

Connecticut State Water Plan Final Draft Report — Public Comment Log

Includes written comments only. To view verbal comments, please view the transcript of the 10/30/2017 public hearing at www.ct.gov/water

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
7/21/2017	Tony	Mitchell	New Hartford	Rivers Alliance of CT	Thank you for using SurveyMonkey for public comments on the Draft State Water Plan. So far it seems like a much easier system to use than the other docket comment systems. We will put links to it on our Topic: State Water Planning webpage (http://www.riversalliance.org/Topics/Water_Planning.php)
7/22/2017	Francis	DeCapua	Milford		I find this entire "water plan" complete nonsense. We need to pass stricter dumping and EPA laws in order for this to make sense. Triple the fines that are currently in place. Then, maybe companies will take it seriously.
7/27/2017	Mike	Papa	Stamford	Artscape organic care llc	Stamford 7/27/2017. Dear ladies & gentlemen . My Name is Mike g Papa. I attended many water plan meetings . I come to the conclusion that we (as people).. underestimate the potential benefits we just leave behind as a result of mediocre water management strategy in place today at the local , state and federal levels. Even as we suffer the consequences of pollution in the waterways, chronic diseases, shortage of water , still ... the public individually or through the elected representatives are not in tune with the implementation and execution of TRUE stewardship work that include first and foremost an EXCELLENT STRATEGY of managing the water in a way that will be ((an asset))) helping the mineralization and immobilization of nutrients in the landscape ecosystem , avoiding leaching then into the waterways Today we the people of this green state and country are suffering the consequences of our own lack of involvement ! We are at the mercy of the WEATHER ! The idea to allow the water company to see the implications of a drought are clearer than the implications of a flood.sssion 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 Eff
8/5/2017	Ronald	Roberts	Wallingford		I believe we need to have tighter controls, laws and regulations limiting the amount and types of fertilizers that are used by homeowners, facilities (public & private) e.g. golf courses, school campuses etc. I also believe the above misuse and overuse products that are harmful to our water supply. I propose the use on natural, ecological friendly products for use. Litter, trash, rubbish dumped on the roadways, parking lots contribute harmfully to our water supply, sources and recreational areas.
8/9/2017	Catherine	Smith	Hartford	Connecticut Department of Economic & Community Development (DECD)	DECD Letter State Water Plan Final.pdf (0.5 MB)
8/20/2017	Judy	Allen	West Hartford		In regard to Section 3, MP4-2.1.2 Public water companies are required to assess whether they have the capacity to supply to water to a new large volume water development. The assessment should include a calculation of future needs as well. It should include consideration of needs in times of drought and the unique demands not only of current customers but for other companies who might need to connect in order to meet the public health needs of its citizens. An assessment of capacity needs to be balanced and include in-stream requirements for sustaining stream flow and aquatic life. When a public water utility is not able to meet those requirements during times of drought, then they do not have the capacity to serve new large volume water developments. Recent attempts by water companies to keep rates down have led to finding new ways to sell more water. Large water bottlers can seem an attractive answer. However, a public water company should never be in the business of economic development. As this see the implications of a drought are clearer than the implications of a flood.sssion 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
8/21/2017	Margaret	Miner	Litchfield	Rivers Alliance of CT	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 NEWPCC Appendix G to the Water Plan should either be corrected or deleted.
9/4/2017	Judy	Allen	West Hartford	Save Our Water CT	In Section 5 there is a suggestion that the state consider some sort of monetizing of water. I think this would be a very bad precedent. In CT water is a public trust, held for the benefit of all. When water gets privatized people begin to think that they "own" pieces of CT water. A water company provides infrastructure for delivery of water to its customers, but its customers are paying for the infrastructure not the water. Across the country and indeed the world, the privatization of water has led to water wars, lack of water for people who desperately need it, conflicts, and the use of water as a resource for power. It may seem that these are unlikely occurrences here in CT, but Fryeburg, ME is an example of how water can be grabbed by the bottled water industry if safeguards are not put in place.
9/4/2017	Judy	Allen	West Hartford	Save Our Water CT	The plan does not address the bottled water industry in any meaningful way. It deserves its own category among the possible economic and development plans. When water is bottled nothing is manufactured except plastic containers. The water is not used in the manufacture of other products such as air plane parts, or to cool power generation systems. The water used in agriculture creates a crop that can be locally eaten with far less transportation costs than bottled water. The large volumes of water bottled here in CT leave our state never to return. Because of this I believe bottled water deserves its own consideration.
9/6/2017	Judy	Allen	West Hartford	Save Our Water CT	Section 5.5 I particularly like the suggestions for conflict resolution. I hope the Advisory Group can make these part of their mission with a pathway for the public, on behalf of the environment to bring issues forward. I like hat the State Water Plan could be used as a guide for resolving conflicts so that it is not resolved solely by people's special interests.
9/6/2017	Judy	Allen	West Hartford	Save Our Water CT	I'm wondering if an index could be created. While the table of contents is great, it does not let you find information that may not have its own section. For example: In the wake of Hurricane Harvey I went to our draft plan to see what it could tell me about flooding. An index could point me to the right places where flooding was considered. Coastal flooding is not addressed in the plan because there are other plans being compiled. But what about in-land flooding? I found some references to floods, mostly related to climate change. Climate change may result in heavier and more frequent precipitation leading to flooding. Is there some kind of flood index like a drought index that can address things related to floods. What are the environmental implications of flooding? I assume that it's location specific for small flood events. What is the probably that CT could face a major in-land flood for water quality and drinking water availability. Is our infrastructure adequate to handle a major flood? To me the implications of a drought are clearer than the implications of a flood.
9/12/2017	Terry Ted Carlo	Gerratana Kennedy Leone	6th Senate District 12th Senate District 27th Senate District	Senate Democrats	SenateDemocrats Letter State Water Plan.pdf
9/21/2017	Colette	Thorpe	Fairfield		Please stop poisoning our water with fluoride. Individuals who think this is an acceptable drug should be free to decide for themselves whether or not to take it. The rest of us should be free to choose NOT to drug ourselves.
9/21/2017	Kim	Suminski	Norwich		Why is the Norwich water supply filled with poisons that have reached unhealthy levels ? That have reached beyond the legal level ? Why do we need a huge plant and chemicals at all when a steam machine and a charcoal filter would be so much more effective than the chemicals that are making everyone sick ! Stop the chemicals !
9/21/2017	Kendall	Sanford	Oxford		I am very concerned about the amount of water that will be used by the CPV Power Plant which is being built in Oxford, CT. It will probably seriously deplete the aquifer which all the communities around Oxford depend on. This needs to be seriously monitored, and if it is seen as depleting the aquifer, the power plant should be shut down. The town of Oxford is not taking this seriously and has no plan in effect to determine if or when the aquifer is in danger of being being depleted.
9/21/2017	Kelly	Vaillancourt	West Hartford		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.
9/22/2017	Jacob R.	Raitt	Bridgeport		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 sold. 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,
9/22/2017	Joanne Z	Evans	Milford		Please remove fluoride from our water. When there are sooo many studies showing the harm in having fluoride in our bodies, why are we still subjected to fluoridated water? I will not bore you 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
9/22/2017	Stacy	Prince	Westport		I 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.
9/23/2017	Lisa	James	Waterbury		Protect our water, it's imperative to humans, animals, and plants, in fact the earth itself.

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
9/27/2017	Adelheid	Koepfer	Wallingford		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, but no longer 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 go 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 for cooling power facilities and delivering hydropower. One of the most effective approaches to conserving water and energy is to control peak demand. Entire streams are diverted and power plants built to meet demand in peak-use times. For example, a hydro facility may impound a river year round so that the plant can supply a small amount of electricity for, say, three months of the year. Thank you
10/3/2017	Beverly	Propen	Orange		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 flows through many peoples' backyards. We do not want any contaminants that may affect the quality of these waters. Thank you.
10/8/2017	Hugh	Rogers	Washington		Comments on the Draft CT State Water Plan Hugh Rogers_10.pdf
10/13/2017	Jennifer	Kleindienst	Middletown		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 impact water in the following ways: Water should be a right, not a privilege, and therefore should be a public trust resource. 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 to have realistic planning. 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 bans on watering lawns 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.
10/16/2017	Paula	Jones	Bloomfield		I'm a Bloomfield resident, and I'm an active member of the citizens' 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 insure that Tilcon does not violate this state priority? 3. Water Conservation: The draft plan points out that "While Connecticut leads the nation in protections of drinking water quality, the State 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 Wnter - http://readersupportednews.org/news-section2/318-66/45909-nestle-makes-billions-bottling-water-it-pays-nearly-nothing-for): "...[I]t 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 industrial-strength guzzling, 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 flows, regardless of the weather?
10/17/2017	Valerie	Rossetti	Bloomfield		Letter to WPC_WPC Advisory Council 10_17-2017.pdf
10/17/2017	Valerie	Rossetti	Bloomfield		Addendum to WPC_WPC Advisory Group 10_17_2017 Letter.pdf
10/22/2017	Tallie	Miller	Bloomfield		COMMENTS FOR OCTOBER 3 WPC MEETING.docx
10/23/2017	Mike	Papa	Stamford		Dear Water Planning Council : In our humble opinion I sincerely feel that an EXCELLENT strategy need to be put in place .This water plan .. that all of you are working on it is to complex to follow with the many narratives without real RESULTS !! I noticed our state suffered the drought cisting the TAX PAYERS a fortune In a desperate move we spend millions of dollars to pipe water to different locations. Today as we take the pipes out , it 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 it is FAILING MISERABLY IN THIS REGARD ! The ct consumer 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.
10/23/2017	Carissa	Vega	Woodbridge		I feel very strongly that the Water Plan needs to highlight that our water is a PUBLIC trust 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.
10/23/2017	Mauriel	Vega	Woodbridge		Our water is a PUBLIC resource and should be treated as such. We must avoid temptations by corporations to come in a bottle 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 interest is a priority 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 property and commercial property 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 fracking wastes.
10/25/2017	Pamela	O'neil	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 through all media that we are in a drought and issue suggestions for preserving our precious water. Take a page out of the playbooks of Calif. and the Southwest - thank you

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
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 Class II Watersheds need definitive protection; not protection that can be altered for corporate benefit, such as for Ticon. 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.
10/26/2017	Kathleen	Devlin	Somers	First Selectwoman	Efforts to develop a plan for water conservation, use of water sources, and protection of natural resources is well overdue. The concern that might be raised is new regulations and unfunded mandates that may be a concern to many towns. We in Somers have already issued an ordinance for water testing, and having public informational meetings helped acceptance. Your idea is conceptually a good idea. My best advice is to move slowly under these hard economic times. "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.). "The state seriously lags in prioritizing water conservation. Demand that the large municipal water utilities implement conservation pricing and promote "Watersense" products to CT residents." (my version)
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 Ticon. 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	David	Schonfeld	West Hartford		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	Karen	Nichols	Middletown		
10/27/2017	Alicia	Mozian	Westport	Westport Conservation Director	Water Plan Comments 102717.doc
10/27/2017	David	Ionno	Hartford		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 the 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/retiree discounts should be established.
10/29/2017	Sharon	Marcantonio	East Hampton		Communities...the people that live there...should come before BIG BUSINESS PERIOD! 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 corporation 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
10/30/2017	Myles	Connell	Bloomfield		Thank you for your efforts to preserve clean water as a precious state resource. Please adopt all further measures recommended by Save Our Water.
10/30/2017	Josh	Davidson	Farmington		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 Ticon. The state lags in prioritizing water conservation. Encourage the large municipal water utilities to consider conservation pricing and promote "Watersense" products to CT residents.
10/30/2017	Meredith	Davidson	Farmington		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 Ticon. The state lags in prioritizing water conservation. Encourage the large municipal water utilities to consider conservation pricing and promote "Watersense" products to CT residents.
10/30/2017	Louisa	Barton	Hartford		Water, pure and clean is so essential to a healthy peaceful life that it should be afforded the highest respect and protections a society can provide. It must be made available to human beings, animals and plants in a pure unadulterated state. Bogs and wetlands must be protected for their essential filtration and purification processes they provide. Water is also essential for aesthetics and peace of mind. These essentials common to all life must come before profits in all cases. Bottled water is a false, immoral and extremely destructive industry.
10/30/2017	Margaret	Miner	Litchfield	Rivers Alliance of CT	Water Plan MM comments 10-30-17.docx
10/30/2017	Judy	Allen	West Hartford		10-30 comment.pdf
11/1/2017	Bruce	Clark	Danbury		As a former Lake Waubesa Board member who was responsible for our water system upgrade, we dealt with the state water officials and established that there was no connection between the Saugatuck River and our well system. The Saugatuck River has several branches other than the branch which starts at the RT 7 pond and runs along West Redding Road. I would be happy to testify at a hearing about this false issue
11/2/2017	Brian	Paganini	Southington	Quantum Biopower	Good Morning: Quantum operates the State's first anaerobic digester system, located in Southington, CT. We recycle 140 tons/day of food waste material, creating methane through a natural process, and using that methane as fuel for a combined heat and power unit. We create 1.2MW of Class I renewable power, 10,000 tons/year of compost and soil amendments from our process. The environmental impact of this facility are significant; our facility displaces 5,000 tons of CO2/year by recycling food waste. At full throughput our facility produces 30,000 gallons/day of water. The water we produce straight from the digester is rich in nitrogen and phosphorus, and BOD. During the design phase of this project, we decided to build a biological nutrient removal (BNR) process to "clean" our wastewater after the digestion process. This BNR process removes 98% of the nutrients from our water. In Connecticut, the function of anaerobic digestion is considered an industrial process, and as such, we are considered to produce an industrial discharge from the water we create from the process. The water we produce, after nutrient removal, is free from metals, and very low in constituents of N & P. This water has value in the marketplace, and needs to be classified outside of an industrial discharge.
11/6/2017	Tom	Lehtonen	New Haven	West River Watershed Coalition	To the Water Planning Council: Thank you for your work on drafting the CT State Water Plan. I think that the fact that water is a public trust resource should be mentioned more in the Plan. I am very much in favor of a plan that includes protection of watershed lands; including prohibition of commercial businesses on water company lands and prohibition of acceptance of fracking wastes. I would also like to see the Plan include the areas of stormwater management and green infrastructure. Thank you for your efforts.
11/7/2017	Robbie	Marshall	Old Saybrook	Old Saybrook WPCA	2014 CT Water Reuse Bill.docx
11/7/2017	Robbie	Marshall	Essex		I previously submitted an example of a Water Re-Use Ordinance in my capacity as the Old Saybrook WPCA Coordinator. The Ordinance was written by Jay Sheehan P.E. of Woodard and Curran. Besides suggesting that the State become more invested in water re-use, I am very concerned about the quality of the water. Connecticut is listed in the top 10 states for highest cancer rates. I believe we should consider that may stem from water quality issues. For example wells in the Haddam region that are unsafe. But, I also believe that we need to implement pesticide and herbicide controls to protect aquifers and groundwater. We are already replacing septic systems in Old Saybrook to reduce nitrogen levels in the Sound. Now we need to consider going further and banning the chemicals that are killing us, as well as researching and finding ways to address pharmaceuticals getting into the drinking water. I think the plan is good as far as conservation and climate change are concerned, but it does not go far enough to protect us from exposure to dangerous chemicals.
11/7/2017	John	Hall	Middletown	Executive Director, on behalf of Jonah Center for Earth and Art Board of Directors	2017-11 Water Plan Comment by Jonah Center.pdf
11/7/2017	Martha	Blume	Cheshire		First, I applaud those involved in creating a water plan for our state. I want to comment on the item, use of class B water for non-potable uses. I would like to see this water be available to businesses and citizens at a lower rate. Also, I would support any measures that could be taken to prevent bottled water businesses from taking groundwater, as in the case of Niagara in the town of Bloomfield, CT, and shipping and selling it all across the US.
11/8/2017	Stephanie	FitzGerald	New Haven		1. The water in Connecticut belongs to its residents. The water utilities don't own our water; they manage it for us. 2. In August many of our smaller waterways dry up. A strategy needs to be developed/ utilized to preserve stream flow throughout the year.

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
11/9/2017	Leendert	DeJong	Woodbury	Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition	PRWC State Water Plan Comments - November 9 2017.pdf
11/9/2017	Nicole	Westfall	New Haven		Dear Water Planning Council: Thanks for your hard work in drafting the CT State Water Plan. This is a great way to emphasize how valuable water resources are to our state. Water is a public trust resource belonging to all Connecticut residents. I believe that point should be emphasized more often in the Plan. Connecticut's water should be managed for everyone's benefit, now and into the future. This should be the guiding principle for all water management decisions stated front and center in the state water plan. I think also we should have a more rigorous water conservation that makes sure our water is regarded as a valuable resource for everyone. This program should be spearheaded by entities other than the water companies as they have a vested interest in exploiting our water resources. Conserving water is not only beneficial to our ecosystems, but it helps make our state more resilient to climate change and ensures our resource will be available for our children and our children's children. Thank you again for all your hard work and I hope you take these comments, as well as all others you receive, into consideration and implement suggestions into the plan.
11/10/2017	Frances	Funk	Coventry		Moving water from one watershed to another to supply an area that has exceeded its local water supply is a practice that should be prohibited. Also, the admission of high-capacity water-bottling plants that ship water from a local supply out of the area should also be prohibited. Water should be available where it is. To do otherwise runs the risk of none being available to the people at the source of local water. To move water from one watershed to another is disruptive to the environment and incredibly expensive. Populations exceeding the local water supplies should be reconsidered. Water availability should be included in the planning considerations of municipalities.
11/10/2017	Jay	Louden	Greenwich		Having attended a public meeting of the Planning Council and heard that data from wells is not comprehensive, I mentioned to Ms. Mathieu and submit here that the planning council might consider the use of a technology available to drilled-well owners that allows them to wirelessly monitor the static head of their individual wells. This capability involves installation of a stand-alone unit installed under/through the well cap that sends a signal via a transponder downward to the water level in the well, and returns the signal for calculation of that point, converting to a measurement of height in the well. A small antenna - not unlike that employed by solar panel lessors like Solar City - transmits that data point wirelessly to an internet-connected receiver on the property. In addition to the value of the information to the well owner, that information could be sent to a central data center for its predictive and diagnostic value in forming water usage policy and practices, even where water resources are centrally provided by reservoirs. The installation of these monitoring devices could be incentivized by a small compensation either in the form of a one-time free installation/maintenance agreement or a permanent/long-term (10 years) reduction/deduction against a town or state tax or other fee. The benefit of installation of hundreds of these monitors across the state seems obvious: at any moment, with the right analytical software, all the interested parties to the management of our water resources become able to increase knowledge of water resource status with great precision, and over time, recommend policies both locally, regionally and statewide as to what practices should be invoked to preserve the greatest possible benefit from declining water resources during periods of drought. If adopted by our neighboring states, the value of this data is inestimable, given the possibility of more drought periods in New England.
11/10/2017	Cynthia	Willauer	Lyme		Re: land management The spread of impervious and poor management of storm water is resulting in excessive accumulation of silt and other earth materials in stream channels. In some case these accumulations are impairing the natural flow of the stream and are associated with loss of deeper, colder rivers and the incubation of life therein. Support for stormwater management and erosion control should also, in appropriate cases, be associated with restoring the river channel to its natural condition. I submit this opinion in relation to the several streams in close relation to which I live, but my broader view corresponds with that of all who value Connecticut's streams and water courses for their benefit to the world around us and to our individual health and wellbeing. This means that addressing the "balance" in water policy and practices requires corrective vision, for greater weight has been tended to societal and business claims on water than to the Planet's. This opinion is dramatically and beautifully expressed in Pope Francis' encyclical letter of 2015 "On Care for Our Common Home, a short document that for all of us who are engaged in protecting our waters for our own and future generations is a "must read." Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the State Water Plan and to make a suggestion for reading we might all benefit from, painful regarding the short term though it is, but destined for essential healing of our vulnerable common home.
11/10/2017	Louis	Burch	Hamden		CCE comments SWP FINAL.pdf
11/12/2017	Lynne	Bonnett	New Haven		I believe that water is held in public trust and belongs to all of us. We have clean water because we have taken care of this resource. We need to balance water usage for in stream and out of stream uses. It is important to evaluate water diversion for each water basin to make sure that in stream and out of stream uses remain in balance. The following points are critical for a good water plan, in my opinion. 1) All registered diversions must be evaluated for their impact on balanced water usage, including grandfathered registrations. Diversion permits should be revised according to the evaluation results. 2) Water held as a public trust should not be sold by anyone or any entity. Especially egregious was the bottling and selling of publicly held water at a discount so that the corporation that bottled the water made a profit from selling our clean water. 3) The State of CT needs to evaluate water usage based upon river basin or watershed geography and promote regional decision making per watershed to manage the resource. 4) We need a reasonable use doctrine to protect the resource. 5) The State of CT should guarantee more funding for communities to enhance their water quality through education, storm water management, conservation, and reduction of chemical land applications that leach into the water. 6) We should not allow contaminated waste water from gas fracking to be imported and / or treated in the State of CT. Thank you for soliciting our comments. I hope that they are meaningful to those making decisions. Not all decisions should be the cheapest available for the State but should be made with a long term view for what is best for our State and our water resource.
11/13/2017	Tony	Mitchell	Litchfield	Rivers Alliance of CT	Water Plan TM comments 10-30-17.doc
11/13/2017	Martha	Smith	Litchfield	Rivers Alliance of CT	171030-CommentsforWPHearing.doc
11/13/2017	Margaret	Miner	Litchfield	Rivers Alliance of CT	Water Plan MM comments 10-30-17.doc
11/13/2017	Ingrid	Boelhouwer	Bloomfield	Seabury Retirement Community Action Forum	We are members of the Seabury independent Living Community in Bloomfield CT. We care deeply about the future of our environment for our children, grandchildren and beyond. We applaud everyone who has worked so hard on the waterplanning document. We like to talk more about water as a public trust resource, that water belongs to Everyone in the State and that we are the custodians of this resource, talk about Water conservation to increase supply. We all have a stake in waterplanning because it is about all of our future. We should have streamflow regulations, review grandfather contracts. Respectfully Ingrid Boelhouwer, Sally Foster, Richard Watson, Patricia Zwerling, Birch Milliken, Mims Butterworth, Anne Brock, Betty Cornish, Bobby Taylor, Nancy Bancroft, Carol Fine, Jo Fandel, Shirley Dudley, Alice Cruikshank, Shirley Keezing, Linda Isham, BJ Hardeston, Peggy Igleheart, Selma Squire
11/13/2017	Sara	Foster	Bloomfield		I approve the Ct State Water Plan with the recognition of present global warming threats to our states environment's health
11/13/2017	Crystal	Sorber	Branford		Water is vital to human life and should be safe, clean and available to the public. Private families' water use is only a small fraction of water use and waste. Housing property management, municipal works and industrial businesses use and waste and contaminate far more water! I wonder why there aren't stiffer regulations on coastal/watershed use of pesticide/fertilizer chemicals which can run off and harm waterways from northern CT to the south. I have seen the bank of America and pine orchard golf club in Branford running their sprinklers during a tropical storm! In addition, as a child I remember freely obtaining clean spring water from an area by the pine orchard golf club and greenway trail and by the year 2000 the club bought the parcel of land and placed a slab over the spring they undoubtedly have polluted by now. All people need water! Clean water! Industry and business and property owners must be held accountable for their wasteful activities.
11/14/2017	Barbara	Gurr	Berlin		I appreciate the work of the WPC in devising this plan. I urge the council to devise SPECIFIC and BINDING regulations about the use of water in our state, particularly for industrial purposes (such as the CPV power plant in Oxford). Further, I would like to see the Council address the bottled water industry directly. Connecticut's water should NOT be monetized in ANY fashion, as suggested may be possible in section 5 -- are you crazy? NO private water, no monetized water. You absolutely MUST guarantee that CT's water is NEVER sold. It is NOT a taxable good, it is a PUBLIC good. I believe the drought planning needs to be strengthened, and we need an ACTUAL plan for conservation, one not led by industry (come one, seriously?) but that industry must FOLLOW. Thank you again for all this work. I understand that it is time-consuming and perhaps frustrating, but it is essential to our well-being.
11/14/2017	Adelheid	Koepfer	Wallingford		CT water is a public good, bottling corporation gains should not come at the expense of CT public. Bottling and shipping CT water out of state should be restricted to availability only after meeting CT public needs. Keep refund for plastic bottles, to avoid further pollution of watershed, contaminating water and endangering wildlife and natural filters. Enforce regulations for industrial and general effluents. Retire unused water registrations. Update drought triggers, as well as response. Increased withdrawal and climate change need to be considered. Implement "Watersense" designation.
11/14/2017	Sarah	Jonelis	New Haven		Dear Water Planning Council, Thank you for your hard work drafting this plan. Having a comprehensive evidence based understanding of our water use is essential to our future as an environmentally educated state. I think that the plan should have a heavier emphasis on water being a public resource that belongs to everyone, and stress the importance of investing in green infrastructure for storm-water management which keeps water where it should be and brings it back to the people more cleanly and efficiently, as well as protecting watershed lands from pollution and misuse. We need a vigorous water conservation program spearheaded by entities other than water utilities that will act in their own self-interest. If we are really going to take climate change seriously, if we are really going to position ourselves as environmental leaders we need to pivot towards a future whose primary focus is sustainability rather than pure-profit. Thank you
11/14/2017	Sarah	Ruden	Hamden		Dear Water Planning Council Members: Perhaps in fear of liability, the amount of chlorine added to water for domestic use seems to have risen in the town of Hamden. My skin is sensitive, and now reacts, with red, painfully itching burns, as it does to over-chlorinated pools. May I at least know what the present chlorine content is, so that I can communicate this to a dermatologist in seeking treatment and a filter? The proliferation of chlorine filters in the consumer marketplace speaks to the overzealous use of chlorine by municipalities.

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
11/15/2017	William	Hofer	Riverside		The development of a State Water Plan (SWP) presents a unique opportunity for the people of Connecticut, to protect our valuable natural waters for our own and future generations. It is our responsibility not only to move this Plan forward but to be sure that there are consequences for failing to adhere to it. Long under development, the SWP must propose precise means to solve the problems highlighted below in a timely manner. Everyone must conserve water, including large companies: The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and Plan for the inevitability of droughts: Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. •Protect healthy streams: Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained Establish and approve a governing structure for the existing Water Planning Council to properly and effectively oversee the best use and management of water sources in the public trust. •Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones!) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. •A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust. •A CT State Water Plan must unequivocally support and allow for complete transparency of utility water use and management data by the public. State, and more specifically water utility, exemptions from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) must be eliminated.
11/15/2017	Jane	Kochersperger	Cos Cob		Everyone must conserve water, including large companies: The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. Plan for the inevitability of droughts: Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. Protect healthy streams: Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. It is currently legal to drawdown or extract water from groundwater and other sources creating artificial droughts resulting in aquatic wildlife kills. Prior regulatory language that served to protect our water supplies was eliminated in 2012. Establish and approve a governing structure for the existing Water Planning Council to properly and effectively oversee the best use and management of water sources in the public trust. Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones!) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust. A CT State Water Plan must unequivocally support and allow for complete transparency of utility water use and management data by the public. State, and more specifically, water utility exemptions from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) must be eliminated. Connecticut must continue to manage our water resources for the benefit of its citizens in an up-to-date and scientific fashion. Climate change is already affecting our resources, and we must plan ahead to meet future events such as flooding and drought. The CT State Water Plan enumerates 10 important and doable goals. I urge that they be implemented. Thank you.
11/15/2017	Alice	Cruikshank	Bloomfield		Comments on the Executive Summary Draft- Basically an excellent document ! Page 5- Requirements of the State Water Plan- Items 4&16 are basically the same. Suggest adding bullet for evaluation of water resources organized by watersheds(basins) and subwatersheds Page10-Collaborative Approach to Planning - Need to encourage DEEP & DHS co-reviews of development projects for wastewater and drinking water as one affects the other. Now agencies act in separate silos. Page18-19-Policy and Water Mgn't Background-New Policy Recommendations - Real-time flow monitoring is very important (USGS or other gages) - Suggest changes to regs re: Affordable Housing only allowable where public water & sewer available and prohibit or minimize large project locations at top of sensitive (Class A) watersheds. - Develop database of historic and current pvt wells test results from state certified labs (DHS responsibility). - Agricultural Practices need to cooperate with USDA/NRCS or CT Conservation Districts for manure management & storm water run-off control. - Unused Registered Water Diversions need to be eliminated over short timeframe or reapplied for showing need. Page20-Top10 #9- Not only "reaffirm", but also "strengthen" by specific controls and prohibitions in Class I&II lands Page23-pvt realistic timeframe on Near Term Steps-like 5 years - don't allow fuzzy open ended language for timing
11/15/2017	Curtis	Read	Bridgewater	Western CT Council of Governments	Page A-4 Table A-2 - WPCAG member Aaron Budris represents the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments (NVCOG) - Not SCCOG.
11/15/2017	Aaron	Budris	Waterbury	Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments	
11/16/2017	Erin	Bouchard	Cos Cob		The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. It is currently legal to drawdown or extract water from groundwater and other sources creating artificial droughts resulting in aquatic wildlife kills. Prior regulatory language that served to protect our water supplies was eliminated in 2012. Establish and approve a governing structure for the existing Water Planning Council to properly and effectively oversee the best use and management of water sources in the public trust. Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones!) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust. A CT State Water Plan must unequivocally support and allow for complete transparency of utility water use and management data by the public. State, and more specifically, water utility exemptions from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) must be eliminated.
11/16/2017	George	Jacobi	Mansfield		Dear Water Planning Council Members: I am writing to push for a stronger State Water Plan (SWP) that offers specific policy solutions to protect Connecticut's water supplies and ensure adequate stream flows for fish and aquatic wildlife. Due to the impacts of climate change and drought being felt in communities across Connecticut and the nation, our state needs a water plan that sustainably balances public and private water needs with those of a healthy environment. The current draft of the SWP falls short in this regard. Almost all of our surface freshwater comes from MA, NH, and VT, making the CT situation riskier than most. The WPC should release a final State Water Plan that makes the following recommendations to the state Legislature: -Water Conservation: The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, particularly private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. -Drought Planning: Connecticut needs a drought plan with a uniform, sensible set of triggers and actionable drought levels for all 169 towns, to be completed as soon as possible. -Registered Diversions: The SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones!) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. -Streamflow Regulations: The plan should recommend that water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. - Let's not sell any of CT's ground water to private companies, i.e. Pepsi, Coke, Nestle. Thank you for your consideration. George Jacobi Mansfield, CT
11/17/2017	Eileen	Fielding	Simsbury	Farmington River Watershed Association	FRWA comments draft water plan.pdf
11/17/2017	Chris	Lund	Groton		I recently reviewed the draft water plan. Unfortunately, it deals almost exclusively with drinking water issues and therefore lacks adequate consideration of the stormwater and wastewater components one would expect to find within a truly comprehensive plan. At a minimum, an annex or appendix on wastewater and stormwater should be a part of the project. Remember, drinking water starts as stormwater (in the form of rain) and ultimately ends up as wastewater. All three parts need consideration. The State should consider moving responsibility for regulating and managing drinking water from DPH to DEEP, so all environmental regulating and permitting is completed by one agency. This consolidation would also ensure better coordination and communication between the various water functions and consistent policies that did not conflict between agencies and organizations. One example of conflicting policy: The drinking water industry uses various phosphate based corrosion inhibitors in their systems. The phosphate that leaches into the water must then be removed by the wastewater industry to prevent nutrient overload in the environment. The cost of removal is born wholly by the treatment industry while there is no incentive or disincentive to the drinking water industry to reduce or eliminate the phosphates from their product. DEEP cannot enforce a standard on drinking water because DPH is the regulatory body.
11/17/2017	Linda	Pagani	Bloomfield	Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Wild & Scenic Study	Linda Pagani comments on state water plan.pdf
11/17/2017	Sally	Rieger	Simsbury		State Water Plan draft comments 11/17/17.pdf
11/17/2017	Jeff	Pugliese	Middletown	Middlesex County Chamber of Commerce	Middlesex Chamber State Water Plan Comments-Nov.2017.pdf
11/17/2017	David	Knauf	Darien	CADH	Comments on Water Plan 11-17.docx
11/17/2017	Virginia	de Lima	West Hartford	Science & Technical Workgroup	MASTER LOG COMPLETED follow up.pdf
11/17/2017	Virginia	de Lima	West Hartford	Science & Technical Workgroup	MASTER LOG COMPLETED (ECS 6-30-17) vdel follow up.xlsx
11/18/2017	Juerg	Loser	Cos Cob		Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones!) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust.
11/18/2017	Erika	Loser	Cos Cob		Everyone must conserve water, including large companies: The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. Plan for the inevitability of droughts: Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. Protect healthy streams: Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations.
11/18/2017	Neil	Anwaka	Wallingford	Wallingford Water Division	WWD State Water Plan Comments 2017-11-17.pdf

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
11/18/2017	Braden	Truscinski	Middletown	Mentor for FL Team 32397 Silver Metal Falcons	CT State Water Plan Comments From FL Team 32937 Nov 16 2017.pdf
11/18/2017	Susan	Murray	Hartland		Good plan with the exception of making water companies exempt from plan. Better think about changing plan as water will soon be more valuable than gold & CT residents will be left high & dry. We have the best water in the country... don't let others legally take it from us with us having a leg to stand on. Advocate water protection for the residents of CT Thanks
11/18/2017	Cheryl	Chase	Ashford		Plan comments Cheryl Chase.pdf
11/18/2017		87 Individuals	Multiple	Multiple	Dear Water Planning Council Members: I am writing to push for a stronger State Water Plan (SWP) that offers specific policy solutions to protect Connecticut's water supplies and ensure adequate stream flows for fish and aquatic wildlife. Due to the impacts of climate change and drought being felt in communities across Connecticut and the nation, our state needs a water plan that sustainably balances public and private water needs with those of a healthy environment. The current draft of the SWP falls short in this regard. The WPC should release a final State Water Plan that makes the following recommendations to the state Legislature: - Water Conservation: The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. - Drought Planning: Connecticut needs a drought plan with a uniform, sensible set of triggers and actionable drought levels for all 169 towns, to be completed as soon as possible phosphate that leaches into the water must then be removed by the wastewater industry to prevent nutrient overload in the environment. The cost of removal is born wholly by the treatment industry while there is no incentive or disincentive to the drinking water industry to reduce or eliminate the phosphates from their product. DEEP cannot enforce a standard on drinking water because DPH is the regulator
11/19/2017	Sally	Rieger	Simsbury		state water plan personal comments.docx
11/19/2017	Leah	Lopez Schmalz	New Haven	CFE/Save the Sound	CFE Save the Sound's State Water Plan Comments.pdf
11/19/2017	Betsy	Gara	West Hartford	CT Council of Small Towns (COST)	Comments - State Water Plan 2017.pdf
11/19/2017	Shirley	Dudley	Bloomfield		I am in agreement that Connecticut needs a comprehensive statewide water plan. I am also aware that there is a CT Water Planning Council working on this idea. For many of us several things have stood out recently to cause concern about the future of our water usage and supply. The first is the possibility of more droughts due to climate change. Many of us do not have the knowledge or incentive to know best how to conserve water in those instances of drought and, more importantly, do not think that it is our responsibility. We think that there is a never-ending supply. The second thing was the authorization of a water bottling plant in the vicinity of Bloomfield – even when there was a drought. This woke us up to a potential shortage in the future. We could not believe that this happened without our knowledge, certainly without an opportunity to weigh in on the matter. Recently I attended a very good talk for our Adult Learning Program by Andrew Fisk, Executive Dir. of the CT River Conservancy, on River Crystals and River's Flow and Change. He gave us a very good understanding of how climate change along with other factors affect fish and other critters in our streams, and the effect that stocking reservoirs has on the down streams. He helped us understand some of the changes that need to be made to encourage the safe passage of some of our fish and many thoughts about the interplay of the river's extensive biology, hydro-electric needs, and safe-drinking water. There are already places in our country where people have insufficient water supplies and there are disagreements. A sensible Water Plan to aid in the decision-making of the future makes extremely good sense.
11/19/2017	David	James	Meriden		Water as a utility should be guaranteed and priced by use. We have decoupled with electricity, we can do so with water. Conservation= sustainability. Profit=depletion
11/19/2017	Philip	Arnold	Woodbridge		1) Take care to maintain at least a minimal water flow in streams and rivers in times of drought. 2) Distribute info on how to make rain gardens to reduce runoff and pollution from roads and paved areas. Rain barrels as well. 3) Encourage the use of water saving bathroom equipment; shower heads, toilets, etc. 4) Discourage over watering lawns and the use of excessive fertilizer on lawns and other flora. 5) Test water in rivers and streams periodically for pollution.
11/19/2017	Lee	Dunbar	Mansfield Center		There are several areas where the plan as drafted falls short of meeting its stated goals: 1. "Management should follow scientific examples" is identified as the first Top 10 Consensus-based Recommendation. I concur. To achieve this goal there must be recognition that "good" or "sound" science absolutely cannot be performed in the absence of access to control or reference sites where the ecological condition that would exist in the absence of human influence can be observed. Environmental science is by its nature a comparative endeavor. You cannot do valid science to evaluate and quantify the impact of human activities on the natural ecology without reference sites. Separating the effects of human activity from natural variability and the effects of broad scale changes (e.g. climate change) requires that scientists can monitor locations where human influence is minimal. The plan notes that resources are needed for monitoring and water data collection, management, and analysis. It does not stress that protections need to be provided for those few stream segments in the State where human influences (principally diversions and development) minimally impact water quality or quantity. This is perhaps the Plan's greatest flaw. 2. The plan advocates for protection of high quality water for current and future drinking water supplies. Good. However, the plan only mentions providing adequate quantity for aquatic life use. Where is the balance here? Healthy aquatic ecological systems require clean water to an even greater extent than is necessary to support human uses since aquatic organisms are incapable of applying technology to treat water prior to its use. If there is any hope of developing a truly balanced plan for managing water resources, there must be recognition that aquatic ecosystems require not just adequate amounts of water but also adequate amounts of high quality water. It is not enough to highlight protection of Class I and II land for human use - similar efforts are needed to protect watersheds for ecological use. 3. The plan must highlight the need to resolve the issue of registered diversions. The "grandfathered" problem is the single greatest impediment to rational and informed management of the state's water resources. The issues associated with grandfathered diversions are too numerous to list here but resolution must be a priority - perhaps a diversion credit trading program to preserve registrants perceived rights to water, perhaps a gradual transition to permits, perhaps sun-setting legislation. Something must be done, soon. 4. Balance requires that the WUCC planning process be consistent with the State Water Plan. The WUCC plans address human use and human need/supply. Balance dictates that these plans be developed to implement the human use side of the balance established in the State Plan - not dictate the human use needs and expect the ecological uses side of the equation to make do with what's left over. The appropriate hierarchy would be - State Plan of Conservation and Development, State Water Plan, WUCC Plan. Thank you for your time and attention.
11/19/2017	Louise	Washer	Georgetown	Norwalk River Watershed Association	water plan letter 11-19.docx
11/19/2017	Richard	Watson	Bloomfield		To Whom it may Concern, I have a motto I try to live by that may help shed light on the issue of "balance" in the plan. I am glad this subject is included already, even with its inconclusive and debated slants on the subject. It seems that some aspects of "Compassion" have been raised although not by name. I would like to add this word into the mix in the context of our American Pledge of Allegiance to the of American flag and the "Republic for which it stands," one nation, indivisible, with liberty and JUSTICE for ALL." Now that may seem inconsequential to most, or far too broad for in the water plan situation, but it certainly is NOT! It is, in fact, one of the conclusions to (nearly) all the world's faith traditions. We are here not for the powerful who wish to grab as much of the world's goods for themselves at the expense of the less powerful! We are here to learn to live in harmonious relationship with all Nature's creations and benefits, with Compassion, aka Justice, for all. These benefits include sanctuary, security, and equitable access to the gifts of the world's resources, including clean air, and clean WATER, in balance with the social needs of communities. So I offer this bit of all-important wisdom which I pen under all my communications, I wish I could find the author: Compassion means justice—and compassion is "just" to the extent that it gives to each person what is rightfully his or hers ...and theirs or its! (even fish, streams, oceans, mountains, animals, ad infinitum! Thank you for your interest and consideration, and best wishes for the best Water Plan in America! Richard Watson P.S. For greater information on this and related subjects, always consider THE EARTH CHARTER @earthcharter.org
11/19/2017	David	James	Meriden	Quinnipiac River Watershed Association	QRWA111917.docx
11/19/2017	Virginia	de Lima	West Hartford		I have some main concerns that are not addressed in the State Water Plan: 1) Analysis at the regional scale is pretty meaningless (although I get it that was all that was possible with time/money constraints) because most of our issues are at a very local scale (think dry stream channels near wells) 2) The plan does not establish a mechanism for making decisions about water use; when push comes to shove, who's going to "win"? and who will make that decision? Those of us who were involved in the process of developing the draft State Water Plan understand that this is a GREAT FIRST STEP in moving towards proper management of water resources in Connecticut. We know that this plan presents a framework for moving forward and is not the answer to all our water issues; there has to be an on-going, iterative process. Unfortunately, I don't believe this is fully understood by the public. There are many issues that have been brought up that are not addressed because there was not consensus around them. Therefore, I think there needs to be an additional section in the report that addresses these concerns and either "bins" them into pathways forward or proposes another mechanism by which they can be addressed.
11/19/2017	Rod	Parlee	Bolton		The plan should include detailed data and maps of Level "A" aquifers in the state. Encourage support of the CT DEEP RBV and Stream temperature monitoring program. Develop a statewide baseline of stream, pond and lake temperatures. Have detailed data on salt water intrusion and set goals on how to manage. Address the issue of importance of water conservation vs over consumption. Make the reduction of extraction during droughts mandatory!
11/19/2017	Marija	Mikolajczak	Greenwich		Innovative ideas for water protection and safety should be considered. For example replacing traditional sewage treatment with municipal biodigesters (create energy, clean compost, and clean water). Another example, promoting composting toilets at home and commercial levels with preference over septic and changing regulatory situation to promote the more environmentally based composting over septic which lead to nitrogen overload. Everyone must conserve water, including large companies. The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. Plan for the inevitability of droughts: Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. Protect healthy streams. Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. It is currently legal to drawdown or extract water from groundwater and other sources creating artificial droughts resulting in aquatic wildlife kills. Prior regulatory language that served to protect our water supplies was eliminated in 2012. The importance attached to a well-conceived state water plan should include the establishment of tiers of use and thresholds of restraint/restriction when rainfall deficits produce obvious reductions in available resources. Since this resource has been monetized, so should it's negligent overuse in times of relative scarcity. Establish and approve a governing structure for the existing Water Planning Council to properly and effectively oversee the best use and management of water sources in the public trust. Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust. A CT State Water Plan must unequivocally support and allow for complete transparency of utility water use and management data by the State, and more specifically, water utility exemptions from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) must be eliminated.
11/20/2017	Leah	Lopez Schmalz	New Haven	CFE/Save the Sound	CFE-STS State Water Plan Comments Addendum.pdf

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
11/20/2017	Jean	Bruder	Cos Cob		Protect healthy streams. Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. It is currently legal to drawdown or extract water from groundwater and other sources creating artificial droughts resulting in aquatic wildlife kills. Prior regulatory language that served to protect our water supplies was eliminated in 2012. Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels.
11/20/2017	Matthew L	Kocyba	Cos Cob		The development of a State Water Plan (SWP) presents a unique opportunity for the people of Connecticut, to protect our valuable natural waters for own and future generations. It is our responsibility not only to move this Plan forward but to be sure that it consequential. Long under development, the SWP must propose precise means to solve the problems highlighted below in a timely manner: Everyone must conserve water, including large companies. The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. Plan for the inevitability of droughts: Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. Protect healthy streams. Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. It is currently legal to drawdown or extract water from groundwater and other sources creating artificial droughts resulting in aquatic wildlife kills. Prior regulatory language that served to protect our water supplies was eliminated in 2012. The importance attached to a well-conceived state water plan should include the establishment of tiers of use and thresholds of restraint/restriction when rainfall deficits produce obvious reductions in available resources. Since this resource has been monetized, so should it's negligent overuse in times of relative scarcity. Establish and approve a governing structure for the existing Water Planning Council to properly and effectively oversee the best use and management of water sources in the public trust. Evaluate all existing large water diversions: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust. A CT State Water Plan must unequivocally support and allow for complete transparency of utility water use and management data by the State, and more specifically, water utility exemptions from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) must be eliminated.
11/20/2017	Ed	Edelson	Southbury		Excellent and comprehensive report. My main concerns based on the executive report are: 1) stronger statement on handling unused diversion registration to minimize risk of future withdrawals at time of drought, 2) the concept of balance is not just between water uses but also with land uses; the latter affects water recharge and groundwater quality and it is not just about agricultural use, 3) I did not see reference to the need for municipalities to be able to enforce restrictions in time of severe drought. I would encourage some words about the need not to constrain economic development based on the severe drought scenario; instead focus should be on low-impact development that minimizes impact of severe drought situation. Towns should be encouraged to consider retrofitting infrastructure to apply LID. I continue to believe that the ecological models are in need of refinement/calibration before they can be used reliably. This is based on my experience with the Meso-Habitat simulation tool used in the Pomperaug Watershed. Its modeling results did not correlate well with our anecdotal experience. More work is needed here.
11/20/2017	Laura	Cahn	New Haven		Dear Water Planning Council: Thank you for compiling a comprehensive water analysis for Connecticut. I hope this plan will help us preserve our natural resources and not encourage squandering them. Suggestions: Conservation – Set public water limits for synthetic turf, golf courses, commercial properties with large lawns, and other non-essential users. They should be encouraged to collect and store rainwater for their use. Give athletic field maintenance entities accurate information about the true cost of synthetic turf on the environment -- not just water use, but also the impact of covering large pieces of soil with plastic and preserving it with chemicals. Educate users to maximize benefits of water use: by watering lawns early in the morning (if at all), for example. Balance - Consider the effect on wildlife of every use of the water and the land around it. Keep access for birds, bees, bats, insects, and animals that depend upon this habitat. Maintain Highest Quality Drinking Water and Maintain Scientific Data – Test water for chemicals used on lawns and gardens, such as glyphosate and dicamba, as those chemicals do not dissipate and are especially likely to be a factor when water levels are low and water is taken from near the bottom of a source. Laura Cahn Concerned Citizen and Chairwoman of The New Haven Environmental Advisory Council
11/20/2017	Maureen	Westbrook	Clinton		As one who has been involved in the State Water Plan process from the onset with roles on various committees, I want to commend the WPC for the timely completion of the draft plan and the extent to which it strives to achieve the intended balance required by the Public Act. There was considerable effort to carefully craft text and any recommendations to reflect a consensus of stakeholders. Where that could not be achieved, the issues or concepts were appropriately noted and recommended for further study. There are clearly more areas such as stormwater management, wastewater, and land use that need to be explored to have a full picture of the state's water resources. The plan provides a solid foundation to which those – and other issues - can be considered as time allows and more data and information is available. The plan provides an approach and process for examining such issues which should be followed, with the current document considered a 'start' to the process. With that in mind, I urge you to consider all the public comments received but NOT to make any substantive changes or additions to the plan recommendations in areas that were not already discussed or would not be consistent with the interests of all the stakeholders. Specifically, if the plan is revised to include recommendations that would pursue amendments to expand the streamflow regulations before the impacts of the current rules are fully understood or to revoke or reduce registrations that are in use and not truly 'obsolete' there would be considerable opposition to that. Further, new requirements for drought response or water use restrictions for large water users which have been suggested have not been vetted through the process would clearly cause concern by a number of parties. There is still an unknown legislative process before the plan is adopted and it is important to avoid complicating that by making substantive changes now to the plan that would take away from the stakeholder driven, consensus-based approach that has been used to date. Finally, it is critical that the plan identify a process and criteria for the WPC to consider before proposing or supporting any legislation to ensure it fully considers and reflects the intent of the plan and does not select single issues or take information out of context to advocate for a particular position. Thank you.
11/20/2017	Robert	kaliszewski	Hartford	CT DEEP	DEEPCommentsSWP112017.pdf
11/20/2017	Anitra Brooks	Kocyba	Greenwich		The development of a State Water Plan (SWP) presents a unique opportunity for the people of Connecticut, to protect our valuable natural waters for own and future generations. It is our responsibility not only to move this Plan forward but to be sure that it consequential. Long under development, the SWP must propose precise means to solve the problems highlighted below in a timely manner: EVERYONE MUST CONSERVE WATER, INCLUDING LARGE COMPANIES: The final SWP should recommend automatic, enforceable conservation measures for large water users, including private water companies and municipalities, during times of drought. PLAN FOR THE INEVITABILITY OF DROUGHTS: Connecticut must complete a drought plan for all 169 towns as soon as possible and include enforceable triggers for when conservation measures must be taken. PROTECT HEALTHY STREAMS: Maintaining streamflows is critical to protecting water quality and habitat for fish and wildlife. The plan should recommend that the loophole that allows water withdrawals attained through groundwater pumping be closed and require those withdrawals to be subject to Connecticut's streamflow regulations. It is currently legal to drawdown or extract water from groundwater and other sources creating artificial droughts resulting in aquatic wildlife kills. Prior regulatory language that served to protect our water supplies was eliminated in 2012. The importance attached to a well-conceived state water plan should include the establishment of tiers of use and thresholds of restraint/restriction when rainfall deficits produce obvious reductions in available resources. Since this resource has been monetized, so should it's negligent overuse in times of relative scarcity. Establish and approve a governing structure for the existing Water Planning Council to properly and effectively oversee the best use and management of water sources in the public trust. EVALUATE ALL EXISTING LARGE WATER DIVERSIONS: Many large water diversions were grandfathered in decades ago, with no permit process to evaluate the potential impacts on water supplies. The final SWP should call for a thorough review of all grandfathered registrations (not just expired or unused ones) to ensure that active diversions do not adversely impact water levels. A statewide water plan needs to directly identify and communicate the social and financial benefits of Connecticut's natural water resources as well as the necessity of adequate natural water resources for the subsistence and benefit of the general public and wildlife in the public trust. A CT State Water Plan must unequivocally support and allow for complete transparency of utility water use and management data by the State, and more specifically, water utility exemptions from the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) must be eliminated.
11/20/2017	David	Sutherland	New Haven	The Nature Conservancy	Comments - Water Plan - The Nature Conservancy 11-20-2017.pdf
11/20/2017	Susannah	Wood	Norfolk		The plan should establish that water is a public resource. It seems too obvious to have to state, but our lives depend on access to clean water, as do the ecosystems we depend on. Private bottling companies should not have unlimited access to our water and their acquisition of it should be part of a larger plan that takes note of potential droughts and who has first rights to the water of the state - its citizens. The plan needs to tackle protection of watersheds and streams in drought conditions more clearly and fully. Also, as we live in an area with many private wells, I strongly urge much more positive effort to make well-testing easily available and more public outreach to alert the public to the need for such testing.
11/20/2017	Wanda	Colman	Tariffville		To3.docx
11/20/2017	Craig & Deborah	Repasz & Johnson	New Haven	The New Haven Bird Club	Water Plan comments from The New Haven Bird Club.docx
11/20/2017	Michael	Muszynski	New Haven	CT Conference of Municipalities	CCM Comments - Draft State Water Plan.pdf
11/20/2017	Patricia	Young	Haddam	Eightmile River Wild & Scenic Coordinating Committee and Salmon River Watershed Partnership	CTWaterPlan.pdf
11/20/2017	William	Urban	Seymour	Connecticut Conservation Association	The Connecticut Conservation Association fully supports the comments regarding the Draft CT State Water Plan submitted by the Farmington River Watershed Association and Rivers Alliance of CT. William (Bill) Urban Executive Director CT Conservation Association (submitted by Margaret Miner, Rivers Alliance of CT at the request of Mr. Urban who does not use email)
11/20/2017	R Kingsbury	Chase	Simsbury		I endorse the comments made by the Farmington River Watershed Assoc.
11/20/2017	David	Radka	Clinton	Connecticut Water Company	CWC SWP Comments.pdf
11/20/2017	John	Breen	Braintree, MA	CPV Towantic, LLC	Connecticut State Water Plan - Towantic Comments Nov 20 2017.docx
11/20/2017	Seth	Molofsky	Amston	Environmental Professionals' Organization of CT	EPOC Comments on Final Draft Report on CT State Water Plan.pdf
11/20/2017	Tony	Rescigno	New Haven	Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce	Water Plan comments Greater New Haven Chamber.pdf
11/20/2017	John	Hudak	New Haven	South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority	2017-11-20 RWA comment letter SWP.pdf

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
					The State Water Plan must refrain from imposing any new or expanded unfunded mandates on municipalities. Policymakers must be careful not to create any additional barriers to economic development that would undermine efforts of towns to grow their grand lists and provide much-needed jobs for residents. Ensuring the availability of public water supplies to meet the public health, safety and economic development needs of residents and businesses should be of paramount importance. The process for determining how to implement the State Water Plan must be collaborative, consensus-driven, and based on data and sound science. The State Water Plan must ensure that it does not impose requirements on municipalities that exceed existing state and federal requirements. Given the magnitude of the state's economic and budgetary problems, the State Water Plan should focus its resources on addressing areas where there are actual impairments in water quality or documented low flows in streams. The State Water Plan should ensure that state policies support the use of interconnections and interbasin Transfers by removing regulatory barriers. There should be a clear process for determining how recommendations should be developed and implemented, ensuring ample opportunity for municipalities to weigh in on how the recommendations may impact municipalities and property taxpayers. As drafted, the plan appears to cede too much authority to the Water Planning Council, which does not include a municipal representative. The State Water Plan should identify regulatory issues that undermine efforts to address water quality and availability issues and/or support new businesses. The plan should acknowledge the limited staff and resources available to state agencies and identify recommendations for streamlining permit processes and other regulatory approvals.
11/20/2017	Tom	Banisch	Madison	Town of Madison	
11/20/2017	James	Marpe	Westport	First Selectman	Water Plan comments.docx
					The Office of Consumer Counsel supports a comprehensive Connecticut State Water Plan. OCC commends the WPC for adopting a plan that is balanced and the result of a consensus stakeholder process. OCC believes the current draft plan maintains the necessary balance intended by the law. The OCC cautions the Water Planning Council from making substantial changes to the plan that are outside the issues vetted in the initial stakeholder process. As the consumer advocate for the customers of the water utility companies regulated by PURA, OCC recommends that the costs of plan implementation should be equitably borne by all users, and not unduly impact water utility customers. The WPC should carefully consider the impacts of any modifications to the plan have on water rates and strive to maintain affordable water rates for consumers and businesses across the state.
11/20/2017	Richard	Sobolewski	New Britain	State of CT - Office of Consumer Counsel	
11/20/2017	Peter	Galant	Trumbull		Comments on Draft State Water Plan - Galant.pdf
					As a consulting engineer with 35 years of working with both Water Utilities and State Agencies, I applaud the State for preparing a very balanced Statewide water plan. One of the top priorities in the plan is and should continue to be protecting public health through preserving adequate supplies of high quality drinking water. In addition to protecting public health, cities and towns rely on these supplies to facilitate growth and foster a strong economy. The adequacy and reliability of these water systems are a testament to the foresight of previous generations, who obtained and developed these major sources of supply that we take for granted. Where would Hartford be with the MDC reservoir, or greater Boston without Quabbin. As an environmentalist as well as an engineer, I am very concerned about some of the comments submitted which would severely undermine the adequacy of water supplies in Connecticut; specifically, comments that recommend 1)eliminating registered diversions, 2) extending streamflow regulations to groundwater supplies, 3) imposing stringent water conservation requirements that may be unattainable, and 4) imposing new permitting requirements on high volume users. The current DEEP Water Diversion policy, although not perfect, strikes a fair balance between consumptive uses and other essential uses of water. The water utilities we work with work hard to meet their customers demands under the current regulatory status. Providing additional regulatory requirements to this already highly regulated resource will result in losses of vital available supplies, reduce the margins of safety the State mandates these system maintains, creating more frequent water shortages, and restrict potential economic growth, which is needed now more than ever. I ask the Water Planning Council keep Public Water Supply as a top priority when considering how to address competing water needs.
11/20/2017	James	Ericson	Glastonbury	Lenard Engineering	
11/20/2017	Steve	Pratt	Hartford	MDC	SP Comments of the Final Draft of the State Water Plan.pdf
11/20/2017	Eric	Brown	Hartford	CBIA	Draft Water Plan.pdf
11/20/2017	James	Randazzo	Hartford	MDC	Final Draft Report- CT State Water Plan - J. Randazzo comments November 2017.pdf
					I am an environmental attorney who has consistently represented the public interest in CT for nearly 30 years. I believe the most important element of any plan or regulatory system of protecting water as a public resource which properly resides in the public trust, is to repeal or at least sunset water registrations. Many of these registrations were made at a time when the volumes of water which could be safely drawn from surface water systems and the adjacent subsurface aquifers was misunderstood. As we now know that the combined registrations are not sustainable, there should be an expeditious repeal and release of these waters back to the public trust. Following that, interbasin transfer permits and regulated withdrawal of water can be made after proof that cold water fisheries, riverine habitats and other wetlands will not be degraded. Another rule should be the immediate confirmation that water supply volumes and capacities in existing impoundments and reservoirs should be publicly available without redaction so that the public may assess any claims of safe yield and capacity made by water companies and other stewards of the public's water.
11/20/2017	Keith	Ainsworth, Esq.	Madison		
					Although the State Water Plan Final Draft Report was full of information, it did not look at how we got to this point. The report should include a section discussing historical usage of water in the State. I think it would be beneficial since most of our cities and towns were located in areas with the abundance of water. This was for irrigation, power, travel, etc. As the cities and towns flourished, dependence on water changed. Are we now at the point where this needs to change? The plan is also very one sided, it looks mostly at water system and their usage. This is most likely due to the available data. I think the State Plan should look at all the competing interests, the water needed for each and the economical impacts. It really does not. What needs to be done is look at entire State's water needs as a whole, not just water systems. Diversion Regulations are only one part of it. The State needs to spend more time doing investigative research. This needs to be done scientifically. The State doesn't have the stream flow gauges necessary to draw conclusions. It doesn't have the ground water monitoring in place necessary to make recommendations. This report shows that more work is needed before any new regulations are implemented. The report also does not really acknowledge that there are many different surface water classifications and ground water classification than A and B. Seeing this makes the document suspect. Thank you for your time.
11/20/2017	Patrick	Kearney	Mancheseter		
					We need to ensure that we are doing everything within our ability to leave a positive legacy and protect our precious natural resource - water. It is abundantly clear that we do not have a limitless supply of fresh water given our recent experiences with severe drought in our state. Bottled water should not be allowed to be sold out of state as this depletes our own water supply. Fertilizers and herbicides and pesticides should have sales tax apply for all non-farm use. State and town governments need to have a stronger partnership to educate our citizens about water including posting of information about proper use of chemicals in town halls, websites and at the point of purchase. Significant fees should apply to the permitting for lawn irrigation systems. All new systems should be required to have humidity sensors so water is not wasted.
11/20/2017	Kim	McClain	Glastonbury		
11/20/2017	James	Toner	Alexandria, VA	International Bottled Water Association	CT Water Plan Comments Final 112017.pdf
11/20/2017	Stephen	Anderson	Hartford	Connecticut Department of Agriculture	171120 Water Plan Comments.pdf
11/20/2017	Daniel	Lawrence	Bridgeport	Aquarion Water Company	Aquarion Comments on Draft State Water Plan 11202017.pdf
11/20/2017	Karl	Wagener	Hartford	Council on Environmental Quality	CEQ Comments on State Water Plan Final Draft Report.pdf
11/20/2017	Michael	Elliott	Norwalk	First Taxing District Water Department	2017 11 20.FTDWD Comments SWP.pdf
11/20/2017	Mary	Mushinsky	Wallingford	State Representative 85th District	Comments of Rep. Mary Mushinsky re Draft Water Plan.docx
11/20/2017	Elizabeth	Craig	Wilton	Town of Wilton	State Water Plan - Craig.pdf
					I am concerned that the State Water Plan outlines broad recommendations without clearly identifying how implementation of the plan will impact the state budget. Clearly, the state should not be moving forward with comprehensive new programs without determining what the impact will be on taxpayers. In addition, it appears that the plan may be used as a vehicle to impose additional barriers on new housing and commercial projects. The state should refrain from enacting policies that create additional roadblocks and/or cost burdens on private development. While it is important to protect the state's water resources, the plan should target recommendations to areas affected by contamination or inadequate water supplies.
11/20/2017	Jon	Berardino	Westbrook		
					There needs to be better transparency for environmental organizations and planning purposes. Public Act 17-211 was supposed to partially instill this, but maps remain redacted and FOIA requests are still being denied. This plan needs to recognize that water resources are a public right. In times of need, public need and access needs to be priority over business enterprise, especially non-essential water uses or sales. There should be no monetizing of public water resources, period, and any mention of it needs to be removed from the state water plan. No further contracts similar to the MDC large volume sales to Niagara should be issued in the future. Water resources that exist in the state should not be bottled and sold out of state for profit. All possible measures to rescind the current Niagara and MDC contract should be made. Low water, pre-drought and drought conditions need to be better considered, and large volume users, such as bottling plants, should be subject to reduction and suspension of use for the public good and to maintain adequate reservoirs. Registered water diversions should be subject to environmental impact reviews, with low water flows considered. Retirement of registrations also needs to be considered.
11/20/2017	Jennifer	Siskind	South Glastonbury		
11/20/2017	Maritza	Bond	Bridgeport	Bridgeport Department of Health	Water Plan Comments.pdf
					From the Bloomfield Conservation, Energy, and Environment Committee: Water is arguably our most vital public resource. Given our state's poor rating for water conservation, the state plan needs to recommend endorsement of "Watersense" appliances and the promotion of water conservation policies. Conservation may result in less need for expanded "new" infrastructure, less stress on water treatment plants, greater margins of safety during periods of drought, and healthier streams and rivers. "Conservation pricing" for water should be studied for use by the large municipal water utilities. There is a need to de-couple water utility income from the volume of water sold; otherwise, there will always be economic impetus to sell more water and a disincentive to conserve. The state plan should specifically oppose "declining block rate structures" which charge lower rates for entities who use more water. The state water planning process should move ahead ASAP with creation of a drought response plan which uses a uniform classification of the stages of drought, allows the declaration of regional drought, calls for the revision of earlier drought triggers, and develops a standardized municipal action plan to be initiated when drought occurs. The state should expeditiously establish a procedure for reviewing/retiring all unused water registrations, especially in watersheds which are stressed. Class I and Class II watershed land should be protected from development or disturbance. As these lands provide key protection for the quality of CT's Class A water supply, enacting exemptions to this current state law will result in a dangerous precedent. Stream flow regulations should be expanded to include streams affected by ground water pumping. Streams and rivers in CT should not be pumped dry. Reasonable regulations providing oversight of large, industrial water bottling operations should be developed, especially as this industry sends treated municipal drinking water out of local watersheds and out of state. A renewable permit system based on long term water demand forecasts should be considered. During periods of drought, when water restrictions are enacted for residents, they should apply to large scale water bottlers as well.
11/20/2017	Marie	MacDonald	Bloomfield	Conservation, Energy & Environment Committee, Town of Bloomfield	
11/20/2017	Frank	DeFelice	Durham		Draft Water Plan Comments.docx
11/20/2017	Robert	Santy	Rocky Hill	Connecticut Economic Resource Center, Inc.	WaterPlan letter.docx
					First, thank you for this Draft State Water Plan, clearly it is an extraordinary effort by many many people, to address the most precious resource of our state. Connecticut must maintain its position that our drinking water be of the highest quality, its not something we can lose and then regain. From a local public health perspective, two issues stand out (although all issues identified in the plan are important and relevant). Conservation must become a high priority and future effort will determine how to best accomplish the outreach and education necessary. And private water supply wells, which serve much of our population, will need to be elevated in our statewide outreach and education efforts as well. Implementation - The effort to bring this Plan forward must be maintained. Balancing our State's water needs is an on-going process - it will not be a completed process, nor should it. It will require the commitment of all stakeholders and a commitment of resources to keep the effort one of integrity.
11/20/2017	Donna	Culbert	Newtown	Director of Health Newtown Health District	

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
11/20/2017	Gary	Pozzato	Vernon		I see a big loop-hole for CT water utilities. The loop-hole is this: The Water Diversion Program regulates activities that cause, allow or result in the withdrawal from, or the alteration, modification or diminution of, the instantaneous flow of the waters of the state through individual and general permits. The WDP regulates certain water delivered via pipe line. Bottling water companies sending the bottles by truck anywhere out of that area or state should require a total review by DPH and DEEP and require a "Diversion Permit". Thank you for your time and consideration.
11/20/2017	John	Looney	New Haven	Connecticut Fund for the Environment / Save the Sound	2017 11 20 Additionla Comment on Frial Draft State Water Plan .docx
11/20/2017	Jim	Miersfelder	Goshen	Woodridge Lake Sewer District	State Water Plan Draft Woodridge Lake Sewer District Comments 11.20.17.pdf
11/20/2017	Anne	Hulick	Hartford	Clean Water Action	CWA comments to state water plan FINAL.pdf
11/20/2017	Peter	Gorman	Woodbridge	Connecticut Association of Golf Course Superintendents	Water Plan Written Comments - CAGCS.pdf
11/20/2017	Michael	Crespan	New Milford	Town of New Milford / New Milford Health Department	With regard to water supply issues, I recommend that consideration be given to requiring or providing incentives for public water supply companies to take a more active role in the expansion of their water supply systems. This is important for resolving problems related to accessing basic water service as well as for potential water quality and quantity issues with private wells. In the municipality I represent, New Milford, there are commercial properties where the public water supply mains are close by but still far enough away so that it is not financially feasible for one customer to extend the water main and connect to the public water supply. In these cases it would seem reasonable for the public water supply company to be involved in extending the water mains. The public water companies reap a benefit from extended water mains and it would seem fair for these companies to be financially involved in assisting with these extensions. They are adding to their customer base from the property owner that wants to have service as well as other from other property owners with private wells (or vacant properties) that may choose to connect in the future. In some cases, these gaps in service in New Milford have caused very serious problems for property owners and the public water supplier has been completely uninvolved and uninterested. Whether there is some mechanism such as legislation or funding assistance or a combination, I think the public water supply companies should bear greater responsibility for seeing that the property owners in their exclusive service areas are provided an opportunity to access public water service at a reasonable cost.
11/20/2017	Art	Elmers	Fort Lee		When considering ways to conserve potable water I ask that there consideration be made for all those in the irrigation industry in Connecticut. Please don't simply ban outside watering of landscapes or restrict usage to two days a week. This only serves to destroy an industry and leads to the loss of thousands of jobs as well as reduces any mitigation of green house gases provided by healthy turf and landscapes. Strategies to be considered to conserve outdoor water use on landscapes include: 1. Require or encourage use of Smart Irrigation Technology 2. Sales Tax Holidays for the purchase of Water Conserving Products 3. Set water allotments based on lot size which could be adjusted for different drought levels and allows the consumer to prioritize which areas of their property to maintain. 4. Require flow monitoring, recording and reporting of outdoor water usage. 5. Multi-Tiered water pricing. 6. Require or encourage the use of high efficiency micro or drip irrigation. 7. Require or encourage use for outdoor landscaping of reclaimed water wherever possible. Consider that Irrigation Professionals know the ways in which to reduce outdoor water use and to arbitrarily curtail outdoor water use without using the knowledge base of these professionals is a waste of our most precious resource, the Human one.
11/20/2017	Alicea	Charamut	Middletown	Connecticut River Conservancy	CRC Draft Final Report CSWP Comments.pdf
11/20/2017	Stephanie C.	Fox	Bloomfield		Water bottling operations are an unnecessary and private drain on a public resource. Once a water bottling corporation sinks its pumps into a well, it will never, ever stop sucking water out. It will spend money - and it has that money to burn - on attorneys to delay its ever being forced to do so. Meanwhile, it will crash the ecosystem it is drying, leaving human residents and other species with ruin and insufficient water. The revenue stream from this idioy will be temporary, and the damage permanent. Do everything you can to impede that! Thank you.
11/20/2017	Mary	Pelletier	Hartford	Park Watershed	Park Watershed StateWaterPlan_Nov2017.pdf
11/20/2017	Lori	Brown	Hartford	CT League of Conservation Voters	State Water Plan testimony 11-20-17.docx
11/20/2017	Martin	Mador	Hamden	River Advocates of South Central CT.	1. The new water plan must provide for a procedure to examine grandfathered registrations and determine whether each should be continued or retired. These registrations had no environmental review of the consequences when issued and carried a promise there would never be one. At the Wallingford November 8 hearing, I told the story of a registration obtained when the diversion system was instituted in the early 1980s. In accord with the new rules, the applicant demonstrated that millions of gallons of water were taken from the river in 1915 to fight a fire. So the registration was granted for that amount with no examination whatsoever of the consequences. The diversion was subsequently halted for over a decade. Again following the rules, it was reinstated years later with no review of the consequences. 2. Diversions for sections of the Quinnipiac River are so extensive that owners actually have the legal right to withdraw more water than exists in the river. There must be a procedure for examining these over allocated river segments and ensuring that the needs of the river itself are honored. Martin Mador, President, River Advocates of South Central CT. Board of Directors, River Alliance Past President, Quinnipiac River Watershed Assn. Co-Founder, Mill River Watershed Assn. Legislative and Political Chair, Sierra Club-Connecticut Chapter
11/20/2017	Andy	Markowski	Avon	National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB/Connecticut)	Letter to PURA re state water plan 11.20.2017.pdf
11/20/2017	Elizabeth	Gara	West Hartford	CWWA	Comments - SWP - CWWA.pdf
11/20/2017	Margaret	Miner	Litchfield	Rivers Alliance of CT	171120-FINALRACOMMENTSondrftWaterPlan.doc
11/20/2017	Lori	Mathieu	Hartford	CT DPH	20171120161213288.pdf
11/20/2017	Kathy	Fay	New Haven		Thank you for all your hard work drafting the CT State Water Plan. Water is one of Connecticut's most valuable resources and understanding more about it helps everyone to use it wisely. Water is a public trust resource and that fact should be mentioned more often in the Plan. It is owned by all of Connecticut's citizens' and should be managed for everyone's benefit, now and into the future. This should be the guiding principle for all water management decisions and stated front and center in the State Water Plan. Related to acknowledging water as a public trust resource, I think allowing the grandfathered taking of water is wrong. Registered Diversions which dry up streams and kill fish is bad water management and should be prohibited. Registered Diversions should be addressed in more concrete steps, such as subjecting them all to CT DEEP's environmental review by 2020. Since water is a public trust resource, we should have a vigorous water conservation program, making sure water is regarded as a valuable resource for everyone. This program should be spearheaded by entities other than water utilities, whose revenues are based on volume of water sold. Personally, I think it is crucial to focus more on stormwater management and green infrastructure and protection of watershed lands. Additionally, a prohibition of acceptance of fracking wastes or allowing pesticides to be used near state waterways is crucial. Not only are humans depending on our water resources, but all the other species with which we share this public resource. Thank you for your consideration
11/20/2017	Neal	Lustig	Southbury	Pomperaug Health District	A very well prepared and thought out CT State Water Plan Summary which will be useful for generations of CT citizens. AS a long term Olcal Director of Health, clean and sufficient drinking water is a key component in the maintenance of good public and environmental health for the citizens of our communities. I will note one serious omission in the 692 page report and 44 page Executive Summary. The impact of polluted ground water systems, especially those affecting public well water supplies was not addressed anywhere in this report. A significant portion of CT Well Water Supply system has been affected by volatile solvent compounds from numerous industrial activities including dry cleaners, gas stations, machine shops and improper disposal of hazardous waste. In the Pomperaug Basin of Ct this has severely impacted the well fields in Woodbury and has been noted since 1979. Orders were issued by DEEP and rescinded and other orders to study and abate were prepared and written but never signed by the Commissioner. As a matter of fact public health was protected by the installation of Carbon Filters and late on Air Strippers. While this solved the immediate short term public health problem it never served to clean up and ground water systems, especially in public stratified drift supplies, not was justice ever served. The untoward side effects of this failure to "enforce" was the never ending gradual degradation of "clean public water" supplies but the inevitable economic black holes left behind. IN that situation the "owners" of the properties associated with the "pollution" can never pass an environmental sector commercial survey and therefor remain in a state of environmental and economic never land. This policy, presently the CT standard of sorts, lead to few cleanup of pollution ever occurring and serious economic dislocations in the local immediate area. While there is a section titled "Environmental Health" it refers to the "aquatic environment". In the public health world, "environmental health" refers to environmental factors that affect humans in some way. I suggest the pain be updated to at least make references to the numerous groundwater pollution areas in Ct, especially those affecting public well fields or future potential public well fields. Thank you
11/20/2017	Mary	Rydingsward	Bristol	Pequabuck River Watershed Association	WaterPlanComments.docx
11/20/2017	Richard	Margenot	Greenwich	Member of Greenwich Conservation Advocates	FOR THE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL2.docx
11/20/2017	Iris	Kaminski	New Haven		Please consider including the following in the plan. 1. Water is a basic necessity that one cannot live without; and therefore should be defined as belonging to the public not be sold to for-profit entities. 2. Pricing: a. The plan should consider what is the true cost of water and pricing should be done accordingly. The state could consider tier pricing or conservation pricing in ensure efficient use of water. b. As a necessity, water pricing should be included in the plan. 3. Preventing water pollution should be high on the list. It is easier to prevent pollution than to treat pollution, and in many cases pollution is irreversible. For example ground water once polluted - will self clean in a thousand years. Preventing pollution is crucial to preserve our water resources. I will just mention two types of pollution with my comment: a. Pollution from unsafe herbicides and pesticides used on private home lawns, golf courses, and for agriculture: These should be addressed in the Water plan. These types of pollutions should be stopped as soon as possible. Alternatives that are proven to be safe should be highly considered as substitutes. In my opinion it would be wise to out-phase known dangerous herbicides and pesticides use in Connecticut altogether. b. Pollution from sewage overflow: Some towns/cities have combined sewage systems that do not have capacities to carry additional loads when it rains. In these cases, raw sewage may overflow into our streams, rivers and into the Sound. I believe we should be proactive about finding ways to reduce loads (pricing mentioned in section 2), education, continue building bio swales, and encouraging people to rain harvest and conserve. Thank you very much for reviewing my comments.
11/20/2017	Joan	Margenot	Cos Cob		FOR THE WATER PLANNING COUNCIL.docx
11/20/2017	Kristin	Sullivan	Hartford	CTDPH State Health Improvement Planning	In 2014, DPH released Healthy Connecticut 2020: The Connecticut State Health Improvement Plan (SHIP), developed by a 150 member, multi sector, State Health Improvement Coalition. The Coalition identified Environmental Risk Factors and Health as one of the seven focus areas in the plan and a corresponding workgroup comprised of environmental experts and advocates, ensured that water quality was included as a concentration area for improved health by 2020. The work group understood that safe drinking water is fundamental to good health and noted that it is important to continuously monitor Connecticut's water supply for exposure to contaminants and ground water pollution, disease causing bacteria, and disruptions to water systems due to major weather events such as storms, floods or drought. Additionally, as part of the SHIP's focus on health equity, it was implicit that all Connecticut residents, regardless of where they live or social circumstances, should have access to the same level of safe, high quality drinking water. Since then, the workgroup has focused on other environmental risk factors. The draft CT State Water Plan and the provision to maintain high quality drinking water using the best data and science is a significant contribution towards a healthier Connecticut, and aligns with the overall intent of Healthy Connecticut initiative to improve the health of residents by 2020. For further alignment with SHIP or public health approach, the planning council may want to consider explicitly addressing equity in water quality, as part of future assessment, planning and policy development activities.
11/20/2017	Stephen	Geckeler	East Granby	CT Irrigation Contractors Association (CICA)	CICA CT WATER PLAN Comments 11-20-17.pdf

Date	First Name	Last Name	City/Town:	Organization (if applicable)	Open-Ended Response
11/20/2017	Stephen	Geckeler	Fairfield	Aqua-Lawn, Inc.	1. At page ES-20 The Water Plan should note for #3 - "Encourage use of current and future innovations in Landscape and Agricultural irrigation practices." As an irrigation professional in the state, I am aware of the large Landscape Irrigation industry that has significant scientific advances in efficient irrigation practices that could and should be utilized. 2. ES-20 #6 - I would like to make the Water Plan Council aware of an Irrigation Association (IA) Educational program and Elementary Curriculum that could be used as a resource. http://www.irrigation.org/IA/Resources/Elementary_School_Curricula/IA/Resources/Elementary_School_Curriculum.aspx or http://ymiclassroom.com/lesson-plans/irrigation/ Thank you for the ability to provide some feedback to the Draft Plan.
11/20/2017	Michael	Bisi	Glastonbury	Connecticut Water Pollution Abatement Assoc & CT Assoc of WPCAs	2017 CWPAA & CAWPCA State Water Plan Response.pdf
11/20/2017	Anthony	Piazza	Simsbury	Town of Simsbury WPCA	2017 Simsbury State Water Plan Comments.pdf
11/20/2017	Frank	DeFelice	Durham		20171205085008.pdf
11/20/2017	Jim	Cordier	East Hartford	East Hartford Health Department	1. Plan should make reference to and have integration with the State Plan of Conservation and Development making it a part of our policy blueprint. Doing so would give the plan more "force of law" in a manner of speaking. This could facilitate more local Planning and Zoning Board designations of aquifer protection zones and appropriate allowable uses (and implicit restrictions) therein. The Plan should also reference the state enabling legislation and best local practices for the establishment of such zones. The new plan should be an instrument that can be used by local Inland Wetlands Commissions when they consider subdivision plan applications (under CGS 22a - 45) and when they update their respective I/W regulations and assign appurtenant setbacks from wetlands, watercourses and aquifers that hold potential for future drinking water sources. 2. The Plan should also address excessive residential well drawdowns (such as filling large swimming pools) to help reduce rates of water consumption during droughts.