

Source Water Protection Collaborative Workshop

Workshop Location: Wallingford, CT

Date: December 4, 2013

Evaluation and Information Form

1. What type of organization do you work for?

5	Public Water System or Utility
8	Federal/State/Local Government
7	Non-Governmental Organization
1	Industry/Commerce
4	Other (specify):

2. How would you rate the overall workshop?

9 Excellent _15_ Good _1_ Adequate ___ Poor

3. Were the topics discussed useful to you?

25 Yes ___ No

4. Are there aspects of the workshop that you believe should have greater (or less) emphasis?

- No
- Land use planners needed. Especially include regional planners.
- Greater – funding/acquisitions
- Pre-workshop info sharing – a ready packet or a ‘these are links you should read’ before the workshop
- More emphasis on members – would like more/better understanding of group
- Joint interest and solutions
- There should have been a discussion of the prospect that traditional funding sources will decline and that new sources have to replace those before doing anything new. The biggest bang for our buck?
- Need to discuss organizational structure: 1. Leadership, 2. Communication, 3. Dissemination of information, 4. Transparency of information/work-product.
- Problems identification; how this group’s activities contrast with others

Please continue on the other side. Thanks.

- Balanced
- What would next steps be?
- It was a good start.
- Less emphasis on surcharge on utility bills to purchase land. More emphasis on educating public on need for source water protection and implementation of watershed regulations.
- No
- Regulations
- Technical information
- No. All info was important.
- More state-specific info
- More on next steps/ideas about governance of a CT SWC
- More recognition of the multiple priorities that towns have – the pressures they face to foster economic development

5. What did you like most about this workshop?

- Interactive discussions
- Facilitator
- Collegial interactions
- Tracy Mehan's talk was great. I think he should have gone first – to frame the discussion
- Tracy Mehan's presentation
- Great presentations
- 1. The idea brainstorming sessions; 2. Chi Ho Sham's presentation.
- Keypad voting
- Taft presentation
- The idea – The nice people
- Chris did a great job facilitating this meeting, capturing ideas and moving things along.
- Collaborative ideas session
- Discussion / audience interaction / brain storming
- Good diversity of participants
- Having different stakeholders at table.
- Open dialog
- Different ideas presented.
- Learning about the time-tested methods for initiating and implementing collaborative changes
- Getting all these groups together
- Stakeholders and presentations
- Diversity of participants.
- Share of ideas; facilitation
- 1. Diversity of good ideas; 2. Polling / points of view
- Hearing the different perspectives

6. What did you like least about this workshop?

- Source water exclusivity. All sensitive waters such as headwaters should be included.
- Formal presentations
- The coffee disappeared before lunch.
- Lack of presentation about actual source water protection in CT – what is the current status
- Facilitation could have led to more concrete outcomes.
- Need to organize structure
- None.
- N/A
- Would have been helpful to have a little more info on what a source water collaborative is ahead of time.
- Need to invite other groups – DOT, land use commission (P&Z, I/W), local officials, business, additional water utilities (public/private)
- The awkwardness of “find a partner.”
- Nothing in particular
- Broaden stakeholders base

To improve source water protection:

I would like assistance on the following issue(s):

- Forestry/watershed management
- Headwater stream assessment
- Identifying headwaters and taking care of them
- Threats (current and future)

I can offer assistance/advice on the following issue(s):

- Water economics; legislative actions
- Link students to clinical outreach projects; a research forest = living laboratory + long term research
- National perspective on green infrastructure use for drinking water protection
- Legislative political process
- Forestry/financing
- CT water policy
- Connections w/ existing linkages to town commissions, planners, etc.
- Water system operation
- Septic system input and development on watershed lands
- Practical aspects of implementing source protection in the field.
- Ag issues

Please continue on the other side. Thanks.

As a result of this workshop, I plan to take the following action(s):

- Begin a discussion with my board of directors.
- QCI – Quiet Corner Initiative – 1. ID what QCI landowners value; 2. ID which landowners can get NRCS funding; 3. Do a PES scheme pilot project in CT
- Watch for progress. Jump in as appropriate. Move forward with DOT re spraying. We have already taken first steps. It is not just glyphosate. And it is towns, too.
- Working with Collaborative to invite some organizations that may also have a role.
- I'll stay involved in the collaboration efforts.
- Bring information back to my agency; open to discussing collaborative efforts between NRCS, DoAg, others, as Lori M. had mentioned.

Contact information (optional):

Guy Russo – guy.russo@middletownct.gov 860-638-3510

Alex Barrett – alex.barrett@yale.edu

Tracy Mehan – Tracy.Mehan@cadmusgroup.com

Kate Brown, Trust for Public Land – kate.brown@tpl.org

Robert Longo, Bristol Water Department, 119 Riverside Avenue, Bristol, CT 06010 860-582-7431

robert.longo@ci.bristol.ct.us

David Knauf – dknauf@darienct.gov

Brian Roach, Aquarion Water Co. – broach@aquarionwater.com

Steve Anderson, Dept. of Agriculture – stephen.anderson@ct.gov

Additional Comments (if any):

- People who should be here: CT Audubon; MDC, CT DOT, Municipal officials
- Need representatives from NFWF, TNC, Trout Unlimited, MDC (and other utilities)
- Trout Unlimited
- Workshop was very well done. I am just not confident this will go anywhere. Too jaded.
- Other parties to invited: CT Soil and Water Conservation Districts; CT DOT
- Good meeting. Appreciate the effort. Important issue.