1	CERTIFIED COPY
2	
3	
4	
5	STATE OF CONNECTICUT
6	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND
7	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
8	PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY
9	
10	STATE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL
11	
12	Regular Meeting held Via Teleconference on
13	September 3, 2024, beginning at 1:32 p.m.
14	
15	Held Before:
16	JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, WPC CHAIRMAN,
17	and PURA VICE-CHAIRMAN
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Appearances (of record):
2	WATER PLANNING COUNCILMEMBERS PRESENT:
3	JOHN W. BETKOSKI, III, CHAIRMAN (PURA)
4	ERIC McPHEE (DPH)
5	MARTIN HEFT (OPM)
6	GRAHAM STEVENS (DEEP)
7	
8	ALSO PRESENT (on record):
9	ALICEA CHARAMUT
10	CAROL HASKINS
11	VIRGINIA de LIMA
12	DENISE SAVAGEAU
13	KATHY CZEPIEL
14	
15	
16	Staff:
17	LAURA LUPOLI
18	ALYSON AYOTTE
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	(Begin: 1:32 p.m.)
2	
3	THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Good afternoon, everyone,
4	and welcome to the Water Planning Council meeting
5	for September 3, 2024. I'm Chairman Jack
6	Betkoski, joined by my colleagues on the Water
7	Planning Council.
8	I hope everyone had a wonderful July July?
9	I wish it was July Labor Day weekend. And with
10	that, we'll call the meeting to order.
11	Approval of the August 6th transcript?
12	MARTIN HEFT: So moved.
13	GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.
14	THE CHAIRMAN: So moved and seconded that the August 6,
15	2024, transcript be approved.
16	Any questions on motion?
17	
18	(No response.)
19	
20	THE CHAIRMAN: If not, all those in favor signify by
21	saying aye.
22	THE COUNCIL: Aye.
23	THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?
24	
25	(No response.)

1	THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.
2	Any public comment on the agenda items today?
3	Any public comment?
4	
5	(No response.)
6	
7	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll move on to action item
8	number four, appointments to the advisory work
9	group. I believe that would be coming from Alicia
10	and Dan.
11	GRAHAM STEVENS: Right and Jack, Mr. Chairman, if I
12	may? I don't believe we've got any
13	recommendations in for it, but we wanted to make
14	sure it was on the agenda because there are
15	vacancies.
16	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
17	MARTIN HEFT: Just so we have it as a standing item on
18	the agenda, but I don't believe we've received any
19	recommendations in to fill any of the vacancy
20	spots.
21	THE CHAIRMAN: Excellent.
22	Okay. Alicia and Dan or Dan?
23	ALICEA CHARAMUT: Hi. Dan is a lucky guy. He's on
24	vacation in Maine. So it's just me today.
25	Yes, we will, before next

THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, Alicea.

ALICEA CHARAMUT: Hi. How are you?

THE CHAIRMAN: Good.

ALICEA CHARAMUT: Good afternoon, everyone. It's a beautiful day.

So we will have a slate for you next month, now that all the other ducks are in a row. We had a very brief meeting on our last meeting because it was the Tuesday after the storms in Southbury and Oxford, and there are a lot of folks that had fires to put out, so to speak, and some very urgent things to deal with. So, we kept our meeting very short.

And other than the reports that you will be hearing from, one of the questions we got was -- and there was discussion about the precipitation data at the USGS stream gauges, which brought up, you know, some questions about whether when we're -- some of these are being discontinued -- I almost said dislocated -- discontinued. Is this due to redundancy? Because there were a lot of folks -- or there were some folks that had seen that these were being discontinued and had some concerns.

So I think it might be good to have a better

understanding of that, both for the advisory group and the Water Planning Council. So other than that, like I said, it was a very brief meeting, other than the reports you'll be hearing.

And also Denise had shared with us a link to emergency assistance, assistance available from the Department of Ag. So she provided that to the advisory group as well.

And that's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Annual report?

MARTIN HEFT: So again, Mr. Chair, the agenda, just so everyone understands, lists all of the committees -- or it may not be reports of those committees at this point, but it's just kind of --

THE CHAIRMAN: A standing --

MARTIN HEFT: -- moving forward. We're just making sure all the committees that we have that are active are listed. They may not have a report, but it keeps everyone in focus that we do have an annual report due January 1st.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MARTIN HEFT: So we should obviously ask our advisory work group to, you know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Keep that.

MARTIN HEFT: Start working on that and just keeping it

1 in the mind for that. 2 THE CHAIRMAN: No, I think it's good to have those on 3 as consistent agenda items. 4 And the same would be with the nominating 5 committee. Right? 6 Yes, Alecia? 7 ALICEA CHARAMUT: Carol, is there anything that you 8 have other than --9 CAROL HASKINS: No, I don't have anything. Currently, 10 the nominating committee hasn't met since we made 11 the appointments for the new calendar year, 12 whenever we made those last. 13 And I think we were still trying to get some 14 clarity on, do we want to fill vacancies as they 15 come up? Or do we want to wait until an annual 16 cycle on them? 17 MARTIN HEFT: Well, vacancies should be filled once we 18 have people, because otherwise they remain vacant 19 for the entire period -- and we don't want that to 20 happen. 21 CAROL HASKINS: Okay. 22 MARTIN HEFT: So we know that there's vacancies for the 23 alternates. I believe there's only one vacancy as the full member, if you will, which I believe is 24 25 under the electricity, maybe, group. I'm not sure

1 which -- if that's right. Or I know there's one vacancy as a full member. And the rest, I think, 2 3 are all, you know, alternates. 4 CAROL HASKINS: It would be two then, because we --5 because Margaret is still vacant. 6 We haven't made that formal yet. 7 THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah. I mean, I think that's correct. 8 We had a vacancy and wanted to fill it ASAP. 9 CAROL HASKINS: Okay. We will get that nominating 10 committee together then. 11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Carol. 12 Appreciate your work on that. 13 CAROL HASKINS: Yeah. 14 THE CHAIRMAN: Denise Savageau sent us something hot 15 off the press a little bit before, and she's got a 16 report for the outreach and education. 17 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. 19 DENISE SAVAGEAU: The outreach and education workgroup 20 is busy getting into our schedule for the fall. 21 First, thank you for the quick approval of 22 the save the date that did go out. As you know, 23 we've got two workshops coming up, one on 24 September 24th. And that will be focusing on 25 emerging contaminants and also a celebration of

the Safe Drinking Water Act. And then the second workshop is in October. And that is Imagine a Day Without Water. We're looking at doing that on flash drought.

Interestingly enough, the Office of Policy and Management is having a first kickoff for Sustainable and Resiliency Week, September 22nd through the 29th. And so our program falls on that week, the September 24th lunch and learn, and they will be publicizing that.

And then as a wrap up, they will also be putting a final press release together with things that are happening after sustainability week, and the second workshop will be listed there as well. So we're working with them on that.

The registration link is now on the website, but our registration flyer, we're still working on that. We had some folks who do a lot of the work. Kelsey Sudol does a lot of our graphics for us and she's away this week, but we knew that we wanted to get that out after Labor Day.

And we'll be getting out the flyer with the more detailed agenda. We'll be sending that to you for your confirmation, and then we'll get that out. But the registration link itself is already

on the outreach and education website, so we're set that way.

The other thing on our agenda, as I mentioned at last time was that we're looking at our theme and what we're going to be working on for 2025 in terms of our lunch and learns, and ask if you guys have any input. So, I will be asking that.

But let me first just share that we had our meeting this morning. And Kim Czapla from DEEP recommended that we adopt the theme that World Water Day has adopted, and that's groundwater, making the invisible visible. We thought it was a great theme. So we're going to be looking at that. We talked about that and how we could possibly use that.

And one of the things that we're going to be talking about in a second is the private well fact sheet we've been working on, and that ties in with the release of that fact sheet as well. So that's one of the ideas we have.

We're open to other ideas, but as you know, one of the things we've tried to do is kind of piggyback on other programs that are happening, either nationally or statewide. And obviously, you know, so building on this World Water Day

event that usually happens on March 22nd, that's one of the themes we're looking at.

But I'm going to open up the floor and see if anyone has given any thought to this or if anybody has any other thoughts. We don't have to make a complete decision today. We'd like to have a decision by October, but if you're comfortable with what we've recommended here, we can start developing that and bring you a full-blown kind of work plan, as we do usually every year for you guys to take a look at.

So any thoughts?

THE CHAIRMAN: You know -- interesting, as you know, in my backyard here we have floods. And I'm wondering, I mean, people talk about a thousand years. I'm wondering if somehow the Water Planning Council, your group, could do something about talking about the whys and hows.

I mean, it was -- as you know from media coverage, it's been devastating. It's billions, billions of dollars in damage. And I'm wondering that maybe we want to take a look at that. I don't know how others feel, but it was quite -- it was unbelievable.

I mean, as you all know, you read in the

paper. I was three when they had the '55 flood.

I don't remember it, but it was actually around
the same exact day that we had the '55 flood in
the Naugatuck Valley. And it did certainly as
much damage that that flood did to the area that
was hit.

MARTIN HEFT: So, Mr. Chair, if I may? I think that's a great topic as well. What I'd recommend is people can, you know, get topics, whatever else, to Denise's group, and we put it on as an action item for our October meeting so we can review and have an opportunity to, you know, talk with our staffs and everyone else for potential, you know, themes or things that we want to look at and come back to the October meeting and have it as an action item to vote for what that '25 theme, you know, would be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: And if anybody sends it to us ahead of time, we can start looking at it and say, like, well, how might we utilize that theme? So we'll look at the groundwater one. We'll look at this one of the idea of a thousand-year storm event.

What does that mean? So to think about how that

might play in.

We did do climate change before, but, you know, sometimes when it's right in your face, it's a good year to pick up on doing that. So we'll take that into consideration as well. And then if anyone has any others, you certainly can bring other topics up.

But we can -- at our next meeting, we can bring these up and see how we might work on those.

GRAHAM STEVENS: So, you know, I have my version of the state water plan here, as I like to. During this meeting I like to consult the document from time to time. And I think that's a great idea, Chairman.

The one thing I would say is, although the state water plan is very, you know, broad in its remit, I would say we should try to narrow that topic to save Denise and her group to some extent, to the extent that we can. So when we're thinking about these ideas, try to think of it in context of the state water plan.

Because that topic that you just brought forward, Jack, is phenomenally important. It covers many, many agencies of state government, town government, private, and, you know,

quasi-private entities and, you know, deals with
what you do in your backyard. It deals with what
decisions state agencies and federal agencies and
towns make.

So I just want to try to focus it to the

So I just want to try to focus it to the point that we can, if possible, to really, you know, tie it to the current version of the state water plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: That makes a lot of sense.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: Thanks, Graham. And we usually do that. And that actually gets in -- oh, Eric. I see Eric has his hand up.

ERIC McPHEE: You can finish your thought before I speak. Go ahead, Denise.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: No, it's going to get into the next topic. So go ahead.

ERIC McPHEE: Okay. I was just going to add that there were two topics out there that might be relevant to sort of see how accurate and applicable they were as a result of this storm. And that is, you know, the Governor's GC3 report and then also the drinking water vulnerability study, which was done with UConn/CIRCA our agency as a result of Superstorm Sandy.

And just to see how those documents stand up

against, you know, what we saw with these storms and how accurate and applicable they are, you know, reading them after the fact and seeing, you know, the recommendations and findings of those two, you know, if they need to be adapted or how they fit into what we've seen recently.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

Any other comments before we move on?

GRAHAM STEVENS: Just to Denise's earlier point. Yeah,

I totally know that you would take that in context

of the state water plan. I'm trying to help a

little bit with the scope of the ideas that people

will be showering upon you.

So thank you, Denise, for everything you do.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: Thanks. So I'm going to share my
screen just quickly because this kind of leads
into the discussion. And Graham, I want to thank
you for bringing up the State Water Plan.

So the outreach and education group originally was with the state water plan implementation team. So a lot of what we were branding was to make sure that people understood the State Water Plan and that we don't want to lose focus on that.

That said, obviously, it's the Water Planning

Council as well, and we can use one logo or both logos, or kind of intersperse them.

And you don't -- we can fix this as we're going forward so you can have a discussion, but looking to see, do we use the state water plan logo here? Do we want to tie the fact sheets that our organization is bringing out and continually make it so that people understand that the emphasis here, again, is that we're trying to narrow down and say, you know, this is about the state water plan and this is the work we're doing with the state water plan.

So I'm just putting that out there. We can obviously change this logo out. We had done this when we were first developing it. We were using this particular logo because that's the committee we were under, but now that committee no longer exists, the implementation -- state water plan implementation team. So I wanted to think about that, how -- how we utilize that.

So I don't want to get into the content of this. You can look at this. We don't need your comments back until, you know, September 20th.

You'll have plenty of time to take a look at the full document, but I really just wanted to kind of

show you the logo right now, and then we'll change this.

Well, I guess I'm looking at guidance. And again, you can talk about it today, but if you want to think about it more, that's fine also.

The state water -- we had been saying the state plan is an initiative of the Connecticut Water Planning Council, and that this fact sheet was created by the State Water Planning Council outreach and education workgroup, but obviously we don't have a program changing that.

But I wanted to know if you still -
(unintelligible). The State Water Plan is an
initiative of the Water Planning Council. And we
would just say the fact sheet was created by the
Water Planning Council outreach and education
committee. So we'll definitely change that last
sentence.

But I wanted -- this is where I'm looking for your guidance on, do you want to keep referring to the initiative of the State Water Plan? This is how we were handling it. And do we want to make sure we --

(Connection lost: 1:50:33 p.m. to 1:50:44 p.m.)

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

-- anything I needed input with you on today. So I'll stop sharing. And, you know, looking for your guidance on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I mean, my feeling is that they're synonymous. I mean, the state water plan really is the Water Planning Council. It's the driving force behind the Water Planning Council.

I don't know how we -- you might want to use, you say -- you used the word "initiative," but it was -- I'm doing wordsmanship here. It was an initiative, but we have written a water plan. it's something that we're monitoring on an ongoing basis.

MARTIN HEFT: Jack?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MARTIN HEFT: So thanks, Denise, for your committee's work on this. So, you know, I can, you know, obviously go through this because I think there's some, you know, positive stuff in here and the information is great.

And I think I don't like the word "initiative" because the state water plan -- it's actually a state statute. It's not an initiative. It's a requirement. It's not, you know, so I think that's a wordsmithing thing, you know, on

it.

You know, the state water plan was developed by the Water Planning Council, but it was actually approved by the Legislature. So it's a legislative approved State Water Plan. It is the state water plan. So I think we can wordsmith, you know, to come up with the right language, you know, for that on there.

One thought just real quick could be, you know, in that top logo. On the right-hand side, you have the logo that says, state water plan.

Well, what about on the left-hand side, you put Water Planning Council logo, and it balances the logo out on the top?

That way you've got both logos on there that highlight the Water Planning Council as well as the state water plan, because I think both are important and we're going to talk about that later under business. I think it's important highlighting both, you know, in there.

And then I think we can work through -- I know there's some suggestions, everything else, you know, for helping, you know, wordsmith and, you know, setting up, you know, the fire document here, too, which I would still like to get before

the interagency drought committee, you know, workgroup as well, you know, to review this as well, since it does deal with, you know, drought in Connecticut, so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Eric, Graham?

GRAHAM STEVENS: No, that sounds great on that.

Thank you.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: So again, we're looking for comments by the 20th. That said, you know, the idea was that then we would be able to have -- be able to incorporate comments and bring it back to you for final review.

So obviously, it's not ready until you guys are ready, but I think at least if we can get initial comments so we can start seeing if anybody, you know, are there major flaws? Are we in the right direction? Is it really just wordsmithing? We just need to have feedback.

It's also out to the Water Planning Council advisory group. So like I said, we're asking for comments by that, but we're hoping that we will have this, you know, ready before the end of the year, you know, for final adoption, that you guys will approve this.

It's been in the works for a long time, but,

1 you know, we really want to get it out the door. 2 So any feedback is much appreciated. 3 And I think that's it for -- unless anybody 4 has any other questions about our work? 5 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you to you and your group for all 6 the work that you do. We appreciate it. 7 Watershed lands workgroup? 8 KATHY CZEPIEL: Yeah, the watershed lands workgroup 9 meets next Friday, September 13th. So we don't 10 have any report today. Thank you. 11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Kathy. 12 Now we're going to go to Alecia's favorite 13 subject, the conservation pricing rate recovery 14 analysis workshop. 15 ALICEA CHARAMUT: No report at this time. 16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And the source water protection 17 workgroup? I think we're back to --DENISE SAVAGEAU: Yeah, that's me. So we are moving 18 19 forward. We've been juggling schedules. We were 20 hoping to get a draft out to the Water Planning 21 Council advisory group for comments at the end of 22 August. But we had a couple of members with 23 either conferences, or including myself, 24 conferences, and/or vacation, or both. And --25 THE CHAIRMAN: It's a tough time of the year.

DENISE SAVAGEAU: It was a tough time of year to get

everything. That said, we're meeting this week;

we should have that out. So we will be forwarding

it to the Water Planning Council advisory group as

well as the Water Planning Council.

And again, this is a first draft. So we're

And again, this is a first draft. So we're looking for comments. This, you know, we're hoping to finalize this by the end of the year, but this will be -- right now we're just looking for final comments -- you know, for initial comments on the white paper and where we need to go.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sounds good. Thank you, Denise.

Any questions, comments for Denise?

(No response.)

(No response.

THE CHAIRMAN: Interagency drought work group. Martin?

MARTIN HEFT: So due to the status of our drought

indicators, we do not have a meeting this

Thursday, September 5th. We will meet again on

October 3rd, and do a summer recap of everything,

but conditions are all good. We've been

monitoring it with all of our agencies.

The team of our agencies have been working,

continue to work on the tabletop exercise and working on that for down the road in the future. And then I will add this drought in Connecticut flyer to our agenda that date, too, for the FAR group to review that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Martin.

Any questions?

(No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: On to new business, business of DEEP role with Colebrook River Reservoir. Graham, are you going to update us on that?

GRAHAM STEVENS: Yes, thanks, Jack.

So I'm not sure how many folks on the call today are familiar with what happened last session and what's going on now with flows in the Farmington, but I did want to just take a moment to update folks on DEEP's role and participation in this process.

So for those of you who've been tracking this issue, you'll have seen that Public Act 24-13, An Act Concerning the Water Resources of the Upper Farmington River Valley passed. That passed, you know, unanimously in both the House and the

Senate. And you know that that bill essentially changed the dynamic with respect to, you know, the calls for, you know, flow augmentation releases from the Colebrook River Lake Dam, which is an Army Corps of Engineers flood control structure.

And that requires the DEEP Commissioner to make releases and hold back requests to the Army Corps of Engineers in consultation with the Metropolitan District Commission. And those releases, you know, are being called for to achieve an optimum flow in the Farmington River for fish and wildlife, recreation, river health, flood risk reduction, tourism, hydropower and safety. And you know, I will say that all of those purposes are not, you know, directly related to DEEP's mission.

And what we are doing at this point is working with the Army Corps and the MDC. And our fisheries staff are taking the lead and making calls for releases during this augmentation period, which typically runs from May to November.

And so for those of you who've, you know, participated in angling or have taken a ride on the tubes, or participated in some, you know, nationally renowned white-water rafting, or fly

fishing, you'll have seen that the Farmington
River flows are higher than they have been over
the past several years. And so, you know, our
thanks to the MDC and to the Army Corps, and to
the proponents of this bill for, you know, pushing
this important issue.

You know the Farmington River, as we all know, is, you know, one of our most cherished resources. And one of the reasons why that river and watercourse is so valuable is because of the DEEP cold water releases that are afforded by the Colebrook River Lake Dam. And, you know, this public act doesn't change any of the existing statutory requirements for releases that came about through the Hogback Commission. So MDC -- MDC is still required to pass 50 cubic feet per second from the Goodwin Dam.

For those of you who don't know, the Goodwin Dam was the predecessor dam to the Colebrook River Lake Dam. The Colebrook River Lake Dam was constructed through the middle of MDC's impoundment, made by the Goodwin Dam, so they're very close in proximity. And so MDC shall pass 50 cubic feet per second from that dam at all times, pursuant to state statute. MDC shall also pass

all natural flow, natural inflow up to 150 cubic feet per second. And the MDC shall pass all releases that are made by the Otis Reservoir Dam in Massachusetts.

So, you know this -- this really is a great example in Connecticut of a flow-managed river that's able to support many different uses. And like I said, that that's really, you know, possible thanks to the cold water releases that the Colebrook River Lake Dam is able to make.

But there is that need for balance and, you know, understanding of the different needs and flow dynamics within the river, particularly taking into consideration the, you know, wild and scenic status of the river.

And the one other thing I will just point out is that the bill also requires the DEEP Commissioner to report to the Environment Committee on recommended ways to manage that Colebrook River Lake, you know, with respect to the releases that she's authorized to call for with MDC's concurrence. And that's going to look at, you know, all things from, you know, flows for fish and wildlife, recreation, river health, flood risk reduction, tourism, hydropower, and safety.

So a lot of different factors to consider.

DEEP is going to be working on that report and seeking stakeholder input on that report, because obviously there's a lot of different parties that have a lot of interest in this, in this river and how those flows are controlled.

So just to explain to folks, because the bill talks about certain elevations of the impoundment. Essentially, this bill provides additional authority to DEEP for some 10 billion gallons of water.

Currently, depending upon the seasonal flows, you know, the DEEP Fisheries Unit already manages two pools for fish, you know, protection purposes during low-flow conditions, and that is a 1.7 billion gallon pool in the spring and a 1.7 billion gallon pool in the fall. And so this, you know, ups the waters under control with MDC's cooperation up to 13.2 billion gallons.

So when you do see our call for, you know, feedback on this report, it would be really vital for folks to express their, you know, comments and explain their interests in these flows, you know, under one or more of those categories that the report requires an evaluation. And you know the

statute does require consultation with stakeholders, which of course we will do anyway.

So I just wanted to provide that brief update to the Water Planning Council because it's an issue that's come up here before, and I wanted to thank the MDC and the Army Corps of Engineers.

I'd also like to thank Representative

Anderson, who was the, you know, primary driving
force, along with Senator Seminara for their early
efforts to, you know, push the State and push the
federal government and push the MDC in a direction
that is for the betterment of the environment and
for the people of Connecticut.

So we're happy with how things are working thus far, and we look forward to, you know, continued input and more formalization of the process that is currently occurring on an interim basis.

And I think I've shared --

THE CHAIRMAN: Graham, what's your secret? What's your secret to have the Army Corps of Engineers, MDC, and DEEP all working cooperatively together?

Because I know Army Corps of Engineers takes their own sweet time with things, MDC does their own thing -- and of course DEEP's a wonderful agency.

So I wonder how's that working out, and what's making it work like that?

GRAHAM STEVENS: Well, I think it's everyone's commitment to the environment and to, you know, the quality of life in Connecticut. And I think also that our legislative leadership chose not to take no for an answer from any party.

I won't say who said no at any one point, but, you know, that there was certainly a desire from the legislative leaders. Everyone wanted to see a better outcome than what we were experiencing over the last few years. And I appreciate the, you know, there's many of you on the call here who I think also played a role in ensuring that this happened. So, you know, thank you to those who did that.

And, you know, I think we all have our experiences and stories with the Farmington River. You know, one of the things that I grew up doing was being shipped off to my uncle's, you know, farm, and he used the Farmington River for irrigation purposes for his nursery, all within the appropriate diversion registration rules and requirements. You know, and that was our recreational resource at the end of a hard day's

work.

So, I mean, everybody has, from a certain part of the state, has those stories. And so it's something that's cherished and should be cared for. And I think everybody, MDC, Army Corps, DEEP, legislative leaders, all came around the table and just decided to, you know, put any concerns aside and move forward.

I'd also like to point out that this really wouldn't be possible either without DPH and OPM's involvement as well -- and which I won't get into, but into precursor discussions and procedures as well, which got us to this point here today.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see an article or a panel or something coming up about this success in the future in some form, for sure. I mean, hats off to everybody.

GRAHAM STEVENS: Yes, absolutely.

ERIC McPHEE: Graham, the MDC will be responsible for the control and maintenance of the flow rates through both dams moving forward?

GRAHAM STEVENS: It's a little bit more nuanced than that. There obviously -- kind of have full control over the Goodwin Dam.

So what happens logistically is every Friday, our fisheries unit, in coordination with MDC,

1 sends a release schedule and request to the Army 2 Corps. The MDC then concurs in writing. So every 3 week we're evaluating this based on, you know, 4 data that we have, information from the Army 5 Corps, information that's available, you know, 6 through our, you know, weather predicting services 7 as well to make the call for releases. 8 And it's working great. It's a lot of work, 9 but, you know, the agency and MDC and Army Corps 10 have all committed to making sure that that 11 happens. So it's not dissimilar from what 12 happened in the past with MDC's coordination with 13 the Army Corps. It's just that DEEP is the one 14 actually requesting the releases and MDC is 15 concurring. 16 ERIC McPHEE: Thank you. 17 GRAHAM STEVENS: You're welcome. 18 THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions for Graham? 19 Thanks, Graham. That's a great explanation 20 of what was going on. 21 22 (No response.) 23

Thank you very much.

So we have on here overall council goals,

24

25

THE CHAIRMAN:

state water plan implementation and updates. And I think that's another kind of a placeholder, is it not?

MARTIN HEFT: Yeah. If I can, Mr. Chair, I'll go through a couple things of why we're popping those on the agenda?

So as we talk, this goes back to our wonderful little summit we had down on Rocky Hill or whatever we want to, you know, call it on that, which was, you know, great. We keep referring back to some of those things. So I want to just, you know, pop it on the agenda because some of those overall goals and the implementation updates are, you know, kind of our guiding principles, if you will. That's the way I see it moving forward.

Some of the things that we said there just to remind people, you know, some of the overall goals and some of which we've accomplished, which is terrific, you know, since -- what was it? A little over a year ago or whatever else. And we did that -- but, you know, of combining the advisory implementation groups, that's been done, issuing the annual report, you know, and gotten that back on track. You know we've done that.

Other things we said was about building a

concrete base to work from, you know, reviewing the water plan. You know it's a five-year. You know, do we look at interim and full, everything else, looking about, you know, staffing, you know, on that? I'm going to talk, you know, kind of the two of these together, they go hand in hand.

One of the things we've said, you know, even when we were looking at establishing a budget, everything else was, you know, our legislators.

Our particular agencies don't always know. What does the Water Planning Council do? Or what is the state water plan.

I mean, it got adopted in, you know, 2019 after several years, you know, before the legislature, you know, to get adopted. But they still -- if you ask a legislator, they probably don't know what the state water plan is, you know, in all honesty.

And, you know, the outreach education stuff, the workshops, I think all of that's good. We've talked about doing, you know, kind of a meeting with the legislators, which would be great to kind of like present the annual report; come when they come up in this upcoming session, kind of do a little, you know, presentation, invite people.

Have it at the LOB, kind of maybe do that, you know.

Because I think part of, you know, to get, you know, money for a budget, to update a plan for whatever, you've got to build a support for it.

And right now, the support is not there, because they're not aware of it. It's not like, you know, on it -- some of the people that were involved with development of this and everything are no longer in the legislature. So a lot of those people may not be there.

So kind of keeping in mind those type of things, you know, I think, you know -- and it's been talked about having that meeting with key legislators, maybe it becomes a presentation of the annual report we submitted. Here's what we go on, the things that, you know, the outreach and education committee is doing, I think is great.

Another thought might be that perhaps we do a quarterly newsletter or a quarterly flyer e-mail blast that says, here's updates on the state water plan or what things are happening, you know, in that sense, you know, as we move forward with all that stuff.

So I want to just kind of have those on there

because to just refresh everyone's mind as we're coming to, you know, the end of a calendar year where we've got to do our annual report. Where are we going forward in the next calendar year? Those type of things. So that's kind of why those, you know, two items were popped on the agenda there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which I think is excellent. I think if you incorporate, the two kind of go hand in hand as we do the annual report, and we can incorporate our goals and then kind of do a dog-a-pony show with particularly the legislative leadership of the Public Health Committee and Planning and Development and Environment Committee. I think that's a great idea and something that we should absolutely do.

And you're right. I mean, as much as we try with outreach and our forums, and what Denise does with her group, there's still a lot to be done.

And you know, water -- I've said this and I've been doing this for a long time -- it's the stepchild of utility. I mean, when you don't have it, people think about it -- but people just take it for granted.

So Eric, Graham, any followup with that?

1 ERIC McPHEE: No. GRAHAM STEVENS: Nothing on there, John. Thank you. 2 3 THE CHAIRMAN: And I think -- if you remember way back 4 when, we actually did have the Water Planning 5 Council, when we were rolling out the plan, we 6 actually went up and we had a forum with the 7 committees of cognizance and we had an afternoon 8 session with them so they could do some Q and A 9 and that kind of thing. So I think that's 10 something to look forward to in the next 11 legislative session. 12 Any public comment on any of the items on the 13 agenda today? Oh, there's Virginia. I didn't 14 think Virginia was with us. 15 And Alicia, did I see your hand up? 16 Where did Alicea go? 17 ALICEA CHARAMUT: I'm still here, but Virginia is going 18 first, I think. Or was she? 19 THE CHAIRMAN: Is she? 20 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Yes. I couldn't -- my raise-my-hand 21 thing wasn't visible. 22 I just want to make a quick comment. If you 23 do decide to go with the issue of floating climate 24 change for one of your topics for next year, I 25 think a good thing to -- whether it's

explaining -- this depends on the audience -explaining or trying to change the mindset away
from talking about these storms as a hundred-year
storm.

Because when we have hundred-year storms two or three years in a row, people are going, huh?

What's going on here? I know 10, 15 years ago,

USGS was trying to change the lingo to calling it a storm that has the potential of 1 percent probability of happening in any year.

So if that happens two years in a row, well, there was a 1 percent chance this year. There's a 1 percent chance next year. That's more understandable to people than calling it a hundred-year storm. So I think if we explain that, if we were to do it as a theme, if we explain that and start ourselves using the lingo of a 1 percent probability of happening, it might clarify some of the public's feelings.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great point.

Alicia?

ALICEA CHARAMUT: So thank you, Eric, for bringing up
the GC3 in terms of what we should be doing for -what changes we should be making on the ground
when it comes to water issues, and especially when

we're looking at the storm of August 18th.

The working in natural lands group made a lot of very specific recommendations that were, I thought, very clear across the board between the forest, the wetlands, ag, and the rivers group on how we can improve our water management in the face of climate change. And a lot of that in the first round report got whittled down, and a lot of it was lost.

And so in terms of looking at the GC3 and recommendations to our water resources, I think it's really important to look at the specific recommendations within those reports and not just what was sort of filtered out and diluted in that first year report, because we lose a lot and we lose a lot of nature-based solutions if we do that.

So just throwing my two cents in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Alicia.

Denise?

DENISE SAVAGEAU: Thanks, Jack.

And I have to say I agree with Alicia. The working lands reports on the GC3 are just critical. And when they started taking some priorities out for implementation, a lot of that

work didn't get put in there as a first round priority, but that doesn't mean all that work should be lost. And we really do need to look at it.

I do want to touch base quickly on setting goals and particularly the, you know, for the state water plan and the budgeting process. I think if we wait for all of the legislators to be educated on the state water plan before we ask for money, we're never going to be able to ask for money.

The Legislature changes every two years. We need to ask for money during the long session.

They're not going to give us it very easily during the short session. So although I agree that education is important, I think we need to make the ask as we're educating people about that. If we're not asking for the money, we're not going to get it.

And so I would really encourage this Council and the agencies that support you that make up this Council to take a look at this, because one of the things that I'm seeing is inaction. And basically, you know, the inaction is basically because of the silos.

The Department of Public Health doesn't want to be the one who puts the money in. OPM doesn't want to put the money in. Nobody wants to make it a priority for their Council. And therefore, the water planning work is not getting done because nobody is making it a priority. So who's going to make this a priority with the State Legislature?

And I think we need to -- and asking for the money and putting it in the budget, it starts the discussion, even if that takes two years. But if you don't ask for it, what's going to happen is they're going to say, well, why did you ask for it now? You didn't ask for it two years ago. We don't want to have that argument.

We want to be asking for it and say, we've been asking for it for ten years. So this is what we need, and we should be asking for it now.

That's the way the Legislature goes.

I do agree with Martin. There's a whole lot of legislators who don't know what we do, but one of the things I will tell you is that, just like a lot of municipalities that we're working with, they're looking that the State -- they just think that this is already being handled. So that the state agencies and the water utilities are

handling this.

They don't understand the role that they can play. They don't understand the role of the state water plan, but there was a reason the state water plan was legislated. And we don't want to have those problems come back and haunt us again because we didn't work collectively with all of the four agencies as well as all the nonprofits and the water utilities and everybody who's around this table.

Because right now, we're not prepared the way we should be for water, whether it be intense rainfall and the water quality, or drought. And we need to be having a better plan in place so that we don't -- so that we are more sustainable. So I'm looking at that.

And, you know, I know I'm pushing it with the legislators I talked to, and I do talk with a lot of them. And I think it's imperative for this group to do that. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Denise. And it's something that has been going -- I mean, this is going on for almost a quarter of a century. And I look at what we've done piecemeal approach. Like in the 2000s, we had a situation where all the agencies

pitched in some money, and we actually had Sharon Mann working for us a little bit at that point.

So we have to kind of get that, that ball rolling. Of course, councilmembers, we have a lot of experience and background in the Legislature. So I think that we have to figure out the best approach to getting that done. And we can incorporate that into our annual report with recommendations moving forward for the '25/'26 fiscal year.

And Graham, Martin?

Okay. Anyone else have public comment today?

Anyone else?

Oh, I'm sorry, Carol.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's okay. I saw you raise your hand,

CAROL HASKINS: I can't find the raise-hand function.

Carol.

CAROL HASKINS: So a couple of things; I would like to underscore or echo what Virginia said about the using the language around the flooding probability. You know, for the Pomperaug River we have seen several storms in the past two years that have exceeded, you know, more than minor flooding.

And this past storm really, I mean, even what

you see on the news, it just -- it makes my stomach hurt to drive around my watershed and see, see the damage. It's, like, beyond comprehension in some ways.

And I just want to share comments that, you know, the response in Southbury and Oxford in particular -- those are two communities I'm most familiar with -- have really been phenomenal. And those town leaders really should be applauded for their responsiveness, as well as the State.

Governor Lamont, Katie Dykes have been out here surveying the damage firsthand. The DOT has been out, they've been putting Band-Aids upon Band-Aids on things, which is, you know, much appreciated in terms of the transportation and accessibility, but when it comes to looking at things like what's in GC3, what's in the state water plan, what's in even this well water resiliency plan, I was just kind of glazing through quickly here during the meeting.

These Band-Aids are not addressing the resiliency in the infrastructure. We're putting like-size pipes right back in, patching things up, and I have my doubts if things are going to actually be upsized. And with the frequency

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

increasing the way it is, and these storm volumes increasing the way they are, it's quite concerning.

And seeing some streams that have relocated and taken out an entire road, a state roadway, and the stream being put exactly back where it was, when that's not where it wants to go, is really disheartening, but I also understand the mercy to get people out from their homes that have been fully disconnected.

So, you know it's a constant balance between, you know, the human element of the natural world and, you know, balancing the infrastructure and the nature needs. And, you know, we know to do it right takes time, and hope that there will be some forward-looking plans to mitigate and try and rebalance some of those Band-Aids.

And, you know, I know we're trying to stop the hemorrhage here, but let's look at the real root of what these problems are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well said, Carol. Thank you.

Graham?

GRAHAM STEVENS: Yeah, just to respond to that. know, Carol, you know, we have been out and in the field and looking at these situations where, you

know, our staff are working side by side with DOT. In some of those decisions, we know that not in every instance are there decisions being made that are, you know, that are changing the dynamics in a way that is going to greatly improve resilience.

I'd also say -- and this is something that, you know, not for you necessarily, but, you know, it's important to remember that, you know, bigger is not always better. And that's something that we've heard and are trying to work with towns on as well, where, you know, sometimes people just want to put in the biggest culvert possible, whereas a culvert may not even be the right approach.

So, you know, one thing that, you know, DEEP is doing that the folks should know about -- and really it's just kicked off last week, is, you know, we've launched an initiative known as rebuilding with resilience, where we're trying to provide in-kind resources to municipalities affected by the 8/18 storm to, you know, look at both, you know, immediate repairs that will end up being the permanent repairs and trying to add resilience where feasible there. And also, you know, working with the communities who've been

impacted and do temporary repairs, but intend to come back and do a more permanent repair to work on sitting with them on the planning and working on the alt-type design features that bring resilience to provide that, you know, service to them to try to eliminate some of the challenges that towns are, you know, faced with when trying to make these decisions about public safety.

Right?

We need the fire department to be able to rescue people if their home catches on fire. We need to be able to collect trash. We need to be able to deliver mail. People need areas of rescue assistance should there be another storm. Right? All very critical and important decisions.

But we also want to say, you know, what are the nature-based solutions that we can add to this project? It may be a project scope increase, footprint increase, impact increase, but is there a net positive at the end of the day? Are there different design features that should be brought in for the permanent? And also ensuring that our contractors can provide some advice with respect to hazard mitigation and the changing rules at FEMA which come into effect on 9/9 to ensure that,

you know, people are getting their due
reimbursement; that they didn't miss an
opportunity to meet a new federal standard for
hazard mitigation, or that they don't leave on the
table an opportunity to seek greater federal
reimbursement for an expanded project. Right?

So there's the issue with FEMA -- is, you know, are you building back better? Are we allowed to say that anymore?

CAROL HASKINS: (Unintelligible.)

GRAHAM STEVENS: Are we building back resilient? And then FEMA is going to say, no, we can't reimburse you for that? Or are they building back like it was, and then FEMA is saying, no, you don't meet our resilient standard for hazard mitigation reimbursement.

So it's a very complicated, as everyone on this call probably knows, process that towns are going to have to thread that needle on. And so, you know, we basically put an e-mail out to them and through DEMHS and through the NVCOG to say, hey. You know, is anybody interested, first off? Right? Are there any takers?

And I know that first selectmen and mayors have a lot on their plates right now, but we're

going to continue to ask in hopes that we can deploy those resources to help them make as wise decisions as possible.

Because I know I've heard from, you know, first selectpeople that they want to avoid the problems that they experienced. Right? You may not be able to design for a thousand-year storm, but what can you design for. Right? And what can you account for?

So it's very fast moving. This is very much in its nascent stage. We just launched it last Tuesday at 8 a.m. on a call, and got it out to municipalities on Thursday, looking for their feedback, you know, but we're hopeful that this is the kind of work that we can do in this space on a going-forward basis.

You know, this Council should also know that DEEP is going to launch its next round of DEEP climate resilience funding through an RFI, a request for information, on an expanded scope for our climate resilience funding, which in 2023, you know, provided 21 grants, totaling some \$8.8 million for planning and project advancement. And we're looking at planning and project advancement, and in a bit of a modified way, but also funding

what we are calling deployment.

For those like Pat in the clean water world, you know, Pat knows all about the priority list. We're trying to kind of conceive of an idea where deployment is going to be awarded on, like, on a ranked basis. And then those, those parties can go seek federal or private, or other funding with the knowledge and comfort that if they get that money, if they move forward with that project, if they fund it themselves, you know, DEEP is going to be there to give an X percent contribution towards that project, another barrier we see in the resilience world.

So I just launched an Office of Planning and Resilience at DEEP. I'll be working in partnership with the Office of Climate Planning that conceived and launched the first DEEP climate resilience fund and is working with me to launch the second round RFI.

So please do look for that next RFI, which should be coming this week or next. We will see. And, you know, also, you know, as you're having conversations with folks, know that there is some more potential funding that the State can bring to help folks make better decisions as we adapt to

the impacts from climate change.

CAROL HASKINS: Thanks, Graham. That's really -- it's very reassuring, and fully agree bigger is not always better, you know -- but planning and projections as they go in here, so.

GRAHAM STEVENS: I know what you mean, but I just want to make sure of that.

CAROL HASKINS: Yeah. Floodplain reconnection is

definitely a big one for our watershed, and I'm

very pleased to hear what's, you know, in the

works and greatly appreciate that.

And I do know the flood, you know, FEMA is very nuanced. And one of the things that we've been hearing repeatedly from folks we've been talking to out, you know, just in the field the past few weeks is, you know, with that, with this .1 percent probability storm, it's a, you know, that these are folks impacted that are not in FEMA designated flood zones.

And yet, so they can't get flood insurance.

And then because of that, they, their damage is not being covered by a traditional storm event either. And it's, you know, that's definitely a big challenge that we're seeing for a lot of folks is the insurance company is getting to have it

both ways, and the little guy is kind of getting screwed here in the process, so.

THE CHAIRMAN: For sure. I mean the --

CAROL HASKINS: Lots of work to be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: A lot of work to be done. Everybody familiar with the Klarides plaza in Seymour, Connecticut, which is owned by Themis Klarides's family, unbelievable the devastation in there.

I mean, wiping out the majority of the small businesses there, package stores, greeting card stores, Ocean Job Lot. I mean, just unbelievable how high the water was in that place -- from a little, they call it the Little River.

Ironically, it's the Little River that runs in the back of all these places, and the Little River became a raging river during this storm. So lots to talk about. Lots of think about.

Anything else to come before us before we adjourn? Lots to do between now and the end of the year; the annual report, and we have seminars and meetings coming up and other things. I hope everybody participates.

And with that, is there anything else to come before us?

MARTIN HEFT: I'll make a motion to adjourn to adjourn

```
1
         at 2:34.
 2
    THE CHAIRMAN: Motion to adjourn. Second?
 3
    GRAHAM STEVENS:
                      Second.
 4
    THE CHAIRMAN: I appreciate everybody's participation
 5
         today. It was a very good meeting.
 6
              All those in favor signify by saying aye.
7
    THE COUNCIL: Aye.
8
    THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed?
9
10
                            (No response.)
11
12
    THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.
13
              See you all October 1st.
14
    GRAHAM STEVENS: Be well.
15
16
                           (End: 2:34 p.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 52 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 September 3, 2024.

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M #857

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: 6/30/2025

1	INDEX
2	VOTES TAKEN
3	(Unanimous Approval) DESCRIPTION PAGE
4	8/4/'24 Transcript approval 4
5	Adjournment 52
6	
7	
8	TOPICS OF DISCUSSION DESCRIPTION PAGE(s)
10	A. Charamut: Advisory group appointments USGS gauges 5-6
11	
12	M. Heft: Annual report due Jan. 1st 6-7
<ul><li>13</li><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	D. Savageau: Outreach & Education workshops 8-9 2025 Theme: Groundwater 10-11 Council Discussion: 11-15 Branding 15-17 Council Discussion: 18-21
16 17	M. Heft: Colebrook River Reservoir 23-28 Council Discussion: 28-31 Plan implementation & updates 32-35
18	Council Discussion: 35-51
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	