



## REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

### Southeast Connecticut Regional Drinking Water Quality Management Plan Groton, Ledyard, Preston, North Stonington, Norwich, Montville, and Waterford Thursday, August 21, 2008

A meeting of the DWQMP Advisory Committee was held on August 21, 2008 at the Groton Utilities Operations Complex Julio H. Leandri Administration Building Conference Room. The meeting was facilitated by Jeanine Armstrong Bonin, P.E., Vice President of Milone & MacBroom, Inc. (MMI). Also present from MMI was David Murphy, P.E. The following members were in attendance:

Advisory Group Members	Representing		Guests	
Al Dion	PRI – Groton Utilities	X	Karl Acimovic, GU	X
Rick Stevens	ALT – Groton Utilities		Joyce Brown, GU	
Mike Murphy	PRI – Town of Groton	X	Ronald Bata, GU	X
Deborah Jones	ALT – Town of Groton		Jeff Butensky, EPA	
Mayor Fred Allyn	PRI – Town of Ledyard		Mike Boland, MPTN	
Mike Cherry	ALT – Town of Ledyard		Marc Cohen	X
Marcia Vlaun	PRI – Town of Montville	X	Pat Bresnahan, UCONN	X
Tom Wagner	PRI – Town of Waterford	X	Bruce Wittchen, OPM	X
Neftali Soto	ALT – Town of Waterford		Joan Smith	X
Mike Schaefer	PRI – City of Norwich	X		
John Bilda	ALT – City of Norwich			
Kathy Warzecha	PRI – Town of Preston			
1 <sup>st</sup> Selectman Robert Congdon	ALT – Town of Preston			
Juliet Leeming	PRI – Town of N. Stonington			
1 <sup>st</sup> Selectman Nicholas Mullane	ALT – Town of N. Stonington	X		
Robert Birmingham, AICP	PRI – Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation			
Ken Greenwood	ALT – Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation			
Jennifer Pagach	PRI – State & Federal Agencies	X		
Lori Mathieu	ALT – State & Federal Agencies	X		
Sharon Mann	PRI – Water Planning Council	X		
Gregory Leonard	PRI – Water Utilities			
Ed Monahan	ALT – Water Utilities	X		
Tom Seidel	PRI –Regional Planning	X		
Jim Butler	ALT –Regional Planning			
Peter Gardner	PRI – Land Owners/Developers			
Clint Brown	ALT – Land Owners/Developers	X		
Margaret Miner	PRI – Open Space/Conservation	X		
Sidney VanZandt	ALT – Open Space/Conservation	X		
Zell Steever	PRI – Environmental Groups	X		
Ryan McCammon	PRI – Health Districts			
Amy Eberly	ALT – Health Districts			
William Sweeney, AICP	PRI – Land Use Consultants/Attorneys			
Tim Bates, Esq.	ALT – Land Use Consultants/Attorneys			
Deborah Donovan	PRI – Business/Industry	X		

### Welcome and Introductions

→ J. Bonin opened the meeting at 9:35 a.m. Attendee introductions were made around the table.

### Review of Meeting Minutes and Correspondence

- J. Bonin invited comments, questions, or discussion on the July 17, 2008 Advisory Committee and Administration Group meeting minutes as well as the August 15, 2008 progress memorandum.
- J. Bonin presented the graphic at the end of the Administrative Group meeting minutes. M. Cohen suggested that arrows point in both directions to signify the back-and-forth movement of ideas and policies. A. Dion concurred and noted that this process will continue past Phase II with a task force in place to ensure its progress. Z. Steever suggested that the diagram show that different towns have different sets of regulations, and S. Mann recommended that arrows from the regulations to the towns could help depict this.
- Z. Steever asked that the federal regulations that drive the DWQMP be addressed in the project. D. Murphy indicated that this will be part of the document.
- Z. Steever asked about the stakeholders that had not been interviewed yet, including the Trust for Public Land. D. Murphy indicated that they had been provided numerous opportunities and had ultimately not been responsive. They will not be contacted again but will be interviewed if they contact the consultant.
- D. Murphy noted that the web site is running and can be found at [www.dwqmp.com](http://www.dwqmp.com) as well as [www.dwqmp.org](http://www.dwqmp.org).

### Water Quality Summary (Supplemental Information)

- D. Murphy presented the memo and explained that spikes and outliers could be correlated to precipitation and runoff events.
- M. Miner asked if this could be related to flows and it was noted that the USGS-gauged stream Pendleton Hill Brook was reviewed for this purpose.
- Z. Steever asked if the information in the memo could be related to design flows for different storm events. M. Miner added that site design for stormwater and water quality should be related to design flows that would be likely to occur. D. Murphy believes that these should be discussed outside the context of this memo, and J. Bonin explained the basis for different designs for water quality vs. flood mitigation, etc.

### Stormwater Management Costs

- D. Murphy presented the stormwater management cost memorandum. L. Mathieu requested additional discussion about the Regional Water Authority (RWA) stormwater management systems, and it was provided.
- C. Brown explained that developers are concerned when they are required to treat stormwater to a certain level, and then the water leaving their sites is commingled with water of a lesser quality. Likewise, developers are frustrated when they have to treat stormwater that enters from adjacent properties. He is in favor of these "global" solutions. It would also provide for additional land on their sites to use for other purposes, if stormwater treatment systems were off-site.

### Added Topic – Trust for Public Land (TPL) Documents

- Z. Steever recommended that the Advisory Committee members read the TPL documents ("Water Protection Series") and pay particular attention to the argument that protection is more economical than treatment. L. Mathieu concurred with the recommendation to review these, and added that the Connecticut edition of the series should be reviewed. D. Murphy stated that the consultant had reviewed these, and that links to the documents will be provided on the DWQMP web site.

### Proposed DWQMP Table of Contents

- J. Bonin and D. Murphy presented the proposed table of contents.
- An executive summary was not listed but will be included.
- Sections 6.2 and 6.3 may be switched if the sequence makes more sense upon completion of those sections.
- The document will include items that may not be apparent in the table of contents, such as Marc Cohen's education plan and a discussion of the Health District's request for accurate watershed mapping.
- Z. Steever asked what would be included in proposed Section 5.6 (Stormwater Management Toolbox) vs. Section 5.7 (Recommendations) and J. Bonin explained that the recommendations would include concise summaries of the concepts in Section 5.6.
- M. Murphy reminded the group that a discussion of economics should be in the stormwater section. E. Monahan recommended that a summary discussion of economics be added to proposed Section 11.0. Z. Steever asked that a time frame should be associated with the economics discussion. M. Miner added that the economic discussion should address "who" pays, and M. Murphy added that costs should be equitable across the watershed.

- Z. Steever asked that the DWQMP have a discussion of "impacts" such as environmental impacts, impacts to development, impacts to communities, and economic impacts as caused by the implementation of different recommendations.
- M. Vlaun pointed out that there may be a need to separate recommendations into two categories: those that are available to implement now, and those that can not be implemented until enabled by legislature or other means. These would essentially be a current toolbox and a future toolbox. The future toolbox needs to be linked to a discussion of the need for legislature, and this discussion should be repeated in the Executive Summary for those politicians who only read the summary.
- A. Dion would like to add a discussion of DPH's sanitary surveys and their outcomes. He also stated that Groton Utilities' role in spurring the DWQMP should be discussed, and the consultant replied that it is meant to be in proposed Section 1.0.
- L. Mathieu requested a discussion of future Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) rules. Instead of having this in Section 6.0, it should fit into Section 9.0. J. Pagach noted that future rules have associated costs of compliance. For example, LT2 requires a watershed plan for one log cycle credit. This will have an economic impact to a water utility.
- M. Schaefer pointed out that the DWQMP must be in a 3-ring binder in order to allow rapid revisions.
- M. Miner asked if the summary of recommendations will be directed to anyone in particular, and asked how it will be organized. It was asked if the DWQMP will have a subset of recommendations that the towns can immediately sign onto. This will not allow for easy approval of the plan; instead, each town will need to bring recommendations back to their own commissions and boards.
- A. Dion reminded the group that the DWQMP should include the Ledyard Sourcewater Protection Plan.
- J. Bonin asked that written comments be provided in the coming weeks. D. Murphy clarified that if comments had been received in previous meetings and memorialized in meeting minutes, they do not need to be submitted in writing.

### Water System Security

- S. Mann indicated that water system security will need to be considered in the publication of the DWQMP. D. Murphy related an anecdote about Norwich Public Utilities' difficulty in getting watershed maps recorded by its watershed towns, and wondered if DPH could offer some guidance.

- M. Miner explained that the security issue has been frustrating for environmental groups, as it makes it difficult to gather and review information.
- L. Mathieu believes that the need for security needs to be balanced with the need for sharing information, and this is best worked out by the consultant. She provided some background about how the current status followed two years of new laws post-9/11. Each FOI request is handled on a case-by-case basis.
- T. Wagner asked how DPH would handle a request for the DWQMP, and L. Mathieu answered that DPH would direct the inquiring party to contact Groton Utilities. This process will not be problematic, as the DWQMP will be available to everyone on the internet.

#### Schedule / Future Meetings

- The schedule remains ambitious. J. Bonin explained the current schedule and opened the floor to discussion.
- L. Mathieu explained that the January 1, 2009 report to the Legislature is supposed to be based on comments from the four State agencies. Although this date can not be changed, those agencies will have a draft report by October 1, 2009 under the terms of the consultant contract.
- S. Mann added that she will be talking about the project at the September 8, 2008 WPC meeting. Thus, the State agencies will not be surprised by the schedule and their need to review the draft DWQMP.
- M. Murphy commented that the State agencies might not respond in a coordinated manner, which will be difficult for this project. S. Mann will work through the WPC to minimize this problem.
- If a draft DWQMP is available by the date of the WPC meeting (September 8, 2008), that could be distributed and then comments from the WPC would be due by September 18, 2008, with a backup of September 22, 2008. Meanwhile, the Advisory Committee will meet on September 18, 2008 to review the draft.
- Public meetings are tentatively scheduled for October 20 (Town of Groton), October 22 (Town of Ledyard), and October 23, 2008 (Town of North Stonington).
- A news release should be planned to publicize the dates.
- The Advisory Committee will meet one last time on October 30, 2008, and a final draft DWQMP will be due to DPH on November 17, 2008.

### Additional Discussion

- M. Miner asked if there is still a difference of opinion by the end of October, who would resolve it? L. Mathieu responded that it's not problematic to have a difference of opinion. It can be articulated in the DWQMP.
  
- L. Mathieu explained that in every land use application, there are choices, for example "curbs vs. no curbs," and DPH already provides comments on applications that are reviewed at the State level. The DEP manuals (Stormwater Quality and Sediment & Erosion Control) provide some good examples and some less appropriate examples relative to drinking water protection. Therefore, the DWQMP should be a toolbox for design. Another example comes from the water supply watershed sanitary requirements section of the public health code. The code states that discharges within 100 feet of a tributary to a public water supply reservoir must be reviewed and approved by DPH. The DWQMP should highlight and discuss this regulation.
  
- Z. Steever stated that the DWQMP process should be separated from the DWQMP product. He also believes that the disagreement in the DWQMP will come from the balancing of protection vs. additional water treatment. M. Murphy and N. Mullane were less concerned about the potential for disagreement. M. Murphy indicated that the toolbox will be suited to these watersheds, and N. Mullane stated that local commissions will understand the intricacies and make appropriate decisions.
  
- S. Mann asked if each town could prepare a summary for the end of the DWQMP document. M. Murphy and N. Mullane do not wish to provide summaries, as it could undermine the plan.

### Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.