

# Connecticut Department of Public Health - Safe Drinking Water Primacy Assessment

## Meeting Summary

September 20, 2018 at 1:00 p.m.

Present: Yvonne Addo, Lori Mathieu, Rachel Nowek, Justin Milardo, Brie Wolf, Kate Keenan, Anne Foley, Kelly Sinko, Maureen Westbrook, Betsy Gara, Lori Vitagliano, Pat Kearney, Michelle Rakebrand, Ron Black;  
Via Phone: Brendan Fox, Chris Stone, Sam Alexander, Lee Albert

### **1. Public Water System classifications**

### **2. Background and Implementation of PA 17-2 Section 676**

### **3. Public Act 17-2 Section 677**

### **4. Discussion Summary**

- a) DPH feels it is important for the law to allow for controlled assessment increases, as personnel costs will increase over time and future federal funding levels are uncertain.
- b) Discussion occurred regarding the language of Public Act 17-2 Section 677 to include transient non-community public water systems in the methodology going forward. Section 676 for SFY 2019 does not currently have the state's 1,400 TNCs, small businesses receiving a bill.
- c) For inclusion of TNCs, the question was asked on what a fair assessment amount and reasonable sequence would be. DPH explained the difficulty in obtaining correct contact information for entities that change hands very often. In times of leaning and streamlining processes, it may cost the state and others, such as contract operators, more than is collected. The Large public water systems present during this discussion want a good faith effort, by the DPH, to include the TNCs.
- d) Public water systems questioned the amount of time DPH drinking water staff spend on community, non-transient non-community, and TNC systems and whether the assessment is reflective of that. DPH explained although small systems, NTNCs, TNCs are often mentioned as being problematic and using a lot of drinking water staff time, CWS surveys, project reviews, and general problems are larger in scale and can use a large amount of the most experienced staff. An accurate time/cost breakdown would be extremely difficult to compile due to the varying degree of staff experience and the different responsibilities within the DWS.
- e) Other states charge an assessment/ fees, however there are no good standards as states are structured differently. Items for further discussion include a reporting requirement and how to allow for controlled increases.
- f) A very brief discussion on whether administrative costs could be addressed occurred. Further discussion may be necessary.

**5. Next Steps**

- a) 30-day public comment period will take place in December.
- b) Next meeting to convene October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2 pm at the DPH Laboratory