

CERTIFIED  
COPY

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

STATE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL

Regular Meeting held Via Teleconference on  
April 6, 2021, beginning at 1:34 p.m.

H e l d   B e f o r e :

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

1     **A p p e a r a n c e s :**

2     **WATER PLANNING COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

3             **MARTIN HEFT (OPM)**

4             **LORI MATHIEU (DPH)**

5             **GRAHAM STEVENS (DEEP)**

6  
7     **ALSO PRESENT:**

8             **VIRGINIA de LIMA**

9             **ALICEA CHARAMUT**

10            **JOSH CANSLER**

11            **DAVID RADKA**

12            **KAREN BURNASKA**

13            **DENISE SAVAGEAU**

14            **MARGARET MINER**

15            **JOHN HUDAK**

16            **DAVE KUZMINSKI**

17  
18     **COUNCIL STAFF:**

19            **LAURA LUPOLI**

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good afternoon. Welcome. I'd  
2 like to welcome everybody to the Water Planning  
3 Council meeting for April 6, 2021, called to  
4 order.

5 The first order of business will be the  
6 approval of the March 2, 2021, meeting transcript.  
7 Do I have motion to approve?

8 LORI MATHIEU: So moved.

9 GRAHAM STEVENS: I'll second, then.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Motion made and seconded that be  
11 approved.

12 Any questions on the motion?

13  
14 (No response.)

15  
16 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, all those in favor signify by  
17 saying, aye.

18 THE COUNCIL: Aye.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: The transcript is approved.

20 Before we begin today, I would like to on  
21 behalf of the Council give our heartfelt  
22 sympathies to Dave Kuzminski on the passing of his  
23 lovely wife Ronna, and let him know that he's in  
24 our thoughts and prayers. He's on the phone with  
25 us today.

1           She sounds like an incredible woman, and  
2           bless her and bless you.

3           And can we just have a moment of silence,  
4           please?

5  
6                                       (Pause.)  
7

8   **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much.

9           Okay. The first order of business today will  
10          be the state water plan. IT will be the  
11          implementation work -- we had a lot happening  
12          since the last meeting. We had our rates workshop  
13          and we had Water Day, and a lot of things going  
14          on.

15          So Virginia, would you like to give us an  
16          update -- Virginia, you look like you're in your  
17          backyard.

18   **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** I am. It's a beautiful day. I'm  
19          not going to be inside.

20   **THE CHAIRMAN:** Beautiful. Very nice.

21   **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** So as you mentioned, we did have the  
22          rates workshop, which was a great success. I  
23          think many people on this call attended it.

24          There were 115 registrants and there were 85  
25          people attending the first day, 87 the second day.

1 And also, as you well know, all the materials are  
2 available. So some of the registrants who might  
3 not have been able to attend the Zoom or the web  
4 gathering can have those, that information later.

5 If there's anybody that needs the information  
6 for that, the slides and all the information from  
7 that workshop, and have not gotten it, you can  
8 certainly contact me and I can forward Mary Ann's  
9 e-mail to you.

10 As I think you may know, Mary Ann has retired  
11 from the Alliance for Water Efficiency. She's  
12 still sort of got one small toe involved in  
13 things, but she's not going to be as actively  
14 involved. And so I think we could all thank her  
15 for the work that she's done, not only in general,  
16 but also in working with us.

17 So the other thing that they were working on  
18 was the water fixture efficiency flyer, and one of  
19 the things that came up at our last implementation  
20 workgroup meeting was that you folks wanted to  
21 discuss it further.

22 And I'm wondering if you have concerns at  
23 this point that you want to express? And also I'd  
24 like to get an update on any potential discussions  
25 with DCP or DAS.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Graham?

2 GRAHAM STEVENS: You want me to take that, Jack?

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, please.

4 GRAHAM STEVENS: And just to clarify, Virginia, I don't  
5 think the Water Planning Council had any issues  
6 with the flyer.

7 I think that at the meeting there was a  
8 discussion of adding the agency logos and contacts  
9 to that flyer, which I don't think was something  
10 that we had discussed or endorsed at the Water  
11 Planning Council in the past, and I don't think  
12 that's necessary at this point.

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: You're saying that you're not  
14 recommending that we add the logos?

15 GRAHAM STEVENS: We do not recommend it. Adding the  
16 logos would just, you know, add an extra layer of  
17 bureaucratic checkoffs that I don't think that we  
18 need. Certainly the fact sheet is, I think,  
19 fantastic.

20 And you know, if it's disseminated, you know  
21 maybe in the future it can be disseminated through  
22 the Water Planning Council and that would be its  
23 endorsement, but that's just something that would  
24 probably also require a little further discussion  
25 just as far as, you know, agency endorsement

1 through a logo would be something that would have  
2 to go through various, you know, reviews and  
3 checks by, you know, counsel's office and  
4 commissioners, and so on and so forth.

5 I think really the idea behind the fact sheet  
6 was to provide the facts to folks who would be  
7 contemplating supporting or endorsing our  
8 legislative initiatives. That's primarily my  
9 opinion on that, but I think other, you know,  
10 folks share the feeling that we don't need to add  
11 the agency logos at this point, Virginia.

12 VIRGINIA de LIMA: But we do need to add a contact  
13 individual, and I don't know if there's been any  
14 discussion on who that would be, who would be most  
15 appropriate to be -- the terms there.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I have no problem with it, but who's  
17 this going to?

18 LORI MATHIEU: Yeah, who's the audience? Like, who is  
19 the audience for this, is my question?

20 VIRGINIA de LIMA: And as a first step the audience is  
21 DCP and DAS. As you have your discussions with  
22 them we felt that this could be a supporting  
23 document so that they could understand what it was  
24 that was potentially going to be proposed.

25 And then ultimately the audience would be the

1           Legislature.

2   GRAHAM STEVENS:   So I would say this to that, Virginia.  
3           I would say, we can add a contact when we're ready  
4           for some sort of more public dissemination.

5           And to your other part of your original  
6           inquiry on this topic, you know, I've already  
7           shared that with DAS and DCP.  Yeah, they were  
8           impressed by the quality of the fact sheet and the  
9           breadth of information covered, and the  
10          impactfulness of that fact sheet.

11          So I think you've hit the mark with respect  
12          to the fact sheet, and you know I think that -- I  
13          for one, and I'm sure others are very pleased with  
14          that product.  And now it's just a question of,  
15          you know, when do we use it in a formal way?  And  
16          that goes I think to the conversation that Jack  
17          and I had with DAS and DCP since the last meeting.

18          And you know, DAS was intrigued about this  
19          topic as they're currently undergoing, you know, a  
20          review of the building code, the state building  
21          code.  And they're going to be looking into how  
22          the state building code can aid water efficiency  
23          and conservation standards, and they are about to  
24          be circling back with us as they start that  
25          process.



1           The Department of Consumer Protection, you  
2 know, they're certainly familiar with, you know,  
3 the legislation that DEEP raised as far as the  
4 stretch goals as well as, you know, the energy  
5 efficiency legislation that included water  
6 conservation standards. But it's our  
7 understanding that that legislation is probably  
8 not going to, you know, make it this session.

9           I think that there was a lot of folks who  
10 wanted a more robust conversation particularly  
11 with respect to some of the breadth of the water  
12 fixtures covered under that legislation as opposed  
13 to the DCP, you know, statute which is currently  
14 in place.

15           And DCP, you know, like we had originally  
16 contemplated at the Water Planning Council I think  
17 two months ago, DCP is happy to work with the  
18 Water Planning Council to align our efforts for  
19 next session to update the statute that they  
20 currently utilize for water fixtures.

21           I don't know if there's anything else you  
22 wanted to add, Jack. Our other meeting, I thought  
23 it was a good meeting.

24 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Yeah.

25 **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** So the next steps are in DCP's

1 Court?

2 GRAHAM STEVENS: Didn't you have something you wanted  
3 to add Martin? I'm sorry.

4 MARTIN HEFT: Yeah. Sorry.

5 So just a follow-up, Graham. Thank you for,  
6 you know, kind of touching base on a lot of that.

7 I think the one thing to just remember for us  
8 that, you know, with this, you know, with the  
9 water fixtures, anything else, any -- if it's  
10 legislative it has to go through a larger process  
11 because each of us are separate agencies.

12 So it has to kind of go through a large  
13 process for any legislative action before this  
14 body would be able to even vote on it that, you  
15 know, for, like, myself I'm going to have to get  
16 OPM's approval, or DEEP's and DPH, and everything  
17 else, you know, for that going through.

18 And it has to go through a full review  
19 process -- thus kind of, you know, the reason we  
20 can't put any logos on it at this time, anything  
21 else, because obviously then we're speaking on  
22 behalf of our agencies without getting full  
23 review, especially if it's legislative on it.

24 And then OPM and the Governor's office have a  
25 huge role in any legislative matters as well. So

1 it's a larger process that things have to go  
2 through. So I think creating all the background  
3 stuff and everything for then us to be able to  
4 move forward with is terrific. And as Graham  
5 said, then we can add in those other pieces later.

6 But just so everyone kind of understands, you  
7 know, the process that it has to go through, it's  
8 not as simple as this body saying, yes, we approve  
9 it, let's submit it to the Legislature for  
10 approval.

11 We've got to do a lot of back stuff before we  
12 can even get to that point.

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: So what would be the next steps on  
14 this process?

15 GRAHAM STEVENS: So the next step I would say,  
16 Virginia, is let's see what happens as, you know,  
17 let's get through this session and then  
18 immediately try to set up a meeting with DCP and  
19 the agencies and the Water Planning Council to  
20 ensure that they're brought in and work with us to  
21 convene their stakeholders, align their resources  
22 to implement the proposed changes that the Water  
23 Planning Council is endorsing with respect to  
24 future legislative initiatives to determine if DCP  
25 would be the sponsoring agency on the water

1 conservation statutory revision.

2 And I think that's what we had always  
3 anticipated as a water planning council, at least  
4 I mean, I'm going to be -- we just did it in the  
5 last three months as we finished up this fact  
6 sheet and the statutory analysis. So I don't  
7 think that we're changing what we had laid out  
8 three months ago.

9 It's just a matter of, now that we've made  
10 contact with DCP and DAS let's make sure they're  
11 fully on board and will have a fully developed and  
12 approved initiative for the next session, because  
13 the agencies need to get approval through OPM and  
14 the Governor's office, and other agency input  
15 before an endorsed initiative is brought forward  
16 through the legislative process, so.

17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** It's something -- none of us on this  
18 call, Lori, Graham, Martin, myself are not  
19 uninformed to the process. We know the process.  
20 So what's going to happen, between now -- usually  
21 October 1st legislative proposals are starting to  
22 go in, and that's when we'll start going through  
23 the process before we get something put together.

24 It was clear to Graham and I when we met with  
25 DAS and DCP. It was something -- they have a lot

1 more on their plate this session and they weren't  
2 prepared to take it up, but they were very  
3 receptive to working with us during the interim  
4 before the 2022 session.

5 So I think I'm optimistic, very optimistic  
6 we'll get something passed next year.

7 VIRGINIA de LIMA: That's great. Is there any --  
8 anything that you would like the implementation  
9 workgroup to do to help you in these next steps?

10 GRAHAM STEVENS: I don't think we need anything at this  
11 point. We have the statutory language. We have  
12 the fact sheet. You know, and I think we've done  
13 an analysis of surrounding states -- correct,  
14 Virginia? That we can pull out if necessary to  
15 look at some of the market issues associated with  
16 water fixtures.

17 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Okay. Good.

18 GRAHAM STEVENS: Okay. I think that's going to be the  
19 key document, because I think some of the things  
20 that DCP was talking about we just, you know, how  
21 do we deal with some of the big-box retailers that  
22 have multiple states?

23 So how do we deal with, you know,  
24 enforcement? How do we deal with existing stock  
25 in stores, you know, when this legislation was

1 enacted in the 'nineties?

2 You know they had sitdown meetings with the  
3 plumbing suppliers on the regional and the local  
4 level as well as some of the big-box chains,  
5 because people were fearful of, you know, having a  
6 special product just for Connecticut, or not being  
7 able to sell out what the stores had already put  
8 on the shelves.

9 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Okay. Well, thank you very much for  
10 that update.

11 Moving on to our topical workgroups.

12 DAVID RADKA: Virginia?

13 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Domestic well water quality group  
14 had a very interesting meeting --

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Virginia?

16 DAVID RADKA: Virginia, can I jump in? Can you hear  
17 me? It's David.

18 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Certainly.

19 DAVID RADKA: Just before we move on from the AWE work  
20 just to circle back, they had -- at least Mary Ann  
21 indicated they were expected to have monies left  
22 over after they finished the rates workshop and  
23 this topic.

24 And so what we need to do is to circle back  
25 and get sort of an accounting from them, and then

1           come back to you and let you know how much money  
2           is left and what you want that directly towards.

3           And one time, I think irrigation and looking  
4           at how other states deal with irrigation, outdoor  
5           water restrictions was high on your list. So if  
6           you want to think about that, the next meeting  
7           we'll have some numbers for you.

8   **THE CHAIRMAN:** That's great.

9   **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** Thank you for that, Dave.

10   **MARTIN HEFT:** And Dave, if also with that -- because I  
11           know we kind of set a priority list for that money  
12           as well. If we can kind of get -- did we meet  
13           those priorities we were asking for, along with  
14           the books? That will be good if we could have  
15           both of those together, please?

16   **DAVID RADKA:** Yes.

17   **MARTIN HEFT:** Thank you.

18   **LORI MATHIEU:** So Jack, if I might? One thing with  
19           going back to the water conservation fixture  
20           discussion, one thing that doesn't come up a lot  
21           but we're seeing more of is pathogens; Legionella  
22           in older buildings, lack of water flow, water  
23           temperature increases, buildings that have sat  
24           stagnant.

25           You know, some of these building efficiency

1 measures lead to water quality issues, and I don't  
2 think we can forget that when we have our  
3 discussions with consumer protection and DAS and  
4 we talk about energy savings, but we should also  
5 be mindful about issues such as Legionella.

6 So it's something that's on the mind of EPA  
7 nationally. It's under discussion for the  
8 unregulated, you know, contamination monitoring  
9 rule around 5-9 known the UCMR 5, which is up and  
10 coming under the Safe Drinking Water Act. There's  
11 a lot of discussion of it across the country.

12 So that's something that, you know, while  
13 we're concerned with water quantity we should also  
14 be concerned with water quality. So I just wanted  
15 to put that out there, and it should be part of  
16 the discussion.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Lori. Good point.

18 Virginia?

19 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Any other comments about the work  
20 that the Alliance for Water Efficiency has been  
21 doing?

22  
23 (No response.)

24  
25 VIRGINIA de LIMA: So moving on to the topical sub



1 workgroups. The domestic well water quality  
2 group, the most significant change that they are  
3 discussing is removing radon from the list of  
4 additional analytes that would be required to be  
5 tested under the current regulations for any kind  
6 of new well, and then potentially for having them  
7 required for any real estate transaction.

8 The reason for eliminating the radon is that  
9 there is -- it's not required of the water  
10 companies to be testing for radon primarily  
11 because EPA does not have an advisory level for  
12 radon in air. And the problem with radon in water  
13 is not so much the ingesting of the water, but  
14 rather the radon that becomes vaporized in the  
15 shower or other kind of environment where the  
16 water is being used.

17 And so since there's really not a way to say  
18 whether your radon level is good or bad, it just  
19 seems like we'd be asking for trouble to include  
20 that in the requirements.

21 So any comments about that?

22 They were going to be looking to other states  
23 in the area to add justification for adding these  
24 additional analytes to the list, the remaining  
25 ones, the uranium and the arsenic. And for

1 instance, there's a study in New Hampshire that  
2 links arsenic in water to bladder cancer.

3 So they are going to be pulling in some of  
4 the neighboring state information in the  
5 justification, but as I said the biggest thing is  
6 eliminating radon from the list of required  
7 analytes. And I'm wondering if you all have any  
8 concerns or comments to make about that?

9 LORI MATHIEU: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. There are water  
10 systems that have tested for it. There are water  
11 systems that treat for it. There are areas in our  
12 state that have very, very high radon levels. So  
13 it is a concern in the State of Connecticut, and I  
14 am not in favor of dropping anything until we have  
15 a much broader discussion.

16 And with private wells, we don't regulate  
17 private wells at the state level. That is a  
18 discussion where we need to bring in local health  
19 directors. So that is a decision that we cannot  
20 just drop and run because the feds haven't done  
21 what they needed to do.

22 And I agree with you, Virginia. You know the  
23 federal government has not been taking this  
24 seriously enough to set a standard. Should the  
25 State of Connecticut set a standard? That should

1 be the question, because we know it's a health  
2 risk. We know that there's health impacts. We  
3 know that people are being exposed. We're just  
4 not testing for it.

5 So we do have suggested standards out there.  
6 There are suggested standards for air. So you  
7 know, we could bring the people in my branch from  
8 our radon program to talk more about that if you  
9 wish and could be part of the discussion so  
10 there's an understanding of the health risks of  
11 radon and what is in existence out there, and what  
12 could be done to address this in a better way  
13 moving forward.

14 So I would be more than happy. I think, you  
15 know, Ryan and Tizz work in the private well  
16 program, but they don't work in the radon program.  
17 There are people in my branch that are part of a  
18 radon program that could speak to this, to the  
19 science in more detail.

20 VIRGINIA de LIMA: I do believe Ryan and Tiziana  
21 have spoken with people in your Radon program.  
22 Dave or anybody else who was part of that meeting,  
23 do you recall -- my recollection is that it was at  
24 their suggestion that Ryan and Tiziana were  
25 suggesting -- that the radon folks suggested that

1           this be removed. Is that your recollection, Dave?

2   DAVID RADKA: That is correct.

3   LORI MATHIEU: Yeah, well I think that --

4   THE CHAIRMAN: I can't imagine how radon would be  
5           removed. I mean, when a person buys a new house  
6           the first thing, one of the things in terms of  
7           home inspection is to check for radon.

8           So is it in the house? Is it at the well?  
9           So I have to agree with Laurie on this. I think  
10          we need to have a little bit more discussion.

11   LORI MATHIEU: It's not the first time I've disagreed  
12          with my staff, Virginia.

13   THE CHAIRMAN: I can't imagine that, Lori.

14   LORI MATHIEU: Radon is a real concern, and you know in  
15          the area of the state that I live in it's  
16          prevalent out here, and it's something we should  
17          think more broadly about.

18          And you know, it's just like the  
19          information -- and Jack, if I might? And maybe I  
20          could add this if Martin allows for it, a  
21          discussion right now -- because Virginia mentioned  
22          it, about arsenic and uranium.

23          There was a new study that we partnered with  
24          the USGS on that that just was announced today.  
25          There's a press release today. I could share that

1 information with you.

2 I got interviewed at noon today by, I think  
3 NBC. I think it was NBC, to talk about the study  
4 so there's -- you know, there's information out  
5 there. We're urging private well owners to test  
6 for uranium and arsenic because of what the study  
7 found.

8 And so you know, while we push for this to be  
9 tested we also need to have a broader conversation  
10 about private wells in general. And if we want to  
11 tee up anything for the year 2022, I'm a big  
12 supporter of teeing up basic testing requirements  
13 for private wells. And local health are on board  
14 with having that conversation to push this  
15 forward.

16 VIRGINIA de LIMA: So Lori, since basically that's the  
17 focus of this topical workgroup, if there's a way  
18 that they could plan -- that you could attend  
19 their next meeting I think it would be very  
20 helpful.

21 LORI MATHIEU: Yeah, either that or we set up a special  
22 time on this agenda to have a broader  
23 conversation -- either way, or maybe both to sort  
24 of tee that up for next session.

25 You know, for me it's -- you know 23 percent

1 of our population are putting water in their  
2 bodies every day and they don't know what they're  
3 drinking, because they don't test for it.

4 And so you know, with the information that we  
5 have now and the studies, the two studies that  
6 helped fund with the USGS, it shows that, you  
7 know, there there's exposure out there to human  
8 beings.

9 And I -- that's why I don't want to drop  
10 radon in any of these discussions. We have to  
11 talk about the suite of contaminations, the  
12 contaminants that are out there and look at the  
13 sites, look at the information that we have and  
14 think about what it is that we need to be doing  
15 better.

16 I would love to bring in, you know, the  
17 president of CADH, which is the association of  
18 health directors, to come and represent  
19 themselves, because that that's a group that needs  
20 to be part of this broader discussion, you know,  
21 similar to the water fixtures discussion where we  
22 need to bring in Consumer Protection and DAS.

23 You know, the directors of the health and  
24 their associations including the, you know, the  
25 environmental health directors as well need to be

1 part of this because you know we need to be  
2 thinking through what needs to change here.

3 Because there's information and science and  
4 data, and we need to share it with the public and  
5 get people to, you know, what we're doing today is  
6 urging people to test for uranium and arsenic if  
7 you have a private well, because the science  
8 shows that --

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So why don't we do that, Lori?  
10 Why don't we -- you know one of the things we're  
11 going to discuss at the end of this meeting is the  
12 agenda for the next meeting. So I know Graham has  
13 got some suggestions, so we can discuss future  
14 presentations at this meeting.

15 LORI MATHIEU: Good. Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Virginia?

17 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Great. Thank you for that.

18 Then in terms of our other groups the -- let  
19 me just scroll down here in a moment.

20 The outreach and education workgroup is,  
21 they're really at this point focusing on  
22 municipalities dealing with COST and CCM and some  
23 of the COGS.

24 And if you may recall back last fall they  
25 sent to you a presentation, the one that they were

1 going to be giving to CACIWC. And you approved  
2 that for their presentation to CACIWC. And they  
3 want to set up a generic template so that it  
4 didn't really need to get approved before each  
5 individual meeting.

6 So if the Water Planning Council would  
7 approve the template, then the tweaks around the  
8 edges can make it pertinent for different groups.  
9 It would be minor, and they could just move  
10 forward without encumbering you to get that by to  
11 go ahead.

12 And so one of the things that they want to do  
13 is make sure that you don't have any concerns of  
14 what they had shared with you, and I can resend  
15 what they shared with you last December so that  
16 you look at it now that several months have passed  
17 and say, oh, you know we really should have. And  
18 give that kind of feedback to the group so that  
19 they can incorporate it into their standard  
20 template.

21 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I have no problem with that.

22 **VIRGINIA de LIMA:** Okay. There their plan is to  
23 actually have two versions of this template, one  
24 would be for the general public and one would be  
25 for the regulated community, the stakeholders.



1           And so obviously the level of technical  
2           presentation would be different in those two  
3           groups.

4           They're also gathering resources that can be  
5           made available to various interested parties.  
6           They plan to put together a fact sheet and also to  
7           come up with a social media strategy. Obviously  
8           they will be working with people in the various  
9           agencies who are already involved in this kind of  
10          work, and so they will be coordinating with those  
11          folks.

12       LORI MATHIEU: So jack, if I could have a question  
13          here? Just with the CACIWC presentation, what  
14          kind of questions did you receive, if any? Do you  
15          know?

16       VIRGINIA de LIMA: I do not know. Is there anybody on  
17          the call who -- Denise or Lou, that could address  
18          that?

19  
20                               (No response.)

21  
22       VIRGINIA de LIMA: I can certainly follow up with them  
23          and ask them what kind of questions they got.

24       LORI MATHIEU: Because one of the things about  
25          representing -- when you present on behalf of the

1 Water Planning Council you're sort of representing  
2 us in a sense. And if you receive questions, how  
3 are those questions going to be answered? And  
4 will those questions be brought back to the  
5 Council to be answered? Or would you --

6 Because a lot of what people might think is,  
7 like, well. What are your priorities? What are  
8 you working on right now? You know, what are you  
9 going to push forward on the legislators? You  
10 know, what are you moving forward?

11 So I don't know how you would answer those  
12 questions, and I think how you represent yourself  
13 is important. I'm fine. I'm on board with what  
14 you've opposed, but I think, you know, bringing  
15 the questions back to us talking about, you know,  
16 I know that CACIWC went very well. I've heard  
17 from other people that that, you know, was well,  
18 well done -- but I did hear that there were  
19 questions. So I was just wondering how those were  
20 addressed?

21 VIRGINIA de LIMA: And I can follow up on that for you,  
22 Lori.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay -- I'm sorry. I would think that  
24 there's specific questions that they can bring  
25 them back to the Council, and then we get it back

1 to the group. I mean, one thing we don't want to  
2 have is people speaking in different -- from  
3 different perspectives and sending out mixed  
4 messages. I agree with you, Lori.

5 I mean, I've always been a little bit --  
6 physically the councilmembers can't get out to all  
7 the groups, and I think it's great that the  
8 implementation group is doing this, but I think we  
9 have to keep checks and balances on it, and I've  
10 always felt that way.

11 So I think unless it's a simple question they  
12 can answer -- but if it's something of more  
13 substance it should come back and then we can get  
14 back to the group.

15 VIRGINIA de LIMA: As you may recall, the presentation  
16 that they gave was based on the water plan itself.  
17 And so it was pretty much a concrete item that  
18 they were presenting.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

20 VIRGINIA de LIMA: And so the questions, my  
21 recollection from what they said at that time was  
22 that the questions related directly back to the  
23 water plan. And so the answers were in the water  
24 plan -- and it was not this, the problem of  
25 potential mixed messages because it was discussing

1 something very concrete.

2 Now as we get into more things being  
3 developed in this whole implementation the  
4 questions may change and become much more fluid,  
5 if you will, and need the input of the Council  
6 more than the questions from the original  
7 presentation.

8 GRAHAM STEVENS: And maybe a suggestion could be that  
9 the presentation contains, you know, a statement  
10 that, you know, folks should, you know, basically  
11 clarify that certain questions are better --  
12 better answered directly to the Water Planning  
13 Council. And that you know certain clarifying  
14 questions can be answered during the presentation.

15 I don't want to stop people from having, you  
16 know, from asking their questions because I too  
17 would like to hear what they're asking, and wonder  
18 if there's a way that we can capture that, or  
19 direct those folks to a specific e-mail contact,  
20 or something that we could see the questions.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good point. As we review the  
22 presentation that we looked at last year and come  
23 up with suggestions moving towards -- with  
24 generic, I think that's one of the things we  
25 should incorporate into that, what questions

1           should come back to us.

2 VIRGINIA de LIMA:   Okay.   Anything more on that topic  
3           of the outreach and education group?  
4

5                               (No response.)  
6

7 VIRGINIA de LIMA:   Also going on next to the  
8           implementation tracking and reporting workgroup,  
9           they are still defining exactly what they are  
10          going to be tracking in the information for  
11          whatever they come up with in terms of a  
12          spreadsheet, or how that tracking develops.

13                 And they need to develop policies on  
14                 confidentiality and what would be tracked, because  
15                 as you can well imagine when you're talking about  
16                 water there are some touchy subjects.  They also  
17                 are really looking at the who audience is; if they  
18                 were to hold a brainstorming session who would be  
19                 invited, those kinds of things.

20                 So they understand that one of the needs for  
21                 this tracking and reporting is clearly the  
22                 Legislature, for the Water Planning Council to  
23                 give their annual update, but they also thought  
24                 that it should be something that would be public  
25                 facing and could be accessed by the public.  So

1 they're really still in the design phase of what  
2 they're going to be doing.

3 And certainly, there is some expertise within  
4 the various agencies, particularly DPH that deal  
5 with data of this type. And so once the  
6 legislative session is finished there would be  
7 time to delve more deeply into this subject --  
8 which led us to a general discussion of the  
9 availability of people to work on these  
10 workgroups.

11 The drought workgroup, for instance, has been  
12 hindered a bit by commitments of the participants  
13 to other, other issues in their own jobs, or other  
14 issues related to the legislative session and the  
15 water plan -- where there was some discussion of  
16 trying to schedule our topical group so that it  
17 didn't overlap with the legislative session, which  
18 of course led to a discussion of, well, summer  
19 isn't good. And the holidays aren't good. So  
20 what's really left?

21 And that led to a discussion of perhaps  
22 cutting our topics into smaller bits that might be  
23 able to be addressed in two or three meetings so  
24 that it could be a workgroup that was very focused  
25 for a short period of time, and those could be

1 scheduled around the other commitments that people  
2 have that have really made it a challenge to  
3 pursue these workgroups.

4 I do want to say in that context that we have  
5 had fabulous participants who have stepped up  
6 and really done -- dedicated their time and done  
7 their homework. And so I'm not in any way saying  
8 that that's not going on, but it has been a  
9 challenge for many folks to do that. So that also  
10 has been part of our discussion and will continue  
11 to be part of the discussion.

12 Any questions about either that general  
13 comment or the specifics?

14 MARTIN HEFT: If I may, Jack?

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, of course.

16 MARTIN HEFT: So Virginia, thank you for that update on  
17 workgroups. That kind of goes back to what I said  
18 at previous meetings, is that I personally feel we  
19 have too many workgroups, that there should be  
20 priority.

21 That there should be, you know, a couple of  
22 workgroups with top priorities, let those finish  
23 and then start something new. We've been trying  
24 to finish up the drought one. I know my  
25 interagency -- our, sorry. Not mine, our

1 interagency drought workgroup is waiting for the  
2 report so we can kind of compare that, you know,  
3 with our stuff going on as we're trying to move  
4 forward.

5 But I think prioritizing which workgroups  
6 need to get work done within a certain timeframe  
7 should happen, and then simplify and let's, you  
8 know, just shorten up because of the workload,  
9 because of the decision.

10 You know all the workgroups are doing a  
11 terrific job, you know, with getting the  
12 information to us and everything. So don't get me  
13 wrong on that point, but I think it's we are at a  
14 point, you know, where we really need to  
15 prioritize what workgroups -- what is the priority  
16 that the Water Planning Council needs to look  
17 forward to that we need this information back on?  
18 Get that project done. Then do the other groups  
19 that way. That would be my recommendation.

20 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Thank you for that.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments for Virginia?

22 So Virginia, you're going to keep on looking  
23 on that and come back with some recommendations?

24 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Certainly.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that the idea?



1 VIRGINIA de LIMA: And then just there's one other  
2 topic that we discussed, as we discussed in this  
3 meeting before and that was the FOIA requirements.  
4 And it was stated at that meeting that it appears  
5 that different agencies have a different  
6 understanding of what is required. And I don't  
7 know if you folks have any further updates?

8 We've gotten input from PURA and from DEEP,  
9 and they didn't seem to be consistent.

10 GRAHAM STEVENS: That's impossible.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I think I'm going to defer to our  
12 resident -- DEEP and PURA agree on everything.

13 Martin Heft our resident parliamentarian --  
14 and FOI, and maybe he can give us some direction  
15 with that?

16 MARTIN HEFT: Well, the information that I have, at  
17 least from what I had to present to a couple of  
18 standing committees that are under OPM, between  
19 assessors and tax collectors, they have to follow  
20 all of the FOI because they are considered  
21 committees of our agencies.

22 And any subcommittees that they have are  
23 considered, you know, part of an agency by  
24 definition under state statute. So that is what  
25 OPM is following.

1           Now there is things that if, you know, a  
2 couple of staff members get together to meet that  
3 happen to serve on another, you know, that serve,  
4 like on the interagency, you know, drought work  
5 group, that a staff is trying to get together to  
6 do a particular topic and everything that's not  
7 kind of an FOI type of meeting, to item that way  
8 because it's not the membership, you know, of the  
9 full thing.

10           It's the staff that's working on it. It's  
11 not the designated voting members that are doing  
12 it. So that's kind of the loophole, if you will.

13           But if it's the appointed members that this  
14 body has appointed, you know, on there either  
15 through you as the, you know, the implementation  
16 workgroup and that you have appointed the sub  
17 workgroups, then they're committees of this  
18 agency.

19           But if they're staff members working on  
20 something, a couple individually on one thing,  
21 then they can kind of probably get away without  
22 it. But all their meetings and everything are  
23 FOI-able and should have to follow all those  
24 protocols -- which is another reason not to have  
25 so many workgroups because it's a lot of extra

1 staff time and work time to make sure all that  
2 stuff happens properly.

3 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Just two comments related to that.

4 One is I think -- it made me think about, what is  
5 the definition of appointed? And certainly the  
6 implementation workgroup has been appointed.

7 The topical groups sort of come together in  
8 an amorphous way and are open to anybody who wants  
9 to participate. And some people come and then go,  
10 and then some people join later. So it's not a  
11 set group. So would that set fall under the  
12 category of being appointed?

13 MARTIN HEFT: Well, they are a set group because didn't  
14 this Council approve those subgroups?

15 VIRGINIA de LIMA: They approved the topics of the  
16 suburbs, but not --

17 MARTIN HEFT: Correct. So that's approving  
18 the subgroups, Virginia, because without those  
19 topics you couldn't have the subgroups. So we  
20 have approved those. Those are appointed. Those  
21 are subcommittees. Those topical workgroups are  
22 subcommittees of all of this.

23 VIRGINIA de LIMA: One of the things that we discussed  
24 was, if we could have our topical group set up a  
25 regular meeting time, as for instance the domestic

1 well water quality group has done. It's the first  
2 Monday of every month. And so if that were on the  
3 web that could be a part of addressing this issue.

4 Also if they had a generic -- or I shouldn't  
5 say generic, but an agenda template that was the  
6 same each time, that could be on the web.

7 And that we also acknowledged that having  
8 more detail is certainly important, both so that  
9 the public would have a better understanding of  
10 what the group was doing and also whether they  
11 wanted to attend a particular meeting.

12 And so where possible we would be putting  
13 more detailed agendas on the website, but that at  
14 a minimum we would have the standard ones so that  
15 there would be something there with the stated  
16 time.

17 And clearly, the minutes, the notes, the  
18 recordings, those are -- as they're produced those  
19 are passed along to, in our case it's Alley from  
20 DEEP that has very graciously agreed to be  
21 responsible for posting those, those minutes. So  
22 that's covered.

23 So we figured we could at a minimum meet the  
24 requirements in this generic sense, but strive to  
25 give more detail.

1 MARTIN HEFT: So that all, you know, seems appropriate,  
2 you know, for what's there, you know. Because  
3 it's, you know, the agendas have to be posted  
4 within 24 hours. So I mean, if you have a  
5 standard work agenda and then if you add a line  
6 item or something into it, you know, as you go  
7 along that all meets the requirements of FOI.

8 And then posting minutes within the seven  
9 days thereafter, you know, on it -- because you're  
10 not necessarily taking votes, you know, per se on  
11 something. It's recommendations back. If you  
12 take votes you have to do a record of the vote,  
13 you know.

14 And there's all kinds of information out  
15 there on FOI, and if it's something that's needed  
16 we can get someone from FOI to sit with the  
17 workgroups or this, this board, you know, to kind  
18 of review what the process is and things are.

19 But there's all kinds of free workshops the  
20 FOI commission does right online that you can  
21 watch through or go through their PowerPoint as  
22 well just to get, you know, a refresher if anyone  
23 needs it as well.

24 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Yeah. So as I said, that's our plan  
25 currently, and with your blessing we will move

1 forward with it. So that's all I have to say.

2 Are there any questions about any of this  
3 stuff?

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any questions for Virginia  
5 or Dave?

6  
7 (No response.)

8  
9 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, thank you very much. Appreciate  
10 everything.

11 We'll move on to Alecia and Josh.

12 ALICEA CHARAMUT: So as far as the items on our  
13 updates, many of these things, the things that we  
14 discussed at our last meeting are later in the  
15 agenda.

16 We did spend a decent amount of time talking  
17 about legislation. There was a lot coming up in  
18 both the environment and public health committees  
19 before our last meeting. So we had a fairly  
20 robust discussion about many of those items.

21 And I -- just an FYI. I have to cut out of  
22 here at 2:45 if there -- for the discussion of the  
23 agenda moving forward if we could move the  
24 watershed lands report back into the water  
25 planning advisory group, I think that just makes

1           it little bit more sense to do it that way.

2           But I see that's later on in the agenda, so I  
3           will --

4   **THE CHAIRMAN:** We can move it now, if you want?

5   **ALICEA CHARAMUT:** All right. Sure.

6   **THE CHAIRMAN:** I've got to be off the call by three  
7           myself. So Alecia, you've got to talk about the  
8           World Water Day where you were a star.

9   **ALICEA CHARAMUT:** Well, I wouldn't go that far -- but  
10          yeah. We actually had a great turnout. We did a  
11          virtual event on Monday, March 22nd. It was the  
12          Rivers Alliance and six other groups that I don't  
13          have the list in front of me, and I know I'm going  
14          to forget someone. So I don't want to try to tick  
15          off the list.

16                 But it was very well attended. We had up to  
17          200 attendees that came on that day. We had about  
18          more than 300 registered, and it went off very  
19          well, and it was a great celebration of water.

20                 And thank you, Chair Betkoski, for coming on  
21          and introducing the Governor and talking a little  
22          bit about the Water Planning Council.

23   **THE CHAIRMAN:** You're welcome. I thought it was a  
24          really great event. I think for a virtual event  
25          it was very well done. The Governor, senators,

1           Congresswoman DeLauro, and your panel was great.  
2           It was very, very happy.

3 ALICEA CHARAMUT: And there is a website OurWater,  
4           that's OurWaterCT.org. You can go there and you  
5           can find a recording of the event as well as a lot  
6           of information that was submitted by different  
7           groups, the various groups that were involved in  
8           the planning and execution. So that website will  
9           be up for quite a while after the event.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

11 ALICEA CHARAMUT: Any questions for me before I hand it  
12           over to Margaret?

13           And I don't believe Karen is here. I believe  
14           Margaret will be giving the report for watershed  
15           lands.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Margaret?

17 MARGARET MINER: Thank you, Jack and Alecia. And by  
18           the way, thank you for your work on the World  
19           Water Day. It really was terrific. And Lori  
20           Brown, I know, and CFE put in a lot of effort.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: They did.

22 MARGARET MINER: Yeah, and it really paid off. And I'm  
23           very excited about next year because the theme I  
24           understand is going to be groundwater. So  
25           everybody else is like, ungh -- and I'm psyched.



1 That's my big topic. So I can't wait for World  
2 Water Day next year.

3 Back to the watershed lands. It's really a  
4 sort of followup on what we've reported before.  
5 As you know, some of the discussion in this  
6 workgroup strayed over into general issues of  
7 siting solar and perhaps other clean energy  
8 projects.

9 And the way that will be handled I believe is  
10 that Josh and Alecia will become members of the  
11 task force that works on the integrated resources  
12 plan, and I went to look that up to be sure I knew  
13 what it was.

14 So in the Connecticut Statute 16a3a DEEP has  
15 to prepare an integrated resource plan every two  
16 years. I think I remember the first one. And  
17 anyway, it's comprised of an assessment of future  
18 electric needs, a plan to meet those needs that's  
19 integrated in that it looks at both the demand  
20 side, conservation energy efficiency, et cetera,  
21 resources, as well as the more traditional  
22 supply-side generation, power transmission, et  
23 cetera, and resources in making its  
24 recommendations on how best to meet future  
25 electric energy needs in the state.

1 I have here a note on my report, if anyone  
2 has questions go to Alecia. My memory of past  
3 discussions of this group is that it pretty much  
4 depended on the year and what people were  
5 interested in, but we will -- that portion of  
6 discussing siting will be moved outside of our  
7 lands group now.

8 Is John Hudak on?

9 I think you're all aware that the Gaylord  
10 Mountain application in Hamden that would have  
11 affected Lake Whitney was rejected by the Siting  
12 Council. This was something that most of us in  
13 the workgroup thought should be done, but was too  
14 close and too risky in its -- both its position  
15 and management.

16 And is John Hudak on? Oh. Hi, John.

17 JOHN HUDAK: Hi. Yeah, I'm here.

18 MARGARET MINER: So would you like to say something  
19 about this and how you see it, you know, how you  
20 see it relating to what we keep on doing in the  
21 watershed lands group and in the Water Planning  
22 Council?

23 JOHN HUDAK: Well, yeah. I can say there's, you know,  
24 one of the two projects we have on our watersheds  
25 that were proposed, or are proposed. This one in

1 particular was twelve acres of forestland on our  
2 Lake Whitney watershed. It was about maybe up to  
3 20, 25 percent slopes.

4 So we're a supporter of renewable energy, but  
5 we were very troubled by this application. As  
6 Margaret, you said, it was denied. Very, very  
7 close, though -- but alternatively there's another  
8 proposed solar project on our Lake Saltonstall  
9 watershed that's on a former agricultural field  
10 well buffered from wetlands. It's a two-megawatt  
11 project, and we just wrote a letter to the Siting  
12 Council that was very supportive of the project.

13 So it's just a matter of hopefully in the  
14 future some of the work by this group that Alecia  
15 and Josh will be participating on will help to  
16 favor the right kind of projects and the right  
17 siting on these public water supply watersheds.

18 MARGARET MINER: And let me mention another solar  
19 application that's out there apparently affecting  
20 a high-quality stream, and that's in Litchfield.  
21 And I'm trying to think of the name of it. It's  
22 on the Litchfield/Torrington line.

23 The issue there is -- what interests me about  
24 this is the engineer who brought it to my  
25 attention works both on applications for solar

1 projects, and sometimes he works for people who  
2 object to solar projects. That's the kind of  
3 person I think we could hear more from.

4 And I'm not sure with respect to the  
5 Litchfield project if the conclusion is that it  
6 just shouldn't be there, but definitely the  
7 engineering appears to be inadequate to protect  
8 particularly the Gulf Stream which is a high  
9 quality -- downstream in the vicinity.

10 So there's another. There's probably others,  
11 but it's not an issue that we've really developed  
12 strong standards for. So I'm sure we'll be  
13 continuing to work on that. And I do know from an  
14 engineering point of view there are people who  
15 support solar and protect water resources at the  
16 same time.

17 Quickly, we have various initiatives we've  
18 talked about to make information on source water  
19 lands more available to legislators when they're  
20 looking at the Conveyance Act, to the Siting  
21 Council to town planners, and town land-use  
22 commissions.

23 And I think one of the main things that's  
24 going on with that respect right now is that Aaron  
25 Bundress [phonetic] is working with Eric McPhee at

1 DPH on a good map that would be kind of  
2 universally useful. Aaron, are you here? Is that  
3 correct? Or Eric?

4  
5 (No response.)  
6

7 **MARGARET MINER:** Well, if I'm not going to be  
8 contradicted, my understanding is we're going to  
9 get a really good map which would be very useful  
10 so we could simply show people this is the  
11 problem. You have to be careful if you move into  
12 this area.

13 And we must follow up on this education of  
14 legislators and land-use people which we're all  
15 talking about.

16 I am attempting to find out what happened  
17 with the Cheshire conveyance from last year. I've  
18 been in touch with, and I've not heard back yet  
19 from the property review board at the Department  
20 of Transportation.

21 And that is my report. I've made it quickly  
22 and I didn't pause for questions, but that's for  
23 your convenience. I'm now ready for questions, or  
24 to refer them to the right person.

25 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. Thank you, Margaret.

1 Any questions for Margaret?

2 GRAHAM STEVENS: I just wanted to --

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Denise -- oh, I'm sorry. Graham?

4 GRAHAM STEVENS: No, go ahead, Jack.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Denise?

6 You're on mute, Denise.

7 MARGARET MINER: Denise, unmute.

8 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Can you hear me now?

9 MARGARET MINER: Yeah.

10 DENISE SAVAGEAU: Okay. Something was going on with my  
11 microphone.

12 Just quickly I wanted to say I'm very pleased  
13 with the Gaylord Mountain decision that the Siting  
14 Council, you know, reported on and released. It  
15 was a really close decision, and I do encourage  
16 the Water Planning Council members to read the  
17 decision just from the perspective of, because it  
18 was a source water drinking water supply watershed  
19 which is referenced in there, but probably not as  
20 much as it should be.

21 There was a lot of discussion on the impact  
22 that the stormwater was going to have and  
23 whatever, but didn't necessarily talk about the  
24 implications just because it was in a public  
25 drinking water supply watershed -- although it did

1 reference that.

2 So I just encourage people to look at the  
3 decision. I think it's very important for the  
4 Water Planning Council to read that -- as we move  
5 forward with the Water Planning Council advisory  
6 group, and Alecia and Josh sitting on that IPC  
7 panel.

8 Thank you.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Denise.

10 Martin or Graham, do you have a followup?

11 GRAHAM STEVENS: Yeah, I just wanted to follow up to  
12 Margaret's comments.

13 Since our last meeting I've reached out to  
14 the folks who are going to be putting together the  
15 solar stakeholder group as part of the IRP. And  
16 Josh and Alecia, you have been so volunteered. So  
17 when that does kick off I'll make sure that you're  
18 part of the fun of that group.

19 So if you do get contacted and then if you  
20 could just let me know, I have a reminder here  
21 just to make sure that they don't forget -- but I  
22 did ask them to copy me when they put them  
23 together. But just for coordination's sake, just  
24 let me know if you're contacted.

25 Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything further for Margaret?  
2 Or anything more, Alecia?

3 ALICEA CHARAMUT: I think that's it. We will be  
4 discussing the outline for the source water  
5 protection paper that we're putting together at  
6 the next meeting.

7 So other than that -- Josh, have I forgotten  
8 anything?

9 JOSH CANSLER: No, I think you covered everything. I  
10 mean, we had a very short meeting because we  
11 followed up the rates workshop that day, but I  
12 think you've gotten everything.

13 ALICEA CHARAMUT: Yeah, we tried to keep the meeting as  
14 short as possible, because we had all been sitting  
15 in the rates workshop and some of the folks had  
16 gone from another meeting.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: A long day.

18 ALICEA CHARAMUT: From that meeting to another meeting,  
19 so we tried to be respectful of people's Zoom  
20 fatigue.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you, Alecia and Josh.

22 LORI MATHIEU: Jack, I have a question for John Hudak,  
23 if I might? So John, you mentioned --

24 THE CHAIRMAN: John Hudak. Prepare for this question,  
25 John Hudak.



1 LORI MATHIEU: So you mentioned two solar projects, one  
2 that you didn't like, one that you did. What was  
3 the difference?

4 JOHN HUDAK: A huge difference. I think the thing with  
5 the first project is there was really no design  
6 workaroud. There was really nothing the  
7 applicant could do to mitigate the fact that  
8 you're clearcutting twelve acres of forestland.  
9 And that's really that forestland is the gold  
10 standard for protecting water supplies. So we  
11 came out. We intervened on the project and we  
12 opposed it.

13 The second project was entirely different.  
14 It was an agricultural field, a cornfield. They  
15 weren't taking down a single tree -- not that we  
16 would oppose taking down a single tree. And they  
17 were a hundred feet from wetlands.

18 The fact is that this project will actively  
19 be a net benefit to the water supply. They're  
20 going to have a meadow environment. It's going to  
21 more stable, not tilled, no pesticides, no  
22 herbicides, and plus it's going to be producing  
23 power. The Town of North Branford is going to be  
24 benefiting through their virtual net metering  
25 program. So it was really a big win-win from all

1 sides.

2 Furthermore, there's a site that was started  
3 with a big parcel that was split into two parcels,  
4 because one of the parcels has historical dumping  
5 on it in a deep NOV.

6 LORI MATHIEU: Okay.

7 JOHN HUDAK: The property owner is going to use the  
8 proceeds from leasing the land of the solar  
9 project to clean up the other site. So nothing  
10 not to like.

11 LORI MATHIEU: Okay. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

13 Anything else?

14  
15 (No response.)

16  
17 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, we're going to move onto old  
18 business.

19 WUCC update, Lori?

20 LORI MATHIEU: Well, not much since the last time. So  
21 there was a meeting and I think I mentioned the  
22 last time that we've had an implementation group  
23 meeting. Everybody is invited. It's open to the  
24 public.

25 We've broken it up into individual

1 workgroups, conservation and drought management,  
2 noncommunity public water system standards and  
3 facilitating connection, local review checklist  
4 and interconnections, regionalization.

5 Next meeting is scheduled tentatively, I  
6 believe, May 19th. In the meantime the workgroups  
7 are continuing to collaborate work through their  
8 topics using Microsoft Teams.

9 And I'm looking at an update here from staff  
10 that said that the Teams teams have been set up.  
11 So if you know you're interested and want to be  
12 involved, you're more than welcome to participate  
13 with the WUCC process.

14 So again, the next meeting is tentatively  
15 scheduled for May 19th, and that's what I have.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Lori.

17 And also private well update?

18 LORI MATHIEU: Well --

19 THE CHAIRMAN: We've already talked about that a little  
20 bit.

21 LORI MATHIEU: Yeah, I did. And it goes onto our press  
22 releases gaining a lot of attention. So I have, I  
23 think, three more requests by reporters, one from  
24 the AP. So you know myself and a colleague from  
25 USGS were on at noon with NBC.

1           This is why we did this press release, and  
2 this is important to get the word out about  
3 arsenic, uranium, private well testing. So we're  
4 happy that the press is catching onto this and are  
5 asking questions.

6           So right now one of the initiatives that we  
7 do within our department at this moment, even  
8 though this session is ongoing, it's April. In  
9 April and May we start teeing up legislative ideas  
10 and concepts that we would like to move forward on  
11 behalf of the branch, and private wells is top of  
12 the list -- so you know, talking through within  
13 our agency what we need to do, what needs to  
14 change.

15           So if there's anybody that wishes to have any  
16 conversations about this -- I know about the work  
17 that's ongoing, but as far as a agency goes it's  
18 one of the top items. In speaking with the  
19 commissioner's level, Commissioner Gifford, Deputy  
20 Commissioner Heather Aaron, they're fairly new and  
21 they're wondering why there are no requirements  
22 for testing private wells.

23           And so given the science and the information  
24 that we have from USGS, and the information, you  
25 know what I just told you about the commissioner

1 level, a lot of questions, a lot of concern,  
2 people due to COVID tele-working running their  
3 wells dry, not testing their water; you know now  
4 is an interesting time to start discussing private  
5 well testing and what should be required.

6 And again as I mentioned previously, local  
7 health is also interested in working with everyone  
8 on what needs to move forward to protect human  
9 health. So anyway, that's it.

10 Any questions on that?

11  
12 (No response.)

13  
14 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Lori.

15 We're going to go right over to Martin and  
16 the EDWG workgroup.

17 **MARTIN HEFT:** Sure. Easy for you to say.

18 So on the drought workgroup we did have a  
19 meeting last month, and as I had mentioned we  
20 started reviewing kind of the overall plan that  
21 was first, you know, we actually first used in  
22 this last drought cycle -- kind of going through  
23 good, bad, looking at, you know, ways that it  
24 should be improved, things that we should change  
25 in it.

1           So we're looking for any, you know, input  
2           from anybody, obviously anyone that's on here and  
3           obviously from the Council itself, you know, more  
4           on just an informal basis. You can just, you  
5           know, just shoot me an e-mail of how you think the  
6           response was and how it got handled, or if you  
7           think something should be changed, kind of just  
8           doing that informally as I mentioned.

9           We are waiting for the sub topical group in  
10          order to get their report to us so we can just  
11          take a look at that, although that information is  
12          based upon the old draft, you know, the old  
13          drought plans. So it's not based on the new  
14          drought plan, but obviously there's a lot of  
15          similar items in that that we can, you know, take  
16          into account as we're looking at that.

17          We're also in the process here at OPM working  
18          on kind of an annual update letter to send out to  
19          all of our regional coordinators, you know, for  
20          each of the municipal areas there to kind of just  
21          say, you know, that we'd like to get out, you  
22          know, early spring here and we'll, you know, get  
23          that circulated out to everyone.

24          But we're kind of looking at that and just  
25          reminding them, here are the five stages. Here's,

1           you know, things that, you know, the drought  
2           doesn't end because it's winter, you know, all  
3           those type of things to get that information out  
4           to them.

5           And with that right now the plan is looking  
6           at -- we're supposed to have a meeting on  
7           Thursday, but we're most likely going to cancel  
8           that and let the smaller work teams work on, you  
9           know, looking at the overall plan and everything  
10          as we continue to monitor, you know, conditions.

11 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Excellent.

12           Alecia has got a question for Martin?

13 **ALICEA CHARAMUT:** Will you still be gathering the data  
14          even though you're canceling the meeting for this  
15          month? We're seeing some concerning trends in the  
16          streamflow and worried that if we don't get our  
17          April showers, that we may find ourselves creeping  
18          back into drought.

19           So I'm just wondering if the data will  
20          continue to be collected even if you're not having  
21          a meeting so you can have something to compare the  
22          next month to this month.

23 **MARTIN HEFT:** Yeah. As I mentioned, that we're  
24          continually monitoring, you know, the situation.  
25          We know that some of the weather forecasts have

1 already shown some -- down in the New London  
2 county area, that they are already, you know,  
3 being dryer, if you will -- on that.

4 So yes, we will be doing that, because part  
5 of our plan, you know we look at some things that  
6 are three months. So obviously we've got to have  
7 the data in order to be able to, you know, do our  
8 evaluations.

9 LORI MATHIEU: Alecia -- Jack, if I might? And I know  
10 we have to start running here, because some of us  
11 have to peel off.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: We do. We do have to run, so.

13 LORI MATHIEU: Yeah. And Alecia, I know you've got to  
14 leave soon.

15 So I know -- because it's a good point about  
16 tracking. And to Martin's point, we're always  
17 tracking, but do we share it with the public? So  
18 one of the things that we're working on is a  
19 dashboard that we could tee up for for the stuff  
20 that we track. You know, the reservoir capacity  
21 for the public water systems and to develop a  
22 dashboard.

23 We've been able to -- I don't know if we  
24 talked about it last time, but we presented it to  
25 Martin and his team and they liked it. And we're



1 starting to brainstorm ideas about how to use it,  
2 what to publish. But one of the things that we're  
3 trying to do within DPH is just get the dashboard  
4 published so that you could see what we're looking  
5 at.

6 Because we do track it. As the utilities who  
7 sit on this Zoom call know, you know we drive them  
8 crazy asking for information. So we gather it.  
9 We want to share it, because to your question I've  
10 noticed that it's getting dry. You know? I've  
11 noticed that, and so that's a good point.

12 One of the things that we talked about -- and  
13 I presented somewhere. I can't remember where the  
14 presentation was, but it may have been at the  
15 rates discussion, that when we look at the last  
16 ten years it doesn't look good over the last ten  
17 years, when you look back.

18 Because Steve Harkey and I looked back to  
19 2016. We wanted to compare '16 to 2020 and see  
20 exactly, were they tracking similar pathways?  
21 Well, they were. They did. And then when you  
22 look back to 2010 the whole decade was pretty dry.

23 So what patterns might we be missing because  
24 we're not looking back at the length of record  
25 that we have? So it's a really good question in,

1 not only looking at what we're doing right now,  
2 but looking back and looking at trends. And  
3 that's something that none of us have the time to  
4 do, unfortunately, but it's something where if you  
5 have a dashboard you can sort of tee it up so that  
6 it's not a burden on anyone of our staff to do  
7 constantly. You know?

8 And the information from USGS is excellent  
9 when you start looking at what they track back to  
10 2016 to 2020. Boy, they tracked very close  
11 together.

12 So it's a great question. It's something we  
13 should keep on the agenda and not forget about,  
14 because we're going to try to tee up our dashboard  
15 fairly soon in the next month. If we do that  
16 we'll share the links with everyone.

17 **THE CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, Lori.

18 Anything else, Martin?

19 **MARTIN HEFT:** Yeah, no. Thank you, Lori, for bringing  
20 up the dashboard. We did have, you know, the  
21 presentation at the last meeting on it. And part  
22 of it we just have to have all our individual  
23 agencies and people that submit the data to  
24 verify, you know, what stuff is public, which  
25 stuff we cannot have on there. So that's all in

1 the process.

2 So Lori, that's a great recap of that, that  
3 that tool that will be available we'll be able to  
4 have there so we can continually monitor it on a  
5 much better scale. So thanks.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Martin, and thank you for  
7 your work.

8 Okay. The next is new business, and what I  
9 wanted to bring up was putting the agenda together  
10 for our next meeting. Lori and I talked a little  
11 bit, and Graham had talked about in terms of when  
12 we should get the -- I should have Alley get the  
13 agenda out to people.

14 Is two weeks in advance enough? Or if  
15 you have something for her to setup, our next  
16 meeting will be on May 4th. So maybe two weeks  
17 prior to that if people have any suggestions, so  
18 we can be in compliance with the agendas and FOI  
19 and everything else.

20 Does that sound okay with everybody? I know  
21 Graham, you wanted to invite some people. And  
22 Lori you wanted to do some things.

23 LORI MATHIEU: Yes, that sounds good. So that we give  
24 ourselves a little bit more time. It would be  
25 helpful.

1 GRAHAM STEVENS: So yeah, the next -- one of the topics  
2 I think might be helpful for everyone to hear a  
3 report out on is for Mary Sotos from DEEP who is  
4 taking the lead on Executive 1 in the water  
5 conservation efforts and measures to try to give  
6 folks a report out at our meeting in June. If  
7 that's sounds good, Jack?

8 THE CHAIRMAN: That sounds very good.

9 GRAHAM STEVENS: Okay. Yeah, we've checked in with  
10 Mary and she's got some information she can  
11 present to everyone to see some of the impact of  
12 EO1, Executive Order 1. And I think that would be  
13 a good way for folks to see how far we've come and  
14 how much further we need to go.

15 It's interesting given the fact that we've  
16 had a pandemic going on here and obviously state  
17 agency office use is down, but still the measures  
18 continue to move forward.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: So we'll put her on for the June  
20 meeting. Right?

21 GRAHAM STEVENS: Yeah. I think June -- is it June 1?  
22 Is that the 1st? I think it's June 1.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good. All right. Alley will  
24 make a note of that, and we'll make sure we do  
25 that.

1           And again, anything that anybody wants in the  
2           two weeks before the May meeting and future  
3           meetings, it would just be good for everybody to  
4           have a look at what we want to do and --

5   LORI MATHIEU:   One item I'm thinking about this USGS  
6           study and the private well information, it would  
7           be great I think to bring USGS in with my staff  
8           and just do a presentation.

9           Maybe we can do that next month?

10   THE CHAIRMAN:   Let's do that.   Let's do that in May.

11   LORI MATHIEU:   In may, if that's okay?

12   GRAHAM STEVENS:   And then the only other topic I had,  
13           Jack, was bringing Rebecca French from DEEP to  
14           give the Water Planning Council an update on the  
15           GC3 efforts.

16   THE CHAIRMAN:   Right.

17   GRAHAM STEVENS:   You know, we've taken this massive  
18           process and tried to assimilate some  
19           recommendations that can be implemented in the  
20           short term.

21           I just want to make sure everyone that -- I  
22           know many of you participated in many of the  
23           working groups, which you're owed a great debt of  
24           thanks.   Too bad we can't give cash payouts for  
25           volunteers.   Still working on that.

1           But you know, great, great work by so many  
2 folks. So I think it's fitting that we get that  
3 report out maybe in July. I haven't  
4 confirmed with Rebecca on her availability. I  
5 just wanted to put it out there as a topic.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Virginia?

7 VIRGINIA de LIMA: Lori, if I can make a comment?

8           Lori, just in terms of the arsenic and uranium in  
9 the private wells?

10 LORI MATHIEU: Sure.

11 VIRGINIA de LIMA: I don't know if it's been part of  
12 your discussion of -- certainly you can make a  
13 recommendation, but how can you get people to take  
14 the recommendation?

15           I say that because, you know, working for  
16 USGS I had some inside knowledge of where some of  
17 those hotspots were. And one of them was a  
18 quarter of a mile from where my sister lives, and  
19 I mentioned it to her -- and she basically  
20 shrugged.

21           She said, we use bottled water for drinking.  
22 I'm not going to worry about it. And I think  
23 that's probably a more prevalent reaction than we  
24 might want to believe.

25           And I'm wondering if you folks are discussing

1           how you might get through to those people?

2   LORI MATHIEU: Well, it started today. Actually, it  
3           started five years ago when we started looking at  
4           similar to what New Hampshire did with looking at  
5           the prevalence in the rock and where are these  
6           rocks. What do we know?

7           Let's do some testing. Let's spend a little  
8           bit of federal grant funds to do this study, and  
9           then put the research together -- and then  
10          reinvest in it, you know, this so many years  
11          later.

12          So now to tell the story. I think to  
13          communicate with people is important. That is  
14          similar to what we just talked about with Alecia.  
15          Alecia's question is a good one.

16          Are you guys tracking, because it's getting  
17          dry? Yes, we are, but we don't promote it. You  
18          know?

19          And we struggle as agencies. A lot of what  
20          we do, regulatory legislation, but we don't have  
21          time to do education, outreach and training on  
22          many things that are non-regulatory, and this is  
23          one of them.

24          So you know, teeing up the science and  
25          talking about public health at this time is really

1 important to the Health Department. And people, I  
2 think it's a different time. They sort of know  
3 what the Health Department does now. Right?

4 And I think they're listening a little bit  
5 more while they sit at home and drink that water.  
6 And maybe they just had a baby. You know, and  
7 maybe they're thinking twice. Like, oh, should I  
8 really spend the money on bottled water? Or  
9 should I get that water tested, and maybe I can  
10 drink that water and save a lot of money?

11 So you know, there's things that -- and then  
12 PFAS is coming around down the road. You know,  
13 maybe at some point, Graham, you and I, we could  
14 present -- or we could have our staff come and  
15 present maybe in the summer when we're getting  
16 ourselves up and running more with PFAS.

17 But you know, when PFAS hits the road we're  
18 going to, you know, we're going to have our hands  
19 full with private well people wanting to know  
20 about what they're drinking. So you know it's a  
21 continuous effort.

22 And you're right. People -- some people  
23 don't care. I talked to my neighbors, like, what?  
24 Is that what that hole in the ground is? All  
25 right, you know, that I hit with my tractor that's



1 in the way of my, you know, whatever, my pool. So  
2 just education as a consistent drumbeat of sharing  
3 information and educating people.

4 They can choose to do whatever they want.  
5 You know that's my message, really. It's your  
6 choice. Some people care a lot, though.  
7 Especially this information from USGS, I -- if I  
8 was out there I'd want to know. Tell me exactly  
9 where I should care.

10 Tell -- like, tell me. I want to know. So  
11 if I want to know I could now go to this report  
12 and learn more, and I think some people will do  
13 that, which is good -- because as you know there  
14 are hot spots. Correct?

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

16 LORI MATHIEU: Yes. Yes.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else before we go -- any  
18 other new business before we go to public comment?

19 Public comment?

20 MARGARET MINER: Jack, it's Margaret with sort of a  
21 little bit of new business, a little bit of public  
22 comment. I'll be very quick.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

24 MARGARET MINER: Currently, and in the last 18 months  
25 or so there have been a number of controversial or

1 questioned water diversions and dam issues, water  
2 company takeover and that kind of thing.

3 I get questions from people, well, you know,  
4 this doesn't look good.

5 And I say, well, is it in the WUCC plan for  
6 your region? Nobody knows what a WUCC plan is.  
7 They don't know that there's an approved statewide  
8 water supply plan, and they have no idea -- nor  
9 are they, you know, that they should be involved,  
10 you know, that it would benefit them to be  
11 involved or to have their council of governments  
12 report to them.

13 Then they ask, well, what about the state  
14 water plan? And let's say this is a question of,  
15 should we have private companies take over public  
16 utilities? Or should this diversion be, you know,  
17 is this prudent?

18 Well, the state water plan, it would have  
19 general information, but it's probably not going  
20 to help you.

21 Well, isn't there a drought? We're concerned  
22 about drought. Where is, you know, is there a  
23 drought management plan that we could look at for  
24 our watershed?

25 Well, that's mostly with OPM and they've been

1 working on it -- and the drought plan has much  
2 better science than it had in the past. But you  
3 know, applying it to the question you have in your  
4 watershed may be difficult.

5 So I feel we've been talking about bringing  
6 the public in. I think they don't understand  
7 water planning in this State. They don't  
8 understand where or how to get involved, and  
9 people get quite frustrated and they can get  
10 cranky.

11 And they don't really have a good  
12 understanding, and that it's partly because the  
13 same old problem we have with water policy, it's  
14 fragmented. And we still haven't unified it in a  
15 way that the public can understand. So maybe that  
16 can be on an agenda for the meeting after next --  
17 or forever, the meeting forever.

18 **THE CHAIRMAN:** I think it's an ongoing topic, but I  
19 think your point is very well taken. I mean, the  
20 thought of the Water Planning Council when you and  
21 I started together at the turn of the century.

22 **MARGARET MINER:** Yeah?

23 **THE CHAIRMAN:** And it was because there was no dialogue  
24 between the old DEP and DPH and OPM, and the old  
25 DPUC. And you know we've made great inroads, I

1 think, but we've got a ways to go.

2 And I think the public should have a better  
3 understanding, and hopefully the outreach group is  
4 going to help with that, but we should probably  
5 look at having some, you know, we took the show on  
6 the road a few years back. So maybe we can look  
7 at doing something like that as well.

8 MARGARET MINER: You know, they need to be able to  
9 apply what we're talking about and what we think  
10 is good. They need to be able to understand it  
11 and apply it to their watersheds when questions  
12 come up.

13 So, anyways thanks a lot.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you, Margaret.

15 Any other public comment?

16 Any other public comment?

17  
18 (No response.)

19  
20 THE CHAIRMAN: If not, if there's nothing else to come  
21 before us, the next meeting is May 4th.

22 Appreciate everybody's efforts and participation  
23 today. And with that, we'll have a motion to  
24 adjourn?

25 MARTIN HEFT: So moved.

1 **GRAHAM STEVENS: Second.**

2 **THE CHAIRMAN: Motion made and seconded. All those in**  
3 **favor?**

4 **THE COUNCIL: Aye.**

5 **THE CHAIRMAN: We are adjourned.**

6  
7 **(Whereupon, the above proceedings were**  
8 **concluded at 2:55 p.m.)**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 69 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 April 6, 2021.



Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857  
Notary Public  
BCT Reporting Service  
55 Whiting Street, Suite 1A  
Plainville, CT 06062

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 INDEX

2  
3 VOTES TAKEN  
(Unanimous Approval)

Description	Page
3/2/'21 Transcript Approval	3
Adjournment	69

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25