NEIWPCC
New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission

State Water Plan for Connecticut
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS
Request for Qualifications for Development of the State Water Plan for Connecticut

February 9, 2016

The New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC), on behalf of the Connecticut Water Planning Council (WPC), comprised of representatives of Connecticut's Departments of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), Public Health (DPH), Office of Policy and Management (OPM) and Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA), is inviting qualification submittals from contractors to develop, at the direction of the WPC, the first comprehensive State Water Plan for Connecticut. The plan, scheduled to be submitted for approval to the Connecticut General Assembly in 2018, will evaluate current and future management of Connecticut's water resources and establish a balanced policy framework to govern water use for public water supply, economic development, ecological health, and recreational purposes.

This project will develop recommendations for the long-term management of Connecticut's water resources, and other requirements identified in the attached Connecticut Public Act No. 14-163, An Act Concerning Responsibilities of the Water Planning Council. Once selected, the applicant will be asked to provide a detailed scope of services, comprehensive technical proposal, and proposed budget.

This request for qualifications (RFQ) includes:

I. Overview
II. Scope of Work
III General Guidelines for Applicants
IV. Statements of Qualifications and Interest
V. Qualification Submission Process
VI. Qualification Evaluation Process
VII. Notification of Applicants
VIII. Conditions

Appendix A. Annotated Outline of Table of Contents for CT State Water Plan
Appendix B. Connecticut Public Act No. 14-163
Appendix C. Water Plan June 2015 Steering Committee Workshop Summary

I. Overview

This is a request for qualifications (RFQ) for a consultant to assist the WPC in the development of the State Water Plan.

The WPC has been charged pursuant to state statute to prepare, within available appropriations, a state water plan for the management of the water resources of the state. The Public Act requires a draft plan to be completed by July 1, 2017, followed by a formal public review process, and subsequent modification of the plan in response to public comments. A final draft plan is to be submitted to the Connecticut General Assembly for approval in January 2018. Connecticut Public Act No. 14-163 "An Act Concerning the Responsibilities of the Water Planning Council" can be found in Appendix B.

To date, the Water Planning Council has established a Steering Committee, a Science and Technical Workgroup, a Policy Workgroup and an Other States Plans Workgroup to assist it in guiding the development of a state water plan. There is also an advisory group to the Water Planning Council, established by CT Gen Stat § 25-33o, consisting of designated members for specific water interests who are charged with providing input on public outreach regarding the Water Plan.

An initial Steering Committee Planning Workshop was held in June 2015. A pre-workshop situation assessment and post-workshop summary report is attached in Appendix C.

Additionally, an Annotated Outline of the anticipated Table of Contents for the State Water Plan is also attached (see Appendix A). A thorough report, properly informed to reflect stakeholder engagement and public outreach, which comprehensively addresses the issues identified in this table of contents will constitute the draft State Water Plan and be the ultimate deliverable for this endeavor.

Supplemental information about Connecticut's state water planning process, including the archived reports, meeting summaries, and other useful resources can be found at: http://ct.gov/water

NEIWPCC has entered into an agreement with the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management to facilitate the process of hiring and overseeing a consultant to assist the Connecticut Water Planning Council to develop the Connecticut Water Plan, including this Request for Qualifications. NEIWPCC is a not-for-profit interstate organization, established by Congress in 1947 to serve and assist its member states individually and collectively by providing coordination, research, public education, training, and leadership in the management and protection of water quality in the New England states and New York.

II. Scope of the Work

This RFQ is for services to produce Connecticut's first State Water Plan, as required pursuant to PA 14-163 and codified in CT Gen Stat § 22a-352 and recommend a process for its implementation and renewal. Working at the direction of the Water Planning Council, the consultant will assist in preparing a draft state-wide long-range plan for the management of the water resources of the state in accordance with the provisions of CT Gen Stat § 22a-352. In carrying out such preparation, the Water Planning Council is tasked with the addressing the following substantive issues and meeting the following process considerations:

> Not later than July 1, 2017, the Water Planning Council, established pursuant to CT Gen Stat § 25-33o, shall, within available appropriations, prepare a state water plan for the management of

the water resources of the state. In developing such state water plan, the Water Planning Council shall:
(1) Design a unified planning program and budget;
(2) consider regional water and sewer facilities plans;
(3) identify the appropriate regions of the state for comprehensive water planning;
(4) identify the data needs and develop a consistent format for submitting data to the council, applicable state agencies and regional councils of governments for use in planning and permitting;
(5) consider the potential impact of climate change on the availability and abundance of water resources and the importance of climate resiliency;
(6) seek involvement of interested parties;
(7) solicit input from the advisory group established pursuant to section 25-33o;
(8) consider individual water supply plans, water quality standards, stream flow classifications, as described in regulations adopted pursuant to section 26-141b, water utility coordinating committee plans, the state plan of conservation and development, as described in section 16a-30, and any other planning documents deemed necessary by the council;
(9) promote the adoption of municipal ordinances based on the State of Connecticut Model Water Use Restriction Ordinance for municipal water emergencies; and
(10) examine appropriate mechanisms for resolving conflicts related to the implementation of the state water plan.

The State Water Plan developed pursuant to CT Gen Stat § 22b-352 shall:

(1) Identify the quantities and qualities of water that are available for public water supply, health, economic, recreation and environmental benefits on a regional basin scale considering both surface water and groundwater;
(2) identify present and projected demands for water resources on a state-wide and regional basin scale;
(3) recommend the utilization of the state's water resources, including surface and subsurface water, in a manner that balances public water supply, economic development, recreation and ecological health;
(4) recommend steps to increase the climate resiliency of existing water resources and infrastructure;
(5) make recommendations for technology and infrastructure upgrades, interconnections and such major engineering works or special districts which may be necessary, including the need, timing and general cost thereof;
(6) recommend land use and other measures, including an assessment of land acquisition or land protection needs, where appropriate to ensure the desired quality and abundance of water and to promote development in concert with available water resources;
(7) take into account desired ecological, recreational, agricultural, industrial and commercial use of water bodies;
(8) inform residents of the state about the importance of water-resource stewardship and conservation;
(9) establish conservation guidelines and incentives for consumer water conservation with due consideration for energy efficiency;
(10) develop a water reuse policy with incentives for matching the quality of the water to the use;
(11) meet data collection and analysis needs to provide for data driven water planning and permitting decisions;

(12) take into account the ecological, environmental, public health and safety and economic impact that implementation of the state water plan will have on the state;
(13) include short and long-range objectives and strategies to communicate and implement the plan;
(14) seek to incorporate regional and local plans and programs for water use and management and plans for water and sewerage facilities in the state water plan;
(15) promote intraregional solutions and sharing of water resources;
(16) develop and recommend strategies to address climate resiliency including the impact of extreme weather events; and
(17) identify modifications to laws and regulations that are necessary in order to implement the recommendations of the state water plan.

III. General Guidelines for Applicants

NEIWPCC and the Connecticut Water Planning Council's evaluation of responses to this RFQ will determine the applicant(s) selected to provide a detailed scope of services and budget. Ultimately, one successful contractor will be chosen for this project. Applicants who are eligible to submit qualifications in response to this RFQ include: federal, state, or local government agencies; interstate agencies; private non-profit organizations and institutions; for-profit organizations; and academic or educational institutions. Partnerships are allowed.

The selected applicant(s) will be asked to provide a detailed scope of services and a comprehensive technical proposal and budget. The proposal should include a detailed project scope, work schedules, specific roles and areas of responsibility to be assumed by the applicant's personnel and consultants, contractual considerations and development concepts.

In accordance with NEIWPCC's Conflict of Interest Policy, NEIWPCC staff and commissioners will not be eligible applicants for this RFQ. A consultant, company, or organization that assisted directly with the development of this RFQ will not be considered eligible for entering into a contract with NEIWPCC for this RFQ.

$880,000 has been authorized by the state to complete this project. Awarded funds may be used for expenses specifically related to the proposed project, including wages and all consultant fees. The final draft report is due not later than April 2017.

The schedule* for this RFQ is as follows:

Questions on this RFQ may be submitted to NEIWPCC by email	February 24, 2016, 2:00 PM EST
Qualifications and Letter of Interest due to NEIWPCC	March 4, 2016, 1:00 PM EST
Applicants Notified of Decisions	March 31, 2016
Detailed Project Workplans and Budgets due	April 8, 2016
Project Start Date	April 22, 2016

Initial Report and deliverables due	November 2016
Final Report and deliverables due	April 2017

*Schedule is subject to change.

Questions on this RFQ may be submitted by email until February 24, 2016, 2:00 PM EST to: jceraso@neiwpcc.org. Responses will be posted at (http://NEIWPCC.org/CTSWP) by March 1st, 2016, 12:00 PM.

IV. Statements of Qualifications and Interest

The applicant's cover letter should be no more than 4 pages and should briefly explain applicant's qualifications for and interest in undertaking the project and its point of view on any project-specific issues identified in the RFQ.

Respondents Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) shall also include the following information:

a. Experience of the applicant and individuals in preparing state or multi-state water management plans, with a brief description of the legal framework in those states for regulating water rights This should include names of specific projects, names of clients (or general descriptions if confidential), time frames in which the project(s) was pursued, the nature of stakeholder engagement and public involvement in the projects. This experience information should be included for any subcontractor(s) the applicant expects to partner with.
b. A preliminary workplan narrative that describes how the applicant proposes to: 1) address, organize, prioritize, and schedule the work required to assist the Water Planning Council in the planning process to prepare a final draft report consistent with the attached Annotated Table of Contents; and, 2) substantively engage stakeholders and the public in the process of developing the plan.
c. An organizational chart that demonstrates how key applicant personnel will interface with NEIWPCC and the WPC and solicit feedback from its various workgroups and committees
d. Description and resumes of the professional staff that would perform the work, including relevant qualifications, hourly rate, and estimated hours each staff would spend on this project.
e. Description of effectiveness in working within collaborative planning processes that constructively engage diverse stakeholder and governmental interests. Relevant experience on the applicant's project team concerning water planning efforts of comparable complexity in Connecticut is highly desirable.
f. Three references from prior projects for which the applicant or individual performed similar work, including names, titles, email addresses, and telephone numbers.
g. Demonstrated knowledge of current and emerging water management and policy issues.
h. Demonstrated organizational ability and timely delivery of work products.
i. Demonstrated ability to control project cost, quality and schedule.
j. Demonstrated ability to work successfully and collaboratively with diverse stakeholder groups and interests, including work with multi-lingual and multi-cultural communities.

k. Demonstrated experience in public engagement processes, consensus building, and experience in distilling public input and the direction of the WPC into a cohesive planning document.
l. Demonstrated understanding of growth and efficiency drivers.
m. Demonstrated ability to recognize how the State Water Plan and any proposed policies in the Plan will impact the ecology, environment, public health and safety of the state.

Cover letters and SOQs must be submitted according to the process detailed in Section V below. Submitted responses will remain unopened until after the submittal deadline date. At that time the SOQs will be opened and distributed to the RFQ Qualifications Review Team. There is no guarantee that NEIWPCC or its partners will utilize the services of any consultant or individual responding to this RFQ.

V. Qualifications Submission Process

Statements of Qualifications and letters must be submitted by no later than **1:00 PM EST on** March 4, 2016. Late submissions will not be considered. Applicants **must submit their proposals electronically** through the NEIWPCC website. Unless prior approval is given in writing, proposals received through e-mail, postal delivery, or any other delivery method will **not** be accepted.

To submit your proposal, go to www.neiwpcc.org/rfp2/ and follow the instructions provided for uploading your file(s). It is highly preferred that the submission and all supporting information are submitted as a single PDF document. This requires Adobe Acrobat or similar Adobe product (the free Adobe Reader does not allow the conversion of documents into PDF format), or a scanner. If multiple files are to be submitted, you will need to create an archive file (.zip, or .rar) containing all of the files you wish to submit. The file name should be in the following format: "Connecticut State Water Plan Proposal_NAME OF YOUR ORGANIZATION." Once you have clicked the "submit" button, please allow adequate time for your submission to process and do not hit the back button or close your browser window. The process is not considered complete until you have reached the confirmation page. If submitted successfully, you will receive an email from NEIWPCC (mail@neiwpcc.org) with the subject line "RFQ Submission Confirmation" confirming your submission. For questions regarding submission of proposals, contact Mike Jennings at NEIWPCC, mjennings@neiwpcc.org, (978)349-2520.

Statements of Qualifications should be no more than 25 pages, not including any appendices that applicant may choose to include.

VI. Qualifications Evaluation Process

NEIWPCC and the Qualifications Review Team will review the submitted SOQs and will use weighted criteria to evaluate responses to determine applicant(s) to continue in the process. This review may include conference calls to seek clarifications for the decision-making process.

Criteria to be considered in determining applicant's qualifications and experience to meet the project needs will include:

- Qualifications, competence and past performance of individuals to be assigned key project responsibilities, as determined by professional references

- Consultant's general experience and 'track record' on similar projects, including quality of services during and after project, contract award price versus applicant's estimates, final contract cost versus contract award price

- Overall competence, intelligence and expertise of the applicant's principals and key employees as presented in submissions and during an interview, if requested, and the extent of involvement in the project anticipated by those individuals and their availability

- Applicant's approach, as demonstrated in submissions, including the Preliminary Workplan Narrative, to planning, organizing and managing the project effort, including communications procedures, creativity, problem-solving and cost estimating methods, quality improvement programs, and other relevant techniques

- Applicant's reputation and integrity within its profession and community

- Applicant's demonstrated ability to control project cost, quality and schedule

- Applicant's demonstrated ability to work effectively with and engage representatives and groups of diverse stakeholders as well as the general public

- Qualifications of sub-contractors, if applicable

- Facilities and equipment to be made available to the project by the applicant, including computer capabilities, reproduction and communications equipment, laboratory and testing equipment, and other specialized items

- Present workload of the applicant, current and future commitments of personnel, especially those to be assigned to the project

- Other recognition of the applicant's achievements, including awards received and technical papers authored by employees

- Applicant's specific experience related to water planning, state or regional water plans, projects with water utilities, demand management, and state agencies, including Connecticut

- Applicant's process for ongoing communication with the Water Planning Council, and its Advisory Group, Steering Committee, and related workgroups

- Applicant's process for coordinating all involved disciplines

- Applicant's experience developing Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs)

VII. Notification of Applicants

NEIWPCC may invite applicants to hold an interview with the Qualifications Review Team for the purposes of clarification and evaluation of the applicant and its SOQ. NEIWPCC will notify the selected applicant(s) of their status in this review process upon completion of the full evaluation of all applicants.

It is anticipated that, shortly after the selection of the highest ranked applicant(s), discussions will commence with the highest rated applicant(s) for the purpose of negotiating a contract for the State Water Plan elements, based upon available funds. Once notified, the highest rated applicant(s) will be asked to provide a detailed scope of services, schedule of deliverables, and a comprehensive technical and budget proposal. The proposal should include a detailed project scope, work schedules, specific roles and areas of responsibility to be assumed by the applicant's personnel and consultants, contractual considerations and, where appropriate, development of concepts and cost comparisons. More details will be provided to the selected applicant following notification. In the event that the parties are unable to successfully negotiate a timely agreement, NEIWPCC will open negotiations with the next highest ranked applicant(s).

NEIWPCC requires its contractors to maintain workers compensation, liability and property damage insurance. Note this applies for all contractors, including sole proprietors. Each policy shall have limits not less than $2,000,000 combined (bodily injury and property damage) and $3,000,000 aggregate, single limit per occurrence. If you cannot provide proof of insurance, please do not apply for this opportunity. More details will be provided to applicants selected for funding.

VIII. Conditions

RFQ Acceptance/Rejection: NEIWPCC and the Connecticut Water Planning Council reserve the right to cancel this solicitation, to reject any or all proposals received (or any part thereof without penalty), to waive irregularities and to award a contract not based solely on the lowest cost, but based on a proposal which best fulfills the requirements of this RFQ.

Clarifications: At its sole discretion NEIWPCC and the Qualifications Review Team may conduct written or verbal discussions with one or more applicants for the purpose of clarifying any information in their SOQ and assuring that the applicant fully understood and responded to the RFQ requirements. NEIWPCC may issue a request for more detailed or specific explanations from applicants. NEIWPCC may limit its clarification process to those SOQs it deems most advantageous. NEIWPCC may issue revisions to the RFQ and permit all applicants to respond to those revisions.

Performance Evaluation: As part of the evaluation process, NEIWPCC reserves the right to contact applicant's clients and former clients, including those projects listed in applicant's Statement of Qualifications, for the purpose of evaluating any aspect of the applicant's performance.

Ranking: In the event the highest ranked applicant and NEIWPCC are unsuccessful in negotiating contract terms and price, it is anticipated that the negotiations will commence with the second highest ranked applicant. Ranking information will not be shared with the applicants other than identifying the highest ranked applicant. NEIWPCC reserves the right to suspend or terminate all negotiations and not select an applicant.

Quality Assurance & Quality Control Requirements
The NEIWPCC Quality Management Plan requires that Quality Assurance Project Plans (QAPPs) are developed and approved for all projects involving environmental data operations (i.e., collection, analysis, and/or manipulation of environmental data). For projects that involve environmental data operations, the contractor will be responsible for developing the project QAPP and submitting it to NEIWPCC for review

after the start of the contract period. NEIWPCC will provide guidelines for QAPP development once a contractor is selected.

APPENDIX A

Annotated Table of Contents – Connecticut State Water Plan

This Annotated Table of Contents contains suggested content for each section of the *Revised* Model Table of Contents, based on the research of the Other States' Plans Workgroup (OSPW). It is intended to act as a starting point in incorporating all the statutory requirements of PA 14-163, plan elements identified by the OSPW in their report and items the Steering Committee felt should be included in the State Plan into the Table of Contents. It is not intended to be all-inclusive nor to drive the planning process.

1. Terms and Acronyms

2. Executive Summary

3. Introduction

A. Public Act 14-163

B. Mission Statement:

A state water plan using science, data and public input to provide for the utilization of the state's water resources in a manner that balances public water supply, economic development, recreation and ecological health in accordance with the provisions of Section 22a-352 of the Connecticut General Statutes, as amended by Public Act 14-163 by the statutory deadline of July 1, 2017.

C. Development of the State Water Plan

This could include a summary of the process used to develop the State Water Plan, including the structure of the WPC, the Committees and Subcommittees, stakeholder/public involvement and the Guiding Principles developed by the Other States' Plan Work Group.

4. Current Condition Assessment

A. Understanding Connecticut's Water Resources

Compile water resource information and data sources. Define and describe the various surface and ground water resources, including both quantity and quality, and the identification of hydrologic boundaries. This should include, but not be limited to: a description of the appropriate hydrologic unit (which may vary in scale depending on local need and the question to be addressed); water budget; baseline/trends; critical areas; protected areas; land use impacts; known areas of contamination; the impact of water use on wetlands, streams, rivers, lakes, ponds and marine waters; consideration of the impacts to wetlands; streams/rivers; lakes/ponds/reservoirs and marine water, and any additional measures necessary to define and describe the existing resource system.

B. Understanding Connecticut's Water Demands

Assess how and where we use our water resources today at the appropriate hydrologic unit. This should include, but not be limited to, quantification of current water uses, including consumptive uses such as water supply, agriculture, and energy/cooling and non-consumptive in-stream uses such as ecological needs, wastewater assimilation and recreation. This assessment should include water withdrawal and water return flows to the natural system and an assessment of land use impacts to both water quality and quantity.

C. Understanding Connecticut's Water Resources Management Structure

Describe the existing management structure at the state, regional, and local levels and identify significant components of the decision-making process. Provide an overview of current water and land management strategies and regulatory programs, including but not limited to, water supply (individual water supply plans, WUCCs, Source Water Assessment Program, Safe Drinking Water Act, watershed protection); water diversion; water quality standards; wastewater (individual municipal facilities plans, Clean Water Act, Water Pollution Control Authorities); stormwater and other non-point pollution sources; aquifer protection; inland wetlands; coastal management; drought management; stream flow; fisheries management; related state, regional, and local plans of conservation and development; and funding and financing.

D. Conflicts and Challenges

Should include a discussion of the current conflicts and challenges identified during the Plan development process at the appropriate hydrologic unit, including, but not limited to, registered/permitted diversions; information security issues; data limitations, and data or other resource gaps that limit our understanding of water resources and needs; the availability of water where it is needed; the energy-water nexus; aging infrastructure; treatment technology innovation; impacts to system viability and demand management; wastewater treatment as a resource recovery facility, and financial needs.

5. Preparing for Change

These are anticipated changes that may positively or negatively affect both supply and demand.

A. Demographics

Estimate future population and water use trends, both short and long term including quantification of water needs for human consumption, industry, irrigation, energy production and agriculture. Discuss current and future capabilities of public water systems and wastewater systems. Identify options to provide adequate quantity and quality of water and to address infrastructure challenges.

B. Technology and Consumer Behavior

Could include a discussion of changes to demand management, conservation incentives, water reuse, opportunities to manage demand, plumbing codes, technological improvements in the water industry, efficiencies in manufacturing, housing codes, and/or changes in societal norms or consumer behaviors that may influence water use.

C. Land Use

Identify the effect various developmental scenarios and land use practices have on quality and quantity of both surface water and ground water, including stormwater and non-point source pollution challenges; Low Impact Development/Green Infrastructure focus; and watershed protections.

D. Economic development

Should include discussion of Conservation & Development Plans; water, including recycled wastewater, as an economic resource and the potential effects this may have on resource availability; the role water resources play or should play in guiding development patterns; and any other relevant factors.

E. Climate Change

Evaluate anticipated climate-related impacts to water resources including, but not limited to, quality and quantity of both surface and ground water; changes to demand; stormwater management; flood risk, and infrastructure impacts for both water supply and wastewater. Identify opportunities for building resiliency and sustainability concepts into the Plan.

6. Recommendations for Implementation:

A. Policy Goals

Establish a set of recommended goals for the use, management and protection of the waters of the state and related land resources, with evaluations of alternative recommendations according to economic, environmental, hydrologic, jurisdictional, legal, social, public health and safety, and other relevant factors. This should include, but not be limited to, discussion and policies on water conservation; demand management; recycling/re-use strategies and drought measures; inter-basin transfers; regional cooperation; use of compacts and incentives; coordination with adjacent states; and emergency management.

B. Proposed Water Resources Management Structure

Describe the recommended organizational structure at the state, regional and local levels, incorporating land and water management plans and programs into the framework. Define the role of the WPC, relevant state agencies, local, regional, and state governments, and public and stakeholder involvement at each level. Identify potential barriers to implementation including, but not limited to, existing legislation or regulations.

C. Data Collection and Assessment

This section should include, but not be limited to, discussion of the water resource assessments conducted under Section 4A; recommendations for the on-going method of assessment, including data requirements; specification of modeling approach (which needs to account for anticipated future changes discussed in Section 5); incorporation of in-stream flows; how to define “over-allocation” and what happens if a basin is over-allocated; identification and establishment of a process for designating priority or critical basins.

D. Proposed Allocation Framework

The State Water Plan might also establish a proposed allocation framework which incorporates the policies established in section 6A and incentives to encourage those water management policies. This could include the adoption of an appointment framework, shared adversity, and similar principles, or the process for determining such, at the appropriate regional or local scale.

E. Conflict Resolution

The management framework should identify strategies to mitigate conflict, including, where appropriate, incentives or disincentives to move from status quo.

F. Impediments

Further the discussion from Section 4D to identify impediments to implementing a state water plan, and recommended changes to legislation or regulations needed to facilitate implementation of the State Water Plan.

G. Funding needs and Strategies

Outline funding needs to support the management framework and identify potential broad-based, sustainable funding mechanisms that are relatively stable and apportion program costs in an equitable manner.

H. Education and Outreach

Outline a program for seeking the involvement of interested parties, including public outreach and education about water resource management. Incorporate websites and other vehicles for keeping the public informed, engaged, and up-to-date on current water topics. Creating opportunities for public input on priorities for water resources and challenges. Identify additional opportunities for individuals to support a sustainable water future for Connecticut.

I. Measuring Success

Should identify specific metrics against which the implementation and effectiveness of the plan can be gaged. Include measures that account for ecological, environmental, public health and safety, economic, and other relevant impacts, and identify on-going data collection and analysis needs to support these metrics.

7. Next Steps

Action items to implement the recommendations of the Plan.

A. Near-term

B. Long-term

C. Review and revision schedule for Plan (include flexibility to identify and incorporate emerging issues as we move forward)

8. Glossary

9. Appendix

APPENDIX B

Substitute House Bill No. 5424

Public Act No. 14-163

AN ACT CONCERNING THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. Section 22a-352 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2014*):

(a) **[**The Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, the Department of Public Health and the Office of Policy and Management shall establish a continuing planning process and shall prepare and periodically update jointly a state-wide long-range**]** Not later than July 1, 2017, the Water Planning Council, established pursuant to section 25-33o, as amended by this act, shall, within available appropriations, prepare a state water plan for the management of the water resources of the state. In **[**carrying out such preparation, the aforesaid agencies**]** developing such state water plan, the Water Planning Council shall: (1) Design a unified planning program and budget; (2) **[**coordinate**]** consider regional water and sewer facilities plans; **[**and provide technical or financial assistance to regional planning agencies in the preparation of regional water and sewer facilities plans which are necessary as guidelines for the planning and designing of local and interlocal facilities and which are required by the federal government as a prerequisite for grants to municipalities for the construction of

certain water and sewer facilities.] (3) identify the appropriate regions of the state for comprehensive water planning; (4) identify the data needs and develop a consistent format for submitting data to the council, applicable state agencies and regional councils of government for use in planning and permitting; (5) consider the potential impact of climate change on the availability and abundance of water resources and the importance of climate resiliency; (6) seek involvement of interested parties; (7) solicit input from the advisory group established pursuant to section 25-33o, as amended by this act; (8) consider individual water supply plans, water quality standards, stream flow classifications, as described in regulations adopted pursuant to section 26-141b, water utility coordinating committee plans, the state plan of conservation and development, as described in section 16a-30, and any other planning documents deemed necessary by the council; (9) promote the adoption of municipal ordinances based on the State of Connecticut Model Water Use Restriction Ordinance for municipal water emergencies; and (10) examine appropriate mechanisms for resolving conflicts related to the implementation of the state water plan.

(b) The [state-wide water resources plan] state water plan developed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall: (1) Identify the quantities and qualities of water that [could be available to specific areas under feasible distribution] are available for public water supply, health, economic, recreation and environmental benefits on a regional basin scale considering both surface water and groundwater; (2) identify present and projected demands for water [for specific areas] resources on a state-wide and regional basin scale; (3) recommend the utilization of the state's water resources, including surface and subsurface water, [for their greatest benefits] in a manner that balances public water supply, economic development, recreation and ecological health; (4) recommend steps to increase the climate resiliency of existing water resources and infrastructure; (5) make

recommendations for technology and infrastructure upgrades, interconnections and such major engineering works or special districts which may be necessary, including the need, timing and general cost thereof; **[**(5)**]** (6) recommend land use and other measures, including an assessment of land acquisition or land protection needs, where appropriate to **[**insure**]** ensure the desired quality and abundance of water and to promote development in concert with available water resources; **[**(6)**]** (7) take into account desired ecological, recreational, agricultural, industrial and commercial use of water bodies; **[**and (7)**]** (8) inform residents of the state about the importance of water-resource stewardship and conservation; (9) establish conservation guidelines and incentives for consumer water conservation with due consideration for energy efficiency; (10) develop a water reuse policy with incentives for matching the quality of the water to the use; (11) meet data collection and analysis needs to provide for data driven water planning and permitting decisions; (12) take into account the ecological, environmental, public health and safety and economic impact that implementation of the state water plan will have on the state; (13) include short and long-range objectives and strategies to communicate and implement the plan; (14) seek to incorporate regional and local plans and programs for water use and management and plans for water and sewerage facilities in the **[**state-wide plan**]** state water plan; (15) promote intra-regional solutions and sharing of water resources; (16) develop and recommend strategies to address climate resiliency including the impact of extreme weather events; and (17) identify modifications to laws and regulations that are necessary in order to implement the recommendations of the state water plan.

[(c) Upon completion of each planning document and when adopted by the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection, the Commissioner of Public Health and the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, said final plan shall be submitted to the General Assembly.**]**

(c) The Water Planning Council shall provide a time period of not less than one hundred twenty days for public review and comment prior to finalizing such plan. The Commissioners of Public Health and Energy and Environmental Protection, the chairperson of the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority and the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management shall post such draft plan and information concerning such comment period in a conspicuous location on their respective web sites. The Council on Environmental Quality shall post such draft plan and information concerning such comment period in the Environmental Monitor. The Water Planning Council shall advertise and hold not less than one public hearing during such public review and comment period. After such public comment period, the council shall fully consider all written and oral comments concerning the proposed state water plan. The council shall make available the electronic text of the finalized state water plan on an Internet web site where the finalized state water plan shall be posted and a report summarizing: (1) All public comments received pursuant to this subsection, and (2) the changes made to the finalized state water plan in response to such comments and the reasons for such changes.

(d) Not later than January 1, 2018, the Water Planning Council, in accordance with section 11-4a, shall submit the state water plan to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the environment, public health, planning and development and energy and technology for said committees' approval, revision or disapproval, in whole or in part. The council shall submit such report to the Governor electronically.

(e) Not later than forty-five days after the convening of the 2018 regular session of the General Assembly, said joint standing committees shall conduct a joint public hearing on the state water plan and submit the plan with said committees' joint recommendations for approval, modification or disapproval to the General Assembly. The

state water plan shall become effective when adopted by the General Assembly as the state water plan for the state, provided if the General Assembly fails to act on the plan on or before July 1, 2018, such state water plan shall be deemed approved.

(f) In the event that the General Assembly disapproves the state water plan, in whole or in part, the state water plan shall be deemed to be rejected and shall be returned to the Water Planning Council for revisions and resubmittal to the committees of cognizance, not later than ninety days after such disapproval, for approval or modification by said committees. In the event that said committees fail to take action on such resubmitted plan not later than sixty days after such resubmission, the plan shall be deemed to be approved.

(g) The Water Planning Council shall oversee the implementation and periodic updates of the state water plan. On or before January 1, 2016, and annually thereafter, the Water Planning Council shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the environment, public health, planning and development and energy and technology on the status of the development and implementation of the state water plan and any updates to such plan. On and after January 1, 2016, the report required by this subsection shall supplant the requirement for an annual report as required pursuant to section 25-33o, as amended by this act.

Sec. 2. (NEW) (*Effective October 1, 2014*) The Department of Public Health, in consultation with the Water Planning Council, shall, within available appropriations, study the feasibility of creating a licensure or certification program for water professionals who are qualified by reason of their knowledge to assist the Department of Public Health in carrying out the primacy requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act and the state's legal requirements in the oversight of safe and adequate public drinking water. Such study shall include, but not be limited to,

desired professional qualifications for such water professionals, review of other states' public drinking water primacy programs, review of the appropriate level of responsibilities for such water professionals and any cost and funding source available to establish such licensure or certification program. Not later than July 1, 2016, said department shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the environment, public health, planning and development and energy and technology concerning such study.

Sec. 3. Section 25-32b of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2014*):

The Commissioner of Public Health, in consultation with the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection and the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, may declare a public drinking water supply emergency upon receipt of information that a public water supply emergency exists, **[**or**]** is imminent or can reasonably be expected to occur without the immediate implementation of conservation practices. Notwithstanding any other provision of the general statutes or regulations adopted thereunder, or special act or municipal ordinance, the Commissioner of Public Health, upon such a declaration, may authorize or order one or more of the following: (1) The implementation of water conservation practices, including, but not limited to, water use restrictions, by a public water system or the municipality in which such emergency occurs, (2) the sale, supply or taking of any waters, including waters into which sewage is discharged, or (3) the temporary interconnection of water mains for the sale or transfer of water among water companies. The Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, upon such a declaration, shall determine the terms of the sale of any water sold pursuant to this section if the water companies that are party to the sale cannot determine such terms or if

one of such water companies is regulated by the authority. The authorization or order may be implemented prior to such determination. Any authorization or order shall be for an initial period of not more than thirty days but may be extended for additional periods of thirty days up to one hundred fifty days, consistent with the contingency procedures for a public drinking water supply emergency in the plan approved pursuant to section 25-32d, to the extent the Commissioner of Public Health deems appropriate. Upon request by the Commissioner of Public Health, the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection, pursuant to section 22a-378, shall suspend a permit issued pursuant to section 22a-368 or impose conditions on a permit held pursuant to said section. The time for such suspension or conditions shall be established in accordance with subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of section 22a-378. As used in this section and section 22a-378, "public drinking water supply emergency" includes the contamination of water, the failure of a water supply system or the shortage of water.

Sec. 4. (*Effective from passage*) Within available appropriations, the Office of Policy and Management, on behalf of the Water Planning Council, may enter into one or more memoranda of understanding with independent consultants for advice or assistance in developing and compiling the state water plan. Such assistance may include, but need not be limited to, data collection, storage and organization of data as deemed necessary by the Water Planning Council.

Sec. 5. Subsection (c) of section 25-33o of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2014*):

(c) The council may establish an advisory group that shall serve at the pleasure of the council. The advisory group shall be balanced between consumptive and nonconsumptive interests. The advisory group may include representatives of (1) regional and municipal water

utilities, (2) regional councils of government, (3) investor-owned water utilities, [(3)] (4) a wastewater system, [(4)] (5) agricultural interests, [(5)] (6) electric power generation interests, [(6)] (7) business and industry interests, [(7)] (8) environmental land protection interests, [(8)] (9) environmental river protection interests, [(9)] (10) boating interests, [(10)] (11) fisheries interests, [(11)] (12) recreational interests, [(12)] (13) endangered species protection interests, [and (13)] (14) members of academia with expertise in stream flow, public health and ecology, and (15) a public health district.

Sec. 6. Section 25-33h of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2014*):

(a) Each water utility coordinating committee shall prepare a coordinated water system plan in the public water supply management area. Such plan shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Health for his approval not more than two years after the first meeting of the committee. The plan shall promote cooperation among public water systems and include, but not be limited to, provisions for (1) integration of public water systems, consistent with the protection and enhancement of public health and well-being; (2) integration of water company plans; (3) exclusive service areas; (4) joint management or ownership of services; (5) satellite management services; (6) interconnections between public water systems; (7) integration of land use and water system plans; (8) minimum design standards; (9) water conservation; (10) the impact on other uses of water resources including water quality, flood management, recreation and aquatic habitat issues; and (11) acquisition of land surrounding wells proposed to be located in stratified drifts.

(b) The plan shall be adopted in accordance with the provisions of this section. The committee shall prepare a draft of the plan and solicit comments thereon from the Commissioners of Public Health and Energy and Environmental Protection, the Public Utilities Regulatory

Authority, the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management and any municipality, regional [planning agency] councils of government or other interested party within the management area. The municipalities and regional [planning agencies] councils of government shall comment on, but shall not be limited to commenting on, the consistency of the plan with local and regional land use plans and policies. The Public Utilities Regulatory Authority shall comment on, but shall not be limited to commenting on, the cost-effectiveness of the plan. The Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management shall comment on, but shall not be limited to commenting on, the consistency of the plan with state policies. The Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection shall comment on, but shall not be limited to commenting on, the availability of water for any proposed diversion, water quality, flood management, recreation and aquatic habitat issues. The Commissioner of Public Health shall comment on, but shall not be limited to commenting on the availability of pure and adequate water supplies, potential conflicts over the use of such supplies, and consistency with the goals of sections 25-33c to 25-33j, inclusive.

(c) The Commissioner of Public Health shall adopt regulations in accordance with the provisions of chapter 54 establishing the contents of a plan and a procedure for approval or amendment to the plan.

Sec. 7. (*Effective July 1, 2014*) The Department of Public Health, in consultation with the Water Planning Council, shall study the feasibility of establishing a general permit for activities that are determined to be minor and that will: (1) Cause minimal environmental and public health effects when conducted separately, (2) cause only minimal cumulative environmental and public health effects, and (3) have no adverse effect on existing or potential uses of water or water bodies. Such study shall provide a listing of activities that may be conducted subject to such general permit and the

circumstances for conducting such activities. Not later than July 1, 2015, the department shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to public health and the environment concerning such study.

Approved June 11, 2014

APPENDIX C

Podziba Policy Mediation

Memorandum

To: Steering Committee Members of the Water Planning Commission
From: Susan Podziba, Podziba Policy Mediation
Date: June 25, 2015

RE: Situation Assessment in Support of State Water Planning Workshop

---

INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the Steering Committee Workshop to be convened by the Water Planning Council (WPC) on June 30, 2015 as part of the state water planning process pursuant to Public Act 14-163, I interviewed all 18 members of the Steering Committee to discuss their interests and concerns relative to the development of a state water plan. (My colleague, Pam Kruger, participated in some of the interviews.) Below is a situation assessment based on the information derived from those interviews.

Overall Water Plan Goals

Connecticut is a water-rich state with a high quality of life, which citizens want to continue to protect and preserve for future generations. Connecticut's plan should ensure that residents have access to an adequate, reliable, and affordable supply of safe, high quality water in ways that balance economic development with environmental protection.

Water Plan Objectives

In addition to the 17 points outlined in Public Act 14-163, various Steering Committee members identified the following objectives in support of the development and implementation of a state water plan:

1. Gain an understanding of the current water situation
2. Identify existing data or data needs to better quantify water availability, actual usage, and future demands
3. Develop a framework for current and future management of water resources
4. Develop a framework for water usage priorities
5. Preserve and enhance natural resources and habitats
6. Ensure an adequate supply of water available for public water supply to meet the public health, safety and economic development needs of customers and communities
7. Identify possible opportunities for innovative initiatives
8. Ensure the plan allows for flexibility rather than one-size-fits-all strategies, given the complexity of the state's water resource and management systems
9. Ensure the plan provides for re-evaluation and resiliency even as it provides predictability and reliability

CONNECTICUT WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Connecticut's water is managed by multiple state government agencies, public and privately owned water companies, and coordinated with 169 towns and cities and their local public health agencies.

State Government

The **Water Planning Council** is a coordinating body of the four government entities with responsibilities for oversight of the state's water resources:

- **Department of Public Health (DPH)** is responsible for protecting and regulating the quality and quantity of the state's drinking water;
- **Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP)** is responsible for the permitting processes required for water diversions and withdrawals by water companies/providers and others and the protection of natural resources, sources, and aquatic life as well as environmental cleanups;
- **Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) r**egulates the rates and services of Connecticut's investor-owned water companies and is part of the Energy Branch of DEEP;
- **Office of Policy and Management (OPM)** prepares periodic revisions to the Conservation and Development Policies Plan for Connecticut.

Service Providers

Public water systems serve 75% of the population, and the remaining 25% are served through private wells. A public water system, by definition, serves 25 or more people for 60 or more days per year. There are 2,500 public water systems in Connecticut, which are inspected and monitored by DPH and its partners at 74 local health departments. According to a water allocation model done in the 1980s, less than 20% of water is used for actual consumptive use. Per person usage has declined dramatically in the recent past, possibly due to water-efficient appliances, conservation, and consciousness of water usage. However, some suggested that peak water usage associated with turf or lawn watering is increasing.

Customers on public water systems are served by:

- Private, investor-owned water companies,
- Regional water systems, or
- Municipal water systems.

Private, investor-owned water companies are regulated by DPH and DEEP, and their rates are regulated by PURA. According to the PURA website, there are nine private, investor-owned companies that provide drinking water. The largest of these are:

- Connecticut Water Company: a publicly-traded company that serves 56 Connecticut towns;
- Aquarion Water Company of Connecticut: an Australian-based investor-owned company that serves 51 cities and towns;
- Avon Water Company: a privately owned company that serves about 5,000 customers;

- Hazardville Water Company: a family-owned company that serves approximately 7,200 customers.

Regional water utilities are legislatively established "political subdivisions," with governing bodies that include representatives of the communities served within their service areas. They are regulated by DPH and DEEP, and set their own rates. To finance infrastructure, they may access tax exempt financing and the State Drinking Water Revolving Fund. The three regional water companies are:

- Metropolitan District Company, which serves the 8 communities in the Capitol region;
- South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority, which serves 15 communities the Greater New Haven region;
- Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority, which serves 21 municipalities and boroughs in Southeastern Connecticut.

Municipal water companies serve their municipalities and sometimes towns within their surrounding areas. They are regulated by DPH and DEEP, and set their own rates.

Private residential wells: One-third of water usage is withdrawn from groundwater, and private wells account for approximately 20% of the total ground water withdrawn. Well owners are responsible for ongoing testing and maintenance of their wells to ensure water quality.

Water Utility Coordinating Committees (WUCCs): Under legislation passed in 1985 in response to concerns about the proliferation of small water systems and extended drought conditions, DPH is required to establish WUCCs. The purpose of WUCCs is to create regional public water supply plans in which local water providers work together to identify water supplies and exclusive service areas from a regional area-wide perspective. In the late 1980s, the state was divided into seven regions, and WUCCs were established in four of those: the Housatonic, Upper Connecticut River, South Central, and Southeast. All four completed and submitted regional plans; DPH approved the Southeast regional plan in 2002.

In 2014, DPH altered the WUCC boundaries, which reduced the original seven WUCC regions to three newly defined regions: Eastern, Central Corridor, and Western. The approved Southeastern regional plan and the three previously submitted regional plans would be integrated into the three new WUCC regional plans.

There is a fair amount of confusion and uncertainty among Steering Committee members regarding the process for establishing WUCCs and approving their plans as well as the current status of WUCCs. Some want to speed the establishment of WUCCs and the development and approval of WUCC plans, and others are concerned that the WUCC process is exclusionary and will preempt water planning efforts.

CRITICAL ISSUES

During discussions, Steering Committee members identified critical issues, which appear to be those issues that have raised concerns and conflicts during discussions of their potential policy and regulatory ramifications. They do not represent a complete list of issues to be addressed in the state water plan. Identified critical issues are:

- Registered and permitted diversions
- Use of Class B water, recycling of gray water, and/or reuse of treated effluent
- Interbasin transfers
- Aging infrastructure
- Climate change
- Economic development

Registered and Permitted Diversions

Water supply in Connecticut is managed through a system of registered and permitted diversions. Of the total number of allowed diversions, 16% are by permit and 84% are registrations. By volume of water allocated, 27% is by permit and 73% by registrations. Not all of the available water in basins statewide has been either permitted or registered, but the total percentage of the state's water that has been permitted and registered is not known. Although there was an effort to create a registered diversions database in 2002, and information on actual use is filed annually with DEEP, it appears that there is currently no accurate, up-to-date, easily accessible water use data concerning registered diversions. Lists of permitted and registered diversions including their allowable withdrawals as of July 2012 are available on the DEEP website.

***Registrations*:** Registrations of water diversions occurred in 1982 under the Water Diversion Policy Act. Registered diversions were "grandfathered" and did not and do not require DEEP permits or regulatory review. Diversions >50,000 gallons per day after July 1, 1982, or modified registered diversions, require DEEP permits. Registrations required information including location, capacity, frequency, and rate of withdrawals of discharges as well as descriptions of the water use and water system. When changes to a registration occur, DEEP may reach back into the registration to require an environmental review.

In interviews, many Steering Committee members described the registration system as lacking coherence in amounts registered, which ranged from actual use to the most ever used on a particular single day. For example, a number of Steering Committee members suggested that one city registered the amount it used the day of a huge fire.

Many described over allocation of rivers through registrations. For example, UCONN had a registration for more than the amount withdrawn from the Fenton River even after it dried out. Some stated the need for rules that would prevent additional withdrawals to prevent rivers from drying out even if water registrations allowed for continued withdrawals. Others described registrations for uses that no longer exist, such as farms that are long

gone and condominium developments that have since been connected to public water systems.

Although there is a perception among some Steering Committee members that virtually all rivers in the state are over allocated, over allocation is likely a problem in fewer than 10% of basins, but further data mining is necessary to establish the actual percentage. Those concerned about over allocation worry that with little remaining water new permitted diversions cannot be granted, thereby stalling development.

There are diverse opinions, concerns and interests related to this critical issue. Some stated that registered diversions are critical to water company stability and certainty. Others expressed concern that registered diversions negatively impact economic development because of over allocation of rivers. DEEP cannot permit diversions without available water for allocation, and proposed development projects are rejected when enough water is not available. Some believe this results in areas being underutilized whereas others see environmental benefits and protections from unwanted development resulting from the limitations created by registrations.

Permitted Diversions: Since 1982, DEEP has required permits for new diversions and changes to registrations. The permitting process requires analysis of alternatives relative to environmental impacts and when changes are made to registrations, environmental conditions on those withdrawals are set.

The regulated community is concerned about a lack of certainty regarding the permitting process. The process is said to be lengthy, with changes that in the past were considered routine for existing registrations now time-consuming. The process also requires expensive analysis, and cost does not appear to be factored into consideration of preferred alternatives.

Updated streamflow regulations, adopted in 2011, which require downstream releases of water from dams with registered consumptive diversions, are expected to improve environmental conditions downstream of such dams. There is concern and uncertainty of the implementation requirements and impacts of the new streamflow regulations, particularly with regard to public water supply safe yields. Groundwater withdrawals are exempted from the streamflow regulations.

Other Steering Committee members spoke of registrations as insurance policies for water companies and expected that there would be no willingness to give them up. Some are very concerned with the notion of eliminating registrations, particularly because the difficulties of the permitting process, particularly the uncertainties associated with implementation of the new streamflow regulations on available supplies for public water supply needs.

Still many feel strongly that registrations need to be brought into better alignment with actual use for better allocation of water resources. There is a widespread sense that registrations need to be revised so as to allow for additional permits and a more predictable, manageable process. Suggestions for revisions to the registered diversions

included: basing registrations on actual and projected use, eliminating inactive registrations with no possibility of future use, and creating a system for selling or trading registrations. The water industry is hoping for a more coherent, certain, clear, and consistent permitting process and preserving its ability to meet customers' needs and protect the investments made in sources, lands, and facilities.

Use of Class B Water, Recycling Gray Water, and/or Re-Use of Treated Effluent

Connecticut uses only Class A or Class AA waters for human consumption. Diversions for human consumption are not allowed from Class B surface waters, which are downstream from any discharges defined as treated water or Class B groundwater, which by definition is not suitable for drinking water without treatment. For example, the Connecticut River is not used for domestic purposes because treated wastewater is discharged into it. Connecticut and Rhode Island are the only states in the nation that do not use Class B waters for human consumption.

Gray water is defined as all wastewater streams generated from households or office buildings except for the wastewater from toilets and kitchen sinks, which is often referred to as "black water." Sources of gray water include sinks, showers, baths, clothes washing machines, and dish washers. Gray water could be re-used on site for uses such as toilet flushing, lawn watering, and cooling.

Treated effluent is the wastewater discharged after treatment at a wastewater treatment plant. In Connecticut, wastewater is not treated to attain drinking water standards.

Virtually all interviewees expect and prefer that drinking water will continue to be derived from Class A/AA waters. Many also noted the environmental benefits of lands set aside for protection of water sources, and expressed gratitude for the forethought of people hundreds of years ago in doing so.

However, many think that gray water and treated effluent could be used safely for other uses, which would make more high quality water available for consumptive and other uses. Gray water and/or treated effluent may be useable for agriculture, irrigation, lawns, golf courses, industrial processes and cooling.

UCONN has built a wastewater treatment plant on its Storrs campus that recycles wastewater (treated effluent) for non-consumptive uses. Some suggest that the reverse osmosis system makes this water ultra-pure and notes that other states and countries use such waters for drinking water and other purposes, but this is not an intended use.

Some Steering Committee members identified considerations and possible constraints for the use of gray water or treated effluent for non-consumptive uses. Some consider that the expense of dual piping infrastructure changes, e.g. the purple pipe for re-use of gray water, is cost prohibitive. Others suggest that while retrofitting infrastructure is very costly, dual

piping at new developments may not be. Some thought that as aging infrastructure is replaced, it could be replaced with dual piping.

Others have concerns that the use of gray water or treated effluent would increase costs for maintenance of pipes and require new treatment technology or facilities. In addition, the energy required to treat, filter and pump gray water and treated effluent might significantly raise costs.

Some feel strongly that recycling and reuse of gray water and/or treated effluent for non-human consumption should be an available option for those situations in which it makes economic and environmental sense. Some suggest that water reuse is more easily implemented on a site basis by incorporating gray water and/or stormwater use into the designs of new or modified buildings. Capturing and storing gray water and roof drainage onsite for use in toilets and landscaping is considered a common feature of green building designs, including LEED certified buildings.

Interbasin Transfers

Interbasin transfers are the movement of water from one subregional basin to another. Under the Diversion Policy Act, DEEP requires individual permits for interbasin transfers when the amount is greater than 50,000 gallons per day. The permitting process requires the generation and analysis of information regarding environmental impacts of diversions on both receiving and donor basins, including needs and demands for future water use within a 25-year horizon. If an interbasin transfer involves a registered diversion, particularly if water will be moved beyond an exclusive service area, the permitting process would require analysis of all environmental impacts and likely result in additional environmental controls of the registered diversion.

Whereas interconnections involving major interbasin transfers require individual diversion permits, smaller scale interconnections are often accomplished under general permits. Examples of such interconnections are the linking of small public water systems to larger ones, connections between two towns to assure emergency water supplies, and linkage of water systems to even supply and use across seasonal dips and spikes.

DEEP permits interbasin transfers. DPH has no prohibition on interbasin transfers but remains sensitive to communities that want to keep water use local. Some regional public water supply systems are built upon a network of interbasin transfers contained within their exclusive service areas, which provides for reliability, redundancy, environmental quality, and open space preservation.

Interbasin transfers are directly tied to the question of where development can and should happen. Some view interbasin transfers as a means to maximize the value of the state asset of water by transporting water to areas that have high growth and limited available water. Others view them as a potential threat to local water resources. ("My water is not going to them.") This latter perspective suggests that development should be directed to those areas

with surplus water. Still others wonder whether there should be a hierarchy of preferences for use of local water, followed by transfers from nearby basins, and then by faraway basins.

Many Steering Committee members raised practical questions related to the safety, quality, and costs of moving water. When it comes to the impact of interbasin transfers on the quality of water, there are concerns about the degradation of water as it is moved, and the risk of contaminating linked multiple sources if one source becomes contaminated. All agree that infrastructure needed to move water is expensive – pipes to move it, tanks to hold it, energy to pump it, and costs of maintenance and upgrades. Some think this will make the practice cost-prohibitive whereas others want to explore for beneficial situations.

Some fear that interbasin transfer infrastructure will serve as a "spine for development" thereby changing the character of rural areas. Some suggested that interbasin transfers could and should be set up for transmission only so as not to encourage development and sprawl. Still others point to the many unknowable unintended consequences of interbasin transfers, including changing natural habitats and creating new ecosystems.

Those more supportive of interbasin transfers want to optimize state water resources. They point to the current situation in which water resources are not located in areas that may need more water for growth and development, and other areas with surplus water. They point to communities where the closure of factories has resulted in an overabundance of water, which utilities would like to sell, but doing so would require moving it to where new customers are (or are likely to be). In addition, some look to the potential for interbasin transfers to assist with stream flow regulations compliance and the provision of emergency and redundancy of supply.

Some Steering Committee members urge the use of interbasin transfers to move surplus water to support development in regions with less available water. Others suggest proceeding with caution and seek to better understand the constraints and potential opportunities for interbasin transfers.

Aging Infrastructure

Many Steering Committee members identified the state's aging infrastructure as a major vulnerability. Some explained that 19th century water resource infrastructure was designed to last 100 years, and 20th century infrastructure was designed to last 50 years, which is now resulting in a convergence of problems. Some spoke of crisis management: water mains break after a cold snap, inconveniencing customers, and must be fixed on an emergency basis and at greater expense.

Privately owned water companies are more likely to invest in maintaining their infrastructure and can use the Water Infrastructure and Conservation Adjustment (WICA) as a timely regulatory mechanism to pass some of the costs onto their customers after making infrastructure investments. Conversely, publicly owned water systems have access to tax exempt financing and the state Drinking Water Revolving Fund (DWRF) but must

have water rate increases in place prior to implementing infrastructure improvements in order to service the long-term bond obligations issued in advance of those improvements. In either case, increasing water rates for infrastructure improvements is a concern. Some spoke of an unfair situation as customers serviced by private water companies pay higher rates, while access to general obligation bonds through the state for water infrastructure improvements benefits only those in the state who are served by publicly-owned water companies.

Some Steering Committee members spoke of the need to create a database of water infrastructure, including every pipe by size, age, pressure, and expected fail date, and then developing a maintenance schedule based on priorities. Others stated that the price tag for such an effort would be billions of dollars. Finally, some suggested that infrastructure investments should be made with future-looking intent, such as dual piping to enable use of gray water for non-consumptive purposes.

Climate Change

Although there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding impacts of climate change, there is a general scientific consensus that it will exacerbate water problems in dry areas and cause increased frequency of high intensity storms and longer periods without water (drought) and with too much water (long-lasting rains).

While New England is likely to have a future comparative advantage of a secure long term water supply, it will also have to plan for potential impacts of combined sewer overflows and salt water intrusions into fresh water supplies in coastal regions due to hurricanes. In addition, hotter and more humid summers will likely lead to changes in water usage as a result of various needs, for example, more energy to run air conditioners, more water to keep swimming pools filled as surface water evaporation increases, and variable amounts of water for lawns and irrigation depending upon the timing of droughts and heavy rainfall.

To prevent flooding and sewer discharge directly into streams, some suggested the need to be creative with storm water runoff, particularly dense areas with large developments such as Stamford. Some expressed a keen interest in green infrastructure and low impact design development for managing storm water. Currently, in some urban areas with combined sewer systems, storm water is typically captured and moved to treatment plants. When those systems are exceeded, combined sewer overflows result in raw sewage discharges into waterways. Green infrastructure and low impact design development catch and use storm water (rather than catch and move) for plumbing, landscaping, gardens, and distribution into natural systems.

To address climate change issues, many suggested the need for scenario planning, including modeling worst-case scenarios.

Economic Development

Water has a profound impact on economic development. Steering Committee members discussed the range of impacts from the potential to market Connecticut as a water-rich state to industries that are dependent on high quality, secure water sources to the lack of available water as inhibiting growth and development.

Some Steering Committee members look to "water as the new gold" for attracting water-intensive industries or developing infrastructure to sell water to neighboring states or regions. Many talked of economic development in terms of the gallons of water embedded in products. For example, it takes 32 gallons of high quality water to create a microchip. Others considered the possibility of attracting breweries, dairy farms, and even the possibility of vineyards as western states experience longer and deeper droughts. However, they also pointed to the high costs of electricity as limiting the state's attractiveness to water intensive, low energy businesses. Some linked economic development to the possible use of gray water and treated effluent for cooling towers, and to interbasin transfers to move water to the places where businesses might locate. Others spoke of the potential redevelopment of brownfields located in urban corridors where local water availability could be an economic driver. Still others urged greater attention to the restoration and preservation of green infrastructure (such as stream buffers).

Other Steering Committee members linked the system of registered diversions to limits on growth and development. They noted that the over allocation of rivers to registrations makes additional permitted uses less likely. Some wondered how rural towns with large tracts of land set aside to protect mostly urban water sources could develop if they choose to do so given that these undeveloped areas create green spaces that contribute to quality of life in Connecticut that most want to preserve.

In addition, some discussed the need to better consider and protect groundwater in planning for economic growth. They raised concerns about the lack of limits on groundwater pumping as well as the contamination of ground water and ongoing efforts to change remediation standards for cleanups. They note that Connecticut water policy has been reservoir-oriented but future sources are more likely to rely on ground water.

CHALLENGES FOR WATER PLANNING EFFORT

Steering Committee members identified a number of challenges that will need to be addressed to succeed in preparing a state water plan. They include:

- Need to balance among multiple diverse interests
- Fragmented water management system and 169 towns with home rule
- Plan needs to be both predictable for investment in infrastructure and resilient to address changing conditions and opportunities
- Possibly limited support for changes to the status quo

- Need the plan to be based on good data, but much of the needed data may not be easily accessible
- Huge costs are associated with almost all options and strategies that may be considered during the planning process, and there is concern about driving up water costs for consumers and businesses
- Questions about the likelihood of completing the water plan by the legislative deadline of July 1, 2017
- Potential for continuing changes to the legislation, Public Act 14-163, which sets out requirements and the General Assembly approval process for the statewide water plan.
- Plan implementation needs ongoing funding to ensure success.

LONG TERM PLANNING PROCESS

The workshop is a kickoff event for the Steering Committee's effort to develop a statewide water plan. It is contemplated that the Steering Committee will be supported by a Science and Technical Work Group and a Policy Work Group. Virtually all Steering Committee members expressed a need for data to support the planning effort, and the task of identifying data needs and sources, within the constraints upon DPH (regarding water supply plans vital to public safety), DEEP, and others for providing data, will likely fall to the Science and Technology Work Group. Its additional roles and responsibilities will need to be defined by the Steering Committee as well the roles and responsibilities of the Policy Work Group. In addition, given that the water plan must be approved by the General Assembly, the Steering Committee will seek input and support from the WPC Advisory Group. Finally, outreach to the general public will be conducted to get additional feedback on plan proposals as well as to provide the public with general education about elements of the plan.

COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

In interviews with Steering Committee members, virtually all agreed that the workshop should be open to the public, but remain primarily a working session for the Steering Committee. All agreed that some limited opportunity should be provided for public comments during the workshop.

Most stressed the importance of transparency and inclusion for the long-term water plan planning effort. To ensure the plan can integrate input from a wide array of groups from across the state with a stake in the outcome, the planning process will need to include a multi-platform communications strategy. Feedback will need to be encouraged, facilitated and captured.

Council Members
John W. Betkoski, III, Council Chairman
Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Ellen Blashinsky
Dept. of Public Health

W. David LeVasseur
Office of Policy and Management

Michael J. Sullivan
Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
Water Planning Council

Connecticut Water Planning Council
Statewide Water Plan Workshop
WPC Steering Committee
Rome Commons at the University of Connecticut
626 Gilbert Road Extension
Storrs, CT

June 30, 2015
8:00 AM – 5:00 PM

AGENDA

7:30 **Arrival / Coffee**

8:00 **Welcome**
John W. Betkoski III, Chair, Connecticut Water Planning Council

8:05 **Steering Committee Introductions**
Brief Introductions by Steering Committee Members:
Name, Affiliation, One reason why Connecticut needs a statewide Water Plan

8:25 **Workshop Agenda Review**
Susan Podziba, Facilitator, will walk through the plan for the day

8:30 **Steering Committee Mission**
Discuss draft mission
Outcome: Increased mutual understanding of Steering Committee Water Plan charge

9:00 **Critical Issues**
For each issue, identify hopes and fears it raises, frame possible parameters of the issue.

- Registered and permitted diversions
- Water recycling and reuse
- Interbasin transfers
- Aging infrastructure
- Climate change
- Economic development
- Other

Outcome: Understanding of possibilities and concerns for each issue, potential limitations on deliberations of each issue

10:00 **BREAK**

10:15 **Critical Issues (cont'd.)**

11:45 **Public Comments**

12:00 **Lunch**

1:00 **Scoping of Issues for the Water Plan**
Consider the critical issues discussed
Consider the 17 points outlined in Public Act 14-163
Consider additional items
Outcome: Preliminary Scope of Water Plan

2:15 **BREAK**

2:30 **Water Plan Planning Process and Timetable**
Use a process map planner to identify work plan product, complementary goal, negotiations, outreach and consultations including integration of work and advisory groups, and communications strategy
Outcome: Preliminary Water Plan Planning Process and Timetable

3:45 **Public Comments**

4:00 **Water Plan Planning Process and Timetable (cont'd.)**

4:30 **Next Steps**
Identify the immediate and short term next steps

4:55 **Closing Remarks**
John W. Betkoski III

5:00 **Adjourn**

Connecticut Water Planning Council
Statewide Water Plan Workshop
WPC Steering Committee
June 30, 2015

Workshop Summary

Welcome

John W. Betkoski III, Chair, Connecticut Water Planning Council, welcomed the Steering Committee members and the public to the workshop. He talked about the need to develop a water plan to secure the economic, environmental, and societal needs of state residents for the next hundred years. The plan should balance economic development with environmental quality; it will create a framework for sustainable decision-making, one that will be resilient and responsive to future dynamics.

Steering Committee Introductions

Steering Committee members briefly introduced themselves and cited reasons for the need to develop a statewide water plan. They suggested the plan should accomplish the following:

- provide fair access to water for all state residents, groups and businesses, while also providing the necessary water for the natural environment;
- balance environmental quality and economic development, including management of the relationship between public water supply infrastructure and development patterns;
- create and support opportunities and incentives for conservation and the use of gray water;
- identify current and potential water-related problems and strategies for addressing all of these issues;
- ensure the issues are fully defined and quantified, based on facts, to support policy changes;
- identify climate change impacts, including potential catastrophes, and develop adaptation strategies to protect against flooding, drought, and infrastructure vulnerabilities;
- integrate state water planning with local, regional, and state development plans as well as water utility coordinating committees (WUCCs);
- predictability in implementation of rules and regulations; and
- real-time management of the state's water resources.

In addition, some stressed that the plan should:

- be data and science-based, using on the latest, most accurate information regarding water supply sources (surface and ground water), allocation, stream conditions, and usage;
- provide a framework for sustainable decision-making, one that allows for flexibility and resiliency so as to be responsive to changing conditions and climate change-related issues; and

- create trust among state governmental entities, municipalities, regional and private water companies and other organizations with responsibilities for water management throughout the state.

Workshop Agenda Review
Susan Podziba, the facilitator, described the plan for the day.

Steering Committee Mission
The Steering Committee developed the draft mission statement below at the workshop. (Subsequent to the workshop, members revised this draft and approved a final mission statement at the joint WPC/WPC Steering Committee meeting on July 16, 2015.)

The Connecticut Water Planning Council Steering Committee will prepare a statewide water plan for the balanced management and protection (proposed: and restoration) of water resources of the state, (proposed: using data.)

The WPC Steering Committee will work to ensure that the state water plan is prepared in accordance with the criteria set out in Section 1 (a); and that the water plan achieves the objectives set out in Section 1 (b) of Public Act 14-163. (See attached -- These sections would be attached.)

Every effort will be made to complete the statewide water plan by July 1, 2017.

Key points during the mission statement discussion included:

Data and science: Some stated that the plan should be based on accurate and comprehensive data; whereas others voiced concerns that the data that exists and/or are available for planning purposes would be limited and flawed and therefore questioned its usefulness.

Focus: The plan should focus on water resources broadly, not only water supply.

Public Act 14-163 (Act), Subsections A and B: All Steering Committee members agreed that the plan should be consistent with the requirements set out in the Act. There was discussion regarding whether or not they should be listed, referenced, summarized and/or attached to the mission statement.

Concise: Most agreed that the mission statement should be short, clear, and inspirational.

Deadline: After some discussion, it was clarified that the Steering Committee should complete its work by July 1, 2017 in accordance with the Act, which also provides for the WPC to deliver the water plan to the General Assembly by January 1, 2018.

Plan development strategies: Some suggested that the mission statement should make explicit the need to involve stakeholders and the public as well as ensure that the plan will be a living document developed through an iterative planning process.

Role of Steering Committee: Some had questions regarding the role of the Steering Committee in the process, including whether it is to prepare the plan, advise the WPC, manage the work, or guide the process.

Critical Issues

Steering Committee members discussed those issues identified during the assessment interviews that have raised concerns and conflicts during past discussions. These were discussed in terms of hopes and fears, and possible parameters for framing the issue.

Steering Committee members agreed that the critical issues – as outlined below -- should be further considered as part of the statewide water plan and identified additional issues.

Registered/Permitted Diversions

Virtually all agreed that data on registered and permitted diversions are critical for a meaningful discussion of this issue. Although DEEP provides information on registrations, information on actual usage is currently unavailable. Such data will be needed to accurately assess which, if any, basins may be overallocated.

Benefits: By identifying actual current use and potential future use of registered diversions as well as defunct registered uses, e.g. defunct farms and condominium developments built with small water companies that are now linked to public water, the plan could help identify available water resources for future development and stream restoration. In addition, it may help to clarify how water is being used thereby enabling better matching between water usage and quality of water available. In addition, some expect that a review of diversions may result in more predictability in the permitting process and more certainty for planning and investment. Over-allocated basins may serve as priority areas for review of registered diversions.

Concerns: Those who hold registered diversions consider them akin to property rights or entitlements and likely would resist reallocation. Although much attention has been focused on public water supply registrations, a review of registered and permitted diversions would also require a review of other registered uses, including those for business, agriculture, and hydropower. Conversion of registrations into permitted diversions is considered costly, time consuming, and unpredictable; therefore, it is also likely to be opposed by those who rely on registered diversions. Uncertainties related to impacts of the streamflow regulations on available supplies have heightened these concerns for public water suppliers. In addition, increased costs resulting from changes in regulatory requirements may increase consumer water rates. Given that DEEP is responsible for protecting resources in addition to permitting uses, the permitting process is likely to continue to require complex analysis and the possibility of denial for a proposed use.

Water recycling and reuse

Benefits: Increased use of gray water and the possible use of treated effluent on site offer a wise use of water resources. Beneficial examples include energy production, which currently accounts for approximately 20% of produced water usage statewide,

and maintaining golf courses. In addition, green infrastructure could be used for rainwater harvesting and stormwater management.

Concerns: Infrastructure costs for the use of gray water and/or treated effluent may be cost prohibitive particularly if it were to require laying an additional piping system or diverting limited resources needed to upgrade existing infrastructure. Existing building codes may impede water recycling and reuse. Although there was strong support for exploring opportunities for the use of gray water, there was not an interest in making policy changes regarding the use of Class B waters for public water supply purposes.

Interbasin Transfer

Benefits: With accurate information and appropriate criteria for prudent determinations, interbasin transfers could balance supply with demand and foster economic development that is harmonious with the needs of the state and consistent with state and local development plans. Water could also be used as an asset for recruiting businesses and industry to the state, which could lead to new jobs and state revenue.

Concerns: Without prudent determination criteria and/or transmission-only infrastructure, interbasin transfers could foster growth in areas that are not meant to support such development as well as change the ecology and chemistry of rivers and basin areas. Interbasin transfers currently exist within and between water utilities and permitting could become more costly, time consuming, and uncertain, which could threaten planned investments.

Aging infrastructure

Benefits: Aging infrastructure, much of which is between 50 and 100 years old, needs to be replaced to avert future emergencies and reduce unaccounted for water. (Unaccounted for water refers to water lost in the network of water pipe between the drinking water treatment plants and consumers as a result of leakage and/or apparent loses due to metering inaccuracies.) In addition, infrastructure replacement could provide opportunities for adapting infrastructure to desired land uses as well as incorporation of green infrastructure. The Water Infrastructure and Conservation Adjustment has enabled private water companies to invest in infrastructure renewal and get timely rate increases while mitigating rate shocks. Expansion of the State Drinking Water Fund or other innovative funding mechanisms could assist regional and municipal water companies in expanding infrastructure investment and provide for increased parity across the state. Coordination among municipal, regional, and state infrastructure activities across gas, energy, and water sectors could yield significant cost savings.

Concerns: The costs for addressing aging infrastructure (estimated at up to $1 million/mile) are very high. It will be challenging to find resources to cover costs as well as to equitably assess costs statewide. Public water ratepayers may be unable to bear the burden of the costs. State-supported funding mechanisms would principally benefit those who get their water from public water companies with

great infrastructure needs; 25% of the state population relies on private wells. There is a perception that private water company rates are already higher than regional and municipal rates, in part, due to infrastructure investments.

Climate change

Benefits: Addressing climate change in the state water plan will enable the state to be prepared for potential problems related to sea level rise and increased frequency of extreme weather events, including increases in heavy precipitation and longer periods of drought. To do so will require modeling to help with forecasting and a plan that incorporates flexibility so government entities and water companies will be nimble enough to respond to changing conditions.

Concerns: The strategies associated with climate change adaptation are complex and costly. For example, this could include raising or moving public water infrastructure and wastewater treatment plants away from current shorelines. It will also require changes to building codes, stormwater standards that are currently based on outdated flooding estimates prepared by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the 1960s, and protection of groundwater supplies. In addition, the need for resiliency will increase uncertainty.

Economic Development

Benefits: As a water-rich state (and with climate change pressures likely to increase Connecticut's comparative advantage), good planning could position the state to attract water-intensive businesses and improve its economy. To do so will require clarity and certainty of supply.

Concerns: Water should be viewed as an economic asset that needs to be safeguarded to guarantee high quality supply for existing residents. Economic development strategies will need to be based on an accurate accounting of the water supply and how it is currently being used.

Other Suggested Issues

- Environmental Flows
- Water quality, for example, levels of arsenic and antibiotics in the water supply
- Groundwater pollution
- Aquifer protection
- Cumulative affects of multiple private wells within close proximity to each other
- Energy-Water nexus
- Streamflow regulations and implications for supply
- Environmental concerns related to protection of high quality groundwater
- Security of the water supply in post- 9/11 era
- Difficulty of obtaining good data, post 9/11

- Potential for identifying new groundwater sources
- Water quality standards
- Regional water issues
- Land use policies for lands held by public utilities and other large land owners
- Investments in water treatment
- Brownfields
- Data and adequate funding for periodic data updates
- Impacts on rates
- Connecticut water supply and management strategies in comparison to other states in the USA and internationally
- WUCCs and timetable for process completion
- Water Planning Council and its authorities to implement the water plan

Scoping of Issues for the Water Plan

For its discussion of scoping of issues for the water plan, Steering Committee members considered the original critical issues, the 17 points outlined in Public Act 14-163(B), and the model table of contents prepared by the Other States' Water Plans Work Group of the WPC Advisory Group.

The Steering Committee asked the Other States' Water Plans Work Group to revise its model table of contents based on the workshop discussions and summary and to ensure that it adequately reflects the requirements of the public act. The Steering Committee will then consider and revise, as needed, the second version of the model table of contents.

Working from the Model Table of Contents, they proposed adding the following:

General

- Registered and permitted diversions
- Water recycling and reuse
- Interbasin transfers
- Aging infrastructure
- Climate change
- Economic development
- Emergency management
- Groundwater
- Wastewater
- Stormwater
- Resiliency
- Emergency storm recovery
- Modifications to laws and regulations
- Agriculture
- Watershed protections
- Recreation/Tourism

- Funding, Rate Structures, and Financing Options (drinking water and wastewater)
- Broaden "Instream/Out of Stream Needs" (Environmental Flows)
- Water Quality (Pollution)

Implementation

- Integration with regional and state plans
- Permitting and registration process
- Assessment of regulatory structural impediments
- Role of WPC as a coordinating body
- Role of WUCCs
- Role of Council of Governments
- Role of local and state governments
- Organizing principle for implementation (e.g. compacts, integration, regional)

Water Plan Planning Process and Timetable

The Steering Committee considered the elements of its planning process including how it will interact with the Science and Technical Work Group, the Policy Work Group, and the WPC Advisory Group as well as possible elements of a communications strategy for outreach to the public.

The Steering Committee will direct the activities of the work groups on its behalf and asked the Science and Technical Work Group, chaired by Virginia de Lima, to identify data needs for developing the water plan. It is likely that a consultant will then be retained to develop the needed data. The Science and Technical Work Group will be composed of a balanced group of approximately 12 members and include Steering Committee members and others.

The Policy Work Group, chaired by Bob Moore, will be composed of a balanced group of approximately 12 members and include Steering Committee members and others.

The WPC Advisory Group, which represents various constituencies, will assist with public outreach via its members. The Steering Committee will solicit the opinions of the advisory group as particular issues arise.

Communications strategy: The Steering Committee expressed interest in developing and implementing a multi-platform public engagement process, including the use of public meetings, email blasts, Facebook, Twitter, and press outreach.

In addition, they considered using the PURA website as the landing page/hub page for the water plan effort, holding evening hearings to encourage attendance, conducting outreach to conservation districts and councils of governments (COGs), and posting FAQs to explain the goals and need for a water planning process and

how it will affect the public. The WPC will prepare an op-ed to inform the public of the water planning process and will meet with editorial boards of newspapers.

Public Comments
Public comments addressed the following issues: continual support for reliable, safe, high quality water; secure water for agriculture uses now and into the future; concern about the use of public money for private enterprises; reduce stormwater runoff; groundwater recharge is essential for anemic streams in urban centers; adequate state funding is required to collect basic data on water resources; fiscal implications of the water plan for rate payers; determine the questions that need to be answered for more focused data requests, and account for the rights of private well owners.

Next Steps
The facilitation team will prepare and distribute a draft workshop summary. Steering Committee members will provide comments and proposed revisions on the summary.

Steering Committee members are asked to contact Virginia de Lima to express interest in serving on the Science and Technology Work Group and Bob Moore for the Policy Work Group by July 10, 2015. The WPC will then assist in appointing additional members to the work groups.

The Science and Technology Work Group will prepare a list of data needs and will then make efforts to determine how to access and/or develop that data.

The Other States' Water Plans Work Group is asked to revise its model table of contents based on the workshop discussions and summary.

The WPC will prepare an op-ed for publication to inform the public about the statewide water planning effort.

The Steering Committee will meet in joint session with the WPC to discuss next steps on Thursday, July 16 at 1:30 pm at the PURA offices at 10 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT.

Closing Remarks
John W. Betkoski III thanked the Steering Committee for a productive day, the public for its attendance and participation, and the facilitators for their work. He also announced inclusion of $1 million for the two-year state water planning process in the state budget.

Attachments
- Workshop Agenda
- Draft Mission Statement and examples
- Public Act No. 14-163
- Situation Assessment in support of the state water planning workshop

- Model Table of Contents of the Final Report of the Other States' Water Plans Work Group of the WPC Advisory Group
- Rhode Island Water 2030 Table of Contents
- Colorado's Water Plan Table of Contents
- Process Design Planner
- Connecticut Water Plan Process
- Casco Bay Estuary Project Process Map
- Workshop Working Document Communications Strategy

Steering Committee Members
Elizabeth Barton
John W. Betkoski III
Larry Bingaman
Ellen Blaschinski
Chris Clark (absent)
Virginia de Lima
Samuel Gold
David LeVasseur
Gene E. Likens
Andrew Lord
Joseph McGee
Margaret Miner
Robert Moore
Susan Stratton Sayre (absent)
Michael Sullivan
Elin Swanson Katz
Maureen Westbrook
Julie Zimmerman

Tom Callahan, Project Manager
Susan Podziba, Facilitator
Pamela Kruger, Communications Expert

Public Attendees
Ray Jarema
Stephen Pratt
Corinne Fitting
Suzanne Blancaflor
Len DeJong
Robert Wesneski
Denise Ruzicka
Lori Mattieu
Ken Skov
Mark Decker
Eric Lindquist

Betsey Wingfield
John Herlihy
Cheryl Chase
Gail Lucchina
Chet Arnold
Richard Smith
Peter Galant
Michael Elliott
Lori Vitagliano
Martha Smith
Matt Paffod
Pat Bresnahan
John Hudak
Don Iannicelli
Robert Young
Jim Hooper
Lee Dunbar
Mike ONeill
Betsy Gara
Don Morrissey
George S. Logan
Davis Kuzminski
Eileen Fielding
Nick Neeley
Alicea Charamut
Mary Pelleler
Glenn Warner
Susan Eastwood
Mike Towle
Stephen Anderson
Alison Hilding
Jonathan Avery