I am submitting this comment early because it calls for action that we believe should be taken now, before the Plan is further distributed. The NEIWPCC Appendix G to the Water Plan should either be dumped or put of place. People (and people) believe in this grist, state and country are suffering the consequences of our own lack of intervention. We are at the mercy of the weather. I think of the idea to allow the water company to solve water problem it is not working. The solution it to work at each level of government being able to deliver some significant stewardship work with the rest of people and private sector can learn. Local government being non-profit are qualified to attend classes at a cost, deep etchhers and DELIVER!!! The problem today at all level of government there is much NARRATIVE and very little EXECUTION. Nature will do most it's OWN if we take the time to manage it's laws. Sincerely, Mike g Papa.
I would like to see the MDC disbanded and a new structure put in place. I no longer trust this corporation (it is NOT a public non profit) with our public resources. We need to have greater focus on making a plan on upcoming drought conditions and a smaller focus on monetizing a community resource that the MDC is stealing and selling. The structure of how the towns unevenly pay for sewage is also an issue and should be rolled into the individual bills.

I have looked over the Connecticut State Water Plan Final Draft Report, and I am afraid that I have seen nothing guaranteeing the residents of the State that Connecticut’s water shall never be cold. We all know that Nestle, as an example, has no qualms about stealing water from a State [see California], and then selling it back to the residents of the State. I wish to see a written guarantee to the people of Connecticut that there are laws, rules and regulations in effect demonstrating that this will not and can not happen in the State. Sincerely.

Please remove fluorides from our water. When there are so many studies showing the harm in having fluorides in our bodies, why are we still subjected to fluoridated water? I will not be one with the names of these studies as I am certain that it would not only be redundant, it would waste your valuable time. Just let the record reflect that I, Joanne Z Evans, of Oak Bluff Road in Milford, CT, no longer want the water at my home to be fluoridated.

As a resident of Milford for the past sixty (60) years, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to have my concerns expressed. Sincerely, Joanne Z Evans

Thank you for your work. I’d like to see more done on the conservation front. Our current water distribution model actually hurts conservation efforts, since more water flowing through pipes = more money for water companies. So we have to think about controlling peak demand and separating water company profits from water company sales right? The fair distribution of potable water will be the most important issue facing the world in the next generation. Taking steps now to put the health of residents first by protecting water sources and reigning in corporate excesses with better regulation AND enforcement is the best way to protect Connecticut’s future.

Protect our water, it’s imperative to humans, animals, and plants, in fact the earth itself.

Please consider the following issues in the draft CT Water Plan:

- Registration of diversions over 50,000 gallons/day: Conservation: Registered water diversions are not required to implement water conservation measures. Ecological Needs: Registered water diversions were granted with no environmental review and allow pumping volumes that dry up streams. There is still no process for environmental review now. Regional Water Planning: A number of the regional basins are shown with critical water needs. Some basins have real water deficits that need to be addressed and others do not, but because of registrations included as water claims, realistic planning cannot proceed. Public Trust Resource: There is no discussion that water is a public trust resource, held in trust by the state for the benefit of current and future uses. When registrations are regarded as “carved in stone” claims on water resources, no other benefit current or future uses, the state is not conducting responsible management of our public trust water resources. No “Pathway Forward” Proposed: Lack of any discussion of revisions to or retirement of registrations in the draft Plan, because it is a politically difficult issue, means the draft Plan does not seriously address improvements in future water resource planning: if we can’t address current problems, how will the draft Plan help us going forward? The Plan needs a bold and brave proposal for a commission to study and prepare a plan recommending how to retire registered water diversions. Conservation of Water: Conservation Effort: The Plan is biased toward modest water-customer conservation efforts, led by the water utilities. But water use by customers has dropped significantly (about 12 percent) in recent years. And, since water conservation normally means less revenue for water utilities, one can hardly expect an energetic and enthusiastic conservation program with utilities in the lead.

Water Conservation Pricing: One promising approach to water conservation that does not unduly stress water utilities is water pricing that separates the direct connection between volumes of water sold and revenue gained. The approved water rate is sufficient for infrastructure maintenance. This is sometimes called “decoupling.” Connecticut has adopted decoupling provisions for private water companies. Public utilities have not been enthusiastic. They do not want state rate regulation. Drought Planning. Connecticut has been working on an updated drought plan for more than 10 years. There is universal agreement that we need a plan that provides for fair and prudent water management in times of drought (such as the summers of 2015 and 2016). But in the state draft Plan, there is no urgency with respect to moving a state drought plan forward for approval. It is critical to have a better drought plan in place before the next drought. Water Conservation and Ecological Health: The Plan states that droughts or other water shortages that harm streams must be addressed in planning. Having water available in pipes while streambeds are dry is not acceptable. But, in general, there is little emphasis on using conservation measures to protect natural streams. Taken as a whole, the Plan implies that meeting instream or ecological needs will be difficult or impossible, as if the impracticality of saving high-quality streams is a foregone conclusion. Municipal Conservation Efforts: The draft Plan gives only slight attention to the role of municipalities and the need for adoption of enforceable municipal water conservation measures. This is important in times of drought and emergency as water utilities have no enforcement powers. The state governor has authority (yet to be exercised) to declare a statewide drought emergency. But often drought and water emergencies occur on a local or regional scale. A local lawn-watering ban might be what is needed, enforced by the municipality. But if the town hasn’t enacted an emergency water conservation ordinance, it can’t enforce a lawn-watering ban or any other water conservation measures. Water Conservation = Energy Conservation: The Plan needs to give more attention to the relationship between water conservation and energy conservation. Energy is used to treat water before distribution, during distribution, and for wastewater treatment after use. Water is used in power facilities and delivering power to control peak demand. Therefore, droughts and energy shortages are connected. The energy needs of power facilities using power from hydropower and nuclear power are increased as water is used in generating power.
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- Registration of diversions over 50,000 gallons/day: Conservation: Registered water diversions are not required to implement water conservation measures. Ecological Needs: Registered water diversions were granted with no environmental review and allow pumping volumes that dry up streams. There is still no process for environmental review now. Regional Water Planning: A number of the regional basins are shown with critical water needs. Some basins have real water deficits that need to be addressed and others do not, but because of registrations included as water claims, realistic planning cannot proceed. Public Trust Resource: There is no discussion that water is a public trust resource, held in trust by the state for the benefit of current and future uses. When registrations are regarded as “carved in stone” claims on water resources, no other benefit current or future uses, the state is not conducting responsible management of our public trust water resources. No “Pathway Forward” Proposed: Lack of any discussion of revisions to or retirement of registrations in the draft Plan, because it is a politically difficult issue, means the draft Plan does not seriously address improvements in future water resource planning: if we can’t address current problems, how will the draft Plan help us going forward? The Plan needs a bold and brave proposal for a commission to study and prepare a plan recommending how to retire registered water diversions. Conservation of Water: Conservation Effort: The Plan is biased toward modest water-customer conservation efforts, led by the water utilities. But water use by customers has dropped significantly (about 12 percent) in recent years. And, since water conservation normally means less revenue for water utilities, one can hardly expect an energetic and enthusiastic conservation program with utilities in the lead.
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Thank you for your work. I’d like to see more done on the conservation front. Our current water distribution model actually hurts conservation efforts, since more water flowing through pipes = more money for water companies. So we have to think about controlling peak demand and separating water company profits from water company sales right? The fair distribution of potable water will be the most important issue facing the world in the next generation. Taking steps now to put the health of residents first by protecting water sources and reigning in corporate excesses with better regulation AND enforcement is the best way to protect Connecticut’s future.

Protect our water, it’s imperative to humans, animals, and plants, in fact the earth itself.

As a parent, grandparent and environmentalist and Master Wildlife Conservationist, I urge you to have strict regulations to protect the drinking water for wildlife and everyone in Connecticut. Protect our water sources from fracking waste and other contaminants. Do not allow any development in or near any watersheds. The Indian River running through Orange, CT supports an array of wildlife and is an important water source. Thank you.
Private Residential Wells: I appreciate that this section recommends education for well owners. In the final plan, I would like to see this education active, not just on a website people may not know about. I appreciate that this section calls for periodic water testing for well owners and that well reports will be made searchable. I am concerned that this is not required. Well testing can make a well owner aware that issues present health concerns. The final plan should investigate ways to make testing cost-effective, since this is often a barrier to testing. The final plan should provide solutions to legal issues if a well pumps local groundwater dry, as this affects drinking water for many more households, businesses, and wildlife. Water Registrations: It should not be legal to pump rivers dry, and I’m pleased to see that obsolete registrations will be taken off the books. However, the plan does not go far enough to address registrations, which have caused many water conflicts in our state. The final plan must have strong recommendations for ways to address these roadblocks, which can get in the way of necessary water conservation. Registrations disrupt this, making water management impossible and irresponsible. Current diversions are not required to implement conservation measures, nor do they require environmental review, potentially damaging our natural resource and habitats. Our state has a variety of water needs, but it’s hard to see which areas need the most attention because of registrations. We need to identify these obstacles and regulations. Registrations should not exist in perpetuity, but should be revised or retired when appropriate. If we can’t address the ongoing grandfathered registrations, how will this plan help Connecticut in the future? Water Conservation: Water conservation should be paramount in the plan. The plan supports conservation as a goal, but needs a lot of improvement to make this goal robust and effective. Connecticut needs a comprehensive drought plan before the next drought, not after. There is not enough urgency currently. Household water use has dropped significantly. Future conservation efforts should not be lead by biased utilities. Water pricing needs to be decoupled for public utilities to encourage conservation. Stream health is critical for a healthy ecosystem. The plan does not give enough attention to the value of these streams during droughts and seems to regard dried-up streams as a necessary casualty of drought. This is unacceptable as a planning principle. Many droughts aren’t statewide, but local or regional within the state. Municipalities should (and should have the authority to) enact emergency water conservation ordinances to allow temporary bars on watering laws or other emergency water conservation measures. Water and energy conservation are closely related, as energy is needed to treat water at all stages, and water is used to cool power facilities. Controlling peak energy demand helps to conserve water. Both should be given more attention in the final plan.

10/17/2017 Jennifer Kleindienst Middletown

I’m a Bloomfield resident, and I’m an active member of the citizen’s group SAVE OUR WATER CT. I’d like to comment today on 3 topics: 1. Drought planning: I know that the State Drought Plan is being updated. We need uniform descriptions of drought stages and responses and updated drought triggers. Water utilities make the point that municipalities have more control over water conservation than the utilities do during drought. I know that only one or two Connecticut municipalities currently have drought ordinances. Being from Bloomfield, I expect that after the upcoming November municipal election my new Town Council will be receptive to the idea of developing such an ordinance, so I will be advocating for that. Does the Water Plan address the need for some type of uniform municipal drought action plan and municipal enforcement? Does it provide guidance or references of where to go for guidance? 2. Protection of Class I and II watersheds. The draft plan highlights the continued need for protection of Class I and II watersheds. How will we ensure that Tilton does not violate this state priority? 3. Water Conservation: The draft plan points out that “While Connecticut leads the nation in protecting drinking water quality, the States lags in its water conservation ethic.” Large water bottlers can take advantage of this. Quoting from a recent Bloomberg article (“Nestlé Makes Billions Bottling Water It Pays Nearly Nothing For”, Sept. 22, 2017 – by Caroline Water – http://readersupportednews.org/news-section/378-66/45009-nestle-makes-billions-bottling-water-it-pays-nearly-nothing-for”) “[It] illuminates how Nestlé has come to dominate a controversial industry, spring by spring, often going into economically depressed municipalities with the promise of jobs and new infrastructure in exchange for tax breaks and access to a resource that’s scarce for millions. Where Nestlé encounters grass-roots resistance against its monopolistic-strength, it deploys lawyers where it’s welcome, it can push the limits of that hospitality, sometimes with the acquiescence of state and local governments that are too cash-strapped or inept to say no.” I would add cash-strapped water utilities to the last sentence I just quoted. Which brings me to my point: Large municipal water utilities need cash to take care of aging infrastructure. Conservation practices can be revenue limiting. Does the plan recommend ways of decoupling revenue from quantity of water sold so that water utilities structured as municipalities have reliable cash flow, regardless of the weather?

10/17/2017 Paula Jones Bloomfield

Dear Water Planning Council: In our humble opinion we sincerely feel that an EXCELLENT strategy need to be put in place. This water plan … that all of you are working on it is complex to follow with the many narratives without real RESULTS!! … We noticed our state suffered the drought cistenting the TAX PAYERS is a fortune in a desperate move we spend millions of dollars to pipe water to different locations … Today as we take the pipes out, …looks like we are going to spend additional millions (to return with the pipes again)), … since we are suffering another drought. … During the last 7 years attended many public hearings warning of the importance of LOCAL GOVERNMENT to play a more active role to educate the general public about the importance of making better use of WATER in the landscape ecosystem, … and to allow our professional municipal workers to become professionals in this regard! … But as of today not much it is done. … The state of Connecticut is FAILING MISERABLY IN THIS REGARD! … The citizen protection agency license BUSINESS without any training at all about water management and agronomy!! … I sincerely consider this behavior from our state a CRIME! As a result we are at risk of going BROKE! … I urge all people of GOOD WILL to practice true stewardship strategy. A failure in this regard will make us suffer the consequence.

10/21/2017 Paul Caban Middletown

Dear Water Planning Council: I feel very strongly that the Water Plan needs to highlight that our water is a PUBLIC resource and that it belongs to the people (the residents in the community/state). That being said, the PUBLIC needs to be made more aware of issues (current and future) with regards to the water and water management. I also believe there needs to be a policy to prohibit the selling of our PUBLIC water for PRIVATE corporate uses (bottling companies). We also need to have tighter regulation with regards to the acceptance of Fracking wastes and do everything possible to keep our water clean and safe for future generations. We should not be taking in toxic materials and instead be conserving our reservoirs and making sure the water is safe and accessible to public residents.

10/21/2017 Mauriel Vega Woodbridge

Our water is a PUBLIC resource and should be treated as such. We must avoid allowing it to come in a bottle or our water to sell it. There needs to be regulation to avoid these types of transactions. We need to be thinking about green infrastructure and storm water management to avoid contamination and preserve clean drinking water for everyone. We also need increased funding to pay for programs to protect and improve water quality.

10/23/2017 Sonia Caban Woodbridge

Water belongs to the public and the state of CT needs to make sure that the public is aware of their rights over corporate and financial interests. The water belongs to the public and that should be made clear as much as possible in this plan. Also there needs to be improved communications to the public about this water plan as well as resources and information about water, water quality and management. Some Public Service Announcements or Campaigns and public education about pesticide use/fertilizer on residential and commercial property and public education especially in areas in danger or run off or storm water drainage. There should be tighter controls around pesticide use near waterways and prohibition of accepting frack waste.

10/25/2017 Pamela O’neal Hamden

Please prioritize water as a public trust, strengthen minimum streamflow standards, enact stronger conservation measures for large water users, and provide thorough reviews of registered diversions to ensure a healthy environment and protect consumers. Please consider communicating thorough all media that we are in a drought and issue suggestions for preserving our precious water. Take a page out of the playbook of Calif. and the Southwest. thank you.
10/26/2017  Valerie Rossetti  Bloomfield  Save Our Water CT

Our water is a public trust resource and NOT a corporate asset. The state plan recommends “balancing the uses of water” and refrains from prioritizing any use over another. It SHOULD prioritize residents, ecologic health, and local agriculture and industry. NOT out-of-state water bottling corporations focused on private profit. When we approach using up to the 10% margin of available water, we SHOULD prioritize where that water goes. The plan does not suggest any regulatory oversight for large scale water bottling plants which send treated drinking water out of our native state basins.

Once water is allocated to these corporations, it is forever gone to residents. There are no requirements for what should be a renewable inter-basin transfer. Ecological needs must be recognized as vital. We cannot allow our streams to completely dry up. Unused registered diversions, which were granted in the past without regard to environmental consequences, should be reassessed. Leaving the huge issue of registered diversions up in the air is problematic. Some of our watersheds have more registered diversions than available water and the plan avoids the difficult decisions involved in addressing these. - Safe yield calculations, the bedrock of water planning, should be reviewed- and be made public- given climate change and the implementation of new stream flow requirements. - Our drought plans need to be standardized; the drought triggers revised; and uniform municipal drought responses adopted. In 2016 the governor declared drought restrictions in Hartford County but MDC continued to send out notices of adequate water reserves to its customer. Who to believe? - Our Class I and II Watersheds need definitive protection; not protection that can be altered for corporate benefit, such as for Tilcon. This would set a very regrettable precedent. - The state lags in prioritizing water conservation. Residents are asked to conserve, but then the large utilities look for increased sales. Encourage the large municipal water utilities to investigate conservation pricing & decoupling income from water sales. Promote “Watersense” products.

10/27/2017  Kathleen Devlin Semers  First Selectwoman

The state lags in prioritizing water conservation. Encourage the large municipal water utilities to consider conservation pricing and promote Watersense” products to CT residents.” From Save Our Water CT There is an inherent conflict in interest between water conservation and water profit. The MDC is raising its rates so it can charge customers more for more water used, while Niagara and other corporate entities use our water for their profit. Reward customers who use less water by implementing conservation pricing. People understand issues when they affect their pocketbook. Make it clear that a customer will be rewarded for using less water (much lower rates for these customers than currently), and customers will be penalized financially for using a lot of water (higher rates). Niagara, as one of the largest single consumers of water, should pay huge rates for its water; so high that they realize it is not viable to continue business in Connecticut. We must reduce/sacrifice now for the sake of future generations. Droughts will be a part of life during the rest of this century; water will become more and more scarce. Think and be proactive for our collective long-term interests (quality of life for future generations), not reactive based on short-term conditions (market forces, etc.).

10/27/2017  David Macbride  Bloomfield

Along with other members of Save Our Water CT, I believe that: In 2010, a U.N. resolution recognized safe, clean drinking water and sanitation as an essential human right. Our water is a public trust resource and NOT a corporate asset. The state plan recommends “balancing the uses of water”. We believe it should prioritize residents, ecologic health, and local agriculture and industry, NOT out-of-state water bottling corporations focused on private profit. The plan does not suggest any regulatory oversight for large scale water bottling plants which send treated drinking water out of our native state basins. Once water is allocated to these corporations, it is forever gone to residents. Ecological needs must be recognized as vital. We cannot allow our streams to completely dry up. Unused registered diversions, which were granted in the past without regard to environmental consequences, should be reassessed. Safe yield calculations, the bedrock of water planning, should be reviewed given climate change and new stream flow requirements. Our drought plans need to be standardized; the drought triggers revised; and uniform municipal drought responses adopted. Our Class I and Class II Watersheds need definitive protection; not protection that can be altered for the benefit of corporations such as Tilcon. The state lags in prioritizing water conservation. Encourage the large municipal water utilities to consider conservation pricing and promote “Watersense” products to CT residents.

10/27/2017  Karen Nichols  Middletown

I am very concerned that our water rights are protected in the State of CT and not sold for corporate interests. Water has become a commodity and research shows that we need to protect its rights to remain a viable state. Recent droughts can attest to this fact and proper water management is vital to the continued health of our state. Please listen to our concerns as citizens and taxpayers and protect this valuable asset. Thank you.

10/27/2017  Alicia Mozian  Westport Conservation Director

Water is life. As a commissioner on the MDC I can see a hostile attitude toward Hartford residents and the city as a whole. We are water rich in this part of the country and the attempts to capitalize and enrich corporate entities, such as the MDC are just wrong and harmful to our public. Our water is held in trust for the future generations. Our water should not be bottled and sold by private companies. Water rates should not be so high as to cause shut off of anyone’s water. Payment plans and senior/disability discounts should be established.

10/27/2017  Sharon Marcantonio  East Hampton

Communities… the people that live there… should come before BIG BUSINESS/PROFIT… THEY PAY TAXES

10/29/2017  Nancy Urban  West Hartford

I believe that it is important that CT establish a state water plan that gives priority to local use. There should be no further contracts with companies that bottle water to sell for profit. And in the case of drought, priority should be given to local residents and companies for water use. There should also be an incentive to conserve with households and companies that use less water pay a lower rate that those that use more.

10/29/2017  Carmela Garofalo  Bloomfield  CT Earth Mercy Committee of Sisters of Mercy

Knowing what water bottling companies have done in a number of states including California and Maine I am deeply concerned about the same thing happening in CT. Once these corporations obtain rights to water there is no going back, even in times of drought. I strongly believe that water is a public trust belonging to the people and not to increase the wealth of corporations. I want to see clear guidelines in the plan so that what happened in Bloomfield with Niagara will not happen anywhere else in CT. Water is for people not for profit of corporations.