



WATER MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 25, 2001

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Janet Bowers	Chester County Water Resources Authority
William Gast	Pennsylvania DEP
Stewart Lovell	Delaware DNREC
Dr. Bruno Mercuri	Mercuri & Associates, Inc.
John Mello	U.S. EPA, Region II
David Milan	Superior Water Company
Mike Bleicher	(for Joseph Miri) New Jersey DEP
Bob Molzahn	Water Resources Association
Frank Schaefer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ronald Sloto	U.S. Geological Survey
Ferdows Ali	(for Sam Race) New Jersey Dept. of Agriculture

OTHER ATTENDEES

Scott Liard	URS Corporation
Eric Grindrod	Spotts, Stevens & McCoy
Rick Wroblewski	ERM
Debbie Lord	Pompeston Creek Watershed Association
Henry He	ERM

DRBC STAFF PRESENT

Lance Miller	Head, Planning and Implementation Branch
David Sayers	Planning and Implementation Branch
Jon Zangwill	Planning and Implementation Branch

Call to order

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Mercuri at 9:30 a.m.

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting (Miller)

The minutes from July 10 meeting were reviewed. The attendance list was amended to reflect the presence of Bob Molzhan and other minor changes were recommended. The minutes were accepted with the minor changes.

2. IRP Guidance Document (Attachment 1) (Bowers)

Janet Bowers gave a brief synopsis to date of the IRP Guidance Document, which included:

- The IRP Subcommittee met on August 23, and reviewed comments given at the July 10 meeting and those received since that date by email. At the meeting a consensus was reached, with a few minor additional amendments approved via email after the subcommittee meeting.
- A recommendation was made to the full Committee for approval of the IRP Guidance Document with the next step being DRBC presenting it to the Commissioners for their approval.
- Janet Bowers made a motion to accept the IRP Guidance. William Gast seconded the motion. Motion carried. The IRP Guidance Document will be presented at the next Commission Meeting on October 31, 2001, for their consideration and adoption as formal guidelines.
- Appreciation was given to Janet Bowers, the IRP Subcommittee, the Water Management Advisory Committee, and DRBC for their efforts/work on the IRP Guidance Document.

3. Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) Program- Determining the Role for the DRBC (Attachment 2) (Sayers/Miller)

David Sayers presented an outline of the (SWAP) program, questioning "How does the Committee see DRBC playing a role in the process?" Whilst the SWAP program is a federal requirement, it is voluntary for communities to use the information provided by the SWAP program for making watersheds protection plans.

Invitations to DRBC are being received, principally from Pennsylvania and New Jersey, to participate in their SWAP programs. DRBC must keep in mind staff availability and be clear on the role it will take.

Mike Bleicher commented that the SWAP program falls under the Safe Drinking Water program in New Jersey, and Mike asked Sandy Krietzman for any input for this meeting. Sandy suggested that since the program involves public participation and is voluntary, it would be beneficial to try and put something on the DRBC Web Page, providing both information and awareness to the public. Mike also reported on who is responsible for New Jersey well head protection area delineations, as well as the process an applicant can pursue regarding those delineations.

David Sayers reported that DRBC involvement so far with SWAP has been limited to attending various meetings involving the assessment part of the program (currently underway), but there is a 'missing link' to how this will evolve into community-developed protection plans.

The Committee posed several questions that could not be answered by those present. These questions related to data requirements, how comprehensive the susceptibility analysis needs to be and if consideration is given to pollutants already within the delineated (groundwater) zones. Consensus of the Committee was to have more information in order to have a knowledgeable discussion on helping decide what is an appropriate role for DRBC to take. Janet Bowers recommended inviting representatives from both states to a Committee meeting to discuss what kind of assistance is needed in their SWAP programs. It was agreed that representatives for the SWAP programs would be contacted with the possibility that they will present at the next Committee meeting. A suggestion given by Lance Miller was for DRBC to convene a meeting with the

two SWAP Programs in the two states, and then report back to this Committee. Lance discussed the next phase (after assessment) which is how to use the information - this may be the point at which the DRBC can play a key role.

Stewart Lovell was asked to explain the SWAP Program in Delaware. The Christina Basin is being assessed on a watershed basis in coordination with watershed groups. This program is fully up and running. In Delaware, state law requires municipalities of a certain population to adopt assessment plans. According to Stewart Lovell, technical documents are in place for delineation and he will share these documents with DRBC, to assist them in to better understand this program. Surface water assessments are not yet completed.

Lance Miller noted that DRBC will get source water assessment protocols/methodologies from the four states for both ground and surface water. These will be distributed to the members of the Committee. It was also the opinion of the Committee, to have all four states report this information at future Water Management Advisory Committee Meetings. Also, a link on the DRBC website to the State Web Pages regarding SWAP issues was recommended.

BREAK 11:15 a.m.

4. Comprehensive Plan - Goals Document and Update on Progress (Attachment 3) (Miller)

A meeting was held on July 24, 2001 at which the Goals Document was presented to and reviewed by the council. Breakout groups were formed that worked on each of the key result areas (editing/filling in blanks etc). The full document was then sent back out to the council for its review (mid August - Sept. 10), giving them an opportunity to provide written comments. No significant changes were necessary. On Monday October 1st discussion will include how the Council feels about the document and if it is ready to go out for public comment at this stage.

DRBC is trying to reach the point where they can give these goals and objectives to the Commissioners to get them to modify/accept them to start the work of the Comprehensive Plan and developing management strategies to achieve the goals and objectives.

The Advisory Committees are going to be responsible for developing management strategies. The Steering Committee of the Watershed Advisory Council developed a proposal, which was sent to Advisory Committee Chairs asking for their opinion as to which Advisory Committees they think should be the lead entity for a particular goal.

Lance Miller then reviewed the key result areas stating assignment by the Steering Committee to this Committee (noting support from the Flow Management Committee on certain key result areas). The committee(s) that will be given the responsibilities for developing management strategies for the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan was presented. It was noted that recent completion of the IRP by this Committee would also be an asset.

In order to support the development of management strategies for The Comprehensive Planning effort by the Advisory Committees, DRBC will engage the services of GSA (explanation given of the GSA process). Then the following would take place:

- Once an Advisory Committee is assigned their goals and objectives, they would meet, discuss, and decide what type of management strategies they would want to see for a particular goal and its objective (DRBC staff would be available to work with the committees in outlining this)
- DRBC would then turn this information into a statement of work, and then have this work reviewed by the either the chair, a subgroup of the committee, or the whole committee
- DRBC would then submit and then acquire a consultant to actually draft the management strategies
- DRBC would have to develop and provide a format for management strategies to the consultants, to

ensure consistency when they are compiled into the Comprehensive Plan

- The consultants would then produce a strategy that the responsible committee(s) would review. If additional work is required from the consultant(s), DRBC would send back the strategies to them, or if it is something DRBC can change then staff would be available.
- Timeframes for the process for developing the Comprehensive Plan were presented, with final Council action in December 2003, the end result being the final Comprehensive Plan that DRBC will recommend to the Commissioners.
- Lance Miller noted that DRBC Staff would also be available to develop management strategies, if that is what the Committee wants.

LUNCH (12:00 - 12:45)

The following was discussed during the review of the goal assignments for the Water Management Advisory Committee:

- Committee members were asked for their opinions on their goal assignments
- Committee members noted agreement when/where an ad hoc committee would be necessary.
- Involvement of different committees coming together to work on specific goals and involvement of those who would have the most expertise in those areas
- The need for various ad hoc committees with the involvement of members of the various advisory committee(s) and/or subcommittee(s)
- Ad hoc advisory committee(s) would be created by the Commissioners for the specific purposes of developing strategies for a particular goal(s) that would go back to the Commissioners and the Council
- Ground rules should include lead responsibility (who will present it to the Commissioners)
- The need for voting resolutions involving a Committee and/or a subcommittee was discussed

5. (1:30-2:15) Retail Water Pricing to Encourage Conservation (Resolution 99-2) - Assessing the Effectiveness. (Attachment 4) (Sayers)

- David Sayers explained the history of the resolution which requires that purveyors supplying over 1mgd have a conservation tariff in place or undertake a feasibility study to look at the impact of implementing one.
- David Sayers pointed out that the main weakness of the resolution in its current form is that it stops short of requiring the purveyor to implement a conservation rate even if the results of the study are favorable.
- The resolution also states that annually the Executive Director shall review the effectiveness of the retail water pricing activities to determine the accuracy in promoting and supporting water pricing that encourages water conservation. This appears never to have been undertaken.
- David Sayers reviewed the feasibility studies done in the past, which indicated that the quality of the studies has been variable and that the resolution has not been particularly effective at promoting water conservation pricing. DRBC believes that this is the first analysis that has probably been done under their resolution.

The Committee was asked to look at this resolution and make any recommendations to the Commission.

Lance Miller suggested that in future when the analysis is done, it will be reviewed and critiqued by DRBC and sent back to the purveyor if necessary. Submission of a study should not automatically result in approval. The study needs to be evaluated. Jan Bowers questioned how this has been done in the past. It is not clear how DRBC staff has done this in the past as no guidelines exist and staff likely to have been involved in evaluations are no longer with DRBC.

Lance Miller recommended to have Project Review Branch at the next meeting to discuss their role in

Resolution 99-2. David Sayers will do more research and report back to this Committee at the next meeting.

Bill Gast stated if this Committee is planning on having further discussions and deliberations on Resolution 99-2, it would be beneficial to have an understanding from a few water suppliers of why they did or more importantly did not implement conservation rates.

If the Committee thinks that it is appropriate to consider changes to this resolution, then it would be appropriate to hear from the purveyors before we make any changes.

Consensus by the Committee was given for having this topic on the next meeting agenda.

6. Other Business and Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Water Management Advisory Committee will be held on December 3, 2001.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Questions?



[David Sayers](mailto:dsayers@drbc.state.nj.us), DRBC Water Resources Analyst, ext. 236

[Hydrologic Info](#) | [News Releases](#) | [Next DRBC Meeting](#) | [Other Meetings](#) | [Publications](#) | [Basin Facts](#) | [Contact Info](#) | [Your Comments Welcomed](#)

Commission Member Links: [Delaware](#) | [New Jersey](#) | [Pennsylvania](#) | [New York](#) | [United States](#) |



[DRBC Home Page](#)

P.O. BOX 7360, West Trenton, NJ 08628-0360

● *Voice (609) 883 - 9500* ● *FAX (609) 883 - 9522*



[*croberts@drbc.state.nj.us*](mailto:croberts@drbc.state.nj.us)