

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Eastern WUCC Meeting #21**  
**Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments – 5 Connecticut Avenue, Norwich, CT**  
**February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018 1:00 p.m.**

The Eastern Water Utility Coordinating Committee (WUCC) met on February 14th, at 1:00 p.m. The meeting was held at the Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments offices at 5 Connecticut Avenue, Norwich, CT. Prior notice of the meeting was posted on the DPH website, Eastern WUCC webpage:

<http://www.portal.ct.gov/DPH/Drinking-Water/WUCC/Eastern-Water-Utility-Coordinating-Committee>

The following WUCC member representatives were in attendance (listed in alphabetical order of affiliation):

| <b>WUCC Member Representative</b> | <b>Affiliation</b>                              |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Kenneth Skov                      | Aquarion Water Company                          |
| Keith Nadeau                      | Connecticut Water Company                       |
| Brad Kargl                        | East Lyme Water and Sewer                       |
| Brendan Avery                     | Jewett City Water Company                       |
| Jonathan Avery                    | Jewett City Water Company                       |
| Mark Decker                       | Norwich Public Utilities                        |
| Samuel Alexander                  | Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments |
| Jim Butler                        | Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments |
| Josh Cansler                      | Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority        |

The following non-WUCC member representatives were in attendance (listed in alphabetical order of affiliation):

| <b>Non-WUCC Member Representative</b> | <b>Affiliation</b>        |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Eric McPhee                           | CT DPH                    |
| Melissa Czarnowski                    | CT DEEP                   |
| Scott Bighinatti                      | Milone and MacBroom, Inc. |

A copy of the meeting agenda is attached. A copy of the presentation given at the meeting will be available for download from the Eastern WUCC webpage.

The following actions took place:

**1. Welcome & Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 1:02 PM by Tri-chairs Mark Decker (Norwich Public Utilities) and Jonathan Avery (Jewett City Water Company). All in attendance stated their names and affiliations.

## **2. Approval of January Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Decker asked for comments and changes to the January Meeting minutes. There were none. Jim Butler (Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments (SCCOG)) made a motion to accept the January Meeting minutes as presented. Josh Cansler (Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority (SCWA)) seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **3. Formal Correspondence**

Samuel Alexander (SCCOG) described the formal correspondence sent and received by the Eastern WUCC.

- Mr. Alexander stated that a letter was sent to the Town of Montville, and notice was posted to the Eastern WUCC webpage, on January 11<sup>th</sup>, announcing the Public comment period for proposed modifications to the Exclusive Service Areas (ESAs) of Norwich Public Utilities (NPU) and SCWA in the Town of Montville. Mr. Alexander explained that the Public comment period would run through February 17<sup>th</sup>.
- Mr. Alexander reported an email was received on January 19<sup>th</sup> from the Water Committee of Carefree Homeowners Association in Lebanon, inquiring about the costs and benefits of making system improvements to their small community water system, or becoming a satellite of a larger utility, such as Aquarion Water Company.
- Mr. Alexander stated that a letter was received from the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (CT DEEP), on January 29<sup>th</sup>, commenting on proposed analyses to be used in the Preliminary Integrated Report. Specifically, the letter spoke to the expected impacts from Streamflow Regulations on available water supply, and the use of Maximum Month Average Daily Demand (MMADD) and available water in making those projections.
- Mr. Alexander stated that the draft Preliminary Integrated Report was distributed to active WUCC members and CT DEEP on January 29<sup>th</sup>.
- Mr. Alexander stated that the Preliminary Executive Summary to the Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP) was distributed to active WUCC members and CT DEEP on February 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Decker asked about the WUCC's obligations in responding to Carefree Homeowners Association. There was discussion about acknowledging receipt and sending correspondence that would point the homeowners' association in the right direction.

- Ken Skov (Aquarion Water Company) stated that the homeowners' association contacted Aquarion Water Company around the same time the letter was sent, and that Aquarion met with the association and toured their water system.
- Scott Bighinatti (Milone and MacBroom) suggested that the WUCC could send a letter pointing to the CWSP, where this topic is discussed in Chapter 4.
- Mr. Decker stated that the decision to become a satellite of a larger utility is a business decision on the part of the homeowners' association. Mr. Decker stated that the

association should also contact the Town of Lebanon who is the surrounding ESA holder, but that a letter should also reference the CWSP.

- Mr. Decker requested that Mr. Bighinatti draft a brief response letter for consideration by the Chairs summarizing the discussion and recommendations.

#### **4. Public Comment Period**

Mr. Decker asked if there were any comments from the public. There were none.

#### **5. ESA Modifications Discussion/Update**

##### ***Town of Franklin: Follow-up on modification to Norwich Public Utilities and Town of Franklin ESAs***

Mr. Bighinatti reviewed the recent ESA boundary modification in the Town of Franklin, that had a public comment period from late December to late January. No public comments were received. Mr. Bighinatti explained that since this was a Type A, voluntary modification of ESA boundaries between two utilities, and no public comments were received, the ESA modification will be effective pending submission of the appropriate materials to the Department of Public Health (DPH). Mr. Bighinatti reviewed the updated ESA map, which aligns the NPU ESA with its current service area along New Park Avenue.

- Mr. Bighinatti explained that the next step is for NPU to submit a new statement of confirmation, based off the expansion of their ESA, and submit new boundaries to the Connecticut Department of Public Health (CT DPH) in the form of a Shapefile.
- There was discussion about the timing of submitting updated ESA boundaries and statements of confirmation to CT DPH. It was pointed out that there is no required timeframe. Mr. Decker indicated that NPU would likely wait until expected ESA modification in the Town of Montville are finalized as well, before submitting information as a combined package to CT DPH.

##### ***Town of Montville: Opportunity for public comment on modification to Norwich Public Utilities and Southeastern Connecticut Water Authority ESAs***

Mr. Bighinatti described proposed ESA boundary modification in the Town of Montville between NPU and SCWA, which realigns ESAs around Stony Brook Reservoir in northern Montville to reflect NPU's existing service area. Mr. Bighinatti explained that the ESA modifications were also Type A modifications and the public comment period concludes on February 17<sup>th</sup>. Follow-up on this ESA boundary modification is scheduled to occur at the March meeting.

- Mr. Avery asked about additional ESA modifications in the Town of Montville.
  - Mr. Decker explained that NPU and the Montville Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA) are working on finalizing proposed ESA boundary modifications.

#### **6. Integrated Report Discussion**

Mr. Bighinatti began a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the progress of the WUCC to-date.

Mr. Bighinatti began a discussion of the Integrated Report, which is a component of the CWSP. Mr. Bighinatti explained that CT DPH requested that the Eastern WUCC delay approval of the Preliminary Integrated Report and Preliminary Executive Summary to the CWSP for public

comment, so that the public comment dates of the three WUCCs could be synced to begin in March. Mr. Bighinatti also explained that delaying the public comment period allows the WUCC time to strengthen the salient points and recommendations of the Integrated Report and collect further input from WUCC members. Mr. Bighinatti also mentioned that there was some desire by the CT DPH to allow for an extended public comment period, which may require adjustments to the Eastern WUCC's current meeting schedule.

- Eric McPhee (CT DPH) explained that CT DPH will defer to the judgement of the WUCC, but felt that with the CWSP being such a large document, it was important to engage all of the interested stakeholders and allow water utilities, state agencies, environmental groups, municipalities, and others to have time to review and provide feedback.

There was additional discussion about the status of the other two WUCCs and their expected completion date of the Preliminary Integrated Report. Mr. McPhee noted that the WUCCs have until the middle of June (June 17<sup>th</sup> for the Eastern WUCC) to submit the CWSP to DPH, per statute, and that cushion is built into the schedule as it is; the WUCC is able to have a meeting in June, prior to submitting the CWSP to CT DPH.

There was discussion about the WUCCs potentially completing the CWSP after June 17<sup>th</sup>. It was explained that CT DPH has a contract with Milone and MacBroom, which requires submission within this timeframe; the preferred course therefore being to complete the CWSP as scheduled while providing ample time for public comment.

- Mr. Avery stated that he appreciates the idea of the WUCCs working in concert; there is a public benefits and also a benefit to utilities that operate in more than one WUCC. Mr. Avery added that the WUCC should keep pressure on itself to meet the June deadline.
- Mr. McPhee raised the issue of the Executive Summary not yet being distributed for the other two WUCCs and stressed its importance because it is a shorter, more accessible document that summarizes the CWSP, including recommendations of the Integrated Report. Mr. McPhee added that many of the recommendations and findings of the three WUCCs' draft Preliminary Integrated Reports are very general, currently. Mr. McPhee stated that the Integrated Report is a much more valuable document if it makes strong findings and recommendations. Mr. McPhee suggested that a shortened version of the Executive Summary, which only includes WUCC policy recommendations, could be distributed to local Chief Elected Officials and legislators.
- There was discussion around the need to strengthen the recommendations and findings of the Preliminary Integrated Report. Mr. Bighinatti suggested that the March Meeting include a review of all recommendations as a specific agenda item and allow the WUCC and attendees to discuss how strongly they feel about certain items.

There was discussion about the need for stakeholder involvement, including WUCC members and non-WUCC members. It was generally felt that in order to best serve the completion of a final Preliminary Integrated Report, the discussion at the March Meeting required broad input.

There was discussion about soliciting involvement. The WUCC discussed the audience and the best way to gain input. The WUCC generally felt that the Integrated Report, as a planning

document, should have a handle on the interests of customers, in order to identify what they feel are critical actions. It was decided that the WUCC would send a letter to all WUCC members and non-WUCC-member ESA holders detailing where they are in the process of completing the CWSP and explaining that additional input is needed at the March Meeting, and moving forward through the process. The WUCC also decided that ESA holders should also be charged with reaching out to local Chief Elected Officials and constituents.

There was discussion about the agenda of the March Meeting and sequencing of prioritizing actions for the Preliminary Integrated Report. To recap, Mr. Bighinatti explained that the WUCC should discuss, in March, how strongly it should position itself relative to the recommendations of the Preliminary Integrated Report, before approving that document and the Preliminary Executive Summary for public review. Mr. Bighinatti added that it will be important to gain input from WUCC members and non-WUCC-member ESA holders not-in-attendance, either before or at the meeting. Mr. Bighinatti continued, explaining that once the documents are approved for public review, non-WUCC members will have additional opportunity to provide input. Following an opportunity for public comment, the WUCC will readdress the recommendations of the Integrated Report and have an opportunity to modify them.

Mr. Skov stated that the stricter interpretation of Maximum Month Average Daily Demand results in a “paper deficit” for a number of utilities, and asked how this issue was discussed in the Western WUCC.

- Keith Nadeau (Connecticut Water Company) explained that draft Preliminary Integrated Report is being updated to include stronger language about the impact of the strict interpretation of the calculation of available water to meet MMADD and for projecting margin of safety.
- Mr. McPhee suggested that analysis done in the Integrated Report to project future deficits should rely on one standard method of analysis. Mr. McPhee stated that the CT DPH requirement of using MMADD in water supply plans does not need to be the analytical driver.
  - Mr. Bighinatti explained that the projections performed using modified available water calculations were performed to show the potential water “deficits” which could be eliminated by realigning the available water calculation with actual utility calculations, contractual agreements, and other procedures. This was “Scenario C” in many tables in Chapter 3 of the Integrated Report. However, evaluation of potential sources was performed using the utility projections modified by passive water conservation savings identified under Scenario 1 of the State Water Plan. This is “Scenario B” in many of the tables in Chapter 3. Mr. Bighinatti conceded that the additional tables not pertinent to the remainder of the analysis may be better served as an Appendix.
  - Mr. McPhee explained that all three WUCCs share this concern and suggested that the WUCCs decide together whether or not they want to push for modification of the regulations guiding calculation of available water.

Mr. Avery asked for further clarification on the process for requesting an extension from CT DPH to complete the CWSP.

- Mr. Bighinatti stated that the WUCC may request an extension; however it would be logistically difficult with Milone & MacBroom's consultant contract.
- Mr. McPhee agreed, adding that the extension would come at an additional cost.

Mr. Bighinatti reminded the group that the WUCC could modify its meeting schedule in order to facilitate more work toward the CWSP within the allotted timeframe.

- Brendan Avery (Jewett City Water Company) stated that the Central WUCC has modified its April Meeting date to better accommodate its proposed 30-day public comment period.
- There was discussion about a potential meeting schedule, moving forward. It was suggested that the April meeting could be held at night, during the 30-day public comment period to receive public input. It was ultimately decided that the Eastern WUCC meeting schedule would be as follows for now: March 14<sup>th</sup> (no change in meeting date); April 11<sup>th</sup> (no immediate change of meeting date, meeting may be moved to the evening); May 30<sup>th</sup> (meeting moved from May 9<sup>th</sup>). This schedule will be formalized at the March meeting.

Mr. Bighinatti continued the PowerPoint, discussing highlights of the draft Preliminary Integrated Report. The WUCC discussed certain sections of the presentation.

- In regards to water demand projections, John Avery asked if water demand projections of each system have been modified since the last meeting.
  - Mr. Bighinatti explained that a correction was made to Groton Utilities' projections to correct the discrepancy identified at the December meeting. Mr. Bighinatti stated that some utilities have looked closely at expected demand and population projections in each town, making sure they match what they have previously publicized. Mr. Bighinatti explained that, in general, water supply plans break down water demand projections by system, not town, and Milone and MacBroom has had to estimate the breakdown of demands by town for multi-town systems.
- John Avery asked if the source data is always identified in the report.
  - Mr. Bighinatti stated that the source is not identified for every system, but that the underlying "current" data is generally from 2015 or 2016, and that water demand projections were either utility-provided or taken from water supply plans.
- John Avery stated that it sounds like there is discrepancy between the timing of population projections taken from water supply plans.
  - Mr. Bighinatti indicated that when older data was used, it was advanced to meet current planning periods per the procedures described in Appendix B of the Integrated Report.
  - Brendan Avery explained that projections for Regional Water Authority, in the Central WUCC, needed to be revised because older projections were much higher than actual demand growth.

- Mr. Bighinatti suggested that a footnote could be added that explains the source of water demand projections for each community water system.

Mr. Bighinatti explained that maximum month average day demand (MMADD) would be the primary driver of whether or not new sources are needed; however it was identified that there were paper deficits for reservoir systems, consecutive systems, and occasionally groundwater systems which utilize supplemental supplies. Mr. Bighinatti explained that for consecutive systems, the deficits could be the result of obsolete agreements, and should be worked out by the involved utilities.

Mr. Bighinatti explained that it was important to demonstrate the potential benefit of correcting the paper deficits. To that end, the report includes analysis of the increase in available water if the MMADD ratio from reservoir safe-yield models could be utilized ("Scenario C").

- Mr. Skov asked about the impact of Streamflow Regulations on available water.
- Mr. Bighinatti explained that utilities projecting deficits due to a reduction in available water as a result of compliance with the Streamflow Standards and Regulations were found likely to have deficits anyway; however he noted that the magnitude of the reduction to available water is reduced when Scenario C is applied. The trade off over not adjusting the regulations, or providing guidance for calculation of available water to meet MMADD demands is that new sources may need to be developed due to margin of safety concerns which may not actually be necessary.

John Avery asked if there is buy-in from the utilities projecting deficits, about the accuracy of the projections.

- Mr. Bighinatti explained he has received feedback from some utilities, but others projecting deficits in the plan have not yet provided comments on the draft report.
- John Avery stated that he would be interested in seeing where and when deficits occur, based on methods for calculating deficits. Mr. Avery explained that he would like to know whether or not systems projecting deficits agree with the deficit.
- In regards to paper deficits due to the use of available water to calculate MMADD, Brendan Avery provided examples of how MMADD could be affected by available water: a consecutive system in the Central WUCC that had a paper deficit due to an obsolete agreement; and Regional Water Authority having a wealth of inactive supplies.

Mr. Butler explained that the population projections from the Connecticut State Data Center are the best-available but that there is a lot of uncertainty in such projections for long-term term planning periods.

- Mr. Decker noted that some of the population projections, particularly for the 2060 planning period, appeared unrealistic. He further explained that it would be difficult to reach consensus from utilities on a method for projecting population across the region. Mr. Decker also stated that he has less and less confidence as the planning periods extend out further, and explained that projected population may or may not be in areas that the utility would provide service.

- Mr. Bighinatti explained that the CT SDC population projections demonstrate declining populations for many communities, which in some cases local and regional planners feel may be unrealistic. The method utilized to project the data through 2060 minimizes the potential for decreasing population but allows for population increase to occur. However, because of the uncertainty with the projections, the population projections were only used to evaluate potential demands by Town and by ESA holder, whereas actual utility projections from water supply plans and data collection responses were used to determine future supply needs. He clarified that the population projections were not used for Section 3.5 of the plan and onward.
- John Avery explained that, despite questions about accuracy of population projections for 2040 and 2060, it is important to plan to those horizons because the WUCC must be thinking long-term about areas of high demand and needed interconnections and source improvements.

In regards to small systems, John Avery suggested adding a map showing all small community water systems, color coded to show their revised scores using the Capacity Assessment Tool (CAT), similar to the one in the Water Supply Assessment.

In regards to the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) regulations, John Avery raised the issue of small-system design. Mr. Avery used the example of a CT DEEP-funded project in which CT DEEP was worried about over-designing the system.

- Mr. Bighinatti explained that there is a similar disconnect with developer-funded projects. Mr. Bighinatti stated that developers typically wish to save cost by designing to the minimum standard, while ESA holders are thinking long-term and want an appropriately-sized main installed to support future fire protection efforts when the satellite system is consolidated. Mr. Bighinatti added that the ESA holder has the right to request system improvements during the CPCN process; however the regulations are unclear as to the limits of such requests. Mr. Bighinatti stated that the WUCC could discuss this issue further at future meetings, and noted that the Western WUCC discussed adding a recommendation to periodically review the CPCN regulations.

## **7. Other Business**

Mr. Bighinatti presented a sample agenda for the March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting and asked for potential additions. There were no other additions to the agenda at this time.

Mr. Bighinatti presented a slide advertising a DPH-funded Workshop to be held on April 6<sup>th</sup> at the University of Connecticut at Avery Point. Mr. Bighinatti explained that the workshop, *Implementing a Drinking Water Resilience Plan for Connecticut*, will be held by the Connecticut Institute for Resilience and Climate Adaptation (CIRCA) and the University of Connecticut, with assistance from Milone and MacBroom, at no cost. It will last from 9 AM to 3:30 PM, and include a review of the findings of the Drinking Water Vulnerability Assessment and Resilience Plan and workshops to facilitate improved resilience for public water systems. Mr. Bighinatti reminded the group that CIRCA presented on this subject at a WUCC meeting approximately a year ago near the beginning of the project. Interested parties should sign up via the CIRCA website. A webinar will be available for remote viewing of the morning presentations.

Mr. Decker adjourned the meeting at 3:03 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Samuel Alexander (Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments)  
Recording Secretary

DRAFT