

Connecticut Source Water Collaborative Workshop

Workshop Summary

Wallingford, CT | December 4, 2013

Total Attendees: 35

Welcome

Chris Feurt, Meeting Facilitator

Introductory Remarks – Ellen Blaschinski, Public Health Branch Chief, Connecticut Department of Public Health (CTDPH)

Ms. Blaschinski welcomes and thanks the workshop participants for spending time to help with establishing the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative. She is fully behind the “Health Connecticut” message and safe drinking water is a key part of keeping Connecticut healthy.

Objectives/Participant Introductions

Lori Mathieu, Chief, CTDPH Drinking Water Section and Eric McPhee, Supervisor, Source Water Protection Unit, Drinking Water Section, CTDPH

Ms. Mathieu gave a brief overview of the history behind the source water protection (SWP) unit at CTDPH and introduced Eric McPhee. Mr. McPhee thanked participants for attending and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for their support. He then introduced the workshop as an opportunity to focus on the evolution of the SWP effort and discuss its direction moving forward in Connecticut. The goal of this meeting was to identify common goals, benefits of collaboration, and potential initiatives that will provide the foundation for the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative (SWC). Mr. McPhee emphasized that the purpose of the workshop was not to develop regulation, but to build new relationships and foster new ideas to move SWP in Connecticut through partnership.

Findings for Water Research Foundation Project on Developing a Vision and Roadmap for Source Water Protection for U.S. Water Utilities

Chi Ho Sham, Ph.D., The Cadmus Group

Mr. Sham described the outcome of the Water Research Foundation project on developing a vision and roadmap for source water protection for U.S. water utilities. He commented on why protecting

source water is an important piece of the multi-barrier approach to providing clean and safe drinking water and how a collaborative approach can improve the effectiveness of this first barrier. Because water systems often do not own land and lack the jurisdiction to regulate land use activities, they need help from planners, regulators, land trusts, and other partners. Similarly, planners would benefit from the inputs of water systems to make their actions more effective in protecting water resources and public health.

Mr. Sham proceeded to discuss the four major themes as envisioned in the vision and roadmap project. These four themes are:

- (1) Raise awareness,
- (2) Enhance coordination,
- (3) Provide support, and
- (4) Increase recognition.

He also relayed the various recommendations associated with both a top-down and a bottom-up approach to advance source water protection – which are exemplified by a number of SWP collaborative efforts across the country. At the national level, the recommendations are:

- Develop system for providing awareness, outreach and education to key decision-makers and the general public (including schools) as to importance and values/benefits of SWP
- Fix gaps to improve integration of CWA regulation and source water protection
- Create a national source water protection coordination organization
- Achieve nationwide recognition of SWP efforts among key land use planning and management organizations
- U.S. EPA, states and ASDWA, AWWA, NRWA, NRCS and other appropriate organizations should provide more information, education and guidance on how to manage watersheds and aquifers regarding emerging issues and other SWP issues specific to drinking water
- Develop interstate and trans-boundary waterway commissions to facilitate SWP across state boundaries.

At the local level, he suggested the following:

- Create an on-site, individual SWP mentoring program for water utilities
- Update and build upon existing SW assessments to move forward to protection
- Leverage current CWA and other state and federal regulations and programs more effectively
- Water utilities should encourage local and state legislative bodies to pass resolutions recognizing that SWP is important
- Develop watershed/aquifer councils of governments and/or partner with NGOs as watershed associations to facilitate natural system-based land and source water planning efforts

The Promise and Challenges of Source Water Collaboratives: A National Perspective Grounded in Local Successes

Jim Taft, Executive Director, Association of State Drinking Water Administrators

Mr. Taft discussed the role of the Association of State Drinking Water Administrators (ASDWA) in supporting the drinking water programs in states, territories, Washington D.C., and the Navajo Nation. He built upon the points introduced by Mr. Sham, emphasizing the importance of SWP to minimize our reliance on treatment, not only economically, but scientifically, with regard to emerging contaminants. Cost-benefit analyses published by EPA and the Trust for Public Land (TPL)/American Water Works Association (AWWA) show that SWP goes beyond economic feasibility to the point of cost-savings. Mr. Taft proceeded to share the activities of other SWCs around the nation and the various roles within such organizations. Outreach efforts of these SWCs include the development of basic educational guides and cost-benefit tools.

Mr. Taft described the lessons learned from existing efforts and emphasized that the key to an effective SWC is to create the conditions to foster activities at the local level and leverage existing authorities and resources. Looking forward, he hopes that the SWC would focus on non-point source issues and initiate a conversation with others that have engaged in similar efforts. He also emphasized that the collaboration for SWP relies on interaction between those who work to support the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) and the Clean Water Act (CWA) and that “hard-wiring” coordination into operations is key to engage both parties. Mr. Taft also discussed the logistics of membership considerations, including the importance of engaging diverse partners and levels of support; leadership options; time and resources; and branding.

Question & Answer

Q: The University of Connecticut Lady Huskies have a head coach that guides the team. Who plays the coach role in the SWC?

Jim Taft: It depends on the SWC. For the Salmon Falls SWC of Maine and New Hampshire, the SWP coordinator of Maine shares major responsibilities with Kira Jacobs of Region 1.

Kira Jacobs: Chris Feurt, the facilitator of the Salmon Falls SWC, has been one of the biggest “cheerleaders” for this effort. Similar to activities with true shared leadership, many members of the Salmon Falls SWC have risen to the challenge as necessary.

Lori: The Lady Huskies are a great example of collaboration. The head coach doesn’t function alone—he is supported by four additional coaches, 15 staff members, and the UConn athletic department. The basketball team is not an individual effort, nor will be the SWC effort.

Group discussion of ideas presented by Jim Taft and their relevance to Connecticut
The group discussed the benefits and challenges from the perspectives of participant organizations and their constituents.

CT SWC has established a website (www.ct.gov/dph/ctswc) that will be updated with all efforts relating to the collaboration, including documents associated with the workshop and other additional relevant materials. Interested individuals can contact Eric McPhee (eric.mcphee@ct.gov) if they would like to share SWP information with other interested parties.

Benefits of creating a Connecticut Source Water Collaborative:

Kate Brown (Trust for Public Land): The Connecticut SWC can help to secure increased funding for land conservation.

Guy Russo (Connecticut Water Works Association]: There are many common interests in this large group. Together, this group will have one voice that will have a stronger impact.

Michael Dietz (Connecticut Nonpoint Education for Municipal Officials): As an educator, I will have more “ammunition” to talk to townspeople, providing a more cohesive message to the public of the problem and the efforts taken to respond to this problem.

Roger Reynolds (Connecticut Fund for the Environment): The SWC can bring about robust conversation about land use decision-making. A group speaking with one voice about land use makes a stronger case against development and for more stringent controls around watershed land.

Betsy Gara (Connecticut Council of Small Towns): The SWC will protect the character of towns surrounding watersheds, provide recreational areas for citizens and preserve the beauty of the land for residents. In Connecticut, the Class I and Class II watershed lands are protected from all but passive recreational uses. Some examples of beautiful Connecticut land that can be enjoyed recreationally include the Kelda Lands, the reservoir in Torrington, and Barkhamsted Reservoir (of the Metropolitan District or MDC).

Jane Downing (U.S. EPA Region 1): This is a good time to address the greatest challenges to SWP and come up with strategies that everyone feels good about, especially since many years have passed since source water assessments were conducted and completed at the national level. Although the threats of contaminants to U.S. source waters were identified at that time, not many local plans have been established to act on the threats. This is a good time to revisit the meaning of SWP and take action.

Joan Nichols (Connecticut Farm Bureau Association): The SWC will be a good conduit between stakeholders' and the various collaborative members' interests. What comes out of the collaborative can go back to practitioners and lead to greater communication.

Jennifer Hoyle (Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies): From an academic perspective, the SWC can synthesize the diverse work portfolio of drinking water protection

among the 169 communities in Connecticut. This is an opportunity to reflect on progress, design future goals and begin taking next steps.

Dave Knauf (Connecticut Association of Directors of Health): Like for all public policy, changing the perspective of the next generation is crucial to trigger change, as was true in the case of solid waste. Similarly, the SWC can build the necessary critical mass to affect public policy with the ultimate goal of protecting aquifers and water supplies.

Roger Reynolds (Connecticut Fund for the Environment): The state legislature representative from Simsbury, CT recently held a water summit and the University of Connecticut (UConn) is planning a water conference in 2014. There is an expectation that legislative action will arise soon, extending beyond divvying water supplies to the synergy of how to protect waters. With a strong voice, the SWC can make a strong impact.

What are water utilities' perspectives?

Rob Longo (Connecticut Section of American Water Works Association): One of our greatest challenges is cultivating knowledge among residents. For example, pharmaceuticals pose a problem in our streams. Some utilities thought the level of pharmaceuticals in their water systems is low, but these contaminants may simply be going into septic systems instead of sources that are tested regularly. Public education is still lacking and it is important to spread the word of events such as annual medication disposal days. While some utilities have properly collected and disposed a significant quantity of pharmaceuticals, they still receive calls from the public saying that they had not heard of the program. If utilities can get the message out there now and educate the public, they will avoid problems down the line. Ultimately, residents and utilities share a common goal.

Dave Knauf (Connecticut Association of Directors of Health): Pharmaceuticals pose a significant problem for multiple sectors (e.g., conservation, health, enforcement). His department has participated in a drug collection event and has received over 300 lbs of drugs from the public. There is a free drug drop-off box at the local police station and there is ongoing public education. Drop-off boxes cost a mere \$600, and offer a huge return. More aggressive marketing to the public is needed to promote this safe disposal practice.

Rob Longo (Connecticut Section of American Water Works Association): The communication effort should also educate politicians, not just residents. Communication about the benefits of investing in SWP was helpful in obtaining buy-ins from local politicians for a drug box in Farmington.

Eric McPhee (Connecticut Department of Public Health): Is there a way to identify the overlap of concerns from multiple perspectives, including water utilities, ground water suppliers, watershed investigators and enforcement officers?

Chi Ho Sham (The Cadmus Group): Publicizing public health as the end product is effective as it sets all parties toward a common goal. The SWC must be able to document impacts and quantify benefits for individuals.

Chris Feurt (Facilitator): The next step is to create an action plan and use adaptive management, modifying goals as the process becomes clearer.

Challenges to creating a Connecticut Source Water Collaborative:

Betsy Gara (Connecticut Council of Small Towns): Competing interests.

Margaret Miner (Rivers Alliance): Funding.

Dave Knauf (Connecticut Association of Directors of Health): One challenge is to sell the concept of SWP to communities that do not use the water source in question. Residents may feel that the rights to their property are being taken. How can we deal with the perception of “taking” associated with SWP?

- Kira Jacobs (U.S. EPA Region 1): If we framed it correctly, this challenge could become an opportunity. For example, Sebago Lake is far from Portland, Maine. Areas near the intake are strictly protected from any uses, yet the rest of the lake provides many recreational benefits.
- Chris Feurt (Facilitator): A similar idea involves payment for ecosystem services. How can we determine how to compensate a farmer or forester for keeping ownership of their land as opposed to selling it to a developer?
- Rob Longo (Connecticut Section of American Water Works Association): We pay taxes in communities that we live in. When the water district owns a piece of land, they must constantly fight appraisals and battles over land classification.
- Denise Ruzicka (Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection): We must be careful not to be so exclusive in our message that we miss out on leveraging opportunities.

Lori Mathieu (Connecticut Department of Public Health): We need to foster in the public eye a broad understanding of the definition and logistics of a public water system (PWS), and why Connecticut watersheds are unique. The public lacks a high-level understanding of water practitioners’ responsibilities, the origin and path of their water, and the steps necessary to clean water and bring it to the tap.

- Chris Feurt (Facilitator): An example activity drawn from academia is to have students draw a watershed, well and septic system to cultivate basic water literacy.

Alex Barrett (Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies): We need to collect, compile and analyze data on the basic conditions of land ownership, use and management. We need baseline

data to understand how and why Connecticut is so diverse in its drinking water supplies. How do we determine the metric to compare those supplies? How threatened is our supply (e.g., use impervious land as indicator)?

Margaret Miner (River Alliance): This state has stringent water secrecy laws. Though the locations of future water supplies have been made public, data is yet to be released on yield. We cannot tell if they're talking about 100 gallons or 1 million gallons. We need more transparency.

Reimagining Source Water Protection - A Leadership Role for Connecticut

G. Tracy Mehan III, U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities

Mr. Mehan began by lauding New England, especially CT, for being far above the curve on SWP, not just in reference to wastewater management but in respect to the landscape as well. When first entering the source water protection world, Mr. Mehan approached water quality from a cost-effectiveness perspective. SWP under the Safe Drinking Water Act is the analog to watershed protection under the Clean Water Act. He noted that, after making investigations among multiple water utilities, cost-savings played only a relatively small role in the decision-making process of providing safe drinking water. The other benefits of SWP are more far-ranging and include habitat, restoration of flow regimes, and mitigation of urban heat effect. He introduced the U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities – which is funded by a trade dispute between U.S. and Canada over timber sales. As part of the settlement, the U.S. received a \$200 million endowment. The Endowment has funded a wide variety of activities (e.g., chestnut tree recovery) and now a national coordinator for source water protection. Mr. Mehan communicated the Endowment's interest in sustaining the American forestry sector while protecting source water. Mr. Mehan noted the Endowment's need for direct engagement with the utility sector. Where possible, they would like to engage the utility sector in a long-term sustainable stream of funding for wood lot owners, forestry and SWP efforts.

To communicate the interests of the Endowment, Mr. Mehan elaborated on the most ambitious SWP effort, the Savannah River Project, whose goal is to put 60% of Savannah River Watershed under protection. The Endowment has made contributions for economic analyses regarding the Savannah River Watershed effort.

Mr. Mehan believes it is important to engage expertise in marketing, outreach and sales. He noted the importance of a conceptual understanding of the link between an investment in the landscape and SWP, but maintained that the business case is crucial, relying on conversation and research to document causal links of SWP to build a business case and garner the support of politicians at the community level. In Connecticut, the major priority is to preserve the land owned by water utilities.

Question & Answer

Q: How can forests be maintained, considering politics, infestation and invasive species? This is a socio-political issue.

Tracy Mehan: It is crucial to encourage creative thinking for funding, looking to planning and zoning boards, the agriculture sector and real estate developers. Since the Endowment is looking to make an investment in SWP with a long-term payoff, attendees are encouraged to contact him.

Group discussion of ideas presented by Tracy Mehan

Jim Taft: Can you further discuss how green infrastructure is being incorporated into infrastructure?

- Mehan: Traditional problems include full-cost pricing and dealing with low-income customers without changing the rate, but utilities are now considering green infrastructure (e.g., low-impact development) regularly as cost-effective approach and are recognizing the need to build a diverse portfolio.

Margaret Miner: There is money available for infrastructure. Could green infrastructure be eligible for some of the same funds?

- Mehan: Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) could be used for non-point source and landscape protection. The problem is that states don't want to divert their funds there. To determine the best use of the tax-payer's money, we need a careful analysis of the benefits of using funds in that way.

Jane Downing: Can you describe the specific interests of the Endowment?

- Mehan: The Endowment is focusing its interests on non-urban areas unless it relates to watersheds that reach rural areas.

Joan Nichols: Given 80% of forest land is in private ownership, has the Endowment considered the forest legacy program?

- Mehan: A one-size fits all, federal approach does not work. Issues in Connecticut involve forest management and putting in place long-term forest protection conservation contracts. I did not mean to imply that the Savannah approach is the correct one.
- Kira Jacobs: The forest legacy program was actually born in New England. In Maine and New Hampshire, the Salmon Falls Collaborative was asked to include a larger area of land in the forest legacy program so that associated watershed land would be eligible. It would be worthwhile to explore forest legacy program opportunities in Connecticut.
- Mehan: We should also consider tax benefits. In some places, if you work with a forester and receive forestry certification, you may get tax benefits – an added financial incentive.

Moving the Vision Forward

Chris Feurt

In this session, Chris Feurt facilitated a conversation about crafting a strategy to implement the Connecticut SWC during its first year, including action items and a timeline. Their first priority should be to identify the attainable goals—the low-hanging fruit. Ms. Feurt discussed the use of collaborative learning technique to obtain ideas from the workshop participants to advance the formation of the Collaborative.

As a first step to implementing a collaborative learning event, Chris facilitated an activity where participants partnered up with another individual, spent five minutes sharing a promising idea for five minutes and reversing roles. After sharing their ideas (i.e., one that connects policy initiatives, identifies missing information/resources, is achievable in a timeframe, identifies concrete management practices that link to outcomes), partners rejoined the group. Below are some of the ideas and lessons learned shared by the participants.

- The problem parses down to education and outreach. In order to create more public demand for SWP to work, the SWC should provide education and outreach to homeowners and citizens, who generally have low water literacy, easily attainable and digestible materials describing the importance of SWP. For example, President Obama, instead of hiring a single contractor, posed a challenge to youth to create a video promoting his health care program and website. Similarly, the SWP message could be more widespread if they turned outreach into a contest.
- Create a document to explain what the state is doing now. Instead of talking about protection for Class I or II properties or private lands, identify what the state is already doing, determine what is working or not working and establish a baseline status.
- Find out the percentage of Connecticut land that is held by water utilities. Calculate the statistics and compare the true threats to SWP with the publicly perceived threats. For example, the public may perceive trash to be the biggest threat, when in reality it is something less tangible (such as bacteria). Talk to municipalities about real economic benefits of increasing SWP efforts.
- Define the problem. Years ago, the biggest ground water protection problem revolved around volatile organic compounds (VOCs), especially benzene in water. Define the source water problem for various sectors in terms of septic systems, climate change and redefined threats of contaminants. Integrate the CWA and SDWA, which will help to identify the greatest opportunity for SWP.
- Map the regulations so that towns can adopt regulations based on their local problems.

- Define the problem and identify ways to preserve land around a watershed. Payment for ecosystem services is an important concept. For example, Yale students in the forestry program, who are working on their experimental forests, can provide services to landowners, crossing the bridge between academic or high-level goals and landowners. Instead of preaching the message, they provide a value to the landowners.
- Leverage on the benefits of this collaboration. Landowners provide students with real-world experience in return for a free product (e.g., plan, assessment), but they also gain pleasure in showing their land and sharing their experience. Everybody benefits from the partnership.
- Engage politicians by providing them with education. The SWC could centralize all information and provide a weekly report to promote the work of the SWC, similar to the one distributed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).
- Additionally, a water quality trading credit program could be beneficial to farmers.
- Determine the incentives or disincentives for water withdrawal in terms of utility pricing. Identify the difference in cost per capita (e.g., in offering a uniform rate to consumers or rates that addresses the difference) in decision-making.
- The Connecticut public utility regulatory authority (PURA) might be helpful, as it encourages good policies. PURA only regulates private and public water companies, so the potential role of PURA needs to be evaluated.
- Given the overpopulation of deer on utility land, the SWC could host a constructive deer hunt. Thus far, the Board of Water Commission has been resistant.
- The Department of Transportation (DOT) ought to be included in the SWC.
- Create planning and zoning boards for watersheds, which are already in consideration and could gain traction. Establish water utility coordinating committees (from a purveyor standpoint). Regional planning agencies need a central place for planning. Districts such as Middletown have created an overlay zone with best management practices (BMPs) and limited activities that can take place in the area in the future. Though the SWC cannot change restrictions, they can support the various efforts to manage watershed areas more stringently. The legislation for these actions has been proposed and is in process.
 - Lori Mathieu commented that Groton Utilities struggled with what they could do for their watersheds and considered zoning and overlay options. Groton considered what could be done without regulation and built a website with those details (the link will be added to the CT SWC website). The communities involved in the Groton effort came close to implementation of some of the planning recommendations but lost traction. The SWC could use concepts vetted in these plans for other areas. A smaller scale

action is to sponsor a contest to design a placard to be posted on catch basins that reads, “This basin drains into your drinking supply.”

- Consider the future of SWP—given climate change and the increase in extreme weather events, plan for what the watersheds will look like and some effects (e.g., algal blooms). The SWC may need to shift its plan according to the consequences of climate change.
 - Chris Feurt mentioned that at a previous coastal zone management conference, ~~where~~ one speaker discussed what would happen to New Orleans if there was a massive hurricane. The same speaker played a large role after Hurricane Katrina. Given the science, to a certain extent, we already know what will happen and should be prepared.
- Consider using cold-water fisheries as the “canary in the coal mine” to show impending trouble in headwater ecosystems and the impact on water quality and availability in source water supplies.
- Explore prospective legal avenues to make land conservation more appealing on a cost-effectiveness front. These could include tax breaks, tax incentives and options to donate land in return for something.
- Explore the feasibility of any of these options. Watershed overlays sound great, but they require funding, as does land acquisition. Since funding is a hugely limiting factor, the SWC must consider funding options (e.g., surcharges by water companies) to begin changes ~~instead~~ in lieu of inspiring ideas. For example, since stormwater is increasing, the SWC could look to stormwater utilities to raise money to create a structure. However, no stormwater utilities currently exist in Connecticut. Instead, the SWC could focus on DOT involvement. If the state does not lead by example, local municipalities will not want to join in the effort. Unfortunately, the DOT is not incentivized to invest in anything other than construction even though SWP could have huge impacts on transportation infrastructure.
 - Chi Ho Sham shared an experience working with Pheasants Forever in Iowa. For one SWP effort, Iowa used SRF funds to purchase land and Pheasants Forever used their funds to plant seed to covert cropland to prairie grassland. The result was a prairie grassland habitat that lowered the level of nitrate in the ground water. Chi Ho also described the Massachusetts partnership between the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation (MassDCR) and Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) to protect source water at the Wachusett Reservoir. This mutually beneficial project included funds from MassDOT to mitigate runoff from roadways and highways adjacent to the reservoir to prevent spills and accidental releases of contaminants into the Reservoir.

- Involve the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in the discussion with utilities and people who conduct watershed inspections. This high-level concept would allow collaboration for waste management in farms and the farm bureau.
 - Water systems believe this is a fruitful idea. They commented that water contamination may not originate from farms. For example, there is a wealthy area of Connecticut where residents have multiple acres of land with horses. They dumped animal waste next to a stream that flows to the reservoir. It is also noted that Connecticut has very diverse problems. Anything that gets accomplished in this complex and diverse state will serve as an excellent example for the country.

Polling Exercise

Chris Feurt, based on the discussion at the workshop, formulated a number of polling questions for the participants. The results for the polling are included in her presentation slides and are highlighted below.

1. Fostering source water literacy is an important objective for the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative – 72% Strongly Agree; 28% Agree; 0% Strongly Disagree
2. Providing scientifically sound, place-based information on costs and benefits of source water protection is important – 47% Strongly Agree; 50% Agree; 3% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree
3. Watershed protection fees on water bills would be well received in Connecticut – 6% Strongly Agree; 10% Agree; 65% Disagree; 19% Strongly Disagree
4. Leveraging our collective efforts in source water protection is an important objective for the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative – 69% Strongly Agree; 24% Agree; 7% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree
5. Enforcing existing source water protection policies and regulations is a statewide challenge that the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative needs to consider – 28% Strongly Agree; 28% Agree; 38% Disagree; 7% Strongly Disagree
6. Improving funding of land conservation is an important objective for the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative – 38% Strongly Agree; 50% Agree; 9% Disagree; 3% Strongly Disagree
7. Providing a unified message about source water protection is an important objective for the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative – 52% Strongly Agree; 42% Agree; 6% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree
8. I feel like my ideas were heard and respected today – 60% Strongly Agree; 37% Agree; 3% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree
9. The right people were in the room today – 7% Strongly Agree; 67% Agree; 27% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree
10. I am optimistic about the potential for the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative to affect positive change – 23% Strongly Agree; 55% Agree; 23% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree

11. It will be a good use of my time to stay engaged in the work of the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative – 31% Strongly Agree; 48% Agree; 3% Disagree; 0% Strongly Disagree; 17% Not sure

Wrap-up

The workshop concluded with a few action items to kick off the Connecticut SWC, including the creation of a listserv for all interested parties to engage in further discussion on the development and establishment of the Collaborative (including contacts or groups that were missing from this initial workshop) and a plan to hold periodic meetings. The group may consider using Basecamp, a low-cost project management software, to host their communication and activities.

Ms. Mathieu wrapped up the workshop by thanking all the participants for their valuable contributions and spending time on the important topic of source water protection. She is going to move forward on the formation of a formal source water collaborative for Connecticut and she and her staff are committed to hold additional meetings to keep the momentum going. Please look for an announcement for another meeting in early spring of 2014. Additional groups, as suggested by the workshop participants of the current workshop, will be invited to participate in taking next steps toward a formal Connecticut Source Water Collaborative. Ms. Mathieu also invited the workshop participants to contact her and/or Eric if they have additional questions and comments relating to the Connecticut Source Water Collaborative.