.

And also health equity. That was an item that at the very end of the conversations of the state water plan and was added to section six and into section seven, I believe, of the state water plan.

And that was when Commissioner Pino was our commissioner. He wanted to make sure that that concept was at least noticed as an item that needs to be discussed in more detail, and we look forward to working on that in the revisions to the state water plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Lori. And I think that what we can do is kind of make these as a checkoff point at most of our meetings to see, see where we're at.

And I could talk to -- Dave, maybe you want to talk to Virginia about some of these items that we talked about. Your next meeting is coming up on the 10th. I believe next Tuesday.

1 That is correct, Jack. And we sent out DAVID RADKA: 2 our agenda today. And we do have an agenda item 3 in discussion of what you've identified as your 4 priorities, either new or affirmation of older 5 priorities. And we will begin the process of 6 kicking around what we think we might propose to 7 you for topical sub workgroups to address some of 8 those. 9 Okay. Very good. Anything else on that THE CHAIRMAN: 10 before we move onto public comments? 11 LORI MATHIEU: There is one more thing that you know, 12 Jack, you and I work on all the time -- are 13 smaller water systems, small community water 14 systems. How could we forget? Right? 15 16

I'd like to never forget -- and add that to the list. There's quite the struggle. You know, financial capacity is constantly a struggle and is something that needs adjustment, that needs a lot of focus.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Lori.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Any public comments? Any public comments today?

I know it's a busy day for everyone for the pre-session adjournment. So I know many of us are busy watching the final hours of the legislature.

1	(No response.)			
2				
3	THE CHAIRMAN: If there's no other comments or			
4	business, our next meeting will be June 7th. And			
5	with that, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.			
6	MARTIN HEFT: So moved.			
7	THE CHAIRMAN: Second, Lori?			
8	GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.			
9	THE CHAIRMAN: Or second, Graham.			
10	All those in favor.			
11	THE COUNCIL: Aye.			
12	THE CHAIRMAN: We are adjourned. Thank you all very			
13	much. Be safe and we'll talk to you all soon.			
14	Thank you.			
15				
16	(End: 2:24 p.m.)			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

## CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 43 pages are a complete and accurate computer-aided transcription of my original verbatim notes taken of the Regular Meeting of the Water Planning Council, which was held before JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, CHAIRMAN, and PURA VICE-CHAIRMAN, via teleconference, on May 3, 2022.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M #857

Notary Public

BCT Reporting, LLC

55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A

Plainville, CT 06062

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX	
2	VOTES TAKEN	
3	(Unanimous Approval) DESCRIPTION	PAGE
4	4/5/'22 Transcript Approval	3
5	Adjournment	43
6		
7	TOPICS OF DISCUSSION DESCRIPTION	PAGE(s)
8	Public Comment:	
9	L. Mathieu: Drinking water week, podcast	3-5
10	A. Charamut: Rowing fundraising	5-6
11	D. Radka: Implementation workgroup, Webinars May 11th & June 8th, Designs	7-9
13	D. Lawrence: WPCAG update	10-11
14	K. Burnaska: Watershed lands group update, questionnaire	11-13
15	M. Miner: GAE response, open space legislation	13-16
16	K. Burnaska: Well testing	16
17	E. McPhee & L. Mathieu: WUCC update,	
18	filling roles, discussion	17-24
19	L. Mathieu: Private wells, House Bill 5500	25-27
20	G. Stevens: Sodium Chloride contamination	28
21	M. Heft: Working group well update	29
22	State and Federal funding update Funding discussion	30-31 32-38
23	Chair: Recap of last meeting	38-39
24	G. Stevens: USGS gauging	39-40
25		