

Draft Meeting Notes for the State Water Plan Implementation Workgroup
January 21, 2020; 11:30 – 1:15
PURA

Attendees: Virginia de Lima, David Radka, Corinne Fitting, Alicia Charamut (Alternate for Lou Burch), Denise Savageau, Bruce Wittchen.

Attended by Phone: Steve Rupar, Tom Tyler, Lou Burch, Lori Mathieu, Mike Dietz

Public: Ali Hibbard

Note Taker(s): Kevin Veilleux, Abigail Davis, Dan Aubin

Meeting Starts 11:32pm

Topics of Discussion

Changes to Agenda

- No changes

Approval/Modification of Notes from January 7, 2020 meeting

- No changes made; January 7, 2020 notes approved

Update on Domestic Wells topical sub-work group

- Met January 13, 2020.
- Meredith Metcalf gave a review of her GIS database. She discussed Steps to set up and Issues
 - One issue is that the data points were mapped by address, not lat/long
 - This could create duplicate entries depending on how a street name is entered (e.g. CT-195 versus Storrs Rd)
 - Need for locational accuracy dependent on end use, e.g., parcel data may be sufficient when identifying potential receptors following a spill
 - Used students to enter their data, reasoning being that it's easier, cheaper, and more efficient
 - Discussion on using students to enter in domestic well data
 - Approximately 4,000 wells in Coventry were entered, at approximately 10 minutes per well record
 - During discussion, it was noted that drop-down menus (e.g., for street names) could help streamline data entry (like what MA has done with their database)
- Question on whether or not funding from the IWR (institute for Water Resources) could be used to fund this logging of data from Students? It was said that this could possibly be funded by IWR
- The biggest focus for the group right now is getting the white paper finished so it can be passed up the chain of command
 - Volunteers are working on different parts of the paper, and then Mike/Corinne plan to edit and finalize
 - Target due date for draft individual components is January 27
- Next meeting: TBD, when the white paper is closer to being finalized.

Update on Drought Plan topical sub-work group

- Met January 10, 2020.

- Still working through the meeting minutes of the Interagency Drought Work Group for the 2015-2016 drought as way to address the sub-work group's three (3) primary charges
- Meeting started with a discussion/review by Eric Lindquist about the recent Interagency meeting on January 16, 2020
 - Focus of the meeting was on functionality of the Interagency group, and some other issues that have been raised by this sub-work group
 - Eric received an email from DESPP stating that they have a "water task force" that could help with communication on the local level, as well as help address formality issues within the group and streamline the chain of command
 - The Interagency drought workgroup discussed the idea of adopting standing monthly meetings, which could be cancelled if there's no reason to meet in a given month
- A representative from DESPP is going to speak at the next meeting to give more information on ways they can assist. Sub workgroup will assess what is the best way to reach out to as many groups as possible.
- Looked back at the 2016 June interagency drought workgroup meeting minutes.
 - The indicators were appropriately assessed, and an appropriate decision to initiate a drought advisory was made in a timely manner.
 - Some discussion on who was going to draft the drought advisory, what is said and who would send it?
 - Believes the notice was not very effective. Many towns were not aware of the Drought advisory or simply didn't care. Sub workgroup will look into these barriers more
- Discussion on the time it takes utilities to update their reservoir levels with the drought group.
- Next meeting: February 7, 2020 at Dinosaur Park.

Review Alliance for Water Efficiency (AWE) Recommendations to WPC

- A commitment of the Connecticut Water Company and San Jose merger was to give a \$50,000 grant to AWE to help implement water conservation items relative to the State Water Plan. AWE proposed nine items to be potentially addressed and the WPC asked the IWG to give input on which items should be the highest priority. (Please note, the 6 items under AWE #4 have been numbered 4,5,6,7,8, and 9.)
- How to utilize the 50k grant funds most effectively was discussed, including whether it would be feasible to have the funds distributed over all the tasks to receive some form of baseline information per task; or, should the funds be spent to thoroughly address one or more priority tasks in order to receive a detailed report or recommendation on next steps.
 - It was agreed funds spent too thinly may leave us with little progress
 - Funds spent on tasks that State agencies or the IWG/ WPCAG could address with internal resources could be wasteful
 - AWE brings a national perspective which could be helpful, but we cannot overlook regional conditions and resources that are presented on the east coast as well as the different types of water suppliers
- The IWG gave top priority to Item #3 (with Bruce, Mike, and Lori leading the discussion)
 - Item #3: "Review the revenue loss issues arising from conservation programs and recommend solutions for addressing this problem"
 - Water Planning Council Advisory Group is preparing to also look at Item #3. Coordination is essential and it would be very helpful for the AWE to take some of this workload off of the WPCAG
- Also identified as being higher priority were items 1, 2, 4, and 6

- Item #1: “Provide and evaluation of existing state laws and regulations”
 - Review could occur as outgrowth of other tasks, e.g., identifying legal impediments to addressing revenue loss (see Item #3) and/or enforcement (see Item #2)
- Item #2: “Analyze the options for water waste enforcement” (note: Dan mentioned that “enforcement” should read “compliance”)
 - Denise would like to know more about the local ordinances and how they were adopted
 - Virginia mentioned the idea of creating a “menu” of clauses from which a town could choose to develop an ordinance appropriate for the situation
- Item #4: “SWP Section 5.2.3.3 – Water Conservation. Policy Recommendation (1) on Water conservation education outreach”
 - Lori would also prioritize this
 - It was felt that several other recommendations had strong educational components
- Item #6: “SWP Section 5.2.3.3 Water Conservation. Policy Recommendation (6) on incentives for outdoor water conservation measures”

Updates from WPC, WPCAG, and WUCC meetings

- **Update from WPC**
 - Meeting ran over; did not discuss
- **Update from WPCAG**
 - Meeting ran over; did not discuss
- **Update from WUCCs**
 - Meeting ran over; did not discuss

Other Business: Ali Hibbard, a newer employee at DEEP accompanied Corinne Fitting to the meeting.

Reminder: moved the IWG meeting time to 11:30am on the third Tuesday of every month, the same day as the WPCAG meetings

Next Meeting: February 18, 2020

Meeting Adjourned 1:17pm