



REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Southeast Connecticut Regional Drinking Water Quality Management Plan Groton, Ledyard, Preston, North Stonington, Norwich, Montville, and Waterford Thursday, April 17, 2008

A meeting of the DWQMP Advisory Committee was held on April 17, 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 were David Murphy, P.E. and Roy Schiff, P.E., Ph.D. The following members were in attendance:

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



Welcome and Introductions

- Jeanine Armstrong Bonin (Milone & MacBroom, Inc.) opened the meeting at 9:35 a.m. Attendee introductions were made around the table.

Review of Meeting Minutes and Correspondence

- J. Bonin stated that the March 20, 2008 meeting minutes had been circulated and invited any comments, questions, or discussions. None of the attendees had comments and the meeting minutes were accepted.
- J. Bonin stated that the public informational meeting minutes had been circulated as well (separate sets for each of the three meetings), and noted the corrections specified in Peter Gardner's email of April 7, 2008, a copy of which was distributed. She clarified that the "Groton representative" referenced in the minutes of the March 31 meeting was a resident of Groton, and not a municipal official. This will be corrected in the minutes. She also explained that the project is being coordinated and contracted through Groton Utilities (and not the SCCOG) because the enabling legislation specifically indicates that Groton Utilities shall do so. A copy of the legislation will be distributed to Advisory Committee members.
- D. Murphy distributed and reviewed the April 1, 2008 Progress Memorandum prepared by Milone & MacBroom, Inc. Z. Steever asked why certain items were not listed under the "analysis" portion of the memo. It was explained that the progress memos are meant to capture only the issues that have been addressed in the preceding month and to provide a project status. If something is not listed, it is still part of the DWQMP, but it has not been discussed or evaluated. Z. Steever asked to see the consultant Scope of Services to better understand the full effort. J. Bonin agreed to do so.
- At this point, a brief discussion ensued regarding committee membership. D. Murphy thanked MPTN for attending and indicated that although the February and March meetings were in conflict regarding attorney participation, both W. Sweeney and T. Bates were present and would continue on the Advisory Committee to represent the land use development stakeholder group from a consultant/attorney perspective. Z. Steever inquired about identifying a new term for the "regulatory stakeholder" role. Following discussion, it was decided that a designation of "State & Federal Agency" would be more appropriate. M. Miner indicated that Eric Thomas from DEP does not feel that DEP is properly represented in this process. D. Murphy explained that he corresponded with Eric Thomas and explained that staff at DPH is representing the State Agency stakeholders on the Advisory Committee and that he should coordinate through Jennifer Pagach and/or Lori Mathieu. This topic was revisited again within the meeting (see below under *Communications Protocols*).
- An April 1, 2008 memorandum prepared by Milone & MacBroom, Inc. on low impact development (LID) was distributed and comments were held until a later part of the meeting.

Communications Protocols

- J. Bonin distributed and explained the content of an April 14, 2008 Communications Protocol memorandum prepared by Milone & MacBroom, Inc. The role of the Administration Group was defined, leading to numerous questions. P. Gardner asked what person or committee would be responsible for adopting the DWQMP or its recommendations at the local level. Z. Steever pointed out that some of the communities were part of this process because they are water customers, but they would not be subject to the same land use regulation scrutiny as the watershed member towns. M. Schaefer from Norwich responded, stating that these towns nevertheless had a vested interest in water quality, and added that the DWQMP process would be used statewide. As such, it will also directly affect Norwich in the future as well. R. Stevens concurred and reinforced M. Schaefer's comments. Mayor Allyn remarked that this goes back to Ledyard's concerns of last year. G. Leonard stated that the upcoming May 15 tabletop drill will be largely about getting water from Groton to the other municipalities, including Norwich, during an emergency. This underscores the regional importance of this process. S. VanZandt inquired about making the notes from the tabletop drill part of the DWQMP process, but it was pointed out that the two are not integrally related.
- The role of the Advisory Committee was defined, leading to numerous comments. J. Bonin asked if it would be acceptable to post contact information of Advisory Committee members on the new DWQMP web site, and everyone appeared to agree that it would be acceptable. M. Cohen pointed out that certain measures can be taken to reduce spam generation from web site miners. Z. Steever asked about EPA, USGS, NRCS, and CIWR having representation on the Advisory Committee. D. Murphy explained that EPA was represented via DPH; NRCS was going to be interviewed in the next few weeks; and CIWR was an invited guest. NRCS and USGS will be invited to participate through an existing Advisory Committee role such as through the "State & Federal Agencies" stakeholder group.
- Z. Steever asked that the Advisory Committee members be included on the distribution of Administration Group meeting minutes. M. Miner inquired about the formation of the Administration Group and expressed concern that the process of this project would overwhelm the goals. M. Vlaun explained how the municipalities came together initially and became the Administration Group. Their responsibilities include contractual oversight, scheduling, municipal liaison communications, oversight of the process to ensure that the project vision, goals and objectives are met, and ultimately adoption of the DWQMP.

Conceptual Watershed Model

- R. Schiff presented the draft watershed conceptual model with input from J. Bonin and D. Murphy. Questions and comments were fielded throughout the presentation. These are summarized below.
- A number of comments were related to the classification of land uses. J. Leeming and W. Sweeney asked about the meaning and nature of land designated as "developed," and Z. Steever

asked for a definition of "other grasses". M. Schaefer noted that this is not the same scale analysis of the TR-20-type evaluation. R. Schiff explained that much of these classifications are generalized based on the scale of the GIS coverage available. M. Vlaun explained that this is a "first cut" on a wide-scale basis and not intended for site specific analysis. Others agreed. Z. Steever asked that the document clarify the methodology for land use classification. M. Cohen suggested that everyone look at the CLEAR web site for more information.

- P. Gardner remarked that subwatershed MP-3 did not appear to be 30% developed. R. Schiff will double-check.
- M. Miner asked how the DWQMP would be linked to the WUCC process. J. Bonin explained that it would not be linked because the DWQMP was much more detailed and watershed-specific. G. Leonard remarked that the regional water supply plan should be reviewed to see how other water supplies may relate to the Groton Utilities supplies. J. Bonin noted that the other supplies will receive a much more limited analysis as compared to the active Groton Utilities supplies.
- S. VanZandt asked what was meant by "development patterns" as related to water quality. R. Schiff explained that concentrations of bacteria and some metals appeared to be related to development in some subwatersheds. Naturally-occurring concentrations were considered, as well. The water quality analysis will be forthcoming.
- S. VanZandt asked if zoning was considered. R. Schiff explained that this analysis was just beginning of the analysis, and that the management strategies would delve into zoning in greater detail. She also asked about how much land is protected open space. J. Bonin pointed out the maps contained in the report that present this information. She also remarked that the watershed has a relatively high percentage of utility-owned land as compared to others in Connecticut. M. Miner asked that community wells be depicted on maps because it helps to show areas that have been developed.
- J. Bonin presented the State Conservation and Development Policies Plan (the State Plan) mapping and described the categories present within the watershed. She compared the map to the generalized zoning map and pointed to similarities, such as the Ledyard Center area. She described the restrictions of state funding to municipalities, leading to a discussion that was initiated at the March 20, 2008 meeting. Many of the Advisory Committee members expressed frustration that the State Plan does not match the Regional Plan developed by SCCOG and/or local plans. M. Schaefer expressed frustration about the restrictions for State funding based on the Plan. As reported in the March 20 meeting minutes, there is interest in developing a DWQMP that provides the protection sought by the State Plan, without taking away a municipality's authority to develop within its own borders. This should be a key element in the DWQMP. The DWQMP could effectively offer an alternative to strict interpretation of the State Plan.

- W. Sweeney indicated that the State Plan should not be treated as a static document. This group could provide a method for modification of the State Plan mapping. Z. Steever wondered if there is something that the State planners knew or understood that we don't see that would have caused them to allocate land into the different categories and deem some of it as not supportive to development.
- S. VanZandt remarked that green bands don't follow all watercourses on the State Plan mapping. Z. Steever would like the group to see yellow (rural center) areas in the other communities involved in the DWQMP, to determine if they should be supported by public water systems. He noted that the pink areas within the watershed are the current threat; how can these potential problems be solved?
- M. Vlaun inquired about the origins of the Billings Avery diversion and remarked that its watershed is roughly half the size of Ledyard Center, and suggested that this part of the supply could be released if it would offer relief to the Town of Ledyard. R. Stevens replied that the Groton Utilities Water Supply Plan shows a future deficit and therefore portions of the existing supply could not be given up. Furthermore, the streamflow regulations are coming and they may cut into safe yield, thus reducing margins of safety. Selectman Congdon stated that the DWQMP would need to find a way to protect Ledyard's interest in its center while also protecting water quality.
- Z. Steever asked about groundwater sheds relative to surface watersheds. D. Murphy explained that they are roughly coincident, and that there aren't any significant areas of groundwater shed that would contribute water to the reservoir watershed. Z. Steever also asked about the Groton landfill and its potential to degrade water quality. It was noted by others that the landfill is not located within the drinking water supply watershed and therefore does not contribute ground water to the reservoir watersheds. Similarly, Z. Steever asked about stormwater systems that may artificially increase the size of the watershed and the need to determine where that could be occurring. It was noted that these systems would occur in small localized areas on the periphery of the watershed and would be appropriate for consideration at the local planning and zoning boards on a site by site basis.
- S. VanZandt inquired about whether the State has regulations for golf courses that protect drinking water quality. D. Murphy answered that there aren't any specific regulations for golf courses in watersheds, and that is part of what has spurred the interest in the DWQMP concept. The DWQMP could offer BMPs for golf courses.
- J. Bonin indicated that she would like to depict water and sewer service areas on the mapping in the report, but would need that mapping from Groton and Ledyard.
- Mayor Allyn asked that the definition of "watershed" be added to the draft watershed report.

Other Business and Next Meeting

- First Selectman Congdon proposed that MPTN be appointed to the Administration Group. Although the legislation specifies which communities must be in that group, it is believed that the Advisory Committee and Administration Group can appoint others that are not listed. B. Birmingham indicated that MPTN was here to help in any way that it could. M. Vlaun concurred that MPTN should be included in the Administration Group.
- Z. Steever asked about the City of Groton not being included in the process; however, it was verified that Groton Utilities represents the City and communicates directly with Mayor Popp. Furthermore the legislation intended for Groton Utilities to represent the City.
- The next Advisory Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 15, 2008 at Groton Utilities. Although this date is in conflict with a tabletop exercise planned for the members of the Thames regional pipeline, a sufficient number of alternates will be available for the DWQMP meeting.
- The next meeting will include a presentation of existing municipal regulations and planning documents. It was recognized that the future watersheds need to be described as the active watersheds were described at this meeting; the future watersheds may be discussed at the May 15 meeting, time permitting.

Adjourn

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