

**CERTIFIED
COPY**

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY

STATE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL

Regular Meeting held Via Teleconference on
November 7, 2023, beginning at 1:31 p.m.

H e l d B e f o r e :

**JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, WPC CHAIRMAN,
and PURA VICE-CHAIRMAN**

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

2 **WATER PLANNING COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

4 **MARTIN HEFT (OPM)**

5 **LORI MATHIEU (DPH)**

6 **GRAHAM STEVENS (DEEP)**

7
8
9 **ALSO PRESENT (on record):**

10 **VIRGINIA de LIMA**

11 **ERIC LINDQUIST**

12 **MARGARET MINER**

13 **CAROL HASKINS**

14 **DENISE SAVAGEAU**

15 **DAVE KUZMINSKI**

16 **ALECIA CHARAMUT**

17 **RICH HANRATTY**

18 **DAN LAWRENCE**

19 **IRIS HERZ KAMINSKI**

20
21 **Staff:**

22 **ALYSON AYOTTE**

23 **LAURA LUPOLI**

24

25

1 (Begin: 1:31)

2
3 THE CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone. Happy Election
4 Day. I hope everybody has voted, or is going to
5 vote.

6 I call the Water Planning Council meeting for
7 November 7, 2023, to order. The first order of
8 business is approval of the October 3rd
9 transcript. Do I have a motion?

10 LORI MATHIEU: So moved.

11 THE CHAIR: Motion made. Seconded?

12 GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.

13 THE CHAIR: Any questions on the motion?

14
15 (No response.)

16
17 THE CHAIR: If not, all those in favor signify by
18 saying aye.

19 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

20 THE CHAIR: Motion to approve.

21 Lori is joining us remotely from --

22 LORI MATHIEU: I'm sorry.

23 THE CHAIR: All right. So let's go on public comment
24 on agenda items. Margaret, did you -- Margaret
25 Miner, did you have something you wanted to bring

1 up now, or later? Laura said you have some items
2 you want to discuss?

3 MARGARET MINER: Yes. I was thinking later, but I
4 could do it now. If you'll remember back in May,
5 I told you about a major project in Washington,
6 Connecticut where the question -- where the
7 chairman said local commissions do not have
8 regulatory authority over water. If you have a
9 question about water in an application go to DEEP,
10 or go to DPH.

11 So I was going to follow up on that and tell
12 you what happened, but I could do it at the end of
13 the meeting.

14 THE CHAIR: Okay. Why don't we wait until the end, if
15 you don't mind please?

16 MARGARET MINER: Sure. I could say one thing now. The
17 Institute of Water Resources at UConn presentation
18 on private wells was very good in Torrington, and
19 I hope something good will come of it.

20 So I just wanted to mention that.

21 THE CHAIR: Good. Thank you, Margaret.

22 MARGARET MINER: Okay.

23 THE CHAIR: Any other public comment on agenda items
24 today? Any other public comment?

25

1 (No response.)

2
3 THE CHAIR: If not, let's move on to action items.

4 We're happy today -- Carol, Carol Haskins, are you
5 on the call?

6 CAROL HASKINS: I am.

7 THE CHAIR: Okay. Carol has some relatively good news
8 for us today, I believe.

9 CAROL HASKINS: All kinds of good news.

10
11 (Interruption.)

12
13 CAROL HASKINS: What's going on? So we have --

14 THE CHAIR: Lori is going through security at the
15 airport. I don't know if she's having difficulty
16 or not -- but I think she's behaving herself.

17 LORI MATHIEU: I think I am. Sorry. Bye.

18 THE CHAIR: All right, Lori.

19 Okay. Go ahead.

20 CAROL HASKINS: So with the agenda we circulated the
21 memo with the nomination slate with details about
22 each group and the necessary action items for
23 member approvals. And then that's accompanied by
24 a sheet that shows each, each group, what the
25 terms are for each group, and then who the

1 representatives are with some notes on if the
2 person listed as a nominee this cycle, or if
3 they're a renewing member.

4 And we have -- every representative category
5 has a name, I think, for the first time in a
6 nomination cycle. So we're delighted for that.

7 THE CHAIR: That's great news.

8 CAROL HASKINS: Yeah. And thank you, Jack, for pushing
9 the Office of Consumer Council for putting forth a
10 representative as an alternate for them.

11 So I don't know if you want me to go through
12 and list who those --

13 THE CHAIR: Why don't you? I know a lot of work went
14 into it. Why don't you go through and list?

15 CAROL HASKINS: Okay. All right. So group one members
16 we renewed last year, January 1, 2023, and their
17 terms go through December 31, 2026.

18 We've had a vacancy in that slot with Eric
19 Hammerling leaving the Connecticut Forest and Park
20 Association and moving up to Connecticut DEEP. We
21 reached out to the Connecticut Outdoor
22 Association, CORA, and they have had interest from
23 their Vice President Jeff Shaw, who is willing to
24 serve as the representative for the recreation
25 category.

1 In group two, group two is the group that are
2 currently up for renewals with terms ending at the
3 end of December here this year. So terms begin
4 January 1, 2024, and span through December 31,
5 2027.

6 There are three representatives that are
7 ready to renew their terms, and those are in the
8 following categories. The regional water utility,
9 large scale; Steve Vitko from regional water
10 authority is willing to renew his term.

11 Representing lakes and ponds, we have Sean Hayden
12 from the Lake Waramaug Task Force. And
13 representing Conservation, Denise Savageau from
14 the Connecticut Association of Conservation
15 Districts. So those three members would be
16 renewing and our nominations putting forth.

17 We have a vacancy that was created when Karen
18 Burnaska retired from Save the Sound in June 2023.
19 And Kathy Czepiel, who is the new land protection
20 manager at Save the Sound, is the nominee we're
21 putting forth to fill that vacancy in the land
22 protection category.

23 Because there's an existing vacancy in that
24 seat, we would suggest that appointing Kathy to
25 serve out the remainder of Karen's term, so

1 basically November/December at this point, and
2 then be renewed as a new four-year term in January
3 as part of the group two cohort.

4 And then in the consumer category, Brenda
5 Watson from Operation Fuel said she was unable to
6 commit to representing another four-year term, and
7 that's where Jack was helpful in reaching out to
8 the Office of Consumer Counsel.

9 And we ended up with Alison McHorney, who is
10 a staff attorney at the office who's willing to
11 serve as a representative in the consumer
12 category. And that would follow the standard
13 four-year term. So Brenda is still our
14 representative through the end of this year.

15 And the other vacancy that we have is in
16 group three, and that is in the business and
17 industry association category. So group three
18 members are kind of in the middle of their terms
19 right now. They began January 1, 2021, and run
20 through December 31, 2024.

21 We've had a vacancy in that slot basically
22 all year here, and it's because there's been a
23 staffing vacancy with the Waterbury Chamber of
24 Commerce, which has been the representative. And
25 they have a new staff person who works on the side

1 of policy, governmental affairs, and that's Steve
2 DelVecchio. And they're willing to serve as a
3 representative for this category. So that would
4 be, again coming in to fill the existing term.

5 And there are no action items required for
6 any group four members. There's no vacancies at
7 this time.

8 So that is the -- those are the names that
9 we're putting forth, and you can see that in the
10 table that follows as far as who those
11 representatives are.

12 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Carol. I appreciate
13 you and the work that you put into this. It's not
14 easy, not an easy task at all.

15 I would entertain a motion that we accept the
16 slate as recommended.

17 LORI MATHIEU: I'll make the motion to accept the
18 slate.

19 GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.

20 THE CHAIR: Okay. We have a motion made and seconded.
21 Thank you very much.

22 Any questions on the slate as presented?

23 MARTIN HEFT: Mr. Chair, a couple of notes, and if I
24 may?

25 THE CHAIR: Sure.

1 MARTIN HEFT: So thank you, Carol, and for all the hard
2 work that you guys have all put together with all
3 of this.

4 As I mentioned at the last, you know, meeting
5 as we're looking at updated membership here and
6 our pending, you know, combination or new advisory
7 group implementation group and everything, and not
8 having a set date yet for when that's going to
9 take effect -- or if we're officially doing all of
10 that and everything, I would feel more comfortable
11 filling the vacancies at this point as the other
12 terms are not up yet until January until we've had
13 that time to decide, which might be later at
14 today's meeting, for appointing the full members
15 starting January 1st -- until we know are we
16 changing over? What is our date of change that
17 way?

18 So I would definitely -- and I have no
19 problem with anyone on the list, believe me, on
20 that. I think it's a great group of people.

21 But I think, you know, in looking at it, I
22 don't want to appoint people and then be like,
23 okay. We're pulling back, because now we're
24 changing the advisory group, you know, membership
25 levels, everything else.

1 So I would feel more comfortable myself
2 appointing the vacancies to fill out these terms,
3 holding off on these new ones that begin January
4 1st, '24, until we know where we're going with the
5 advisory group, in which case they may be the
6 nominees for that new group going forward.

7 So that would be my recommendation for this,
8 is for us to just appoint filling the vacancies,
9 holding off the renewal of the new terms that
10 don't start until January until either next month,
11 you know, on that.

12 **THE CHAIR:** I see your point, Martin. Any questions or
13 comments -- so do you want to amend the motion?

14 **MARTIN HEFT:** Yeah, I would amend the motion that we
15 just appoint the vacancy positions and not any
16 that are full term, you know, which would be the
17 group two category and the Consumer Counsel,
18 because we have somebody; they are already
19 appointed. Or if less, that's a vacancy to fill
20 in, because it doesn't say vacancy on here.

21 But so I'm not sure on that one, if that's a
22 vacancy, because I know we've been trying to get
23 someone on Consumer Counsel if they're replacing
24 someone as a vacancy. I don't have an issue with
25 that one, but I think, you know, it would be, you

1 know, modify the motion that we're just filling
2 the vacancies, not appointing any new four year
3 terms.

4 THE CHAIR: Any comments on this. Carol, do you
5 understand?

6 CAROL HASKINS: Yeah, I understand the thought process
7 here as far as, you know, looking at reconfiguring
8 and, you know, potentially reassigning the groups
9 and all of that sort of stuff.

10 So, yeah. I certainly understand, and
11 understand why you would want to hold off a little
12 bit and understand why you'd want to fill just the
13 vacancies.

14 So that would be the recreation seat is an
15 active vacancy. The business and industry is an
16 active vacancy. Land protection is an active
17 vacancy. The consumer category is a pending
18 vacancy. You know, Brenda is still technically
19 the member. She hasn't stepped away. She's not
20 able to attend.

21 THE CHAIR: But I just want to -- excuse me for
22 interrupting, but she's given notice she's leaving
23 Operation Fuel.

24 CAROL HASKINS: Oh, she is? Oh, I didn't realize.

25 THE CHAIR: So -- resigned from Operation Fuel.

1 to vote on the amendment to the main motion first,
2 and then the main motion has amended. So we have
3 to do two votes.

4 THE CHAIR: That's where I was just going.

5 MARTIN HEFT: Okay. I'm just clarifying for everyone
6 so they understand where we're at.

7 LORI MATHIEU: Also to clarify, we had a motion on the
8 floor. I think it was the seconded. Are we
9 taking away that original motion? Or are we
10 amending that original motion?

11 GRAHAM STEVENS: Amend.

12 LORI MATHIEU: It would be great to read that exact
13 motion into the record so it's clear.

14 THE CHAIR: We're amending the original motion.

15 MARTIN HEFT: Correct, and that will be the first vote,
16 is to accept the amendment to just vote on the
17 vacancies.

18 THE CHAIR: All those in favor.

19 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

20 THE CHAIR: Opposed?

21
22 (No response.)

23
24 THE CHAIR: The motion has carried. Now for the main
25 motion, with the motion as amended. I feel like

1 I'm back in the House of Representatives again.

2 Any questions on the amended motion, as
3 amended?

4
5 (No response.)

6
7 THE CHAIR: If not, all those in favor signify by
8 saying aye.

9 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

10 THE CHAIR: Opposed?

11
12 (No response.)

13
14 THE CHAIR: The motion adopted. Thank you all very
15 much and thank you again, Carol, for all your work
16 on this. Much appreciated.

17 CAROL HASKINS: You're welcome.

18 THE CHAIR: We're making great progress here.

19 All right. Let's move on to the status on
20 the annual report, which I have looked at and
21 others have as well. I have a great, great report
22 here going forward.

23 Virginia, would you like to take the lead on
24 that?

25 VIRGINIA de LIMA: I can start it off. We've had a

1 fabulous group of folks working diligently over
2 the last -- well, maybe three weeks or so to pull
3 together the annual report. You've all gotten a
4 copy of it.

5 We did get some input from Lori that we
6 needed to include some mention of the WPC retreat
7 that we had back in July. So that was added in
8 the version that you got just last night. And so
9 I don't know if you've all had an opportunity to
10 read it, but it was pretty much taken directly
11 from the report of that retreat.

12 And what we decided to do at that point and
13 at several other points is to include things
14 through links. And so, you know, there's words
15 like if you want a more detailed discussion of the
16 challenges that were addressed during the retreat,
17 go to the report, click here, kind of thing. So
18 that was in an effort to keep it as brief as
19 possible.

20 We also acknowledge that the executive
21 summary could be beefed up to be a one, or a
22 one-and-a-half page summary of perhaps the only
23 thing that somebody might read -- because the
24 report itself, going into the details, is longer
25 than that. And I know, Martin, you had requested

1 that we keep it to two pages, and I think we might
2 do that through the executive summary.

3 Right now it's a very, very high level
4 executive summary, but we were very conscious of
5 trying to keep it as short and sweet as possible.
6 But there is a lot of stuff that's happened, a lot
7 of good stuff that we didn't want to leave it out.
8 So we can certainly go in that direction. But I
9 do want to express appreciation for all the folks
10 that worked on it.

11 And a lot of the details were handled by Eric
12 Lindquist, and so to get into more of the
13 specifics, I'm going to turn it over to Eric.

14 ERIC LINDQUIST: I was just saying, Virginia, you did a
15 great job giving that overview. I really don't
16 have too much else to add other than to address
17 questions from the Councilmembers, if they have
18 any.

19 As far as a timeline goes to get this wrapped
20 up, we're looking for feedback from the
21 Councilmembers, hopefully this week into early
22 next week so that we can get a revised report
23 completed and sent in to the Council for the
24 middle of next week, leaving enough time for
25 individual agency reviews. So that's where we

1 stand on progress.

2 And I want to thank, express thanks again to
3 all the agency staff and volunteers that have
4 contributed their time, because it's been a good
5 solid couple weeks of regular meetings. So it's
6 been great, great getting it done and ahead of
7 schedule.

8 VIRGINIA de LIMA: I would like just to name those
9 people who have been actively involved in getting
10 this. Kim Czapla, Rebecca Dahl, Alecia Charamut,
11 Anne Hulik, Denise Savageau were the key people
12 who were working on the guts of it.

13 We had some other people participate a little
14 bit in expressing ideas, and I know each of them
15 reached out to agency staff and their respective
16 agencies. And so thanks to all of you.

17 THE CHAIR: Thank you.

18 VIRGINIA de LIMA: So yes, we would -- anything that
19 you can tell us today, we actually have a meeting
20 plan for tomorrow and we can start incorporating
21 things immediately, but our goal is getting it in
22 within the next week or two.

23 THE CHAIR: Is there anything additional? Now is that
24 your intent to look at the recommendations that
25 are coming in within the next couple of days and

1 then get that back to the Council, and then we'll
2 vote?

3 If we vote on this on December 5th, that's
4 soon enough to get it to the General Assembly.
5 Correct?

6 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Yeah. I have a couple of questions
7 that are, I guess, directly related to this. It
8 was not clear to me after our last meeting, or
9 some former meeting, what you -- as the Council,
10 what your ideas are in terms of asking for
11 funding.

12 If you may recall, a year ago we had very
13 specific requests for funding to hire a water
14 chief and funding to update the plan itself, which
15 did not move forward. I had understood and I may
16 be -- I may have misunderstood that you are not
17 planning to go for funding, you were not planning
18 to seek funding from the Legislature this year.

19 Is that correct, or is there still a plan to
20 make that request?

21 THE CHAIR: I know to turn it over to Martin, because
22 we do have a plan moving forward. Martin?

23 MARTIN HEFT: Sure. Thanks. And thanks, Virginia and
24 Eric and everyone else that worked on this. I
25 know it's been great. I've read through it and

1 read through the, you know, additions last night.

2 In answer to your question, it is correct.
3 The Council, you know, said that we were not
4 submitting a midterm budget adjustment for fiscal
5 '25. We are going to wait until the biennium
6 budget in order to, if you will, lay the
7 foundation for requesting funding so we really
8 have an idea of what we're looking at.

9 We know we have, you know, as my, kind of,
10 summary at last month's meeting, kind of
11 reviewing, you know, creating that foundation we
12 need, making sure we get information out for our
13 legislators so they know why are we asking for
14 money and giving a rationale for everything on
15 here and building that up, and building the
16 support up over this next year and really
17 analyzing what is it we're going to do.

18 Are we going to do a full update to the state
19 plan? Are we going to do it, you know, an
20 intermediate update to the plan? And these are
21 things that still have to be discussed. So we
22 said we were not ready yet to submit a full plan.

23 But we also know that I've already talked,
24 you know, on the OPM side for some additional
25 staffing to help out the Water Planning Council in

1 fiscal '25. I have in the current budget to be
2 able to hire an additional, you know, person for
3 my unit, which we're going to dedicate some of
4 that time to Water Planning Council activities.

5 So we are working towards things. You know
6 there are pieces there working on that, but we are
7 not submitting, you know, a midterm budget
8 adjustment for fiscal '25.

9 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Okay. So just to -- if I understand
10 correctly, what you're saying is that within each
11 individual agency there may be some efforts and
12 requests for funding to have agency staff working
13 to develop a more comprehensive approach that
14 would then become part of the next biennium
15 budget.

16 Is that understanding correct?

17 MARTIN HEFT: Well, I can only speak for OPM's side,
18 you know, on it. But then we have, you know, a
19 position allotted in fiscal '25. Nothing has been
20 finalized yet, but part of that is looking at
21 utilizing that person there.

22 Other agencies may, you know, they have staff
23 members there. It's just, you know, what time can
24 they commit? It may not be adding new staff
25 members there. So you know, it's a combination of

1 things. We know, you know, Jack with, you know,
2 his agency, you know, provides staffing already.
3 You know DPH provides staffing. DEEP provides
4 staffing on their own for everything. It's just
5 depending, you know, where is that at and creating
6 our plan so that, you know, we are still
7 continuing using that internal staffing of all of
8 our agencies.

9 Just that in fiscal '25, the plan is that
10 we're going to be adding some additional staff
11 here at OPM that's going to have some dedicated
12 resource, you know, is the plan that way.

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Got it. Okay.

14 MARTIN HEFT: Yeah. And just on that note, I would,
15 you know, under -- and I did send this back to at
16 least to Eric on here under the priority
17 recommendation of the plan, because I think
18 overall the report is terrific.

19 The annual report, a couple things I would
20 mention under the priority recommendations where
21 it says, funding implementation of the state water
22 plan, really should state -- because under
23 statute, it's funding implementation and periodic
24 updates of the state water plan.

25 That is what the statute calls for, so let's

1 reference what the statute is. The statutes also
2 reference that's where the funding comes from. So
3 let's reference that statute of 22a-352. I also
4 think we should reference this Connecticut statute
5 in our executive summary, you know, the Water
6 Planning Council pursuant to Connecticut state
7 statute.

8 You know, so the legislature knows when
9 they're reading this, this is a statutory thing.
10 It's a legislative, you know, act here that we are
11 working with/under, and it provides the background
12 of where that comes from.

13 So that's my one big suggestion to make sure
14 that we add in there that that statute references
15 in the executive summary, and then changing that
16 funding piece there so it says, you know,
17 implementation and periodic updates, because that
18 is actually what the statutes stand for.

19 We are actually looking. You know it's a
20 combination of both that we need to really fund
21 and move forward, but otherwise I think, you know,
22 great job, and I appreciate the additional piece
23 that came in last night on the summary of the
24 workshop that we had.

25 **THE CHAIR:** Eric, I see your hand up.

1 ERIC LINDQUIST: Thank you. Thank you, Martin, for
2 those comments. Regarding the comments about the
3 priority recommendations, that's -- that the
4 framing of those is something that we had a lot of
5 discussion on in our group, and how we wanted to
6 broach that.

7 And the way it is right now, it's sort of
8 broken into two distinct pieces, whereas priority
9 number one talks about funding implementation in
10 the sense of staff time, dedicated staff resources
11 and other funding resources to pursue research
12 opportunities, for example, that we don't
13 currently have. And then the second priority
14 being more about the regular updating of the plan.

15 Now there's -- and it could go either way.
16 We could split it in two, the way it currently is,
17 or conjoin those to talk about the funding in
18 general, both for staff and plan updates. And we
19 wanted some input from the Council on how you'd
20 like that framed so we can adjust if necessary.

21 MARTIN HEFT: Yeah, thanks. And I guess I look at it
22 as it should be a combined piece, because we
23 really didn't set one as a priority over the
24 other. At this point as a council, we haven't
25 gone that route yet of saying, okay. This is a

1 higher priority than the update, or this is the
2 update's higher priority than implementation.

3 So I think combining it -- and I appreciate
4 that, you know, that it is split out that way, but
5 I think putting it in as it is in statute, that
6 it's for these two purposes, then you could break
7 it out after that, you know, saying here it is.

8 Maybe don't list it as priority one and
9 priority two, but this is, you know, just kind of
10 our priority recommendation period is funding, you
11 know, for this purpose is that way and that way,
12 and two not separate ones. That would be my -- my
13 thought on it.

14 LORI MATHIEU: Martin, this is Lori. I agree. I agree
15 with what you just said. When I read, the first
16 time reading the report -- by the way, everybody,
17 excellent work. This reads well. It's well done.
18 It outlines the high priority items that we have.

19 But I -- and I also agree with your mention
20 about the statute. I think there are two statutes
21 that we operate within. You know there's a
22 statute that set us up under 25-330, which created
23 the Water Planning Council. Then there's a
24 statute that created the need and the ability and
25 the details of the State Water Plan, and that's

1 22a-352. And I think we should mention both to be
2 very clear we have statutory responsibilities.

3 And so I'm fine, Martin. I like your
4 comment. I would agree to that end. Thank you.

5 THE CHAIR: But I think we have to continue to
6 reinforce the fact that the ultimate goal is that
7 we want a full-time person dedicated to the Water
8 Planning Council. We're still doing a Band-Aid
9 approach here to it.

10 I mean, Martin, you've done a lot of work
11 over at OPM. You have -- I think last time you
12 said you might have an FT -- a half an FTA to
13 devote to the Council. But if I'm hearing you
14 correctly, what your recommendation -- is that we
15 wait until fiscal year '25-'26 before we really go
16 the full boat to get money to update the plan, get
17 additional money to update the plan and hopefully
18 get a FT, a full-time person to be the director of
19 the Council.

20 Am I understanding that one correctly?

21 MARTIN HEFT: Well, most of it correctly, yes, that we
22 wait until fiscal, you know, '26, you know, '27,
23 you know, for that biennial year to do that. And
24 I don't know if there's full support for a
25 full-time person at this point. We have a lot of

1 things to look at yet. I mean, that's one
2 possibility.

3 It isn't the plan for hiring a person, but
4 we've also talked about partnerships and working
5 in that direction, such as with UConn or Eastern,
6 everything, and starting to work with a
7 consultant, everything else. So I don't want to
8 jump the gun and say we need to hire a full-time
9 person at this point when we know we've got areas
10 to explore and everything else.

11 And I think outlining that is perfectly fine,
12 and that's where I mentioned about that we really
13 need to build our foundation and decide what is it
14 we really truly need, you know, for this in order
15 to move us forward. And that's where we've really
16 got to take the next year, six months, really
17 eight months before we're developing the next
18 budget, you know, to get that, you know, in line.

19 So in essence, yes, Jack, you know, but I
20 think there's some caveats in there, too, where
21 it's not a hundred percent that we're hiring. I
22 don't want to hire someone, because I think there
23 may be a combination or it might be a phase-in
24 type approach.

25 **THE CHAIR:** Right. Okay.

1 GRAHAM STEVENS: Yeah, I would agree, Martin. And I
2 also think that, you know, we should we should
3 stress in the report that we're looking at other,
4 you know, we're looking at options to try to, you
5 know, provide additional resources to the
6 Council's operations, because that may be through
7 contracted resources. That might be through
8 other, you know, non-appropriated funding.

9 So I think there's lots of different options
10 that are out there and building our case for that
11 full-time person is one of our priorities to show
12 that with additional resources we can accomplish
13 more that moves the State's agenda forward.

14 THE CHAIR: Virginia?

15 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Just following up on that, in our
16 last implementation workgroup meeting we had a
17 general discussion of perhaps putting together a
18 workgroup to look at exactly what you're talking
19 about, Martin.

20 What are some of the -- what's the range of
21 possible approaches we could have to updating the
22 plan in everything from a complete redo on one
23 extreme, to just going through and seeing what
24 things were identified as priorities? But we
25 haven't even gotten to it yet that could be

1 explored further.

2 What comes to mind immediately for me, being
3 the technical person in this crowd, was all the
4 work that CDM Smith did on watershed modeling, the
5 accounting modeling that was done to see if the
6 water resources were being over allocated. If you
7 may recall, the Quinnipiac was used as an example
8 to try and do something along those lines.

9 But to look at the range of possible
10 approaches and then have just a very high level
11 assessment of what that would take in financial
12 and personal resources to do each of those kinds
13 of things so that we could then decide how we want
14 to present to the Legislature what we mean by an
15 update.

16 So I was going to bring that up in the IWG
17 update to see if that was a workgroup that you
18 would want us to talk about and perhaps put
19 together a proposal. So that was one of the
20 things that we have discussed, yeah.

21 **THE CHAIR:** I think that's great.

22 **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** And then I have one thing after
23 that.

24 **THE CHAIR:** Okay. But remember, IWG may -- so you can
25 have a workgroup, but it would probably fall in

1 the Water Planning Council advisory group.

2 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Exactly. This was just from the IWG
3 discussion. And you know, as we integrate the
4 two, I don't see the IWG as disappearing.

5 THE CHAIR: No.

6 VIRGINIA de LIMA: It's disappearing as an entity.

7 THE CHAIR: Right.

8 VIRGINIA de LIMA: But it's brain power will still
9 exist either formally or informally in that group.

10 THE CHAIR: Agreed. Agreed.

11 VIRGINIA de LIMA: The other different comment,
12 completely different comment that we talked about
13 at length was whether or how we should include
14 progress on the state water plan being made by the
15 individual agencies. And clearly, that would
16 start with the agencies. That's not something
17 that our group was capable of putting together,
18 even though we had some good representation from
19 agencies.

20 I would say, clearly it's not going to happen
21 in this year, because we are trying to move this
22 report through very quickly. But in terms of
23 another year, should this report to the
24 Legislature include initiatives that have been
25 done by the agencies? I think, for example, of

1 the work that's being done on the diversion,
2 registered diversions. That's a very significant
3 thing that's been accomplished within an agency.
4 And the question then becomes, should this be
5 itemized in the report?

6 And it would only be the very significant
7 stuff, because of many of you have heard me say
8 sort of facetiously, you know, if I worked for
9 DEEP, I'd say, well, everything in our water
10 division, you know. Or if I worked for DPH I'd
11 say, everything within our --

12 MARTIN HEFT: Water section.

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: -- our water group. So it's,
14 obviously, we can't talk about all the day-to-day
15 stuff, but really big, significant stuff, whether
16 that should be included in the annual reports of
17 the Legislature.

18 And on the other side, there's a whole lot of
19 work that goes to implementing this water plan
20 that's happening in the nonprofit sector. And
21 should we be reaching out to them? That would be
22 a Herculean task, but should we in some way
23 acknowledge the work that's going on in the
24 nonprofit sector or even in some of the commercial
25 sectors?

1 So these are philosophical decisions that for
2 a year from now we would like some input to.

3 GRAHAM STEVENS: Jack, I have some thoughts on that, if
4 I can respond?

5 THE CHAIR: Sure.

6 GRAHAM STEVENS: I think it's a great idea, Virginia.
7 I mean, I think many of us would say that we spend
8 a majority of our time working on water-related
9 issues, many of which can fit under the state
10 water plan in some way, form, or fashion.

11 So I mean, I think we just need to, on a
12 going-forward basis, institutionalize documenting
13 those, that progress and that success for, you
14 know. And I don't think it needs to really be
15 that, you know, one agency did it, or the Water
16 Planning Council did it. I think that we're all
17 members of the Water Planning Council, and we're
18 working towards a collective goal.

19 So you know, having additional
20 accomplishments within the annual report that
21 maybe don't fall directly under the auspices of
22 the Water Planning Council, you know, further
23 bolsters, you know, our, you know, belief that
24 we're making progress.

25 Now in the nonprofit world, that might be a

1 little bit harder, but the, you know, the
2 corporate world, whether it be water companies or,
3 you know, work within the WUCCs, you know, there's
4 certainly -- we certainly could. We could seek,
5 you know, inputs from folks and see what we get.

6 THE CHAIR: All good points. Any further comment? Any
7 further comment on the plan?

8
9 (No response.)

10
11 THE CHAIR: So we want to get our comments back to the
12 workgroup, Virginia, by the end of the week?

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: That would be good.

14 THE CHAIR: Okay. By the end of the week. And please
15 do that, and then we'll do formal approval in
16 December.

17 Any other questions on this, please?

18
19 (No response.)

20
21 THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you all very much. We'll move
22 on to Alicia and Dan Lawrence.

23 ALECIA CHARAMUT: Okay. So we spent the majority of
24 our time at the last meeting discussing what an
25 integration of the Water Planning Council advisory

1 group and implementation workgroup would look
2 like. And you know we discussed options for terms
3 and others, and one of the things that we did --
4 we are hoping to get from the discussion today is
5 a clearer idea of what the vision is from the
6 Water Planning Council as far as makeup goes.

7 Our discussions, I think there, there could
8 be some tweaks here and there as far as adding
9 categories, but you know the main goal is to keep
10 the balance and we are in balance right now with
11 in stream and out of stream. We did have a brief
12 discussion about potentially having a tri-chair
13 potential, not necessarily, you know, putting it
14 in there as a, this could happen as long as the
15 tri, the third leg of the chair would -- is a
16 neutral party.

17 So, I look forward to hearing the discussion
18 later on in the meeting. Again, that was the
19 majority of our meeting. And also, we -- I had
20 given a report on hydrilla. As many of you know,
21 but some people are still finding out that the
22 Connecticut River strain of hydrilla has moved out
23 into some lakes and ponds across the state, both
24 east and west.

25 So that's the only other thing I think that

1 isn't going to come up later on in the agenda,
2 unless someone else wants to remind me of
3 something else we discussed at the last meeting.

4 But that's all I see from our notes.

5 **THE CHAIR:** Thank you, Alecia. Anything? Any
6 questions for Alecia or Dan?

7
8 (No response.)

9
10 **THE CHAIR:** Okay. We'll move back to Virginia, the
11 workgroup.

12 **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** Okay. Thank you. I'm trying to
13 find my cheat sheet here. We basically have had
14 two active workgroups going. One was the annual
15 report group, which you've clearly been talking
16 about. The other one was the USGS data
17 collection, and that workgroup is in its final
18 report of the reviewing stage, and I expect that
19 they'll be sending it along to those of us who are
20 on -- what's currently known as the implementation
21 workgroup for review shortly. I believe that the
22 intent is to have that completed before the end of
23 the year. So that is making very good progress.

24 And once we've had a chance to review it and
25 the advisory group also has a chance to take a

1 look at it, this is one of the things that will
2 become much simpler in the future. We'll be
3 sending it along to you, you folks for final
4 approval.

5 And just in terms of the merger, the folks
6 that are not -- do not slide easily into the
7 existing slots of the advisory group, we do
8 have -- currently, we have a representative from
9 Clean Water Action. And so we would need to
10 really look at the categories. And so Alecia,
11 Dan, and Carol, you might have input to this,
12 whether there's one of those potentially vacant
13 slots that somebody from Clean Water Action would
14 fit into.

15 Also, we have somebody from one of the
16 councils of governments who does not -- when I say
17 slide easily into it, either -- you know, and we
18 have two people on the IWG who already are on the
19 advisory group. And so those are no-brainers.
20 And the four agency representatives would be
21 hopefully intimately involved. They're not
22 necessarily official members.

23 We have somebody else who is sort of a
24 subject matter expert who could slip in in any
25 number of places. And myself, those are the four

1 that sort of are -- would need to find a slot to
2 officially stay involved. Though, as we've all
3 said, participants who are not official are always
4 welcome to enter into the discussions. So that's
5 where we're at in terms of the integration of the
6 two groups.

7 The other thing that I -- what I'm trying to
8 find here is -- the other workgroups that we were
9 considering. I mentioned one to look at the
10 possible updates to the plan. So another thing
11 that we talked about was looking at the
12 recommendations that have come out of workgroups
13 in the past and sort of tabulating what has been
14 included, what has made progress, what changes are
15 still necessary, what has happened, and sort of
16 give ourselves a report card in terms of, we've
17 made these suggestions -- and when I say
18 ourselves, I mean hugely broader, our state's
19 progress, what recommendations have been
20 implemented. And the ones that haven't been
21 implemented, are there challenges and barriers
22 that we can address?

23 So basically going through and looking at how
24 our recommendations have been received and
25 implemented, and if they haven't, what we can do

1 about it.

2 This also means that we have to be thinking
3 more specifically in terms of measurable
4 recommendations, and though that measurement,
5 those metrics could very well be qualitative
6 because we're not making widgets here, but to have
7 some way of evaluating, not only the
8 recommendations that have been made, but the
9 progress that's been made on implementing the
10 ideas of the state water plan, either through
11 those recommendations or in general.

12 And so a lot of, I think a lot of thought
13 could go into we can likely say we need metrics,
14 but what exactly do we mean? And what actually
15 could work without being more onerous than they
16 were valuable?

17 We also did have a formal workgroup that was
18 sort of the phase two of the tracking and
19 reporting ones. That has not actively moved
20 forward, but could be revitalized to develop,
21 again working with metrics to develop a tracking
22 system, hopefully an electronic tracking system
23 that would allow us to stay on top of the progress
24 that we are actually making.

25 So those were some of the thoughts of

1 possible future workgroups, and I'd appreciate any
2 input into whether you would want us to put
3 together a formal proposal for any or all of
4 those.

5 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Virginia.

6 Any input or questions, or comments from
7 Councilmembers?

8 MARTIN HEFT: No. Thank you, Virginia, and thank you,
9 Alecia, too, because I kind of jumped right in --
10 and so for both your reports, I'll thank both of
11 you for that.

12 Looking at, you know, other workgroups,
13 everything, I think some part of it, you know, my
14 preference right now is holding until we make our
15 decision if we're combining, you know, moving
16 forward that way. But I think looking at it, I
17 think there was some discussion in the last
18 meeting of looking at, you know, the update to the
19 plan, of kind of actually doing, as you said,
20 looking through what are some immediate things
21 that have to happen?

22 What are some things that might be further
23 out, which would be very similar to the way we did
24 the drought plan update of going through, looking
25 and saying, what are the immediate things? What

1 are the things that can be simply done that update
2 the plan, or what are things that need a little
3 more review, everything else that way? So kind of
4 having that kind of spreadsheet chart would be
5 very helpful, you know, in that sense.

6 You know, personally, I think if you were
7 going to look at all the, you know, past
8 workgroups that have been done, everything else,
9 the advisory group can just do that. You split it
10 out. Each member takes a thing. You know, I
11 don't think that needs a sub workgroup, but you
12 know I'm not part of the work group. So I'm not
13 sure, you know.

14 But that would be my thought process on it,
15 that that would just be something that the
16 workgroup itself does. And maybe at each of the
17 meetings, you pull a couple of reports out and
18 just review them as part of your meeting, rather
19 than a separate workgroup. But that's just, you
20 know, my, my thoughts on it -- because you asked.

21 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Yeah. Well, thank you.

22 THE CHAIR: Graham or Lori?

23 GRAHAM STEVENS: Yeah. Thanks, Jack. That's a lot to
24 unpack, Virginia. I'm just going to have to say,
25 I'm going to have to think about that. I don't

1 have a reasonable answer based on the size of the
2 question at this point -- but thank you very much.
3 It gives me a lot to think about.

4 **THE CHAIR:** Lori?

5 **LORI MATHIEU:** I agree with Graham. It's a lot to
6 think about. So thank you for that. So I guess
7 more (unintelligible).

8 **THE CHAIR:** And I think I'm in this same mode. I think
9 we're in a state of transition, if you will, with
10 the potential combination of the State's workgroup
11 and the Water Planning Council advisory groups and
12 what we're trying to look forward to legislatively
13 here, putting the report together for the
14 legislature.

15 So I think that you can hold off a little bit
16 on this and then provide the report back, if
17 that's acceptable to everyone.

18 **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** So a quick question. And Graham,
19 you've alluded several times to whether or not
20 we're going to do this integration. I had thought
21 that decision was made, and apparently it hasn't
22 been. But is that something that we can do today,
23 or you can do today, decide whether we are going
24 to merge, combine, integrate whatever term you
25 want to use?

1 GRAHAM STEVENS: My understanding -- and Martin can
2 correct me if I'm wrong. Isn't it on the agenda
3 for today's?

4 THE CHAIR: Yeah.

5 MARTIN HEFT: It is.

6 GRAHAM STEVENS: So I think all -- I think everyone was
7 supportive, but I just think that we needed to --

8 THE CHAIR: I think we're good. We're going to do a
9 formal approval under new business.

10 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Great. Thank you.

11 THE CHAIR: All right. Anything else?

12
13 (No response.)
14

15 THE CHAIR: Martin Heft, I think we have a lot of rain.
16 Martin Heft, I don't know about your drought.

17 MARTIN HEFT: We have. The numbers are great for
18 drought on -- or non drought, I should really say.

19 But we did meet last week, reviewed all
20 conditions. We did meet the previous month. No
21 changes were made in any of the stages. We're
22 actually in good shape and got updates, but a
23 couple of things I wanted to just note that in
24 December that the Massachusetts/Connecticut -- two
25 drought teams are going to do a meet and learn

1 session.

2 I know some of our members, staff members
3 here are heading up to Massachusetts mid December
4 to meet with them and kind of do a little
5 tabletop. We are planning a 2024 drought
6 roundtable tabletop, or drought plan tabletop
7 exercise on here, and then we are continuing as
8 was, you know, approved at our Water Planning
9 Council last month.

10 We are continuing to work on the development
11 of the drought plan and post-drought
12 recommendations that we came up with with the
13 post-'22 drought plan that we all, you know,
14 adopted at last month. So we are continuing being
15 active even though we are not in a drought stage.

16 We are still, you know, monitoring everything
17 and moving forward with other aspects in the
18 drought arena. So thank you.

19 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any questions for Martin?

20
21 (No response.)
22

23 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

24 LORI MATHIEU: Actually, yes. I think one thing just
25 to note is that tabletop that Martin mentioned --

1 and I don't know if it's something we should put
2 on our agenda for next month just to think about
3 with this team and all of the people that are here
4 to think about your input for that tabletop. I
5 think that might be helpful.

6 So thank you.

7 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Lori.

8 If there's no further questions, Denise
9 Savageau, outreach and education?

10 DAVE KUZMINSKI: Jack?

11 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Hi, everyone.

12 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry.

13 DAVE KUZMINSKI: Jack, if I can?

14 THE CHAIR: Sure.

15 DAVE KUZMINSKI: Martin, is that exercise -- is WebEOC
16 going to be utilized in that?

17 MARTIN HEFT: On which?

18 DAVE KUZMINSKI: On your drought exercise?

19 MARTIN HEFT: That nothing's been -- it hasn't been
20 planned yet. So once we get to that level we'll,
21 you know, inform everyone and work with that. But
22 I know our drought -- state drought coordinator is
23 on the call here and I'm sure she's making a note
24 of that.

25 DAVE KUZMINSKI: Okay. Great. Thank you.

1 THE CHAIR: Any further questions for Martin?

2
3 (No response.)
4

5 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Denise?

6 DENISE SAVAGEAU: So the outreach and education
7 committee met this morning and we're moving
8 forward with, you know, the work plan that we had
9 in place. One was to get some resources out there
10 on drought. So we're continuing to work on a fact
11 sheet for private wells in drought.

12 And Mike Dietz has provided us with a draft
13 and now we're looking to put that into a format.
14 He gave us kind of basic information, which is
15 really great, but now we want to make it a pretty
16 fact sheet. So get it, that, and then and make
17 sure we're incorporating the information we have
18 on the last droughts into that as well. So that's
19 where we are with that.

20 Last time last month I presented you with our
21 work plan theme for next year which was, again
22 source water protection and focusing on two
23 things, the 50th anniversary of the Federal Safe
24 Drinking Water Act, and the 20th anniversary of
25 the Connecticut Aquifer Protection Act. And so we

1 went over that work schedule.

2 We're looking at, you know, groundwater
3 awareness week, safe drinking water week, as well
4 as source water protection week to do some work.
5 And we're going to be, you know, starting to now
6 fill in those. So we've kind of assigned that and
7 we're looking at, for example, the groundwater
8 folks and the folks working on aquifer protection
9 at DEEP are looking at, you know, that first week
10 in March that happens to be groundwater awareness
11 week.

12 And then we also reached out to the
13 Connecticut section of AWWA in terms of drinking
14 water week, and they're going to be collaborating
15 with us on that. So we're just starting to put,
16 again, all the information together for that theme
17 for next year. And so stay tuned.

18 Just a couple of other things we talked
19 about, and I wanted to make sure that you are
20 aware of. We had originally said we were looking
21 at making sure we had a press release on December
22 16th, which is actually the official date of the
23 Safe Drinking Water Act, but we were thinking
24 about that we really should do a press release at
25 the beginning of the year and at the end of the

1 year.

2 So we'll be drafting a press release. I'll
3 bring it to the Council, and making sure we get it
4 out so that people can get it out through the
5 different, you know, media outlets that all the
6 agencies have. And we're looking at our first
7 program being in March, so we'd probably like that
8 press releases to go out in February.

9 So we'll be getting a draft to you so that
10 you'll have that and that, you know, you know a
11 month before so that we can have that released and
12 you can go through your channels. So we'll try to
13 get that, some stuff ready for you probably for
14 your December meet and January meetings.

15 And then the last piece that we came up with
16 today -- that this is a new addition to the work
17 we had said we would do -- is we thought it's just
18 such an important year with these two
19 anniversaries that we would do some video clips
20 particularly on source water protection and
21 bringing in some of our partners.

22 For example, EPA, some students; the Solar
23 and Water Conservation Society is doing work, as
24 well as obviously all of our partners that serve
25 on the Water Planning Council, you know, and

1 obviously all the agencies.

2 But really doing some video clips on source
3 water protection that we can put on the websites
4 and the various media outlets. So we're looking
5 at doing that and getting that, and starting
6 possibly with some of our partners at EPA.

7 The name came up, and it's Kyra Jacobs.
8 She's a great resource for us at EPA and, you
9 know, starting out with something like that, but
10 also thinking, like, okay. Within the agencies,
11 whatever, how do we get these video clips in?

12 So that's something we are just going to
13 start exploring and seeing how we can get that
14 done. And I guess that's kind of the wrap-up for
15 where we are right now.

16 If anybody has any questions I'd be happy to
17 answer them.

18 **THE CHAIR:** Thank you very much, Denise. And we know
19 that you are committed to continue the great work.

20 Any questions for Denise?

21 **MARTIN HEFT:** No -- yes. Thanks, Jack. Denise, great
22 work on that again as Jack said looking at that.

23 Just -- also just a reminder. I know you
24 were going to look at dates and the upcoming with
25 legislative session and everything else, you know,

1 for potential, you know, of conflicts and
2 everything else. So to just keep that on the
3 radar as we're getting closer to start a
4 legislative session, whether we can do something
5 there, or -- because I believe that one of them
6 was going to be during, like, the last week of
7 session, you know. So that may be the conflict,
8 just as a reminder of looking at dates of holding
9 the events.

10 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Definitely looking at that and I
11 think we were also looking at, is there anything
12 we could do to, you know, do some more work with
13 the Legislature. So we're looking at that as part
14 of it, and looking to include them as part of
15 this. So it may be even, for example, one of our
16 video clips could be somebody from, you know, one
17 of our partners from the Legislature. So thanks.

18 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any further comment?

19
20 (No response.)

21
22 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Denise.

23 Alecia, you're up again.

24 ALECIA CHARAMUT: So conservation pricing and rate
25 recovery analysis; we have developed a draft

1 survey for the municipal regional and some of the
2 larger community systems. We met this past
3 Thursday to discuss the survey, and it's turned
4 out that it will be beneficial for myself and some
5 others to meet with CWWA to sort of explain the
6 goals and what we're trying to get out of this
7 survey, and make sure that we're asking all of the
8 right questions.

9 Betsey was kind enough to put it on there,
10 their last agenda, but she will be setting up a
11 meeting with some key folks and us. And
12 hopefully, we'll get to meet before our next
13 meeting at the beginning of December. So we can
14 hopefully finalize the survey and get it out.

15 But this is important in understanding what
16 the rate-setting experience is like for the
17 utilities that do not fall under PURA's
18 jurisdiction in being, sort of, where they're at
19 and being able to generate revenue to cover their
20 expenses while still being able to encourage
21 conservation.

22 Because remember, the whole reason we're
23 doing this is now that we have, you know, sort of
24 an improved drought response, we're looking at how
25 do we improve year-round conservation? And

1 understanding that it may be revenues are --
2 generating revenue is a barrier to really getting
3 to that point where it can be encouraged across
4 the board, and we're trying to make this more
5 consistent.

6 So hopefully, we'll have a survey out the
7 beginning of next year -- and I can't believe that
8 is a lot sooner than it sounded just a month ago,
9 so.

10 THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

11 Any questions for Alecia?

12
13 (No response.)
14

15 THE CHAIR: Okay, let's move to watershed lands group
16 workgroup, Margaret?

17 MARGARET MINER: Hello.

18 THE CHAIR: Hello.

19 MARGARET MINER: So I've been talking with our new --
20 newish co-chair Rich Hanratty, and we are planning
21 to send out an email to the group questioning,
22 asking them their opinion on a good agenda for our
23 December meeting.

24 Now the group already decided that it would
25 be a good idea to look at aquifer protection

1 regulations, and I guess the case study for
2 something like that would be if you're a town and
3 you were given 40 acres of aquifer protection
4 space and you can do economic development, what
5 exactly can you do or not do under the aquifer
6 protection regulations?

7 And Rich has been looking into them and he
8 may have a different perspective -- so Rich, just
9 speak up in a minute.

10 We also thought, well, we're looking at
11 regulatory issues under lands. What about a
12 science issue? And I think it even came up today
13 how much when we look -- if you go to a
14 conservation district and look at their map of
15 groundwater and groundwater quality, it looks like
16 we have a lot of really good groundwater. What
17 could the problem be?

18 So we thought one agenda item we might
19 suggest to the group would be to inquire our new
20 review as to whether there are good volume and
21 quality assessments that go along with so many of
22 the high quality designations.

23 And I think Virginia mentioned CD smith.
24 There their analysis of available water did not go
25 down to a suitable scale of making decisions. The

1 absolutely brilliant one from some years ago was
2 done by Pomperaug River Watershed Association with
3 Dr. Mark Taylor where they really examined the
4 available groundwater for use within a given tract
5 of land.

6 So we would be looking for something in
7 between, do we have the data? Is our
8 assumption -- and what the maps tell us, that
9 there's all this good water down there. What's
10 the last -- this is me. I'm not speaking for Rich
11 right now. I don't know. Is that true? What do
12 we have down there? Or perhaps some other science
13 topic so that we have a balance between thinking
14 about regulations for land protection, watershed
15 land protection and some of the science needed.

16 That's what we'll be doing. Rich, did you
17 want to say -- did I miss rep? How far are you
18 along?

19 RICH HANRATTY: Okay. Thank you, Margaret. Just to
20 your point, that I'm not sure if everyone has seen
21 it, but there was a very recent New York Times
22 article about the tangle of rules to protect
23 America's water is falling short. And they did a
24 pretty comprehensive survey countrywide. They
25 contacted all 50 states, and it's definitely worth

1 a read if. I can find the link I'll post it.

2 But just real quickly on the aquifer
3 protection area of regulations, I've been looking
4 at those closely and we'll discuss it at the
5 watershed lands workgroup meeting on December 8th.
6 But it looks like we should really drill down on
7 the prohibited and regulated activities and see
8 how that's working, or not, in real life and look
9 at the distinction between new development and
10 existing facilities.

11 But with regulations, a lot of them -- a lot
12 of the sections are already implemented in those
13 regs, but you know there could be some fine
14 tuning. And if there needs to be, it looks like
15 there might have to be some actual statutory
16 changes made if the Legislature decides to go in
17 that direction. That's it for me.

18 GRAHAM STEVENS: I Have a question.

19 RICH HANRATTY: Yeah?

20 MARGARET MINER: Go ahead.

21 GRAHAM STEVENS: What do we think is the issue with the
22 aquifer protection statute, or the rules that are
23 implemented by the municipalities?

24 RICH HANRATTY: Yeah, that's a great question, but I
25 think it's early on. We've just been asked; our

1 charge is to just examine what's on the books to
2 see if it's adequate to, you know, to meet the
3 goal of reducing and preventing groundwater
4 contamination.

5 So to be honest with you, looking at these
6 regs I think I'm not sure if there's enough there
7 on the books or not. I think that the working
8 group would delve into that and come up with any
9 suggestions or opinions. But I think it
10 ultimately comes down to, how are these
11 regulations working on the ground in the
12 municipalities? Or how are they falling short?

13 MARGARET MINER: So I have a different answer. If you
14 want to know what's lacking from the regulations,
15 I was there while Betsey Wingfield was negotiating
16 them. And one thing that's lacking is everything
17 that was removed in the last few months of
18 negotiation in order to get the regulation passed.

19 And it was a considerable concern. It was a
20 concern of our conservation district here. So
21 from the point of view of seeing what DEEP started
22 out with and what they got, my first thing would
23 be to look at, okay. What did we have to cut out
24 in order to get it passed? And do we still have
25 to not use those standards or those rules?

1 So that would be my historic look at the
2 problem. I know it's not a new problem. It's an
3 old-ish problem.

4 **GRAHAM STEVENS:** Okay. Now that's what I was trying to
5 get at, Margaret. So here you're looking at the
6 genesis of the program as opposed to whether or
7 not it's operating as it's intended to operate?

8 **MARGARET MINER:** Well, it's hard to say because on a
9 small project, I mean, in some cases that might.
10 But the question is when you have a very large
11 development in a lot of aquifer protection land, I
12 mean, that's the obvious question.

13 And also the existing, the expansion of
14 existing facilities was very controversial. So
15 there are plenty of things to look at, and it's
16 the genesis -- yeah, it's what was left out. I
17 know what DEEP wanted to have in there and I know
18 what they ended up with, and I'd like them to get
19 what they originally wanted.

20 Not that it's likely to happen, but that
21 would be my goal dating back to the negotiations
22 and the passage of the regulations.

23 **THE CHAIR:** Any other comments?

24 **GRAHAM STEVENS:** No.

25 **THE CHAIR:** Thank you, Margaret and Rich.

1 Onto other business, the Connecticut hazard
2 mitigation strategy. Graham, are you doing -- I
3 kind of lost a little track of this. Were you
4 submitting something for us.

5 GRAHAM STEVENS: Not that I recall, no.

6 THE CHAIR: Lori, were you submitting something for us?

7 GRAHAM STEVENS: I Think Eric is going to try to bail
8 us out here.

9 THE CHAIR: Oh, there's Eric.

10 ERIC LINDQUIST: Jack, if I may? I can chime in on
11 this.

12 THE CHAIR: Please.

13 ERIC LINDQUIST: So where we left off was there were
14 some concerns raised during the development of the
15 NHMP, the Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan, that the
16 Water Planning Council and some of the
17 representative agencies including, I think, all
18 three -- or three out of the four, DEP and OPM and
19 DPH had been assigned some activities as part of
20 the plan for mitigation activities over the
21 five-year cycle that none of the agencies nor the
22 Water Planning Council were aware of or had
23 endorsed.

24 And after numerous discussions among the
25 various agencies with DEMHS, the Division of

1 Emergency Management and Homeland Security, which
2 is preparing the plan in accordance with FEMA
3 regulations, it was decided that we would remove
4 all of those references, all of those assignments
5 and take a fresh look at that and decide how each
6 agency was going to be involved with the plan
7 going forward.

8 And so as a result of those conversations the
9 consultant that's preparing the plan, Dewberry
10 removed those references, removed those
11 assignments. I'm waiting for final confirmation
12 on that actually, but I'm told that that's what's
13 happened. And that's where things currently
14 stand.

15 So now we can come back to the table working
16 with DEMHS taking a fresh look at the plan and
17 understanding what the appropriate role is for the
18 Water Planning Council and for the representative
19 agencies going forward.

20 **THE CHAIR:** Eric, thank you very much, because quite
21 frankly, I was always kind of unclear exactly. It
22 was kind of -- we were just kind of bucked in
23 there and I'm not sure what our role was.

24 So thank you for that clarification, and
25 we'll just wait to hear back to them. Then we'll

1 act accordingly.

2 ERIC LINDQUIST: Yeah, and just for additional
3 background, Jack, it seems like what happened was
4 after the state water plan was adopted, first
5 adopted in 2018 --

6 THE CHAIR: Right?

7 ERIC LINDQUIST: The next Natural Hazard Mitigation
8 Plan was prepared in 2019.

9 THE CHAIR: Right.

10 ERIC LINDQUIST: And the onboard consultant at that
11 time took a look at recently adopted state plans
12 and strategies and extracted goals and policies
13 out of those strategies to plug into the NHMP.
14 And it appears as though they took some of the
15 strategies from the state water plan, extracted
16 those into the NHMP and assigned those to the
17 various agencies without anybody really knowing
18 about it.

19 And so now going forward, this came to our
20 attention, of course, in the current revision.
21 And going forward we can work with them more
22 appropriately.

23 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Any questions from the Council
24 for Eric?

25

1 (No response.)

2
3 THE CHAIR: Appreciate it Eric, thank you so much.

4 ERIC LINDQUIST: You're welcome.

5 THE CHAIR: The final item on the agenda is the motion
6 to really formalize the consolidation of the
7 advisory and implementation workgroup moving
8 forward.

9 Do I have a motion to that effect?

10 MARTIN HEFT: Jack?

11 THE CHAIR: Yes?

12 MARTIN HEFT: I'd like to make a motion to approve the
13 elimination of the implementation workgroup, and
14 to revamp the advisory workgroup membership and
15 guidelines by the spring of 2024.

16 THE CHAIR: Very good. Do I hear second to that?

17 GRAHAM STEVENS: I'll second that.

18 THE CHAIR: Motion made by Martin and seconded that --

19 MARTIN HEFT: If you need me to repeat it, let me know.

20 THE CHAIR: Rob do you have that, our transcriber?

21 THE REPORTER: I got it.

22 THE CHAIR: Okay. Good. Thanks, Rob.

23 Okay. Any questions on the motion?

24
25 (No response.)

1 THE CHAIR: If not, all those in favor signify by
2 saying, aye.

3 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

4 THE CHAIR: Opposed?

5
6 (No response.)
7

8 THE CHAIR: Motion is carried.

9 ALECIA CHARAMUT: Can I ask a quick clarifying
10 question? So for our discussion at the next Water
11 Planning Council advisory group meeting, so I know
12 we put off the class of January 2024, but we're
13 looking at spring now of '24 as far as getting all
14 of that settled.

15 So what does that mean for membership in that
16 time between the beginning of this coming year and
17 spring when we finally get all this ironed out?

18 MARTIN HEFT: So if I may, Jack?

19 THE CHAIR: Sure.

20 MARTIN HEFT: So obviously, it's by the spring of '24,
21 So it could be done any time between now and that
22 timeframe once we get it done. My recommendation
23 would be, as with any typical boards or
24 commissions that are on as current members serve
25 until they're replaced, you know, on that, even

1 though if their term is up -- because we know
2 we're going to be in a process of changing. So I
3 would recommend that we just, you know, continue
4 those memberships of those people on there for
5 those few months, or whatever the time period may
6 be in the beginning there, and then we appoint new
7 members once we're ready to go, or reappoint those
8 members. So I think that would be, you know,
9 appropriate.

10 Obviously, if someone does not want to
11 continue after that, you know, December 31st date
12 then we would, you know, obviously fill a vacancy,
13 you know, on that. But otherwise, I would say
14 current members would just serve until which time
15 we make this, you know, consolidation modification
16 piece done.

17 **THE CHAIR:** Does that make sense, Alecia?

18 She gave us a thumbs up. So I guess it makes
19 sense. So that's good.

20 **ALECIA CHARAMUT:** I see Carol put her or camera on and
21 her brow was furrowed. So I want to make sure
22 it's clear to Carol.

23 **CAROL HASKINS:** It is clear. You know, I could see
24 with it being ambitious about it, getting it done
25 before year end certainly, but leaving that time

1 until the spring.

2 With that there's three group-two members
3 that their terms will expire in December of this
4 year. I don't know if you want to do, like, a
5 formal extension of those terms through, like,
6 the, you know, June or something of 2024? Like,
7 do a six-month or something like that so it
8 mirrors the timeline for the merging the
9 committees, because otherwise we're Looking at
10 losing -- well, not losing, but like, there's
11 three, three Representatives that could be lost.

12 MARTIN HEFT: Yeah, as I stated those three members
13 would just continue on it until which time a
14 merge. And we wouldn't extend terms. They'll
15 just go to -- we're not reappointing a position
16 there. I mean, we could --

17 CAROL HASKINS: Yeah, but their term expires?

18 MARTIN HEFT: Correct, but as I just stated we would
19 just be extending their terms until which time we
20 do the consolidation.

21 CAROL HASKINS: Okay.

22 MARTIN HEFT: Which we could do as a full --

23 CAROL HASKINS: So would that be an action that you
24 take your at next meeting in December,
25 potentially?

1 MARTIN HEFT: We could do that.

2 CAROL HASKINS: Okay.

3 MARTIN HEFT: You know, once we have a better idea of a
4 timeline.

5 CAROL HASKINS: Okay.

6 MARTIN HEFT: Or that I have no problem doing, you
7 know, recommending we appoint them until which
8 time the consolidation is done -- so there is, you
9 know, rather than a six-month period or something.

10 CAROL HASKINS: Yeah.

11 MARTIN HEFT: We are continuing members. I don't have
12 any issue, you know, with that. So I don't have a
13 problem with, you know, with doing that. Whatever
14 seems to, you know, whatever the rest of the
15 commission would like to do, I don't have a
16 problem, you know, with that.

17 Either way --

18 THE CHAIR: Graham are you -- is your hand up, Graham.

19 GRAHAM STEVENS: No, sir, but I agree with Martin.

20 People should serve, continue to serve until
21 they're reappointed.

22 THE CHAIR: Right.

23 GRAHAM STEVENS: Until they resign, or are replaced.

24 THE CHAIR: I don't think we have to have a formal
25 motion for that, Carol. I think they're fine just

1 to continue.

2 VIRGINIA de LIMA: And I don't want to speak for Alecia
3 and Dan, but I don't see it as a big problem to
4 Integrate the documents to update the official
5 advisory group document. I mean, it's the three
6 of us and perhaps you, Carol, got together. I
7 think it could be done in a matter of hours.

8 And so this would become a non-issue, just as
9 a side --

10 ALECIA CHARAMUT: Well, that depends, Virginia, on how
11 much longer the annual reports is going to take.

12 VIRGINIA de LIMA: No, Alecia, they're going to approve
13 it as written, and we don't have to worry about
14 that. So yes, a very, very valid point.

15 But Martin, in all due respect, I don't like
16 to be eliminated. I prefer to be merged or
17 integrated.

18 MARTIN HEFT: Well, we've already voted and that's the
19 terminology. So it's -- we are eliminating that
20 workgroup, in essence. So we are making it
21 official that we're eliminating that workgroup and
22 we're going to revamp.

23 THE CHAIR: Revamp, we're going to revamp it.

24 MARTIN HEFT: I understand. We're not trying to
25 eliminate any individuals.

1 THE CHAIR: No, no.

2 GRAHAM STEVENS: In this case revamp means merge.

3 THE CHAIR: Right.

4 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Okay.

5 MARTIN HEFT: Right.

6 THE CHAIR: Okay. Let's move on here --

7 MARTIN HEFT: Jack, just one other thing while we're on
8 this topic? Because I know it was mentioned in
9 both Alicea's or Virginia's report, and maybe just
10 to help with their clarification as we're moving
11 forward, because they did talk about, you know,
12 that obviously the various categories and
13 everything, to give them a little direction.

14 One, I think as, you know, a piece looking at
15 this moving forward and, you know, merging those
16 two together is, remember that, you know, as doing
17 so and as we as members looking at the initial
18 piece of the merge, that we're looking at this by,
19 you know, the actual categories or, you know, the
20 group stakeholders that we want within the group,
21 not the individuals or the people that represent
22 those groups.

23 Because that -- obviously, this is a
24 longer-term thing versus who is actually there.
25 So obviously, just to keep that in mind and I know

1 you've all been doing that already, but just to
2 put that out there.

3 On the other piece there's been some, you
4 know, obviously discussion, but I don't think
5 there's been a formal piece on it regarding
6 agencies on the workgroup. And you know,
7 discussions we have had for this -- and I'm
8 willing to make a motion -- that agencies, you
9 know, would not be voting members of the advisory
10 workgroup mainly because they report back to, you
11 know, us as an agency here, the four of us making
12 up an agency.

13 And that agencies could be represented there
14 as, you know, ex-officio non-voting, or just be
15 there as participants. But they should definitely
16 not be non-voting members of the advisory group,
17 because that -- obviously, the term, they're
18 advising back to themselves, if you will, as an
19 agency, so.

20 **GRAHAM STEVENS:** I would support agency members as
21 ex-officio non-voting members, which is a
22 continuation of its current -- of the current
23 paradigm.

24 **THE CHAIR:** It should be okay. It's just a part of it?

25 **MARTIN HEFT:** Right, yes.

1 And I don't know if Lori is still on, but I
2 know I had a conversation with her. I don't want
3 to speak on her behalf, but that was her
4 conversation as well as what Graham had kind of
5 just said. So I think that helps give you some
6 direction on that piece, because I know that was a
7 piece that was still outstanding.

8 And Jack, any other -- I don't want to speak
9 on you, for you either, but.

10 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry. Somebody just walked in here
11 and said the lights were on in my car.

12 MARTIN HEFT: So what did we just vote you to do?

13 THE CHAIR: Yeah, what are we doing here now? What's
14 the issue? Virginia doesn't want to be
15 eliminated.

16 MARTIN HEFT: No, that's all taken care of.

17 THE CHAIR: Okay.

18 MARTIN HEFT: I was just discussing about agencies
19 being non-voting members of the advisory group.

20 THE CHAIR: Oh, yes. Yes.

21 MARTIN HEFT: And that they should, you know, they can
22 be ex-officio if that's a recommendation.

23 THE CHAIR: Right.

24 MARTIN HEFT: Non-voting because they are boxing back
25 to us as an agency. Then Graham was in agreement,

1 and I mentioned that I had spoken with Lori,
2 because I don't think she's still on.

3 **THE CHAIR:** No, she's getting on the plane.

4 **MARTIN HEFT:** And that was her, you know, feeling --
5 well, when I last spoke with her. But I didn't
6 want to speak for you, and that's where I left it.

7 **THE CHAIR:** I think we're all in the same place as far
8 as that's concerned, so.

9 Okay. Virginia, you happy? You okay now?

10 Okay. Public comment? I know Margaret has
11 public comment. Denise has public comment.

12 Margaret?

13 **MARGARET MINER:** So I will do a follow-up memo, but in
14 your meeting of May, May of this year I spoke
15 about the application in Washington, Connecticut
16 for the largest project ever, which is an inn and
17 spa on a prominent site. It has been in
18 litigation since 2007. It gets a lot of press
19 because the Rolling Stones spent a summer there.
20 It has since burned down.

21 So from the very beginning in 2007 until the
22 last hour last night -- and there was a vote to a
23 sort of preliminary approval, water issues have
24 been among the two or three topics to which people
25 have given the most attention, including pages and

1 pages of data.

2 Now the question I brought to you in May was
3 that unequivocally the Chairman of the Zoning
4 Commission Nick Solley said back -- that I brought
5 you in May -- said back then, local agencies do
6 not have the purview over water issues. We are
7 not going to take up water issues. If you have a
8 question about water issues, the places you should
9 go are DEEP, DPH or the health district.

10 So my question was -- back then was, is Nick
11 right? That if a big application comes in with a
12 lot of water use, don't bother talking to zoning.
13 Go to DPH. And that question I would say is still
14 unresolved.

15 Toward the end -- but back in May there was a
16 lot of conversation about the fact that in this
17 case and many others where the water provider is
18 an ESA holder, there is no opportunity for public
19 comment at all. And in fact, the water company
20 need not tell DPH about the project, and Lori had
21 said she'd never heard of it. So that was sort of
22 an ongoing issue.

23 Where/when would the public get to talk?
24 Mike Zizka, who I'm sure you all know -- council
25 for the zoning commission last night said -- and

1 it was as much Mike -- right? Then I'll do a
2 thing.

3 He said, if you want approval of septic you
4 go to DEEP. And if you want approval of water,
5 you go to the water company. And he just said in
6 general, any water company, you go to the water
7 company. Obviously, to the layperson that looks
8 like -- oh, so your supplier gets to decide if
9 their plans are good, and then approve them? To
10 some extent that seems to be true. So I believe
11 that's an aspect of the WUCC law that is very
12 confusing.

13 In the hearing comments by lawyers and other
14 people, the DPH and water company were kind of
15 just mixed together. Like, the applicant would
16 say, well, we have DPH approval. The commission
17 did not have a single piece of paper from DPH, nor
18 had they ever talked to them about it. But they
19 just said, oh, well. You know we have water
20 approval.

21 I think there's really something quite wrong
22 with this process. I'll do a follow-up memo;
23 there's a confusion between DPH and certain water
24 companies.

25 And that the last thing I'll make -- two last

1 things, real quick -- upon saying that they could
2 supply water, the water supplier said, but of
3 course we don't mean we can do fire. And so the
4 fire arrangements had to be made under a separate
5 agreement with the water company. I don't know if
6 they have the same legal status as this, the
7 domestic supply, but, in fact, it is quite
8 confusing. And as my fire department is one that
9 would be called upon if there's not enough water,
10 I have a sort of different interest on that.

11 So when fire suppression is treated as a
12 separate issue with a separate agreement, and I
13 happen to know the laws, the statutes, and the
14 local laws regarding fire authorities are quite
15 confusing, that's another aspect of this process
16 that -- on that I just have a question.

17 And finally, just a little complaint because
18 I don't have, you know, I'm saying I think the law
19 is bad because it shuts the people out and it
20 confuses them. But one thing that I thought in
21 the settlement agreement, the court settlement
22 agreement to which everybody is supposed to
23 comply, it said that the water company will say
24 where, where they're going to put it, what wells
25 they're going to put, and where are they going to

1 put them? This is a water short district, so
2 everybody wanted to know that.

3 But they, the public was told, we can't tell
4 you where we're going to put our wells, which is
5 sort of silly because everybody will know the
6 minute they start to dig the wells where they are.
7 But the position is, we're not going to tell you
8 where we're going to put our wells. And if you
9 think it will come next door, just wait and see.
10 You'll find out sooner or later.

11 So it's been an unhappy process, and I will
12 put into a memo what I think are the practical
13 implications. Who does the public turn to? Do
14 all water companies have final approval of their
15 own plans, and what happens with fire suppression?
16 So I'll put it in a memo, but I wanted to update
17 you.

18 In addition to the original question, is Nick
19 Solley right, saying there's no purview for local
20 agencies? And is Mike Zizka -- the next thing, is
21 Mike Zizka right when he says, with septic you go
22 to DEEP, and for water supply you go to, without
23 qualification, you go to the water company?

24 So I'll do a follow-up memo, but it has been
25 a mess, let me tell you. In fact, this site

1 originally was in place starting in the 1990s. So
2 the legal documents take up a room, but I'll do a
3 followup.

4 THE CHAIR: Wow.

5 MARTIN HEFT: Jack, if I may?

6 THE CHAIR: Go ahead.

7 MARTIN HEFT: Yeah. Just thanks, Margaret, for that.

8 So I think one -- a couple just notes, and I
9 know this was discussed at our June meeting and
10 we, you know, recommended you speak with, you
11 know, Lori at DPH and Dan Lawrence offline on the
12 topic, you know, back when you --

13 MARGARET MINER: I did.

14 MARTIN HEFT: Okay. Let me just finish, please -- you
15 know, on it.

16 Zoning, you know, just as you're, you know,
17 most likely aware, zoning is local. The State
18 doesn't have full control over zoning. State
19 statutes provide those are all done in the local
20 level town by town. So we have 169 different, you
21 know -- or actually, 168 because we have one town
22 that doesn't adopt zoning -- zoning regulations
23 that are all done by their same.

24 I think, you know, you are correct. The
25 State about having jurisdiction? Yes, it goes by

1 whichever agency, you know, whether -- and Graham
2 can speak on behalf of DEEP. You know in DPH
3 there's certain, obviously, you know, levels for
4 which each, you know, represent there and
5 everything else.

6 You know, but the jurisdiction I don't
7 believe is under the Water Planning Council. It's
8 under each of the individual state agencies, you
9 know, for this topic and everything. And it's
10 great to be made aware of it, but you know, in
11 essence as was kind of done at the June meeting,
12 it's really got to get directed to the individual
13 state agency, obviously which you have
14 representation here on.

15 But that's where this conversation should be
16 brought, not to the full Water Planning Council,
17 you know, that we can give you advice, you know,
18 on behalf of the Council.

19 **MARGARET MINER:** Well, it certainly is a tough
20 question.

21 **THE CHAIR:** I see Alecia and Denise?

22 **ALECIA CHARAMUT:** Well, Denise, I had my hand -- or you
23 had yours up first, but I just wanted to follow on
24 to what Margaret was --

25 **DENISE SAVAGEAU:** Yeah, go ahead if it's just part of

1 the conversation. I have something different.

2 ALECIA CHARAMUT: Okay. So having also followed this
3 issue, one thing I would like to say is Margaret's
4 big issue here is that -- and I have to agree with
5 her, because I know there are several people
6 locally that have brought this to the local land
7 use commissions, and brought different numbers and
8 data that conflicted with what the developer had
9 submitted as far as water needs for that property.

10 And I know -- and I've talked to Dan myself
11 Offline and, you know, it's his understanding
12 that, you know, from what he got from the
13 developers, they would be able to provide that
14 water. And I completely believe him, but the fact
15 is that who -- and I think this is what Margaret
16 is getting at -- who's checking to make sure that
17 the numbers that the water utilities are getting
18 are correct and sufficient?

19 Who's checking on that, because when the
20 public is questioning it -- that the land use
21 folks, they have no idea. They don't know. They
22 have no idea. They can't fact check it. And
23 Margaret brought it here because this, I think, is
24 definitely a water management issue when we're
25 handling things at the town level where folks that

1 are making decisions on resource availability that
2 they don't completely understand.

3 And you know they're relying -- and I see Dan
4 has his hand up and, you know, I'll let him have
5 his say. And I'm sure I'm going to hear from him
6 what we already talked about, but you know, again,
7 they're relying on what they're getting from the
8 applicant and if what the applicant presented was
9 wrong.

10 And what if we now have a development on a
11 property that, not only can't even, you know, that
12 that is not going to have on-site fire
13 suppression, but now would not have enough water
14 to supply the development, that may impact the
15 neighbors who may have hydraulically connected
16 groundwater wells. So I think that this does have
17 bigger implications, because we still haven't
18 gotten a good answer to. Who does the checking on
19 how much water is needed for these developments
20 when it comes into question?

21 **THE CHAIR:** I'm going to turn to Dan. Dan Lawrence,
22 would you like to weigh into this?

23 **DAN LAWRENCE:** I apologize. My camera is not working
24 today, but so -- I mean, just a couple quick
25 things. One, on the fire suppression side, we

1 don't provide fire suppression when a water system
2 is not designed for fire suppression. That is not
3 a system in which we try to provide fire
4 suppression. So that means we wouldn't provide
5 fire suppression for anyone, a hydrant for the
6 Town or anyone who wanted it.

7 So that means -- and again, even in our
8 larger systems if someone has a higher fire
9 suppression requirement than we can provide, they
10 can either upgrade our system, or they can augment
11 that fire suppression on their property. We don't
12 want -- you can't. We're not going to subsidize a
13 development.

14 So having on-site fire suppression is very
15 common. Having people have fire tanks and pump
16 stations is common, because that usually we can't
17 meet or agree to always meet the pressure
18 requirement that they may have, because that
19 requirement went up a few years ago.

20 So when you think about pressure and fire,
21 that's just generally our perspective on how we
22 handle that, which I believe is equitable to our
23 customers and makes a lot of sense on who reviews
24 documents.

25 Ingrid Jacobs, our Manager of Planning and

1 myself, when there's questions, do look at numbers
2 and make sure they do make sense. We don't
3 actually do go to the nth, just more of rational
4 of reasonable -- are those numbers reasonable?
5 Because we're not building it, and that's what
6 they say they need, and we tell that if we find
7 out they're going to use more, then they're going
8 to have to lower their demands.

9 So that's really all I wanted to say, is
10 that's how we work through that process, so.

11 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Dan. Iris, do you want to speak
12 on this topic or another topic?

13 IRIS HERZ KAMINSKI: No, another topic.

14 THE CHAIR: Okay. So Denise, please?

15 DENISE SAVAGEAU: All right. Thank you, Jack.

16 The Connecticut Council on Soil and Water
17 Conservation working with UConn CLEAR and DEEP has
18 come out with a source water protection tool.

19 I want to thank Laura from your shop, Jack,
20 for getting this out to everybody. I put the --
21 we did a workshop on this, and we were able to get
22 the information out. And we had over 80 people
23 attend the workshop.

24 The tool is now on the UConn CLEAR site, and
25 I put that in the chat for everybody, so. And

1 we're probably going to be holding some other
2 workshops on it and putting the workshop we did
3 have on our website shortly, but wanted to make
4 sure you have that. And again, we did this with
5 UConn CLEAR and the Department of Public Health.
6 This was kind of a brainchild of Eric McPhee with
7 some other folks working on source water
8 protection.

9 And what this tool allows you to do is look
10 at land in public drinking water supply
11 watersheds, and being able to evaluate it and
12 prioritize it in terms of protection and the work
13 that we do on those lands. So I think it's a
14 really important tool that's out there. So glad
15 that we can finally get that tool out there. I've
16 been talking about it for a while.

17 Just another thing is, I wanted to give the
18 agencies a heads up. The National Association of
19 Conservation Districts in partnership with the
20 U.S. Forest Service and with our Connecticut
21 Department of Environmental Protection Forest
22 Division put in a grant to the U.S. Forest Service
23 for a northeast forest and water partnership
24 program.

25 We're going to be doing some forest

1 restoration work on that, but more importantly
2 this northeast partnership is going to be
3 having -- bringing folks together who are making
4 that connection between healthy forests and making
5 sure we're protecting our public drinking water
6 supply. So we will be touching base with the
7 various agencies about possibly participating in
8 this.

9 Connecticut DEP is already signed on. We
10 know who's going to be working from that, but as
11 this program gets rolled over we just -- the grant
12 announcement came out in October. And as we're
13 going to find out more and more about this, there
14 may be people from your agency who get identified
15 to participate, and I wanted to give folks a heads
16 up. This program is modeled after a successful
17 water and forestry program in the southeast and
18 it's being now brought to the northeast part of
19 the United States.

20 And then the last thing I just want to
21 comment on -- and this has to do with the water
22 chief. And I understand the short session and why
23 you would possibly not want to put dollars in for
24 funding this year, however I want to make it clear
25 that there's a challenge when we are just trying

1 to do this with staff.

2 Even if you get more staff to focus on water,
3 the difference with the water chief and the work
4 that this, you know, state water plan
5 implementation team put together -- and that it's
6 very specific in the state water plan itself is
7 that we need someone. We call it a water chief or
8 whatever, but we need someone that works for the
9 Council, because we're not getting the work done
10 that needs to be done collectively.

11 The agencies, that we understand, go back and
12 they do the work within their agencies that
13 they're responsible for within the water piece,
14 but there is work the Council is doing
15 collectively. And I'm just going to bring up
16 this, you know, piece again.

17 We have a piece of legislation that we should
18 be passing in terms of on the work that was
19 brought to us that had to do with getting new
20 standards for water conservation appliances.
21 Nobody has been able to bring that forward. It
22 was something that came forward. The legislation
23 is written. People were kind of talking, but we
24 didn't have collectively somebody saying, we're
25 going to move this through.

1 And those are the types of things that end up
2 falling through the cracks, and I think that I --
3 I know I don't speak just for myself. We had
4 major discussions on the need for a water chief,
5 and I just want to make sure even if this year
6 there's going to be dollars just to, like, be
7 looking at the state water plan, and get our ducks
8 in a row for a legislative push next year, that
9 you really, really pay attention to that.

10 We need someone who is dedicated to the Water
11 Planning Council and the work that we're doing,
12 and the implementation to the state water plan,
13 not just the roles of the individual agencies. I
14 can't stress it enough, I think we're making a
15 mistake by not pushing this forward.

16 I think having the water chief in place so
17 that as we start talking about what we need to do
18 with the state water plan, we would have somebody
19 in that position to help us guide that discussion
20 so that we could be ready to go and get that state
21 water plan implemented.

22 So like I said, I understand why it didn't
23 get put in because of the short budget year, but
24 I'm not -- but I really think we need to be paying
25 attention to this, and I'm hoping we're not back

1 stepping on this need.

2 Understand headcount; worked in a
3 municipality for many years. Headcount is huge
4 and I understand that, but I think we're making a
5 mistake by not telling the legislators what we
6 need, and that is another person very dedicated to
7 this.

8 And I will just let you know, with another
9 hat on, I serve on the League of Conservation
10 Voters. We specifically talked to legislators
11 last year when we thought the money was going to
12 be put in, but never got put in by the agencies.

13 We had it teed up. We very specifically
14 brought it, that this was coming. We had people
15 like Martin Looney say, yes, I'll be looking for
16 that and I will support it, but it never got put
17 in.

18 And this is one of the things I'm concerned
19 about, is that your agency's individual here
20 saying, that's not our priority. That's not a
21 priority. We have these other priorities, and
22 nobody is prioritizing staff for the Water
23 Planning Council, and I think it's a mistake.

24 And we need to be able to get through this,
25 and I think it's the same mistake we're going to

1 have if we start backing off on this.

2 Thank you for listening.

3 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Iris, do you anything
4 further?

5 IRIS HERZ KAMINSKI: Yeah, a new topic. I'll try to be
6 extremely brief.

7 THE CHAIR: I hope so, because people are blowing up my
8 phone here -- but go ahead.

9 IRIS HERZ KAMINSKI: Okay. I just wanted to raise a
10 new topic -- it's not new, one for dioxane. I am
11 affiliated with the Yale School of Public Health.
12 They recently got a grant for a superfund
13 research, to create a superfund research center.
14 And I wanted to know if anybody's interested in
15 partnering with us?

16 And I know there was some work done in
17 Connecticut back in 2015, because there's a fact
18 sheet from 2015. There's some work done in New
19 York; they passed limits on household cleaning
20 items very recently, and also they created a
21 maximum contaminant limit of 1 ppb for drinking
22 water. So I just wanted to put that out there,
23 and I'm exploring with other non-profits to see if
24 Connecticut would be interested or not at this
25 time.

1 And I could revisit this early next year.

2 **THE CHAIR:** Thank you so much, Iris.

3 Anything further to come before the Council?

4
5 (No response.)

6
7 **THE CHAIR:** Our next meeting, you know it's the first
8 Tuesday in December. If I don't see any people
9 before thanksgiving. Happy thanksgiving,
10 everyone. Have a wonderful thanksgiving.

11 Is there anything else to come before us
12 before we hang up?

13
14 (No response.)

15
16 **THE CHAIR:** Thank you all for your participation,
17 because we covered a lot of ground here today, a
18 lot of work to do.

19 Denise, I hear you loud and clear. I mean,
20 don't get me going. All the money we have in the
21 State, I don't know why we can't figure out how to
22 come up with the money -- but we'll figure it out.

23 So motion to adjourn?

24 **MARTIN HEFT:** So moved.

25 **THE CHAIR:** Second?

1 GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.

2 THE CHAIR: All those in favor?

3 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

4 THE CHAIR: Thank you, everybody. Take care.

5

6 (End: 3:11 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 87 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 November 7, 2023.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M #857
Notary Public
My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

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

1 INDEX

2 VOTES TAKEN
3 (Unanimous Approval)

DESCRIPTION	PAGE(s)
10/3/'23 Transcript approval	3
*Appoint vacancy positions, not 4-year terms	14/15
Elim. implementation group and revamp advisory group member guidelines by spring, 2024	61
Adjournment	87
	*Amended motion

8 TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

DESCRIPTION	PAGE(s)
C. Haskins: Nomination slate, approvals	5-9
Council discussion	9-13
V. del Lima: Annual report review	15-17
E.Lindquist: Council feedback requested	17-18
Council discussion (Water Chief)	18-29
Council discussion (IWG)	29-30
Council discussion (Water Plan)	30-33
A. Charamut: WPCAG and Implementation Group	33-34
Hydrilla found in CT lakes/ponds	34
V. del Lima: Annual report & USGS groups	35
New workgroups & merger	36-39
Council discussion	39-42
M. Heft: Drought - MA & CT meeting	42-43
Council discussion	43-44
D. Savageau: Outreach and Education	45-48
Council discussion	48-49
A. Charamut: Conservation Price & Rate Recovery	49-51
M. Miner: Watershed Lands workgroup	51-53
R. Hanratty: NY Times article, regulations	53-54
Council discussion	54-56
E.Lindquist: CT Hazard Mitigation Strategy	57-59
Council: Change in Implem./advisory groups	61-69

INDEX (cont'd)

Pub. Comment:

M. Miner - Washington, CT reg authority	69-74
Council discussion	74-80
D. Savageau - U.S. Forest Service grant	80-81
Water Chief/Appliances	81-84
I. H. Kaminski - Dioxane superfund	85

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